

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick</b>	<p>Comment – Escrick is a Designated Service Village (DSV) in the Selby Core Strategy Local Plan (Policy SP2). Selby District Council envisages, in principle, that some development may be appropriate in Escrick to meet part of the District’s objectively assessed housing need. However in Selby District, Escrick is constrained by the defined York Green Belt. In York’s area, Escrick is constrained by the Draft Green Belt. Selby is considering a review of the Green Belt and this may be done in advance of any allocations in order to ensure any allocation is appropriate in terms of the Green Belt. Any proposals for additional growth needs to be thoroughly jointly assessed to ensure that these numbers are proportionate, reasonable, and the village and its services can cope with such a level of growth. There is currently a Legal Challenge to the District’s Core Strategy concerning the designation of Escrick as a DSV. It may be a high risk strategy to rely on Escrick’s current DSV status to propose sites for residential development as this status may change following the result of this challenge. SDC would welcome further discussion to clarify a number of matters, therefore Selby District Council is not objecting to this site, but is reserving its position pending further information and discussion.</p>	9/18557	Selby District Council
	<p>Comment – whilst the proposed site allocations lie in the City of York’s administrative area, they lie to the immediate north of Escrick village which falls within the Selby District. To all intents and purposes the allocation would act as an extension to the village. The Selby District Council Local Plan Core Strategy defines Escrick as a Designated Service Village, where limited development (up to 100 homes across the plan period) could contribute towards meeting Selby District’s needs and demand for new homes. A development of the scale supported by Site Reference 183 has the potential to change the nature of Escrick village, and its role as a Designated Service Village within Selby District’s settlement hierarchy. It is not clear how the proposed allocations are intended to relate to the policy context for Escrick as defined within the Selby Core Strategy. It is therefore imperative that before these two proposed site allocations are confirmed, that there is clarity and agreement with Selby District Council through appropriate cross-boundary discussions as to how the proposed allocation at Escrick is to relate to the village’s Designated Service Village status and role within the Selby Local Plan Core Strategy. These discussions and agreement should include whether it is intended that the allocations are to help meet some of Selby’s housing needs within the locality. The County Council strongly urges the City to have full regard to the representations that Selby District Council makes in relation to this matter. From a Highways and Transportation perspective, the County Council in its capacity as the</p>	11/26156	North Yorkshire County Council

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Local Highways Authority will respond in detail to this consultation separately. Detailed comments provided, see response.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection - through undertaking a full and meaningful public consultation exercise with residents, Escrick Parish Council has been given clear mandate to object to the proposal by York to allocate the proposed strategic and safeguarded land. Opposed to the scale of development, on access, highways, drainage and flooding grounds, as well as the capacity of local infrastructure. Detailed comments provided, see response.	18/18895	Escrick Parish Council
	Objection – loss of agricultural land 3ha. Should be deleted, as any development would be unsustainable and prejudice the setting of the village.	45/18783	York Environmental Forum
	Support – Council is generally in favour of the proposals, but has a number of concerns which should be addressed before plans are finalised and development commences. Concerns to be addressed include the junction from Mine Road to A19, hazardous junctions turning right onto the Mine Road when travelling northbound on the A19 and similarly vehicles exiting the Mine Road to turn right heading to York. Parish Council believes that a roundabout at this junction would significantly improve safety, along with a pedestrian (pelican) crossing near the bus stop on the A19 in Deighton village, to improve safety for those travelling on foot. We would like to request that the Highways Department look into the issue of safety in light of the Parish Council's concerns. Concern regarding use of good agricultural land – need to consider environmental impact upon future generations. Council believes that Peel Environmental, just a short distance down the road, could reasonable export some energy to the site to provide a much more environmentally friendly solution than the suggested bank of photovoltaic panels on nearby fields. District heating has been shown to work in many areas.	58/18841	Deighton Parish Council
	Objection - in his report, the Inspector of the York Green Belt Local Plan stated that the relationship of York to its surrounding settlements is one of the elements which contribute to the special character of the City. This relationship relates to not simply the distance between the settlements but also the size of the villages themselves, and the fact that they are freestanding, clearly definable settlements. The eventual development of this site would reduce the separation between Escrick and Deighton to just 425m. Overall, English Heritage consider that the safeguarding and development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the City and, therefore, would conflict with the saved policies of the RSS and national planning policy.	238/18171	English Heritage
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20533	
Objection – against the addition of new sites “safeguarded” for long term future development. Over development of the villages, leading to loss of character, pressure on	995/20554		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the small primary schools and increased traffic on small country lanes.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – amount of land proposed for housing in York is unrealistically high. This site is particularly unsustainable, as the A19 through Fulford has insufficient capacity to cope with peak traffic and without any development commencing yet at Germany Beck the traffic is tailed back at times in the morning to Fulford Interchange and in the evening to the Inner Ring Road at Fawcett Street. There can be no measure appropriate to achieve increased traffic flow through Fulford. The two proposals for Escrick should be refused.	1050/19179	
	Comment – due to the size or location of this safeguarded land it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and would be of interest to the Agency. The Agency has not made any assessment of the potential impact of this, together with other sites, at this stage. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from CYC before proceeding with the mesoscopic modelling exercise to assess the cumulative impact of local plan development on the SRN.	1264/18592	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	Objection – not clear whether the residents of Escrick have been consulted, since the majority of them reside outside the City of York boundaries. From recent emails received from residents and Parish Councillors in Escrick, do not believe this to be the case. Urge the Council not to progress this proposal until it is satisfied that a thorough and active consultation with the community has taken place. Proposal should not be considered in isolation. Its potential impact on traffic levels on the already congested A19 must be considered alongside potential impact of the ‘safeguarded’ land directly to the north and the impact of 5000 new homes at Whinthorpe. No explanation given as to how increased vehicle movements will be tackled. No indication given as to how Council will obtain the already much needed investment to upgrade the A19 to cope with current traffic levels, let alone the additional vehicles that will come in the future.	1355/18626	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to robust town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17930	
	Comment – landscaping is required to maintain the area.	2765/206020	
	Objection – see survey 4. Roads are too congested already – without further building, especially A19 Selby-York Road	3864/27311	
	Objection- opposed to the proposal to build hundreds of houses in the green belt around Deighton/Escrick.	9310/18391	
	Objection – need new housing and if that is to be, this is the best site however with only 370 houses in Escrick, another 150 is maximum and developers should be	9512/18677	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	responsible for the cost of all infrastructure. There is no need for a major development. Traffic is already at gridlock and it already takes three quarters of an hour to get to York at peak times. Germany Beck and Whinthorpe will make this worse plus the new Selby Developments. There will also be a substantial impact on amenities: school, shops and surgery. Housing within York, but really an 'Escrick Problem' which may be worsened by planned development in Selby.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – believe that this development should only allow 50-100 homes maximum due to the pressures that it would put on village infrastructure and that changes to the nature of the village would be too detrimental if it exceeded a growth of 30%. The proposal for 250+ homes would add about 70% plus to existing 370 households. Believe that this development should not go ahead if any part of the proposed 2 developments (to the south east of the village and the to the west) by Selby District take place. Selby and York need to demonstrably cooperate on proposals for Escrick as it rests on the boundary between the two districts, so any development should be a controlled total, not a disproportionate increase due to the developments proceeding in isolation.	9520/18700	
	Objection – have all brownfield sites been used before encroaching on good arable land. A19 already overburdened and queues into York can reach through Escrick in the mornings. Schools and surgery already oversubscribed. Sewage and drainage issues. Can more use be made of the infrastructure at North Selby Mine instead of encroaching on arable land.	9535/19269	
	Objection – A19 is busy and hazardous to pedestrians. This and other developments would mean an additional 5,000 vehicles travelling through Escrick and additional HGVs from the Anaerobic Digester Facility. Villagers will have more difficulty getting on to the A19, as well as pollution concerns. Amenities of the village would have to be expanded. Children walking to school could be at risk from increased traffic. Catchment areas for the Fulford school would be affected. The existing village of Escrick is within Selby District Council area, whilst the proposed new housing would be in York CC area. This could cause the village to be divided and not work as a community, which is essential for village life. Any new development proposals should take into consideration the size of the existing village and its amenities, particularly if built on green belt land.	9564/19087	
	Objection – the proposed development will increase the village by two thirds which is outrageous since there is no infrastructure to carry anything of this scale. The school and medical facilities will be inundated and will not be able to cope. Such influxes will also create traffic chaos and possible gridlock (due to Germany Beck and Whinthorpe developments, and also the anaerobic digester facility and new houses to the south from	9673/21953	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Selby).		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – the A19 between Escrick and York is already congested and with the development at Germany Beck, travel into York and vice versa would be more difficult. The proposal to build 150 houses outside the village boundary would mean 25% of the village would be controlled by York and 75% controlled by Selby. Different rate conditions would apply. Schooling – Escrick catchment area means children can go to Fulford. Would these arrangements still apply? Sewage and bin collection would be completed by two Councils? Before any development takes place, the boundary line must be made clear and what ever is decided residents must have a vote. A small development of say 25 houses would be accepted provided that there is a need which has yet to be established.</p>	9674/20143	Escrick Village Support Group
	<p>Objection – anaerobic digester facility near this site will increase our traffic to a totally unacceptable level.</p>	9675/19508	
	<p>Objection – traffic on A19 a problem especially peak times. Already development in Selby at Olympia and Staynor Hall will make it worse. The anaerobic digester works will also make more traffic. Selby has plans for development for Escrick so that is enough.</p>	9676/19510	
	<p>Objection – opposed to further development in Escrick. Development over the past 20 years has been absorbed back into the village, but the infrastructure has not been upgraded in this time. New development should give serious consideration to: traffic, in and around the village, widening the A19 or providing a new bypass to take traffic away from residential areas; Flooding, since the pumps were installed at Cawood on the Ouse, the area in and around the village has not flooded. However, there is an ever increasing risk of Flooding and Escrick is particularly low lying; drainage has not been upgraded even with recent new development in the village; provision of school places and consequent movement of school children to schools in other areas outside the village; implications of the proposed biodigester on New Lane which will affect Escrick as well as Wheldrake; provision of additional health services, recreational facilities etc and need of residents, large houses or smaller homes for the growing number of people to live on their own. Consultations should be between York CC and Selby DC as Escrick PC to discuss the provision of dwellings for individuals and families, and also bearing in mind the large number of proposed dwellings on A19 on outskirts of Selby. What additional jobs are there to cover the large amount of extra dwellings.</p>	9677/18498	
	<p>Objection – any new development in Escrick should be on a far lesser scale and within Selby District General boundaries to ensure the community cohesion and inclusiveness continues in the village.</p>	9678/19512	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – it would be an appendage to Escrick, yet under a different authority, and as such would only harm and complicate the present ambience of the village. It would overload present services and destroy the present balance achieved between rural and village community. There is no need to build this number of houses, especially on agricultural land, which presently produces food. Recent surveys show that we will be struggling to produce enough crops to feed ourselves in years to come. Existing services will be inadequate to cope with it and it will affect the present catchment area of schools. Who would finance all the additional services necessary. The A19 is already under great strain – it will result in thousands more cars and lorries using the road.	9682/22471	
	Objection- the extra housing will increase the traffic on the A19, which is already difficult and is going to be worse anyway because of York’s decision for the anaerobic digester. Traffic to York from elsewhere should be directed along York West instead of A19 except of course for Selby	9691/19524	
	Objection – the A19 can’t cope now with the level of traffic passing through Escrick. School children and pedestrian walking along the pavement everyday are in danger of this high speed traffic going well above the speed limit. The proposed development will also load a minimum of an extra 100 – 500 vehicles passing the village each day. The Local Schools are already limited to the amount of pupils they can accept each year, and I believe there is already a lengthy waiting list. Any of the proposed sites would be a disaster I believe that any of the proposed sites would be a disaster to Escrick for the following reasons: A19 – far too busy now and congested; schools couldn’t cope and village and community feeling will diminish	9695/20145	
	Objection – opposed to the proposals to develop farmland site 183 for housing. Escrick would become a divided community with residents in the new housing. It is potentially not a harmonious prospect. No reported discussion to date on the proposal between York City Council and Selby District Council representing Escrick village. Medical facilities, the infants’ and juniors’ school and, possible the sewage works, would be inadequate for the proposed enlarged population. Traffic on the A19 – Road is already highly congested with still more traffic to be added in the near future from the approved developments at Germany Beck and the anaerobic digester at the north Selby mine sites. Children in danger – A19 would be dangerous for children walking to school.	9699/20148	
	Objection –will put unacceptable strain on the social and commercial facilities in the village maintained by Selby District Council. The inevitable increase in traffic in and around the village would greatly aggravate what is already an intolerable load on the A19. Pedestrians already face great risk when trying to cross to the surgery, the	9702/20148	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pharmacy and the church, as well as the only bus stop.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – A19 Infrastructure, concerned about impact of another major development. Already, Germany Beck, Whinthorpe Village, North Selby Mine and Anaerobic Facility – these will put an extra pressure on an already busy road. Few/ small amenities would not be able to cope. It would not be safe for children to walk back down A19 to school. Green Belt Land currently home to much wildlife including Barn Owls, which have been spotted around the village on this land.	9722/22477	
	Objection – immediate plan would add 128 houses to Escrick which is equal to an increase of half to existing village. Selby also has plans to add to this village – this would change the village completely and have a massive impact on traffic, services etc/ Danger of Escrick merging into Deighton would also cause an odd situation regarding the village (being part York and part Selby). Planning to build houses on Green Belt land on York’s boundary appears cynical and opportunistic. That we have only just heard of this plan beggars belief.	9723/20191	
	Objection – opposed to the development as there is no need for this volume of houses in this rural area, prime agricultural land will be lost to this proposed development, the proposed development will have access to the A19 via a road that has been earmarked to carry up to 70-80 and existing services in Escrick village are not sufficient to cope with the proposed development. Will York City Council provide the finances to upgrade these services.	9724/20193	
	Objection – York has already proposed in excess of 20,000 new homes in the area. Escrick is not in York City Council and is, in fact, just outside the extreme boundary. Economic expansion and employment in North Yorkshire is not growing at a rate to warrant this. Most major employers in York are downsizing. Employment in Leeds is growing but not at a rate requiring growth in the commuter belt. A number of proposed developments will impact the main arterial road network within a 10 mile radius of Escrick village. All of these are likely to proceed in broadly similar timescales to the local housing proposal under discussion. The A19 will become a major bottleneck as the impact of the following developments takes hold: Germany Beck, Whinthorpe, Anaerobic Digester, Selby Area Housing Developments, Escrick. The environmental impact of these new large volumes of traffic could be significant. The school would need to be expanded, children could have to go to a different school, children walking to school could be at risk from greater levels of traffic on the A19, the future catchment of Fulford School could be affected. The amenities in the village e.g. Shop, Post Office, Surgery, Village Hall are not of a standard to deal with so many new houses. The fact that the new housing would be	9736/19545	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	in York CC and the existing village is within Selby District Council, could affect community cohesion. The feel of the village could change dramatically as the community is divided by the new developments which would feel like an appendage to our community.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – there should not be the need for this development, population growth of 0.7% should be capable of being met from brownfield sites. Development will add further traffic congestion. Will overload the village of Escrick’s infrastructure. It is an imposition by York on Escrick, unwanted or needed and lacks any community cohesion with Selby District Council. Likely to mean that Fulford School will no longer be able to accommodate Escrick children which will undermine the attractiveness of the village.	9741/19551	
	Objection – there is no need for any further housing in Escrick and the proposed site is immediately next to Selby District Council boundary, which will create a split village. North Yorkshire and York are not growing at a rate to warrant this. The public sector, Aviva, Network Rail are all downsizing. Concern regarding traffic, the A19 is already overcrowded and is becoming a major bottleneck and more vehicles from Escrick will further increase this. Concern regarding amenities. Brownfield sites should be used first.	9746/20205	
	Objection – York has already proposed in excess of 20,000 new homes in its area within 2013 Local Plan. Economic expansion within the area is not growing at a rate to warrant and there will not be enough employment opportunities within the area. There will be an impact on the main arterial road network which will affect Escrick directly. There will be an impact on amenities and services including the need for a larger school, children will be at risk walking to school, the amenities in the village would not be capable of coping with such large increase in housing.	9753/22956	
	Objection – proposals to develop land north of Escrick are misguided for several reasons. Understand that York City Council is required to exhaust existing brownfield sites for development prior to embarking upon schemes in other areas, particularly green belt areas. It does not make sense to develop land on the south side of York from which the access into the city is via A19. Surely the focus should be on land on other arterial roads served by the improved park and ride sites. The A19 in Escrick is already extremely busy and there are frequent accidents/near misses. The proposed developments would add significantly to these dangers. The A19 is very busy to cross for pedestrians and would become busier. Escrick CE Primary School would not be able to cope with the influx of pupils. The doctor’s surgery is not designed to serve a village of the projected size. It makes sense for York City Council to develop housing in areas that are not on the absolute fringe of its boundaries. It is damaging for the village to be split between two	9785/20243	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	local authorities, with neighbours receiving different services and paying different rates of council tax.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – further development in this area will cause excessive traffic build up and delays leading to gridlock on the A19. These proposed developments will have a deleterious effect, impacting local amenities and services, such as school, shop, post office, surgery and Fulford School catchment area and affect the nature of Escrick village.	9795/20260	
	Objection - opposed to the allocation of this site. It is village is primarily in Selby authority and is an unsustainable location to meet York's needs. It is greenbelt land. The proposal is too large and will put too much strain on the village infrastructure. The proposal is some distance from the centre of the village and amenities. The site will be near the proposed anaerobic digester and will be subject to noise and odour pollution. This site has been previously rejected for development. Access is questionable and there is no provision for pedestrians or cyclists. Community consultation of whole village undertaken by Escrick Parish Council showed that many residents supported some additional housing but it was emphasised by most that the quantity of houses developed should be appropriate to the size of the current village and the level of service. Detailed comments provided, see response.	9800/26349	
	Objection - Escrick is not within the York County Council boundaries. Most major employers in York, i.e. Public sector, Aviva and network rail, are downsizing. Employment in Leeds is growing but not at a rate requiring growth in the commuter belt. The proposed development will impact the main arterial road network within a 10 mile radius of Escrick village. The A19 will become a major bottleneck. The environmental impact of these large numbers of vehicles would be significant. Getting out of the village onto the A19 is bad enough already. The village school would need to be extended and other amenities in the village, i.e. the shop, the post office, doctor's surgery, would not be able to cope. The feel of the village would change dramatically as the community is divided by the new developments which would feel like an 'appendage' to the existing community.	9855/20289	
	Objection – no need for a major development due to current economic and population growth. Grid locked roads. Increase of local pollution and risk of accidents. Negative impact on local amenities, service and community.	9869/22962	
	Objection- scale of proposed development is significant and will impact adversely on traffic flow on the A19. No justification for a development of this size- York's population growth was under 10% over the last 10 years, yet this proposal is looking to add around	9891/20305	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	50% to the village housing stock. Escrick school and surgery will not be able to cope with such a development in the short term. The proposed development will have no road connection with Escrick and looks as though it will in effect be separate but at the same time causing traffic issues and putting pressure on local services.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection- scale of proposed development is significant and will impact adversely on traffic flow on the A19. No justification of a development of this size- York's population growth was under 10% over the last 10 years, yet this proposal is looking to add around 50% to the village housing stock. Escrick school and surgery will not be able to cope with such a development in the short term. The proposed development will have no road connection with Escrick and looks as though it will in effect be separate but at the same time causing traffic issues and putting pressure on local services.	9903/20308	
	Objection – the proposed development will increase the village by two thirds which is outrageous since there is no infrastructure to carry anything of this scale. The school and medical facilities will be inundated and will not be able to cope. Such influxes will also create traffic chaos and possible gridlock (due to Germany Beck and Whinthorpe developments, and also the anaerobic digester facility and new houses to the south from Selby).	9995/21956	
	Objection - opposed to the allocation of this site. It is village is primarily in Selby authority and is an unsustainable location to meet York's needs. It is greenbelt land. The proposal is too large and will put too much strain on the village infrastructure. The proposal is some distance from the centre of the village and amenities. The site will be near the proposed anaerobic digester and will be subject to noise and odour pollution. This site has been previously rejected for development. Access is questionable and there is no provision for pedestrians or cyclists. Community consultation of whole village undertaken by Escrick Parish Council showed that many residents supported some additional housing but it was emphasised by most that the quantity of houses developed should be appropriate to the size of the current village and the level of service. Detailed comments provided, see response.	10005/26158	Dower Chase and Dower Park Residents Group
	Objection – York has already proposed in excess of 20,000 new homes in its area within 2013 Local Plan. Economic expansion within the area is not growing at a rate to warrant and there will not be enough employment opportunities within the area. There is no need to increase the size of the village by over 50%. There will be a likelihood of causing crisis for the provision of local services and infrastructure. There will be an impact on the main arterial road network which will affect Escrick directly. There also will be an impact on amenities and services including the need for a larger school, children will be at risk	10118/22958	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	walking to school, the amenities in the village would not be capable of coping with such large increase in housing.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection- it is necessary to keep a balance and sense of proportion in dealing with problems in order not to create further problems. Question whether development in the farmland in Escrick would show positive benefit in relation to the costs of potential negative infrastructure effects. Concern Escrick primary school could not cope and access to places at Fulford school. Concern over healthcare facilities and amenities that would need to be expanded. Concern regarding transport infrastructure effects of such development when traffic conditions on the A19 are already bad. More work needed on what other works need undertaking as precursors of such development.	10191/19107	
	Objection – strongly object to proposals to build on land to north of Escrick. The village is within Selby District Council and is already expected to expand within Selby’s Local Plan – cannot see why there should be pressure from two councils to increase housing within one village. Such a huge increase could double the size of the village and the existing amenities and services (i.e. school, surgery, shop) would not be able to cope. Traffic on the A19 is already very nearly gridlocked. With new developments planned for Germany Beck and the anaerobic digester at the old mine site, this can only get worse. New housing within City of York Council could never become part of the existing village as it is under a different council. It would end up as a new village tacked on to the original. Green belt – we all need open space.	10192/19402	
	Objection – whilst not opposed to sensible development the plan to build 250 homes seems excessive given that it is proposed to build 20,000 homes in the York area. The development would almost double the size of the village. The existing village is in Selby District Council whilst the new homes would be in York District. Traffic on the A19 is already high and the addition of possibly 350 cars from the new development plus traffic from the proposed anaerobic digester facility, 700 homes at Germany Beck, and Whinthorpe new village near Elvington, could make the A19 more dangerous and virtually inaccessible at peak times. Present amenities in the village are not sufficiently robust to cope with the influx of residents. The school would almost have to double in size and the surgery is already working at full capacity. It seems illogical to build what is in effect a new small village on to an existing one with each being in a different council area. The proposed development would change the whole character of the village to the detriment of the present inhabitants.	10242/22071	
	Objection – economic expansion and employment in North Yorkshire and York is not growing at a rate that requires this influx of housing. The impact of traffic on the A19,	10243/22073	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	which is already busy especially driving into Fulford and York will be a nightmare. The primary school would have to provide new classrooms and assembly hall. There is a safety issue with children walking along busy roads – parents would probably elect to drive the children to school causing parking problems in Carr Lane and Main Street in Escrick. The surgery is working hard to cope with the present demands of patients in Escrick and surrounding villages.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Comment– should ensure infrastructure is in place. Not enough agricultural land. Brownfield sites available. Support if circumstances are met.	10244/21232	
	Objection- the proposed scheme is too big for the village and will destroy the character of the village. Concern regarding the impact the scheme will have on the already overloaded A19, and the impact on the local environment and existing village amenities. Considering the size of the proposal and the fact it is being built on Green Belt land, the level of communication has been poor. Concern that the proposal is from CYC and Escrick is located at the very edge of their administrative boundary gives little confidence views will be taken seriously.	10393/22488	
	Objection – A19 cannot carry more traffic. Escrick residents struggle to enter and leave the village. Houses built at Fulford and Barby, the Anaerobic digester will increase traffic, noise and pollution. Village amenities will need improving. Village will be totally altered. Escrick is Selby District Council the development is York City Council, this would split the village. If houses are built in this area we need a bypass urgently.	10404/22494	
	Objection – the development will change the character of the village and will stretch amenities to bursting point. A burden will be placed on the primary school. It may affect the catchment area of Fulford School. The surgery may not be able to cope. It will increase congestion on the A19. Escrick is Selby District Council. Is it realistic to expect seamless integration of planning, amenities, costs and services if York City Council develop this land. The local plan is misguided.	10408/22501	
	Objection – the development will change the character of the village and will stretch amenities to bursting point. A burden will be placed on the primary school. It may affect the catchment area of Fulford School. The surgery may not be able to cope. It will increase congestion on the A19. Escrick is Selby District Council. Is it realistic to expect seamless integration of planning, amenities, costs and services if City of York Council develop this land. The local plan is misguided.	10409/22503	
	Objection - no need for more houses. Effect on congested traffic.	10417/22511	
Objection – seems totally inappropriate to allow the development of up to 250 homes, increasing the village size by almost 60%, it would change the character of the village	10439/19412		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	entirely. Over the years development has been managed according to the Escrick Park Estate's ethos: in diversification we retain our commitment to conserving our beautiful environment, local community, flora and fauna. The A19 is an extremely busy road, crossing it to get to the doctors surgery, bus stop and church is becoming increasingly difficult and dangerous by foot or car. Further development of Escrick will only increase traffic flow, also taking into account the heavy goods vehicles associated with the anaerobic digester will only increase pollutants and traffic noise further. The openness of the countryside should be preserved and green belt/arable land protected.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – no need for a major development in Escrick. Economic expansion and employment is not growing at a rate to warrant this. Traffic congestion. Environmental impact of these new large volumes of traffic and danger for pedestrians. Full school. Insufficient amenities. Effects in community cohesion.	10523/22709	
	Objection- opposed to the development as it would impact upon amenities and services, especially schools. The feel of the village would change dramatically. There would be impacts on traffic, especially on the A19. The environmental impact of these new large volumes of traffic could be significant.	10525/22711	
	Objection – Escrick is not in York City Council. Economic expansion, employment in N. York's and York is not growing enough to warrant this. Most major employers are downsizing. Employment in Leeds is growing, but not enough to require commuter belt growth around York. Impact of traffic on A19. A number of proposed developments will impact on the road network within 10 mile radius of Escrick. A19 will become a major bottleneck. The school will need to be expanded. Children could be at risk from volume of traffic when walking to school. Local amenities will struggle with increased population. Fulford School catchment area could be affected. New housing proposed is in York City Council yet Escrick is Selby District Council, this could affect community cohesion. The feel of the village could change. The new development feeling like an appendage to the existing community.	10526/22713	
	Objection – seems a very bad idea to build here considering the new Anaerobic Digester facility is going to open just down the road, surely heavy noise and smell pollution. Also the A19 is already very heavily congested during the day, won't more traffic make it exponentially worse. It will change the feel of the countryside village into a more industrial disjointed area and will ruin the exclusivity of the place.	10643/19731	
	Objection – not economically viable due to the slower rate of growth in employment in North Yorkshire. The A19 to the south of York is gridlocked when travelling in and out of York. With additional proposed new houses, 700 at Germany Beck creating	10644/19732	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	approximately 1000 vehicles, 3,500 new houses at Winthorpe village with approx 5000 vehicles, approx 100 vehicles travelling from Selby village new developments. The worst problem is the anaerobic digester facility on the Selby mine site working every day of the year with 40-60 32 tonne trucks travelling along the A19 every day. More houses at Escrick would have a negative impact on the community. Escrick school, the shop, post office, village hall and the surgery are not of adequate size to deal with the new houses. With most of the existing village being Selby council and the new houses proposed are to be in York County Council the community cohesion will be affected and the feeling of the village will change.		
<b>183 Land to the North of Escrick (continued)</b>	Objection – the development will add further traffic congestion to the A19 through Escrick to York. It will overload the village of Escrick and the infrastructure. Fulford school will not longer be able to accommodate Escrick children.	10856/19444	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11203/27239	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11212/27242	
	Support – see survey 3.	11213/27244	
	Objection – see survey 3. Totally opposed to more development on the A19. The A19 already has more traffic on it than it can cope with and there are already daily traffic jams at peak times. Local services could not sustain any further development.	11224/27247	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11319/27282	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11320/27284	
	Objection – see survey 3. There is great concern regarding increased use of the A19, south of York, ie Escrick, North Selby Mine, Germany Beck. The Council seems to plan to make only logical route into York into several miles of stationery traffic.	11321/27287	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11322/27290	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11324/27293	
	Objection – no need for a major development due to current economic and population growth. Grid locked roads. Increase of local pollution and risk of accidents. Negative impact on local amenities, service and community.	11386/22924	
Objection – brownfield sites first. Divisive impact and affect community cohesion. Not enough amenities. Full school and devastating effect upon property values. Gridlock on the road. No demand for homes in rural sites.	11390/22928		
<b>752 East Field, Wheldrake</b>	Objection – loss of agricultural land 5ha	45/18788	York Environment Forum
	Objection – the site has been scored a 'pass' for criteria 4 for 'residential access to services', however local knowledge indicates that this is incorrect. Amended boundary	79/17998	Wheldrake Parish Council

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>contains land that ranges in use from intensive cultivation or grazing, to internationally designated Nature Reserves. The proposed designation of site 752 as 'safeguarded land' is unlikely to be sympathetic to nature conservation objectives, as land immediately to the east of the site is managed in a similar way to Wheldrake Ings and Derwent Valley Reserves and therefore forms an important buffer to the Reserve Areas. Site 752 should remain in the Green Belt as land which has good agricultural value, is outside the natural boundary of the built environment and maintains the quality of the nature reserves to the east. Object to the removal of this land from the draft green belt .Productive agricultural land should not be developed when brown field and lower grade agricultural land is available. The land is outside the natural northern boundary of the village defined by the Wilgesic Beck which flows eastwards towards the River Derwent, water voles are present in the becks and ditches associated with this field. Problems of access have been identified in the appraisal carried out. It is unlikely that the capacity of waste water pumping and treatment will be adequate if proposed site H28 is developed and other infilling takes place. Further expansion of school facilities are likely to be required. Future development of this site would require major infrastructure changes to the village. The condition of some roads serving the village is very poor, additional traffic generated by development will exacerbate existing problems on the A19 and other roads linking to the City. The development will have an adverse effect on local wildlife – barn owls.</p>		
<p><b>752 East Field, Wheldrake (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - the site was one of those specifically considered by the Inspector at the Green Belt Local Plan Inquiry in 1994. He stated that the site is outside the physical and visual framework of the village and therefore not considered that its development could be considered as a rounding off of the village. Such development which would adversely affect the setting of the village and encroach into the open countryside and is contrary to the Green Belt Objectives'. The development of this area seems likely to harm one of the elements which contributes to the special character and setting of York.</p>	<p>238/18173</p>	<p>English Heritage</p>
	<p>Objection – opposed to all sites which are outside the proposed inner boundary of the Green Belt including those which are outside the existing development limits of inset villages (as opposed to proposed development limits for such villages), or are extensions beyond the outer ring road, where the site does not bridge between the existing urban core and an inset village, or is located within a green corridor as identified by the Green Corridors Tech Paper (2011). Location of developments sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS.</p>	<p>544/20495</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban core ie Heworth or Acomb. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.</p>		
<p><b>752 East Field, Wheldrake (continued)</b></p>	<p>Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.</p>	943/20538	
	<p>Objection – against the addition of new sites “safeguarded” for long term future development. Over development of the villages, leading to loss of character, pressure on the small primary schools and increased traffic on small country lanes.</p>	995/20555	
	<p>Objection – Wheldrake has little enough open green areas, unlike other villages we have no village green. Any open space has been built on. Are we now to lose the few green fingers of open countryside that enhance the environment that we have left?</p>	1200/21683	
	<p>Objection – see survey 4</p>	1210/27305	
	<p>Objection – site represents substantial increase to existing footprint of the village and when taken alongside other development proposals in Wheldrake, it will have an obvious impact on its character and setting. There are no indications as to how the existing amenities in Wheldrake will cope with the increased population. Of particular concern is Wheldrake Primary School which is already consistently oversubscribed.</p>	1355/18631	Julian Sturdy MP
	<p>Objection – does not appear to have been subject to proper planning methodology and scrutiny.</p>	2681/17942	
	<p>Objection- the site is green belt land and should continue to be used for food production. The site is very low lying with a large dyke which is necessary to reduce the flood risk for all the surrounding fields. The field immediately flooded in the last winter. Further development would cause major flood risk to the current surrounding homes and the sewerage works in the corner of the proposal. The services in the area are already overloaded. The roads are very busy due to development in Wheldrake and more traffic due to the Elvington Industrial Estate. The local junior school is already full with many</p>	2701/17952	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	parents from Wheldrake already commuting to schools elsewhere.		
<b>752 East Field, Wheldrake (continued)</b>	Objection - see survey 4. The land is green belt and is used for growing crops which should be continued. The area is low lying and has a substantial dyke running on its perimeter which works during heavy rainfall. There is a sewerage works on the edge of the dyke which relies on it to disperse fresh waste water. There are nesting barn owls in the neighbouring field which hunt along the hedgerow- these birds already on their way to extinction. Many other birds use this area as it is close to the Ings which is a bird sanctuary. The primary school is full to capacity and could not cope with more children.	2702/17954	
	Objection – land should retain in agricultural use	2765/20610	
	Objection – see survey 4	3864/27309	
	Objection – see survey 4	3882/27313	
	Objection – see survey 4	3920/27315	
	Objection – if houses were built on this in use farm land it would completely negate the reason for moving to the area. Extra houses would not only affect the nice view out the window but would impact on the whole village's traffic, school places and waste water capacity not to mention the wildlife that lives in the area. The extra noise pollution would be an issue as their company is run from a home office overlooking the field which was a factor in moving to the area. Any development would dramatically degrade the fell of the two quiet cul-de-sacs at this end of Wheldrake.	4086/18005	
	Objection – there does not seem to be a clear justification for yet another large increase in new houses in the village, bearing in mind the original local plan development has already added a significant number. The village is already at full infrastructure capacity for its school, sewage works and roads. The proposal appears to have a housing density of nearly double that in the adjacent estate and indeed the rest of the village. Why does this council believe such huge expansion in housing is needed in York over the forthcoming years, which requires encroachment on greenbelt rather than utilisation of existing brownfield sites.	4197/21718	
	Objection – opposed to the removal of green belt and expansion outside the natural boundary of the village, leading to loss of agricultural land and have negative ecological impact. 100 homes is a large % increase in an overstretched village. Another problem would be how the drainage system would cope. The village school is full. Newcomers have to send their children to schools in neighbouring villages. The village shop has no car park so cars park either side of the road – a safety concern.	5560/20745	
	Objection – removal of green belt would lose good agricultural land. Village already overstretched with its amenities. There are few jobs locally.	5872/20965	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>752 East Field, Wheldrake (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 4. The Local Plan is absurd – with 75 new homes in Wheldrake, this means a possible 75- 150 new children needing schools – where? 150 more cars on the lane to the A19 and then into York. distinct lack of infrastructure to support new homes. Children are already being bussed out of Wheldrake. Can the water treatment and waste be accommodated or will there have to be a new treatment plant as well as new sewerage pipe work. Village amenities will not be able to cope. Growing world population means there will be a need for this prime agricultural land. Why can't empty office blocks be converted into flats and also develop the derelict buildings like Piccadilly.	6209/24062	
	Support – landowner confirms that advanced landscape planting to be agreed with the Council will be carried out should the allocation be confirmed in the adopted Local Plan. Also confirmed that the land owner will support the safeguarded land designation at the Local Plan Examination.	6341/24069	Jennifer Hubbard
	Objection – already housing development planned in the area. Infrastructure needs improving in the area. Development detrimental to the environment.	7624/21088	
	Objection – land would be removed from its current green belt status, another unnecessary loss of our countryside. Wheldrake will change out of all recognition. The natural boundary of Wheldrake to the east side is 'The Beck', that should be the natural limit to the expansion of the village. To expand further Wheldrake will change from village status to urban. There must be plenty of brownfield sites around York for residential building. Would add to an unnatural increase in population, resulting in a strain on the surrounding roads which are already becoming overcrowded with existing traffic. There isn't any cycling infrastructure to York from Wheldrake and the bus service is very infrequent meaning most of the extra journeys will be by car resulting in more pollution and congestion. Understand that the school is at maximum capacity. There is a colony of pipistrell bats, the loss of the field will destroy their natural feeding supply of insects. Access to the site through Derwent Park, Mount Pleasant or through Beck Lane would cause severe disruption to the existing home owners.	9267/17832	
	Objection- the site is inappropriate for safeguarded land due to services that struggle to cope currently. The pumping station struggles already and as such associated litter has been known to flow into the beck. The beck now has no wildlife residing there. Concerns over how gas, electricity and water would be piped to the development. Concerns over access requirements for development o the safeguarded land- many lanes cannot cope with 2 way traffic already. The school is oversubscribed and the village shop already has plenty of cars parked on the main street. Concern over the loss of wildlife currently residing in the area namely barn owl which are protected under the Wildlife and Country	9286/17862	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Act 1981.		
<b>752 East Field, Wheldrake (continued)</b>	Objection – this would remove the land from the greenbelt which lies outside the natural boundary of the village. There would be an increase of approx 750 inhabitants, 25% of the current population. The existing infrastructure and pump station cannot cope with demand. The primary school is at capacity. Access to the site would be through Mount Pleasant which is on a dangerous bend.	9295/18045	
	Objection – greenbelt site which the dikes and ditches are home to water voles. These are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The field is used by hunting barn owls, protected un the 1981 wildlife and countryside act.	9298/18048	
	Objection – this development would erode the greenbelt with development beyond the natural boundary of the village, there are problems with access, the village does not have sufficient supporting infrastructure, and it will put further stress on the condition and capacity of the local road network.	9299/18049	
	Objection – opposed to site 752 being removed from the Green Belt. The local schools, including Fulford School, are already at capacity and will not cope with the extra pupils. The roads around the school are very busy and are likely to become dangerous with an increase in students being dropped off and collected. The proposed site has agricultural value and is used for farming of many different crops, and has recreational value for lots of people who enjoying walking their dogs around the fields. There is loads of wildlife, including bats and barn owls, present at this site. Concerns surrounding Wheldrake becoming one large housing estate.	9385/18147	
	Comment – Wheldrake is a sustainable settlement with the current facilities that it has and this proposal could be accommodated. Would be a perpetuation of the settlement form and character of the village. Concern about the access. Would object strongly to any access from Beck Lane other than to provide emergency access. This access could be unacceptably close to main habitable rooms causing present and future occupiers an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance which would be extremely damaging to residential amenity.	9805/24174	
	Objection – see survey 4. Concerned about the proposals. The school is not taking new pupils, some parents are faced with a drive out of the village each day causing extra congestion. Some houses have 3-4 cars. Very large agricultural vehicles already drive through all the year round.	10004/25944	
	Objection – the proposed increased housing is not proportional with village size, the loss of green belt, lack of proper planning and consultation with the community.	10074/26159	
	Objection – increase in traffic on small roads. Green belt land should be protected. Lack	10507/22684	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of school spaces. Shops and doctors lack capacity to cope.		
<b>752 East Field, Wheldrake (continued)</b>	Objection - insufficient resources to support an increased population. Roads are too small to cope. Green belt land would be impacted. Would reduce quality of life in the village	10510/22689	
	Objection – the expanded site may cause additional through traffic, congestion and noise in the area.	10656/19589	
	Objection – green belt land. Encroachment onto the countryside. Sewerage is at capacity. School cannot expand. Infrastructure is not in place to support the development.	10695/19819	
	Objection – due consideration has not been given to the infrastructure of the village. Roads are very narrow and constantly have to be repaired due to the volume of traffic. The school is already full. There is only one shop.	10762/19996	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot support the expansion. Additional housing will increase existing issues; the school is already full, the sewage system has capacity issues and the main road through the village is congested. There is no acceptable site access. Would change the character of the settlement and expand the village outside of the natural boundary. Green belt land with trees and hedgerows that support wildlife, development of the site would result in environmental damage and significant ecological impact on this site and neighbouring nature reserve at Wheldrake Ings. Should use brownfield sites rather than destroying the greenbelt in established villages.	10763/19997	
	Objection- see survey 4. The village has seen many developments over the last 20 years and neither requires nor can sustain further development. The infrastructure, including access, roads, drainage, school places and village amenities is already overstretched. Further housing development would irrevocably damage the village character in the loss of green space as well as having significant detrimental habitat and ecological impact. Massive impact upon traffic numbers on already congested A19 through Fulford and York. Increased vehicle numbers will inevitably cause gridlock.	10822/21365	
	Objection – village is crowded, the school is over capacity and council recently stopped buses to the area.	10945/21597	
	Objection – see survey 4	11161/27319	
	Objection – see survey 4	11162/27321	
	Objection – see survey 4	11164/27323	
	Objection – see survey 4	11166/27325	
Objection – see survey 4	11167/27327		
Objection – see survey 4	11168/27329		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
752 East Field, Wheldrake (continued)	Objection – see survey 4	11170/27331	
	Objection – see survey 4	11171/27333	
	Objection – see survey 4	11172/27335	
	Objection – see survey 4	11174/27337	
	Objection – see survey 4	11176/27339	
	Objection – see survey 4	11177/27341	
	Objection – see survey 4 – Regarding building of houses at Eastfield, this would mean making Back Lane two way traffic, this would cause all sorts of problems for local people. A footpath crosses this lane for children to get to/from school, making it very dangerous. There are tankers down quite regularly pumping out sewage at the pumping station ie. another danger. Pumping station is already having problems coping with the sewage as the village is getting so much larger. Back Lane is no way wide enough for a two way road. Also, a footpath for children going to and from school	11178/27343	
	Objection – see survey 4	11179/27345	
	Objection – see survey 4	11180/27355	
	Objection – see survey 4	11181/27385	
	Objection – see survey 4	11182/27393	
	Objection – see survey 4	11183/27398	
	Objection – see survey 4	11184/27409	
	Objection – see survey 4	11185/27428	
	Objection – see survey 4	11186/27443	
	Objection – see survey 4	11187/27476	
	Support – see survey 4	11188/27478	
	Objection – see survey 4	11193/27480	
	Objection – see survey 4	11195/27481	
	Objection – see survey 4	11196/27483	
	Support – see survey 4	11197/27485	
Objection – see survey 4	11199/27487		
Objection – see survey 4	11200/27489		
Objection – see survey 4	11201/27491		
Objection – see survey 4. Eastfield Wheldrake – capacity at primary school wouldn't sustain such a large influx of families / travellers in Elvington. Totally against.	11202/27493		
Objection – see survey 4. Very unhappy about the 12.5 acres of land at Eastfield	11204/27496		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	"safeguarding for future development". The village cannot sustain anymore current or long term development.		
<b>752 East Field, Wheldrake (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 4	11205/27497	
	Objection – see survey 4. Wheldrake cannot possibly support an increased population Children had to be sent to Escrick school, 10 years ago. There has been no expansion of the school. Wheldrake is a pleasant rural village . Building plans will ruin the very special nature of the village. Also, the roads are not suitable for yet another increase in population. The local infrastructure is struggling to cope with present levels of population.	11206/27499	
	Support – see survey 4	11214/27501	
	Objection – see survey 4	11221/27503	
	Objection – adjacent to a natural reserve and an established breeding barn owl site. The proposed site is currently in agricultural production and forms part of the overall mosaic of habitats within the Lower Derwent Valley and is regularly used by owls for hunting. The flora and fauna within such designated sites are also dependent upon there being suitable surrounding land as a buffer from potentially damaging activities and to provide the necessary area required by some species to create viable and robust territories. This location is contrary to the Council's own policies regarding the protection of biodiversity.	11255/22857	
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park</b>	Objection – loss of agricultural land 25ha	45/18728	York Environment Forum
	Objection – site is wholly in Green Belt; any development would take away the rural aspect and west of York setting so depreciating the City's heritage and environmental assets; area has a high water table and flooding cannot be ruled out. Recommend that a highway infrastructure/ traffic impact study be carried out before any further development is considered.	71/18974	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – opposed to this proposal as the site is wholly within the draft Green Belt designated area. If there is to be expansion of Northminster Business Park on to green belt believe it would be more sensible to locate it on the site currently designated SF8 thus providing proximity to the new Park and Ride for those employed at and visiting the facility. The site should not extend beyond the current western boundary. Any safeguarded land should be on site ST19.	74/18836	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection – site is wholly in Green Belt; any development would take away the rural aspect and west of York setting so depreciating the City's heritage and environmental assets; area has a high water table and flooding cannot be ruled out. Recommend that a highway infrastructure/ traffic impact study be carried out before any further	78/19012	Upper Poppleton Parish Council

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development is considered. The proposal does not address the necessity for expanded infrastructure encompassing healthcare, education facilities, drainage, sewerage, roads and parking. Very difficult to agree to any development when there is no indication of the financial costs involved. The costs of expanded infrastructure will be considerable for the Council and consequently the tax payer. Does not address the necessity for expanded infrastructure encompassing health care, education facilities, drainage, sewerage, roads and parking. Very difficult to agree to any development when there is no indication of the financial costs involved. The costs will be considerable for City of York Council and consequently the tax payer		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – Northminster Business Park has previously been discretely developed hidden by green screening so that it does not impact adversely on the greenbelt around Poppleton. Any enlargement of the area allocated for business use would reverse this and impact harmfully through the scale of development. Poppleton has taken its share of development. If developed alongside ST19 would increase what is already an expanding unattractive sprawl around the Poppletons, along two key approach roads for York, A59 and A1237.	192/23767	
	Objection - the proposed area of safeguarded land, in addition to site ST19, would increase the size of the Business Park from 10 hectares to some 65 hectares. This large consolidation of development at this location would represent a huge incursion into the open countryside to the north-west of the City which forms part of the rural setting of York. It will also threaten the separation of Northminster Business Park from the village of Knapton which will be just 250m from the southern boundary of this area and Upper Poppleton. Indeed, with the completion of the Park and Ride Site, this would result in development virtually linking the village of Upper Poppleton with Knapton. Overall, English Heritage remain of the opinion that the allocation and development of this area in conjunction with ST19 would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the City and, therefore, would conflict with the saved policies of the RSS and national planning policy.	238/18170	English Heritage
	Objection – opposed to all sites which are outside the proposed inner boundary of the Green Belt including those which are outside the existing development limits of inset villages (as opposed to proposed development limits for such villages), or are extensions beyond the outer ring road, where the site does not bridge between the existing urban core and an inset village, or is located within a green corridor as identified by the Green Corridors Tech Paper (2011). Location of developments sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as	544/20496	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban core ie Heworth or Acomb. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.</p>		
<p><b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b></p>	<p>Support – support proposed safeguarding of land to north of Northminster Business Park. There is substantial current demand from existing occupiers for expansion space. It is anticipated that this area can supply employment land for the next 5 years with take-up rates of between 1 and 3 acres per annum based on the present building densities on The Park. The internal site infrastructure (including utilities and drainage) is already in place to allow employment land delivery immediately upon allocation. The Park works alongside the Park &amp; Ride on Northfield Lane and there is a train station at Poppleton, and direct link to the cycle network. All surface and foul water run-off is privately managed on site and controlled at agreed rates with both Internal Drainage Board and Yorkshire Water. Detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	<p>866/19481</p>	<p>Northminster Limited</p>
	<p>Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.</p>	<p>943/20532</p>	
	<p>Support – see survey 13.</p>	<p>956/26172</p>	
	<p>Objection – green Belt will be lost forever, a precious commodity which cannot be regained when lost and urban creep will take its place. Where are all the jobs for people. Schools/drainage sewage systems/NHS and Doctors will be overloaded. Potentially 4000 more cars on the A59 and Ring Road in an area where there is already far too much traffic. More air pollution. Inadequate infrastructure makes this development unsuitable. Do we need 4000+ people on the outskirts of the village? Has this need been estimated on factual evidence. This development will spoil the character of the quaint, unique, historic York that visitors come to see. If they want a modern sprawling city they go to Leeds. It is easier for developers to build on green belt than tackle brownfield sites but we should</p>	<p>1217/20566</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	ensure that the brownfield sites are used first to enhance the existing environment instead of wasting our green fields. Food production on the green belt is important. Preserve the individual and unique character of York which is attractive to visitors and investors.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – overall footprint of the proposed Business Park does not appear to have changed dramatically, if at all, however much more of the land has been changed from ‘safeguarded’ land to land for employment use within the Plan period. It is not clear why this has been recommended and what its implications are for the remaining piece of ‘safeguarded’ land. This proposed development is very close to the ring road and will very likely contribute to the growing congestion issues on the A1237. If it is pursued without any guaranteed investment in upgrading the ring road the business park will follow in the footsteps of much of the office space on Clifton Moor and be vacant and underutilised, with congestion persuading many employers to seek alternative premises.	1355/18625	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – Northminster is not an appropriate location to meet business needs. Fails to meet NPPF requirements.	1512/20579	Tangent Properties
	Objection – see survey 13.	1582/26176	
	Objection – see survey 13.	2009/26184	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to proper town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17920	
	Objection – land should retain agricultural use	2765/20615	
	Objection – see survey 13.	2874/26195	
	Objection – strongly oppose the current local plan, with particular reference to the proposed developments on the west side of York, mainly around the A59 and Boroughbridge Road. The infrastructure, including schools, highways and local amenities within the area is currently grossly oversubscribed and will only worsen should further development occur – unless there are plans to enhance the existing facilities.	2882/20623	
	Objection – the area will no longer be a village, just an extension of Boroughbridge road. This proposal will increase traffic and no longer be safe.	2888/23834	
	Objection – roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable. The area around Northminster Business Park, Northfield Lane, the existing industrial unit and the new A59 Park and Ride already impact on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the government (regional special strategies Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion will further erode the green belt which is essential to preserving the character of Poppleton, and would directly	2893/20682	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	contravene Government directives.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – the traffic flow is a problem now as the ring road cannot cope with existing demands. Drainage was highlighted in the previous plan of 2003 as a cause for concern and still is. GPs are already overloaded, hospital also overloaded, schools already full, shops – only have an inadequate coop, too far away from Acomb exchange for reliable broadband, ambulance and emergency access, Poppleton cut off when ring road is blocked. Brownfield sties if any should be used, not green belt.	2895/18262	
	Objection – see survey 13.	3043/26203	
	Objection – see survey 13.	3278/26210	
	Objection – see survey 13.	3481/26215	
	Objection – the proposed developments would totally destroy the character of the existing villages and desecrate the Green Belt concept in and around this area. Need of more facilities (school, shops, and medical facilities). More traffic on already busy roads.	3284/20712	
	Objection – the proposed developments would totally destroy the character of the existing villages and desecrate the Green Belt concept in and around this area. Need of more facilities (school, shops, and medical facilities). More traffic on already busy roads.	3285/20718	
	Objection – at present some sites around Poppleton, that have been started, are under utilised/ Not able to be let, therefore still not developed to their full potential because of this. Traffic situation around and outer ring road. Clients are not able to get in or out the offices, going elsewhere.	3378/22307	
	Objection – see survey 13.	3502/26220	
	Support – see survey 13.	3507/26225	
	Objection- the Green Belt was approved by the Council in 2011. Further protection was given in January 2013 when it was safeguarded following the revocation of the RSS. Opposed to the guidelines being ignored when settlement limits were agreed in the 1970s.	3559/23910	
	Objection – see survey 13.	3565/26230	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	3577/21999	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around	3596/22014	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – the visual impact of the area would overwhelm the local area and disturb the local residents.	3618/23931	
	Support – see survey 13.	3628/26235	
	Objection – see survey 13.	3735/26240	
	Objection – opposed to proposals at Northminster Business Park. ST19 and 793 . The proposed expansion is too large and should be restricted in size . Any development should be on the site identified for safeguarded land(793) with it's proximity to the new park and ride and close access to the A59. The site identified as ST19 should be no more than a safeguarded area (and a much smaller area). Thus not encroaching on the countryside and the newly constructed multi-use path from Rufforth to Poppleton.	3880/21689	
	Objection – quite a few units are empty and there is no need to extend the park so much. It would use good farmland which is needed to grow crops to feed the future generations.	4008/21705	
	Objection –opposed to the ST19 and 793 proposals - a better and more sensible proposal would be to reverse the sites. The area of safeguarded land which is much too big should become the Strategic Land, so that development occurs between the present Business Park and the new Poppleton Bar Park and Ride. The effect would be to decrease and compact any development. The proposed Strategic site would become the Safeguarded Land but decisions would need to be made regarding its extent and whether it would be needed during the life of the Local Plan.	4647/22053	
	Objection –land in the draft green belt. Any development would be detrimental to the rural aspect. High water table. Flooding risk. It would remain as green belt. Over development of land generally and encroachment on/removal of land from the green belt. Detrimental to the heritage of York. Rural routes should be protected. Development of a residential, industrial and/or retail nature would destroy valuable arable agricultural land, green belt and the green corridor. Extensive residential development will cause coalescence of communities, destroying the individual characteristic of them. Reduction of the agricultural land/green belt and destruction of the green corridor. Infill of commercial/semi industrial land which will be detrimental to the valuable wildlife and	4726/22329	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	heritage of the area. Inadequate infrastructure to support high volume development: congested roads, sewer/drainage system up to capacity, detrimental to the landscape and high water table with further risk of flooding, stretched water supplies, insufficient schools or medical facilities. Brownfield sites in and around the York first. Vacant retail units in the city centre and around the periphery. Still undeveloped plots of land at business parks for needs to expand employment opportunities. Alternative use for unoccupied business or other units.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – safeguarded gives the wrong impression. This should be land reserved for potential development.	5408/24011	
	Objection – there is evidence that the adjacent site although developed a few years ago has never fully been occupied. Business park site (White Rose Way) under developed and many sites available to development. No need to open up new areas when there is available land but no business finds it appropriate. Traffic issues and congestion. High water table and land subject to flooding. Future needs should be based on demographic factors rather than dreams.	5686/20803	
	Objection – opposed to the proposal to ‘safeguard’ the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development. Any further expansion would erode more green belt.	5704/20821	
	Objection – opposed to the proposal to ‘safeguard’ the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development. Any further expansion would erode more green belt.	5705/20836	
	Objection – the existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the government. Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt which is essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York, directly contravening the government directives. The houses on Northfield Lane vibrate with the HGV traffic and this will increase with further use. Original building restrictions on use and opening times are not being adhered to and an extension to the business park will be unbearable to live with. Negotiating areas around the green where there are no footpaths is already difficult and will be worse with the additional traffic caused by more families. Another junction on this stretch of road to provide access to houses on Blair Gowrie is going to make the school run dangerous. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature	5735/20855	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	trees by having a few, well spaced houses. The extent of this development is excessive. this number should be reduced. This land forms part of the green belt corridor which is essential to preserve Poppleton as a village and not a suburb of York.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	5817/20907	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	5852/20946	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	5882/22402	
	Objection – see survey 13.	6203/26255	
	Support – see survey 13.	6425/26260	
	Objection – opposed to increasing this business park when there are others in the immediate vicinity. Will put too much pressure on the already burdened road system. Would represent an over concentration of employment in an area that does not require more employment. Development in the area is sufficient. No need to safeguard land should be treated and regarded as greenbelt.	9302/18089	
	Objection – see survey 13.	9331/26262	
	Objection – opposed to the process of including all the further sites added to the existing plan in the Rural West Ward (ST1, ST2, ST19, 779, 733, 742, 772, 253, 206 and SF8) as	9411/18443	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>potential for housing development. These amount to at least 2000 extra houses and increase commercial development in an area that should be kept as Green Belt. The total potential development will take more land than that currently occupied by Nether and Upper Poppleton and is out of proportion to existing settlements. The use of this land will swamp the established communities of Poppleton and Knapton, ruin them as villages and be contrary to the Village Design Statement Guidelines. York has 'windfall sites in the last few years and the Council should allocate all available Brownfield land for development before thinking of Greenfield. Some of the commercial land which is available in York now has not been taken up e.g. Poppleton Business Park, Terrys Site and many offices in the City Centre are vacant. Infrastructure: Drainage/ flooding risks; Medical support GP surgeries currently overloaded; Schools full up to capacity; Shops are inadequate or non-existent in some settlements; Broadband- BT Acomb exchange rates are woefully slow and inadequate coverage; Transport – roads (unable to cope with current traffic levels), buses (extremely poorly covered), rail (poor service).</p>		
<p><b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the proposed site will ruin a huge part of the Green Belt on the approach along the A59 and ruin a very peaceful bridlepath on the southern boundary of these plans. The Green Belt is already under too much strain from development already in the area i.e. park and ride, Poppleton Garden Centre, Luigi's Restaurant and Minster Vets. The environment of residents living on the A59 and Station Road is being systematically destroyed. We have already lost Green Belt at the New Park and Ride and will lose a huge swathe if the Northminster Business Park extension is approved.</p>	<p>9509/18669</p>	
	<p>Objection – even though a statement is made regarding the separation and setting for Poppleton, the fact that a separation exists should hold no weight whatsoever. The immediate area cannot take any more traffic and the infrastructure will not support any more development. If housing were proposed on this site in future years local services, police services, post offices etc would be inadequate for the numbers of people. Any development on this site would be an infringement on greenbelt and the visual impact would be horrendous, effectively elongating the urban environment and removing green corridors into York. Having looked at the 5 criteria think that this piece of land does meet preventing unrestricted sprawl, preventing neighbouring towns (but what about villages.) merging (it is too close to Poppleton), safeguarding the countryside or preserving the character of historic towns. Surely it doesn't have to meet all 5 criteria to be regarded as green belt.</p>	<p>9614/20632</p>	
	<p>Objection – safeguarding is a misleading phrase, would lead to further urbanisation of this rural area. Would impact on the level of traffic. This is a green space and should be</p>	<p>9634/24156</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	kept as such; once green spaces are lost they are gone forever.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to "safeguard" the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8). The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	9692/21944	
	Objection – see survey 13. No further development should take place in NW York until the near gridlock conditions on the A1237 have been sorted on a permanent basis - burning valuable fuel , polluting the atmosphere in this rural belt.	9827/26267	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to "safeguard" the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	9874/24293	
	Objection – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9882/24316	
	Objection- there are general concerns re the impact on Poppleton village and infrastructure. Poppleton will no longer retain its character as a village. Green corridor needs to be retained.	9966/24512	
	Objection- there are general concerns re the impact on Poppleton village and infrastructure. Poppleton will no longer retain its character as a village. Green corridor needs to be retained.	9969/24516	
	Objection – totally inappropriate for the area. The outer ring road creates a natural boundary to the York conurbation and if Greenfield development is required to meet housing requirements there are plenty of Greenfield sites located within the outer ring road. These should be fully exploited before sites like this are considered. Brownfield sites need to be fully exploited before any Greenfield sites.	10041/24390	
	Objection – see survey 13.	10069/26268	
	Objection – the local infrastructure cannot support this. This would put a massive burden on the ring road. Local services are over subscribed. To loose valuable farming land	10153/25992	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	would be a considerable detraction to the conservation area.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – disproportionate number of houses to the remainder of the local community. Oversubscribed schools. Bad road access. Highly undesirable ribbon development. Protected grey partridges.	10202/21149	
	Objection – see survey 13. There are too many big sites in a small area where roads are already clogged up with traffic. Infrastructure improvements (roads, schools etc) must be made prior to development/	10301/26273	
	Objection- the existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (regional spatial strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton.	10430/18946	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10580/23730	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10582/22786	
	Objection – increased congestion on A59 and A1237, use of green field land, fails technical officer assessments, Connected to ST19 forms large development out of keeping with the rural aspect of existing area. Potential conversion to housing if business use not viable. Impact on historical character and setting	10637/20429	
	Objection - determined to change Rural West into industrial west by safeguarding this land, i.e., taking even more land out of greenbelt and leaving it open for future industrial development.	10642/19746	
	Objection – there is apparently a need to classify more land as safeguarded because some land previously down to be classed as safeguarded is now included in sites which are going to be developed. Why? Surely if more houses are going to be built in the short	10705/19842	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	term then less extra sites are needed for the longer term? Huge space to be taken out of the Greenbelt, this would make a significant contribution to increased traffic congestion both on the ring road and the roads in York itself as well as increased pollution and other infrastructure issues. One of York's current strong economic points is that its a lovely historic city which is relatively easy to access and look around. Turning it into a massive urban sprawl with a small, hard to get to centre won't do much for the tourist industry.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – wholly situated within the draft green belt. Any development would take away the rural aspect and west of York setting. Area with exceptionally high water table and possible flooding. Highway infrastructure/traffic study should be carried out before any further development.	10734/19913	
	Objection – see survey 13.	10736/26278	
	Objection – see survey 13.	10752/26281	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10754/19974	
	Objection – development is on green belt land. Agricultural land. Village losing its village feel. New plan will encroach further into the village. Student accommodation needs to be addressed first.	10759/20433	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10767/20026	
	Objection – further expansion would further erode the green belt essential to preserving the character and identity of the approach to York and would contravene Government directives. Strongly object to these parcels of land as suitable for future development due to infrastructure – mains sewage and surface water. It is difficult to understand the overall impact on the green belt, as one stage led to another, without improvements to the sewage network or a comprehensive drainage plan. There is no indication of where	10771/20039	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	excess surface water will go and how flooding or issues downstream will be prevented. Industrial units will change the character of the approach to York, altering it to an urban sprawl.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection – the existing Northminster Business Park and the A59 Park and Ride facilities already impact on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the green belt and directly contravene Government Directives.	10791/20650	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10805/22823	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10811/21340	
	Objection- land should be protected from development, not for it. Allowing any future development here would change the whole character of rural west York. It is a highly agricultural land, how will the country feed itself in future generations. No housing crisis in York, it appears this whole development is based on housing people from outside York, adding further burden on local amenities. Development here would create unsustainable pockets of agricultural land. This area should be designated green belt with full legal protection, not a land for development.	10836/21390	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8). The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10848/21929	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10850/21424	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10852/21439	
	Objection – opposed to SF19 and SF8 for industrial development, due to their impact in the Green Belt policies.	10855/21462	
	Objection – the existing site together with the A59 Park and Ride impacts on the Green belt policies for York. Any further expansion would further erode the greenbelt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York.	10881/25897	Georgina Grace Trust
	Objection – the existing site already impacts on the green belt. Any expansion would erode the green belt.	10904/21536	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	10957/21621	
	Objection – see survey 13.	10989/26286	
	Objection – see survey 13. The roads will be even more blocked up by motor traffic	10990/26291	
	Objection – see survey 13.	10992/26296	
	Objection – see survey 13.	10993/26301	
	Objection – see survey 13.	10996/26309	
	Objection – see survey 13.	11001/26317	
	Objection – see survey 13.	11002/26323	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)	Objection – see survey 13. To add more traffic, industry and housing to this would destroy the village, would become just an added suburb to the sprawl. Green Belt land is paramount to the protection of the environment.	11011/26336	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	11155/21643	
	Objection – the existing site already impacts on the green belt policies for York. Further expansion would erode the green belt land.	11215/21904	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	11246/22846	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	11248/22121	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8). The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	11251/22136	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8). The existing	11252/22151	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.		
<b>793 (SF8) Land at Northminster Business Park (continued)</b>	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	11254/22166	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	11257/22181	
	Objection - would like to object to the proposal to “safeguard” the area around Northminster Business Park for industrial development (ST19 and SF8) . The existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the Government (Regional Spatial Strategy Jan/Feb 2013). Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York and would directly contravene Government Directives.	11259/22196	
	Objection - encourages over population. Job opportunities declined since 70's. Green belt areas need to be preserved. 36 houses too many. Extra housing would swamp the locality. Amenities overcrowded. More transport required.	11345/22878	
	Objection – the amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11417/23749	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village</b>	Comment – various development sites proposed are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. The Council is currently working with the Highways Agency and the City of York Council to assess the cumulative impact of both Authorities' Local Plan development aspirations on the interchange. It is therefore important that the modified/additional sites, in particular, are likely to have an impact on the interchange: Site 97, ST7, ST15, SF3, 811, 802, 815, 22, 747, 794. These sites in particular, should therefore, be carefully factored into the transport assessment for the A64 interchange.	10/18965	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – opposed to this proposal and recommend that it is rejected. Proposed site extends into green belt. There are no special circumstances attached to this site which would warrant the breaching of the green belt status. If developed the site would be out of proportion, given the rural nature of a village such as Elvington. The infrastructure, school, medical practice and sewage system would be inadequate for the significant extra burden. There is no proven need for an increase of this proportion. Proposed site would adversely affect the centre of the village which is a conservation area. The extra traffic generated from 100 extra houses would choke the main road B1228 to and from York. There is very limited opportunity for the creation of jobs in Elvington therefore the occupants of any new developments would have to travel to find work. As there is no effective public transport this would mean a car journey into work.	34/19144	Sutton upon Derwent Parish Council
	Objection –loss of agricultural land 3ha. Should be deleted , as any development would be unsustainable and prejudice the setting of the village.	45/18785	York Environment Forum
	Objection – the Parish Council strongly objects to this site being taken out of Green Belt. The potential number of houses to be built here is disproportionate to the needs of the village and would adversely affect the existing nature and culture of a rural community. The development would significantly alter a long stretch of the eastern boundary of the village and is unsustainable. There is no infrastructure to support a development of this size.	61/18830	Elvington Parish Council
	Objection – housing development is unsuitable whilst no improvements to utilities, roads or amenities are made beforehand. The extension of this traditional and increasingly rare English village community by almost a quarter will change the historic balance irrevocably which, bearing in mind the huge amount of existing areas waiting to be developed, is unsustainable. Allowing further housing development without associated infrastructure development, it will create a sudden reduction in standards of living for the whole community. Business and employment will bring to suffer as they relocate to better accessible locations. The queues on Elvington Lane have grown enormously and the lack	246/19162	Yorkshire Air Museum

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of local authority support for bus services over the past 15 years has exasperated an already difficult situation in this small rural community. Would propose that this extension to domestic development is refused because of the clear infrastructure to support it and the imbalance it will produce to the lack of existing rural village.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – opposed to all sites in the Further Consultation which are: outside the proposed inner boundary of the Green Belt including those which are outside the existing development limits of inset villages (as opposed to proposed development limits for such villages), or are extensions beyond the outer ring road, where the site does not bridge between the existing urban core and an inset village, or is located within a green corridor as identified by the Green Corridors Tech Paper (2011). Location of developments sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban core ie Heworth or Acomb. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.</p>	544/20493	
	Objection – removal of land from the greenbelt and will affect road safety. Infrastructure at capacity.	657/23781	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20535	
	Objection – against the addition of new sites “safeguarded” for long term future development. Over development of the villages, leading to loss of character, pressure on the small primary schools and increased traffic on small country lanes.	995/20556	
	Objection – no account has been given to how the village’s infrastructure will cope with future possibility of significantly disproportionate housing. The school is full, the surgery is full, the land is Green Belt and the village centre is dangerous because of parked cars,	1008/18204	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	HGV and commuter cars. It is particularly dangerous to vulnerable people or cyclists. Many cars are ignoring the new 30mph and 20 mph speed restrictions. The term 'safeguarded' is extremely misleading, and has led people to believe that these sites are safeguarded from development.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 2. The scale of development is too big. The village infrastructure is already at capacity. Elvington lane is in poor condition and extra traffic will make it worse. The character of the village will be lost.	1152/23792	
	Objection – informed by Mr Julian Sturdy and Mr George Barton that there was no requirement for safeguarded Green Belt land for future development. Whilst new housing is required, infrastructure in Elvington is not there to accept large amounts of additional housing. The school is at capacity, the sewage treatment plant is at capacity, and surface water treatment is at capacity. Elvington Lane is in poor condition and at certain times above capacity. The bus service is non-existent. Strongly object to any site that takes away greenbelt land especially around Elvington, where the roads are not suitable to take any more traffic and the infrastructure within the village is not capable of taking this amount of increase.	1175/18210	
	Objection – if land is developed, any new developments would be wholly out of proportion to the existing village – the rural character will be lost. Elvington does not have the infrastructure of facilities to cater for such large scale development. Greenbelt is to protect the rural nature of York's surrounding villages and yet York Council seems intent on changing to designation of greenbelt, regardless of local people in it's pursuit of urbanising York and surrounding villages	1259/20569	
	Comment – due to the size or location of this safeguarded land it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and would be of interest to the Agency. The Agency has not made any assessment of the potential impact of this, together with other sites, at this stage. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from CYC before proceeding with the mesoscopic modelling exercise to assess the cumulative impact of local plan development on the SRN.	1264/18594	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	Objection – strongly agree with comments made by Elvington Parish Council and the Keep Elvington Rural Action Group, in that the scale of development proposed in the village is disproportionate to its needs and would 'adversely affect the existing nature and culture of a rural community'. Community is right to oppose this disproportionate development on the grounds of the impact it will have on what is currently one of York's most rural	1355/18628	Julian Sturdy MP

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	communities. Proposed homes on the site must be considered alongside the existing Local Plan proposals for Dauby Lane and Church Lane, as well as the other safeguarded and employment allocations at the Business Park and the seven Traveller pitches and three Showpeople pitches in the village.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – the scale of development would alone represent a 20% increase in the existing housing stock of the village. All the proposed developments in Elvington will double the size of the village, a scale which is unsustainable as local infrastructure is already at its limit. To attain the growth rate Elvington need only add 40 houses. This site is within the recognised green belt.	1666/20441	
	Objection – inappropriate due to its size. Number of houses is too many for present infrastructure. The local school and surgery are already at capacity. There is little employment within the village footprint and poor transport links to the city. Most of this land has already been considered for development in the past and the proposals rejected for a number of reasons. Would be illogical and irrational to move to overturn the Council's own prior sound decisions. Likely to adversely affect the drainage around the village the increased flood risk should be taken very seriously. Concerns about the ability of the local system to cope with the increased processing needs of the sewerage produced by new homes. Taken together, proposals could raise the number of houses in the village by 400, 40% increase in the present population. Given the local plans shows the city population is expected to grow by 7.6% shows that the growth in Elvington is neither proportional nor reasonable. No study showing that there is a need (from within the village) for this vast increase in housing. The development is not for local need but in-migration from other areas. Would be far more sustainable for the city's housing needs to be met by expanding the urban area at the fringes of the city as this could more easily link into the better facilities afforded.	1667/23794	
	Objection – limited employment here and there isn't a regular bus service in and out of York/Pocklington for people to get to work. Primary school and doctors are currently full or near to capacity, so new facilities would be needed.	2658/20590	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to proper town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17939	
	Objection – would like to see the plans to develop the schools (currently full), medical practice (try getting appointment now), sewerage (currently at capacity according to Yorkshire Water), surface water drainage (beck overflows regularly now) and traffic flow (the queue at the end of Elvington Lane often stretches back to Clock Farm). How does building on green belt land protect the environment? Under great pressure to provide	2720/17785	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	food and green energy – all of which needs green belt land. Building on brownfield has to be exhausted first. The essential character of the village will be destroyed forever as it will become another expanding small town with infrastructure issues. 'Safeguarded' is contradictory and misleading term. This is not a mandatory requirement.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – huge lorries congest small roads. School spaces at capacity. Wildlife is in danger. Character of the village would be destroyed.	3011/22257	
	Objection – no infrastructure to support the development. Green belt as a large area for rainfall to naturally drain into. No spare capacity in the current drainage system.	3031/20703	
	Objection – no proven local need. Extends the village footprint quite significantly into the greenbelt. Unsustainable development. Over development. Housing requirements should be met first in urban areas with out limited development in the villages. Most of the land has previously been considered for residential but rejected. Schools could not cope. Roads are already congested, additional cars will cause road safety hazards. More traffic pollution and noise. Urban sprawl.	3046/19343	
	Objection - Loss of greenbelt with adverse wildlife and environmental impact. Compromises rural nature of village, evolved over generations. Disproportionate development would stress village amenities and infrastructure. Conflicts with previous planning rejections on same land.	3063/22264	
	Objection – the additional houses are disproportionate to the village. There is no infrastructure to support this. There is no drainage capacity. It will have a detrimental effect on the village feel.	3108/23855	
	Objection – not in favour of this land being safeguarded, as it is removing land from the Green belt. A large housing in the centre of the village would be putting at risk the existing community 'feel' of the village. The road that runs alongside it already carries a large amount of traffic and heavy goods vehicles. More houses mean more cars, more pollution, more noise and less safety for residents. The York area is at risk of losing its small characterful villages and in danger of becoming more like Haxby, Wiggington, Strensall. More houses mean more driveways, concrete etc., less drainage and water run off and more risk of flooding in this low lying area.	3113/22272	
	Objection – this is disproportionate increase to the size of the village. The greenbelt and infrastructure implications have not been considered.	3135/23861	
Objection – inappropriate and contrary to general planning guidance. Development should be proportionate. An increase of the amount proposed here even if deferred for several years is not proportionate. Elvington is one of the few remaining small detached villages, its character contributes to the attractive character of the Greater York area as a whole.	3220/23872		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>This was acknowledged by the Inspector in his report on the 1992/3 public inquiries. The village character should be substantially retained. Shape and size would largely destroy the existing character of the village including the rear rural outlook of the existing small developments and their identity. Would become a commuter dormitory suburb. The development does not serve local need. The village is already overloaded with traffic the development would exacerbate this. Upgrading of the roads would be to the detriment of the relatively rural nature of Elvington. Land is currently Green Belt, site was rejected firmly in the 1992/3 inquiry and deemed Green Belt. There is no justification to take it out of the Green Belt now.</p>		
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the size of the proposed development will make the B1228, the country road that becomes the main street through the village, and the feeder roads, extremely dangerous. There are no special reasons for this land to be removed. Objection to the process by which this land has been ‘safeguarded’ before brownfield sites have been full explored.</p>	3363/21975	
	<p>Objection – will cause extra traffic on the B1228, the road surface is constantly in a poor condition and it is very narrow. Main sewer/surface water cannot cope. Facilities such as the school, medical centre and shop would not cope. There is a very limited bus service. The valid reasons for rejecting the proposals in the 1990s still apply now.</p>	3532/20585	
	<p>Objection – disproportionate to the site of the village. It is Green Belt land. Alternative brownfield sites should be considered and used first. Public transport services are very limited. The primary school is already at full capacity as is the medical centre. The drainage system already struggles. Increase in traffic through the village and on the B1228 would increase already extended travelling times and cause congestion. This will increase pollution which will be detrimental to the conservation area. Large reduction of agricultural land for the growing of crops and producing the rearing of animals to produce food.</p>	3598/23922	
	<p>Objection – Elvington is a traditional rural village and the local infrastructure cannot support the amount of development being proposed. The road access is along a windy country road. The school and doctors surgery are stretched to capacity. The local plan suggests a growth of 7.6% is required. This would imply Elvington would need to grow by no more than 40 houses, not the 400 plus proposed in various sites across Elvington. We do not want to expand out of all proportion to the predicted growth in need for housing. This would entirely alter the character and visual appearance of the villages.</p>	3909/21698	
	<p>Objection – scale of proposed development is too large. This will add to congestion. The infrastructure cannot sustain this development. The land has previously been rejected.</p>	4309/23959	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Traffic is already a hazard. Drainage is at capacity.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection - this part of the plan proposes an overwhelmingly large development, increasing the footprint of the village disproportionately and is massive overdevelopment of the green belt. We want to retain the rurality of Elvington and this simply would not be possible with a development of this size. Potentially we would lose light from developments as well as the visual amenity our home enjoys. This would also lead to a loss of privacy. Strong concerns about the safety of children, and indeed all pedestrians, with a development of such a size in both geography and number. There would clearly be noise disturbance and it is vital to protect that rurality. The development is in close proximity to the water works and the associated birdlife and other wildlife that comes with that long-standing existing development would be disastrously affected.	4358/19665	
	Objection – this land is designated green belt, to protect the countryside from urban growth and maintain areas of agriculture and outdoor leisure. There is wildlife which needs protecting.	5146/22367	
	Objection – this land was designated as green belt to protect from future development, and prevent the character, beauty of the countryside being taken over by urban sprawl. Safeguarded land is a misleading term. Brownfield should be used first. Impact on unique city surrounded by historical countryside – plans would change this. Land surrounding Elvington is an area of outstanding natural beauty and of historical and wildlife significance, it is important that this is preserved. There is no mention of plans to improve the transport network – many local roads cannot cope at peak times. New residents will commute to Leeds as employment opportunities low in York.	5147/22376	
	Object – green belt land. Roads would be dangerous. Infrastructure could not handle the increase. Growth is too large for the size of the village. Green belt should be protected except in special circumstances	5153/22375	
	Objection – proposed enormous developments in Elvington are more in keeping with a large city such as Leeds or Sheffield rather than the quaint jewel of a city like York. Should reconsider the impact that a development of this size would have on existing services and the serious consequences on the infrastructure of the city as a whole.	5228/21763	
	Objection – called ‘safeguarded’ land but little doubt that it would be developed within a few years into a large and dense housing estate. Would be an increase of around 20% of the village size. At the same time, the city of York itself is envisaging a significantly smaller increase in houses and population. Do expect some development, but to a measured and modest extent such that it can be readily assimilated. Development should be proportionate to that planned for the rest of York. An increase of the amount	5235/23996	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>proposed, even over many years is not proportionate. Elvington is one of the very few remaining detached villages within the Greater York area. As such, its character contributes to the attractive character of the Greater York area as a whole. Acknowledged by the Inspector in his report on the 1992/3 public inquiries. The village character should be substantially retained: this means development which is modest and in keeping with that of a village. This large development will look like a large commuter suburban sprawl. Will not be in keeping in character with existing development in the village. It would destroy the rear rural outlook of the existing small developments, along with their identity. This development would not serve 'local need'. It would be a commuter dormitory for the rest of York, and places further afield such as Leeds. There is no evidence that it would serve local need. Already the village is overloaded with traffic and this will exacerbate the problem to the point where it will feel that it is on a main road. The essentially rural character will be seriously damaged. This land is currently Green Belt. That is for a purpose: to retain the rural nature of the community. And this is highly relevant to the identity and character of the York area as a whole. This site (or effectively this area) was rejected firmly in the 1992/93 Inquiry, and deemed Green belt. There is no justification to take it out of the Green belt now.</p>		
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the boundary for this site is shown incorrectly and includes part of my garden. This has already been raised with your colleagues and subsequent correspondence with your colleagues. Elvington is a rural village which had a population of 933 inhabitants in 488 houses at the last census. The centre of the village is a conservation area, with its traditional village green and rural aspect. The proposals in place would expand the village by almost double and outstrip the provisions of the local infrastructure. – school, sewage, roads, public transport. The site is currently part of the green belt. There are five purposes for including land in green belt. This proposal clearly contravenes 4 of the purposes. I also note that appendix 2 of the further site consultation document includes sites 749 and 297. These appear to have failed your. Detailed comments provided on Technical Officer Assessments. See response.</p>	<p>5237/21776</p>	
	<p>Objection - the proposal would significantly extend the village footprint into green belt land, which would not only affect local residents but which would be visible to residents in other nearby villages. The scale of development implied (more than 100 houses on this site alone) is out of proportion and unsustainable for a small village of less than 500 houses and would represents an increase of 20% on the current size of the village. Elvington has very limited employment, a pitiful bus service and a primary school which has only just replaced two deteriorating old portable classrooms with 2 permanent</p>	<p>5259/20070</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>classrooms and does not have space for a large influx of additional pupils. Expansion would reinstate temporary classrooms. At the only doctors' surgery, patients can have to wait up to 2 weeks to get an appointment for non-urgent matters. There is one tiny village shop and no post office in Elvington – the nearest full day post office services are at Wheldrake, Dunnington or in Pocklington or York, yet the public transport to get to these places is limited or even non-existent. Furthermore, most of the land on this site has already been considered for possible residential development and been rejected in the past for several reasons including access, visual amenity and effect on wildlife. It is illogical to reintroduce this land when all the original problems and causes of previous rejections remain. An extra 200 cars driving to the main urban area each day will cause congestion and road safety hazards through the village, particularly around the school. Currently many children walk or cycle without adult supervision to the village green and to the play area. Additional traffic puts their safety at risk, as it does to the older and frailer residents who already find crossing the road near the village shop a cause for concern. There would be increased traffic noise and pollution for all residents, plus road safety issues around the school and increased congestion at the access to the Grimston Bar roundabout. The proposals in place would expand the village by almost double and far outstrip the provisions of the local infrastructure (school, sewage, roads, public transport)</p>		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – 'safeguard' is a misleading term ever. If fully developed it will have 84 houses in a village that currently has approx 900 houses. Nearly a 10% increase. Disproportionate to the size of the village. Will have an adverse effect on the local village school. Will have an adverse effect on the local surgery. Will have an adverse effect on the local wildlife. Will have an adverse effect on local services including sewers, roads etc. If built, should be on brown land and not green.</p>	5284/18382	
	<p>Objection – the size and scale is inappropriate. The village cannot sustain this site. Has been previously rejected for several reasons including access, visual amenity and effect on the wildlife.</p>	5423/24014	
	<p>Objection – in the Green Belt and inappropriate for a small village. Scale of development will have a massive impact on the character and feel of the village. The village cannot offer much employment, there is limited transport, the school is at capacity, the doctor's surgery is also at capacity and the village cannot accommodate any more traffic. The site has previously been rejected for several reasons which remain valid. Increased traffic, noise, pollution and road safety issues.</p>	5439/24022	
	<p>Objection – there is no requirement for the council to safeguard land despite the fact that the current local plan has allocated 85% of land for housing on the green belt. In the</p>	5447/18847	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Chancellor’s Mansion House speech he said further reforms to the planning rules would be introduced to force local authorities to focus building on building on Brown field sites. This proposal is inappropriate for such a small village of only 933 inhabitants, a traditional village with many rural aspects. The site is a haven for wildlife. Only today I saw deer loping across this field. This land has recently been considered for possible development for housing and it was rejected for many valid reasons. The same problems remain today. This small village has a primary school which is currently full, a doctors surgery running at capacity, a poor bus service, a very busy narrow main street through which cars from all the surrounding villages beyond the bridge over the derwent pour through every day. Elvington has recent development of affordable housing next to the Conifers where access is not a problem. Access to new houses on this proposed green belt site would be problematical and development of this site would materially affect the character of this boundary of the village as well as having a visual impact on a significant number of residential properties. Elvington is one of only three villages with fewer than 1,000 inhabitants. People live here because of its size and rural aspects. Do not object to some minor infill near Danby lane but to build on site 802 land is inappropriate and unsustainable. Elvington residents do not wish to be living in a commuter settlement.</p>		
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the village deserves to retain its status. Infrastructure, schools, sewerage, roads or doctors are all at capacity. Green belt land. Disproportionate development would alter the character and nature of the village. Dangerous roads. No reason to site Gypsy and Travellers site in Elvington. The village is not equipped to handle an influx of potentially transient residents. Neither the local employment opportunities, nor the infrastructure. Totally unsuitable site</p>	5450/21815	
	<p>Objection – this site is liable to flooding. The village infrastructure cannot sustain this. This is greenbelt land. The scale is too big for the village. This will add extra pressure to the small footpath through the village and cause more traffic.</p>	5472/24029	
	<p>Objection – if developed would increase the village by almost a quarter. Do not have the infrastructure to cope with this, school, doctors, roads etc are already working to capacity. Would seriously imbalance the village.</p>	5535/18011	
	<p>Objection – if developed would increase the village by almost a quarter. Do not have the infrastructure to cope with this, school, doctors, roads etc are already working to capacity. Would seriously imbalance the village.</p>	5536/18016	
	<p>Objection – this would take land from the green belt. Potential increase in size of the village is disproportionate to the current village. The infrastructure would have to be completely changed to support the scale of development eg drainage, facilities, schooling.</p>	5571/20761	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The plans are disproportionate in scale to the existing village.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – this would take significant amount of land from the green belt. The infrastructure would have to be changed to support the scale of development eg drainage, facilities, schooling. The plans are disproportionate in scale to the existing village.	5572/20762	
	Objection –will overload the village infrastructure. Roads will become gridlocked. Exit and entry to the site will become high risk accident areas. The school is at capacity. This is significantly increase the village size. It will cause erosion of the wildlife.	5595/24037	
	Objection – this proposal is too large for a small village. Elvington would grow into a small town but without the amenities of a small town and the development would lead to Elvington becoming an urban sprawl and commuter settlement instead of a rural village. The road network around the village is presently over stretched at peak times; adding further traffic from these developments would possibly bring them to breaking point, causing congestion and further pollution not only around the village but also the likes of Grimston Bar roundabout and the A64. Most of the land on this site has previously been considered, and rejected, for residential developments on the grounds of visual amenity, effect on wildlife and access. These problems still remain.	5741/20870	
	Objection – the land has already been rejected for development for numerous reasons; access; wildlife and visual effect, none of this has changed. Larger villages would be more appropriate to accommodate an increase in housing rather than a small rural village like Elvington. The additional traffic on very busy and poorly maintained roads will cause problems with further damage to roads, more congestion, pollution and safety. There is very limited employment in the village for additional residents. The school is already at capacity. The GP surgery is already at capacity. Public transport is extremely limited. The village will almost double in size and destroy the character of the village, putting pressure on, already at capacity, amenities and infrastructure. The land is green belt and should be protected from development.	5781/20887	
	Object – no need to safeguard a large amount of land. Scale of development is out of proportion with the size of the village. Very limited employment available, and schools and medical services are at capacity. Roads are not big enough to cope. Use Brownfield land first. Land has been previously rejected. Increase in traffic noise and pollution	5816/20898	
	Objection –will significantly increase the size of Elvington, by 20%. Small village limited employment, transport, capacity at school and doctors surgery. Village cannot sustain development this size, the amount of traffic would increase. Guidance states that proposals to develop sites for houses must initially be met by extending urban areas and then consideration to limited developments of larger villages only. Developments in	5842/22391	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	smaller villages must only take place by small infill. Proposal cannot be considered as such and removing greenbelt is inappropriate. Land as been previously considered for development and rejected on ground of problem with access, wildlife and visual impact on the village – therefore how can land be removed from the greenbelt for future development when its previously been rejected. Single main road in and out of the village already well used and congested therefore safety issues would be compounded with development. Would fundamentally alter the character and aspect of the village – change into a commuter settlement due to the amount of urban sprawl.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – deep reservations about using Green Belt land. The City of York is a beautiful and historic city which is surrounded by many rural villages, the continued development of Green Belt is damaging the character of the area. Interested in seeing the consideration of brown field sites as a first option before this location is considered. 20% increase of the village, alongside other proposed developments could lead to the village doubling in size. Small rural villages with little public transport and very few local jobs aren't well suited to accommodate such a large increase in dwellings. Elvington suffers from high volumes of traffic which would be made worse. Totally disproportionate to the total required new housing in the area.	5878/24056	
	Objection – more housing would turn this village into a York Satellite settlement. The shop, school and medical centre is at capacity. The road is hazardous. Sewerage is a problem. This village would not longer be unspoilt.	6196/18024	
	Objection –see survey 2. Further development for residential properties in Elvington and surrounding area – does not bear thinking about. Area within the CYC is at present reducing employment by at least 1000 jobs per year, who will be purchasing these properties.	6281/21034	
	Objection – the site is in the greenbelt. The scale of development is inappropriate. Development is not sustainable. This site has already been rejected.	9258/24095	
	Objection – takes land out of green belt. Residential size of village could increase by 65% - disproportionate increase adversely affecting the existing culture of the community. No infrastructure to support this. No drainage capacity. The road running through Elvington and into York, the B1228, is in poor condition. There is no mention if there is going to be any commensurate increase in expenditure on the infrastructure to take into account the increase in population in Elvington should the plan be put into effect. Until there is meaningful discussion by the Council will oppose the plan.	9265/17828	
	Objection – there is no infrastructure to support these proposals	9278/18037	
	Objection- the provision for the future building of many new properties will impact upon	9283/17853	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	traffic. The village is busy and noisy enough and any development will place unreasonable demands on local services and roads.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – ruination of a peaceful and historic village within a significant green belt area. What will amount to a doubling of the village population - it will no longer be a village. Services such as sewage and drainage, schooling and medical facilities are already at capacity, how can the village cope with further stress on these services. The unacceptable impact of traffic congestion when throughput of traffic in Elvington is currently far too high with roads unable to cope adequately with heavy lorries and increasing pollution. This will also create further accidents especially in spots such as the school and village centre. What happens when the population and development plans create even further traffic throughput. This is totally unacceptable and dangerous. Disregard for wildlife habitat. Elvington is home to many endangered species such as barn owls, other birds of prey, buzzards etc . Surely there are alternative options/sites which would create less adverse and irreversible effects. These plans will lead to a disproportionate increase in the size and character of Elvington. The Council must examine them and find another solution. The proposals will result in a doubling in size of the population and will impact upon the natural and historic heritage of Elvington. The village already suffers the effects of very heavy traffic and pollution and it is considered that additional traffic could pose a danger to school children. Development would also impact on the sewage and drainage, medical and education infrastructure – services which are largely all at capacity. There is a disregard of wildlife habitat and endangered species, such as barns. Loss of Green Belt land is unacceptable when there are alternative sites.</p>	9387/18148	
	<p>Objection – if Elvington village were to expand you would not only lose the community spirit, but you would also lose the rural nature of the village. If there were an increase in traffic, community events held on the village green could not go ahead as people's safety will be at risk. Increases in the number of vehicles passing through would not only increase pollution levels, but would also increase congestion in and around the village areas. This would have a negative effect on wildlife in the area. The local school would not be able to cope with the extra capacity as they are already full. Drainage and sewerage would also need to be taken into account. We are struggling to get new superfast broadband as there are not enough ports to supply the existing village, so what would happen to the technology side of things if the developments were to go ahead? If there was an increase in developments, or the possibility of a travellers site within Elvington the whole ethos of the village will change. People will no longer want to allow their children to play outside, as there will be too many 'strangers' they may encounter.</p>	9435/18451	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The proposed developments will no doubt decrease house prices in the area.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – residential size of village could increase by 65%. Disproportionate increase adversely affecting the existing culture of the community. No infrastructure to support this. No drainage capacity. Not sustainable as a development.	9436/18457	
	Objection - takes an important part of land around Elvington out of the Green Belt. Development of this land will adversely affect the open aspects of a very large number of houses in the village. Assuming average building density, development of this land if brought forward, together with your other proposals in the Local Plan would increase the amount of residential accommodation in the village by 65%. This is clearly disproportionate; it would have a massive adverse effect on the character and culture of the village. Any development of this land, together with your other proposals for the village, would result in the full development of the Northern side of the village from the Sports Club to Derwent Bridge, with no open land. This is unreasonable and totally in conflict with the purposes of Green Belt to avoid 'rural sprawl'. Yorkshire Water confirm that the Main drainage system is already inadequate to cope with current needs, and they have previously indicated no interest in increasing this. The sewage system is also at full capacity. There is no adequate infrastructure to support such large scale development. There is no requirement for you to include 'safeguarded land' in the Local Plan. You have provided no justification as to why this land must be safeguarded. I therefore strongly oppose your proposals for this site.	9441/19111	
	Objection – it will no longer be a village, the school is full, sewage works on full power, and the traffic through the village is terrible. The 30 mile an hour speed limit is not observed very often.	9447/18468	
	Objection – the development would spoil the character of Elvington village. The village is already prone to flooding and if these fields are built on, which are also known to flood, and due to climate change, we will have more flooding as the water will have nowhere to go. The traffic in Elvington is already bad enough and to increase it by another 150+ will increase pollution in the area. There is no employment in this area. The local bus service is not very good, so people will use their cars more and there will be increased congestion at Grimston Bar roundabout. The school in Elvington is also full. There will be more children walking to school and it will be increasingly hazardous due to increased traffic. The doctor in Elvington is also full, so increased people in the village will mean longer waiting times. There will be more pressure on emergency services because of increased traffic. Wildlife will also be affected. The sewage works in Elvington cannot cope with an increase in population. More houses means more traffic, more noise pollution, more	9448/18470	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	flooding and no wildlife. More houses means more fireworks. These houses are not for the locals, but for people wanting to move to York from different areas. York and its area used to be a beautiful historic city, but with the expansion of the University and increased development of other villages, I think the time has come to put a stop to all this expansion.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – this site is greenbelt land. Brownfield should be used first. The infrastructure of the village cannot cope with this. Increased traffic will cause a hazard to children. There will be an increase of pollution. Question if there is a need for more houses in Elvington.	9462/24123	
	Objection – this site is greenbelt land. Brownfield should be used first. The infrastructure of the village cannot cope with this. Increased traffic will cause a hazard to children. There will be an increase of pollution. Question if there is a need for more houses in Elvington.	9466/24133	
	Objection – this site is greenbelt land. Brownfield should be used first. The infrastructure of the village cannot cope with this. Increased traffic will cause a hazard to children. There will be an increase of pollution. Question if there is a need for more houses in Elvington.	9467/24136	
	Objection – see survey 2. Can't understand how this 'massive' housing plan is viable as it is not based on local need at all. It is totally inappropriate. With this proposal, along with others, it will mean the village will double in size. The road infrastructure in the village is totally unsuitable for this growth. The water and sewage facility for the village is already at full capacity. The local school in Elvington is already at full capacity with 'temporary' additional classrooms to cope. This housing will result in additional traffic bringing the village to its knees. Most of this area in and around Elvington has already been considered for development in the past and has been rejected for many of the above mentioned reasons, including the effect on wildlife. The area will merge to become a 'soulless' urban area totally destroying the character, charm and history of this area, just making York (and Elvington) another 'Leeds'.	9470/18485	
	Objection – find the word 'safeguarding' in this instance to be completely miss-leading – this land would be removed from the Green Belt to allow the building of over 100 houses. In my view, this is the very opposite of safeguarding. The plan would increase the village footprint significantly into the Green Belt and it is totally inappropriate in a village of fewer than 500 homes. Alongside proposals for Dauby Lane and Church Lane, this could mean the village could almost double in size. Elvington is a small rural village, with 933 inhabitants, little employment, very limited public transport, a primary school which is full, a doctor's surgery at capacity and one small shop. It is one of three villages around York with a population of less than 1000. The CYC Local Plan suggests a growth of 7.6% is required. Which if this is applied to Elvington this would suggest an increase of 40 houses,	9473/18494	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>and not the 400 which could be built if all of the Local Plan sites in Elvington were passed. Therefore, the site plan is not appropriate, proportionate or sustainable. The site has been considered for development in the past and refused on the basis of access, visual amenity and the effect on wildlife. If these 100+ houses were built it would result in possibly an additional 200 cars driving in and out of the village. This would amount to 1580 journeys (in and out of village, access to employment, education, shopping and leisure activities) and cause a safety hazard near the school. It would also add to congestion at Grimston Bar. Developing the Green Belt sites like this one in Elvington could result in York changing from a beautiful historic city in a rural setting into a city surrounded by urban sprawl in which all villages would merge.</p>		
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the proposal massively increases the village footprint into greenbelt land – representing a 20% increase to the size of the village. Should this development and proposals at Church Lane and Dauby Lane go ahead the village could almost double in size. Housing requirements should be met by extensions to the urban area, supplemented by limited development at large villages and by minor infill at small villages such as Elvington. To do otherwise is unacceptable and unsustainable. This sites has been considered for development in the past and has been rejected for numerous reasons including access, visual amenity and effect on wildlife. Objection – The proposed development could lead to an additional 200 cars driving into the centre of the village daily causing congestion and road safety hazards in the village. The centre of the village is a conservation area – the proposals would almost double and outstrip the provisions of the local infrastructure (school, sewage, roads, and public transport). The proposed plans for Elvington are not “proportionate” “sustainable” or “appropriate”. For Elvington to grow by the 7.6% that applies to CYCs total area, that would imply fewer than 40 additional houses, not more than 400.</p>	<p>9474/19256</p>	
	<p>Objection – should remain in greenbelt. Safeguarding the site would be identifying it for future development and therefore not protecting its long term environmental interests. Part of the plot is ridge and furrow and could be of archaeological importance. It is a haven for wildlife. The site has previously been rejected because of visual impact and wildlife considerations. There reasons still stand. Access would be required along Riverside Gardens which would significantly increase traffic and compromise children's safety. Could result in potentially 168 plus cars which would further add to the congestion in the village. Many parents use cars to take children to the school, this would increase with more housing at this end of the village further adding to congestion. Pavements are narrow, increased traffic hazard. The village school is currently full, further classrooms would be</p>	<p>9476/26133</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	required. Would have implications on secondary schooling. Would change the character of Elvington from a traditional village into commuter sprawl. Would be disproportionate growth compared to the plans 7.6% suggested growth.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – infrastructure in Elvington is not adequate to facilitate a large growth. An increase in homes will mean more traffic passing through the village. This is already an issue.	9484/18745	
	Objection - the sewage system is already at capacity.	9501/18658	Flatford Limited
	Objection - the proposal will significantly change the village into a commuter location, which will change the feel of the community. There are insufficient amenities within the village to support a large expansion. The schools would have to drastically increase its places and size, and this scheme would increase flooding potential within the village. This development would increase traffic congestion and road safety within the village.	9518/18694	
	Objection – Elvington is already at full capacity with its services, i.e. sewage, surface water, school which still has a strong village atmosphere. Does not want to be made into another town.	9527/22430	
	Objection - would change the character of the village and its setting, making it more of a commuter suburb rather than a village. Road congestion, increased road noise and pollution. Main drainage and sewerage are already at capacity. Ecology and flooding, e.g. more run off from paved and tarmac areas, lack of green belt around the village.	9528/22432	
	Objection –the mass build of housing will increase traffic, which already makes a mockery of the 'B' class road to York. The mains drainage is already at capacity. The village school is already at capacity. The village will become a 'commuter' settlement and not a village. York Council needs to take the strong views of the village community before proposing any of these developments.	9551/19059	
	Objection –proposed size of development is inappropriate for small village and will have negative impacts on current services e.g. school and surgery are already at capacity, public transport service is limited and an increase in traffic would cause increased congestion and pollution. Elvington is only accessible by one road and increased cars would cause safety hazards, particularly near the school. Housing will destroy the habitats of deer which have been seen on this site. Elvington has only recently seen the development of The Conifers – there is no proven need for yet more housing in this village.	9554/19062	
Objection – the existing village's infrastructure is already at bursting point. Several people have given up cycling in the village because it has become dangerous to do so. Developing this area will only lead to the above situation being made untenable for those	9556/19081		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	already here. No requirement for this site to be set aside for future development. Should remain as productive farmland.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – residential development of this land should not be permitted under any circumstances. Elvington village cannot sustain a site development of the proposed size as the impact on traffic count, road safety and amenities (school, doctor’s surgery) will be disproportionate to the existing community. Rain water run-off from the developed land will overwhelm the existing drainage system which runs under the Main Street – foul water flows up and out of the manhole covers when this happens. This becomes a health and safety hazard to everyone, as well as the potential for property damage in the centre of the village.	9572/19075	
	Objection – road safety in Elvington is already an issue, the traffic outside the school is a hazard, the traffic levels are dangerous due to the narrowing of the road and lack of visibility due to parked cars. The rural nature of Elvington is already decreasing. Development will also have a significant impact on the biodiversity of the area. The area in question is currently an ideal habitat for a wide variety of flora and fauna.	9573/19279	
	Objection – this plan will increase the village by 20% and depending on occupancy of the houses could almost double the population. Only one shop, one public house and a hairdresser. The school and doctors’ surgery are already over-subscribed and there are simply not the facilities to sustain such an increase in residents. This will mean that they will commute up and down an already unsuitable and congested road. The current level of traffic is unacceptable and dangerous to the majority of school children who walk to school. City of York Council plan a growth of 76% - were this figure applied to Elvington it would mean an additional 37 houses, not the more than 400 that this could mean if all planning is granted. In the 1990s these proposals were rejected for the reasons of infrastructure, facilities, social impact etc.	9574/19281	
	Objection – by building more houses will cause issues such as ruining character of a rural village, school won’t be able to cope, road which is already too busy and dangerous will get busier and cause more danger to our children, increased crime and litter and why building on greenbelt land. Overall this plan is a disaster for our village.	9597/22448	
	Objection – significant issues include loss of green belt, diminution in the overall character of the village, a serious increase in the size of the village. Biggest concern will be the increase in road use and the linkage to road congestion around the shop and primary school. The B1228 already has attracted more traffic, increasing the ‘rat run’ through Elvington for East Riding village residents. The B1228 runs straight through the village.	9602/22460	
	Objection – this plan has too many houses.	9624/24152	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – main road cannot cope with extra traffic. Hazardous to people and vehicles. Very few amenities. Extension should be made to the urban area.	9640/22466	
	Objection – the scale would represent a very large and unsustainable increase in the size of this small rural village. This site is in the greenbelt. The facilities in Elvington are very limited. There is already considerable traffic noise and pollution and severe congestion at Grimston Bar at busy times. This will only exacerbate these problems.	9647/19770	
	Objection – not in residents’ interest to safeguard land. Should consider development proposals of the time not in advance. No exceptional circumstances to warrant development in greenbelt. Will no longer be protected from urban sprawl. Would double the size of the village. Disproportionate and unsustainable for the village services, amenities and impact on the highways and safety. Some of the land has already been considered for residential development and rejected; the reasons for refusal remain for these proposals. Social impact includes stretching services beyond adequate levels. No proven need for the provision of so many houses.	9667/19456	
	Objection – there will be traffic problems as a result of this development. 65% increase in size means this is no longer a village. No suitable drainage system. Safety on roads will be an issue.	9670/20131	
	Objection – the school is already full. The road would become too dangerous for children to cycle to school. It would be too dangerous for children to go to the playground alone.	9671/24207	
	Objection – extra traffic on an already very busy road. School is full. Field under discussion has ridge and furrow landscape. A haven for wildlife, birds and deer. The old bridge can only take so much traffic. Why take away Green Belt – we need all we can get.	9700/20149	
	Objection – disproportionate increase in the size of the village. Would turn Elvington from Rural Village into a commuter settlement. Village School is already at capacity. Increased Traffic Congestion. Road safety issues. Mains drainage and swage is already at capacity. Proposed sites are on current Green Belt and would ruin the special character of Elvington.	9710/20169	
	Objection– it takes away green belt land. The scale of development is too big. Small village environment would be compromised.	9714/20177	
	Objection – number of houses proposed is too high for the size of the village. The drainage and sewerage systems would not be able to cope. Schools and doctors surgery at capacity. Detrimental effect on the wildlife.	9719/20184	
	Objection – no opposed to some expansion to the village, but this is just too much. This is almost double the village. Any Local Plan should be based on local need and not aware of such a great need to join our village. Already the drainage is at full capacity and more housing means more cars.	9726/20200	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – understand the village school and doctors surgery are running at capacity and a further influx of people would reduce the quality of medical care and education for existing residents. Public transport would not be adequate and Elvington Lane would become more congested and dangerous. The amount of traffic would increase significantly leading to increased traffic, noise, pollution and additional danger for pedestrians especially school children.	9731/19536	
	Objection – local plan suggests the need to accommodate a growth level of 7.6%, this would amount to 40 houses in Elvington, not the 100 houses plus proposed. Scale of the proposals is not appropriate for a small village with only one shop, a primary school which is full, a doctor’s surgery operating at maximum capacity, no worthwhile public transport and significant congestion on local roads. Occupiers of houses on this site would inevitably travel into York for employment, education, shopping and leisure which cannot be sustainable. Significant housing development should only allowed within the ring road.	9743/19553	
	Objection – safeguarded land is supposed to be land that is safeguarded from development. Once safeguarded for future development (after the 15 years of this Local Plan), development on the site could possibly be brought forward. Scale of development implied is inappropriate for a small village of fewer than 500 houses and represents an increase of approx. 20% in addition to other proposed developments. Proposal significantly extends the village footprint into green belt land. Development of this site cannot be sustainable in a small village which offers very limited employment, no useful public transport, one primary school – currently full, one doctors’ surgery – currently at capacity. Expansion would reinstate temporary classrooms. The City of York housing requirements should be met primarily by extension of the urban area, supplemented by limited development at larger villages and by minor infill at small villages such as Elvington. To do otherwise is inappropriate and unsustainable. Most of the land on this site has already been considered for possible residential development and been rejected for several reasons including access, visual amenity not to mention the detrimental effect on wildlife. It is illogical to reintroduce this land when all the original problems remain. Will cause congestion and road safety hazards through the village, particularly around the school. Development of this further safeguarded land would mean that Elvington becomes a commuter settlement, rather than a rural village full of character. There will be increased traffic noise and pollution, and increased congestion at the access to Grimston Bar roundabout. The centre of the village is a conservation area, with its traditional village green and rural aspect. There is no proven need for the proposed level of existing housing in this area. Surely any local authority’s plan has to be based on	9766/20221	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	proven local need, not (as is the case here) on City of York Council's aspirational growth ambitions, which would irreversibly change the whole aspect of Greater York.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – object to this land being safeguarded because the potential number of homes which could be built on this site is disproportionate to the size of the village, and it would have an adverse effect on the rural nature of the village.	9776/20229	
	Objection –concerns relate to the size, and character, of the village. The village will double in size and this will, undoubtedly, change the character of the settlement from being a rural village to becoming a commuter township. Local school is already at capacity. The school would require substantial enlargement, at considerable cost. The atmosphere, and ethos, of the school would also be detrimentally affected. Demographic fluctuations may also necessitate the council funding costly travel to other schools. Traffic congestion, pollution and road safety concerns. The village already suffers from HGV traffic and further traffic, particularly around school hours, raises logistical issues pertaining to road safety and parking. Concerns relating to infrastructure most notably pressures on drainage and sewage. Development is on Green Belt and would be to the detriment of the village's character and its attendant local Wildlife Habitat. It would be wholly disproportionate to the size and character of the existing village. There must be more suitable locations for development.	9778/20232	
	Objection – proposals would seriously damage the environment of Elvington. The plans would inevitably make the village much busier and noisier, the roads and surroundings would be more dangerous to children. There is likely to be a rise in crime and anti-social behaviour, while the school (which we understand is already close to capacity) and other local facilities would be stretched beyond reasonable levels.	9788/20247	
	Objection – developments in Elvington will be disproportionate for a small village. There will be too much encroachment on to Green Belt land. No account seems to have been taken as to the affect these plans will have on the wildlife of this area. 135 homes is disproportionate for this small village. It will alter the structure of the village considerably. This is not a sustainable development, drainage capacity is inadequate, the local medical and school services could not sustain such an increase, and the road system could not cope with a large increase in traffic.	9791/20252	
	Objection- the number of houses would be as many as 135, increasing the size of this rural village by as much as 65%. This is disproportionate to the size of the community. The current infrastructure is not large enough to support this increase in population, making it more unsafe for children to travel about the village unsupervised. This land has already been rejected due to impact on wildlife, visual amenity and access. It will change	9798/20267	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the rural nature of the village.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – increase of 20% is unsustainable. Considerable increase in traffic which will have detrimental effect on the whole of the village. The primary school is full, the medical practice is at capacity, there is virtually no employment in the village, public transport is minimal and sewage and waste services are at full capacity. Local Plan suggests 7-8% growth in new housing, recently built new homes in the village mean another 20 or so properties over the next 5-10 years would be sufficient to meet the declared growth requirement.	9803/24169	
	Objection – can only be damaging for the village. Small pockets of development such those planned for Church Lane and Dauby Lane with properties in keeping with the rest of the village character would not be a problem.	9804/24171	
	Objection – this land is Green Belt, therefore must remain this way to retain the wildlife/flora/fauna of the village. Proposal would increase residential aspect of the village by 65% - this is a disproportionate increase which would adversely affect the existing culture of the community. The water infrastructure cannot cope. Yorkshire Water confirmed they do not have the drainage capacity for such an unrealistic development. The B1228 cannot cope with the demands of current traffic, resulting in congestion and long traffic queues not only at peak times. HGVs cause noise / damage. The village no longer has a post office and public transport is minimal. Street parking outside the only shop is becoming a danger, particularly at peak times. The surgery is currently at capacity. Already have too many powercuts, extra residents' means extra demands on a system already stretched.	9812/19327	
	Objection – this land is Greenbelt, it must, remain this way to retain the wildlife/flora/fauna of the village. The proposal would create a disproportionate increase the residential aspect of the village which would adversely affect the existing culture of the community. The infrastructure cannot cope. Yorkshire Water has confirmed that they do not have the drainage capacity for such an unrealistic development. The B1228 cannot cope with the demands of current traffic. HGVs cause noise and damage. Public transport is minimal. Street parking outside the only shop is becoming a danger, particularly at peak times.	9813/20273	
	Objection – excessive increase would adversely affect the community. It is not proportionate. Extension into green the belt would change the character of the village as well as a unique factor of York. Recent national government instructions to utilise brownfield sites ahead of green belt. Majority of the site has previously been rejected. These reasons are still valid. Increase in traffic which is already an issue. Would affect the	9814/24182	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	safety of adults and children walking or cycling in the village. Significant effect on the quality of life in the village. Current infrastructure would not support such an extensive development. Yorkshire Water has confirmed there is no drainage capacity to ensure development is sustainable.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – scale is inappropriate. Doubling the size of the village. Villages’ services are at capacity. Traffic would cause a safety hazard in the city. Plans are not sustainable. Development would lead to an increase in pollution and noise in the village. The plans are not sustainable.	9823/20280	
	Objection – removal of Green Belt land will have a negative impact on availability of agricultural and livestock farming land meaning less locally produced food, affecting the local economy and having wider environmental consequences. Wildlife habitat of fields and hedgerows will be destroyed and the loss will be irreversible. Can ill afford to lose green land which provides soak-away and natural defences against carbon emissions. Development would create additional pressure on the drainage system. The existing drainage has no further capacity to support any development. There are not enough amenities or sufficient infrastructure to support growth to the extent proposed by site ref 802. There will be an inevitable increase in traffic volume which would cause major congestion problems. Existing parking/road safety issue at the site of the doctor’s surgery/sports club. There will be an increase in pollution from traffic and also from the new households, by way of carbon emissions and light pollution, which will have an adverse impact on what will be left of the wildlife in the area. Where are all the extra people going to come from, not representative of local need. The proposed expansion of the village is totally inappropriate, not needed, unsustainable and out of proportion. It should be abandoned as ill-conceived and not based on reality. There will be a likely negative impact on local property values – housed will no longer be in such a rural setting and therefore less desirable. In 1990s a planning application covering a similar area was rejected on the grounds of many of the points raised above. If these points were valid then, they should be valid today.	9824/20284	
	Objection – opposed to taking land out of the green belt. Will lead to a significant change in the nature of the village. Increased traffic congestion and there are already road safety issues. These issues would be intensified.	9828/24226	
	Objection - the land has already been considered for possible residential development and been rejected for several reasons, including effect on wildlife, roads, amenities, a full village school, a full doctor’s surgery, pollution, sewerage. Minor infill would be a positive to bring Elvington village together but still remain a rural characterful village, not the	9831/22066	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	intrusive suggested proposal. The proposed new developments would just swamp the village and create the most horrendous traffic problems, and access.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – not proportionate for a village. Council suggest a 7.6% growth in the population of York, any increases in housing in the village should be in line with this figure, not the proposed nearly 40%. Very limited public transport, one shop, no post office, a school at capacity so the proposals are not sustainable. Infrastructure network is poor. Parts of the site have already been turned down at the previous stage, seems illogical to create an even larger allocation.	9833/24266	
	Objection – will lead to overloading of utility services and amenities. The roads are not up to standard for the existing volume of vehicles and at times is quite dangerous.	9845/24251	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)	Objection – this land should not be taken out of the greenbelt. The infrastructure cannot cope with additional houses.	9847/24191	
	Objection- the land should not be taken out of the Green Belt. The infrastructure of the village is insufficient and the drainage system could not cope with the increase.	9848/21496	
	Objection – other proposals already in place for considerable residential development, alongside the Whinthorpe development which would have a massive impact on this side of York. The present proposals would be disproportionate and have an adverse affect on the existing culture of the community. There is no infrastructure to support the development. The roads are already very busy. The extra traffic will cause problems for residents and be a danger to children walking or cycling. There is a very limited bus service. The main sewer/surface water drain cannot cope so would struggle to cope with the extra surface water. The valid reasons for rejecting the proposals in the 1990s still apply now. Inappropriate and unsustainable.	9852/24256	
	Objection – unnecessary for a small village and will have a huge negative impact on village life in terms of extra traffic congestion, safety, noise and its population. Green belt should not be used to enable the village to remain a village. The school is operating at capacity. The impact on safety is of grave concern.	9861/24264	
	Objection- should use brown field sites first. Local infrastructure cannot cope with additions. Sewage, surface water, drainage and schools are already a problem.	9873/20302	
	Objection – the village is clam and peaceful and should stay this way. People move to the village for a healthy positive life, concerned this development will jeopardise this.	9875/24294	
	Objection- the present population would be a disproportionate increase which would have an adverse affect on the existing culture of the community. There is no infrastructure to support this development. The B1228 is already very busy. The extra traffic would have to access the development through white house grove and Riverside Gardens cruising problems or cycling to school down main street. Facilities such as the school the school, medical centre and shop would not cope with the number of people involved. The school is full there is also very limited bus service. The main sewer/water drain cannot cope with current population.	9877/203030	
Objection – there needs to be a village plan put in place to allow growth at a steady and practical pace. The primary school and doctor’s surgery are already over subscribed. Before any further building is considered it is necessary that plans are in place to cope with any increase in village population. The main road is already very busy. No guarantee that jobs at the industrial estate would go to local residents thus meaning additional journeys through the village. Would increase the village 20% when the	9884/24320		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	council say the growth across the city is 7.6%. Drainage/sewerage must be improved. Improvements to the roads and suitable safe cycle routes are also needed.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – inappropriate development in the green belt, detrimental social impact and impact on the character and aspect of the village. The level of development is unsustainable. The site was previously refused. Enormous impact on roads, safety, noise and pollution. Schools are at capacity. 20% growth in Elvington compared to 7.6% across the city. Will become a commuter sprawl. Doctors are at capacity. There is limited public transport and retail. The sewerage system is at capacity.	9900/24343	
	Objection – the village cannot sustain anymore large scale residential development. The main B1228 road is totally inadequate for present traffic. The drainage services could not cope. The river/flood defence system for the whole area struggles to cope with heavy rainfall and will only be an obstacle to any future large scale development. . East Riding of Yorkshire Council have recognised that Sutton upon Derwent is a special rural village and is to be safeguarded from certain development in their Local Plan. Elvington is a special rural village and should be maintained as such. Elvington should be treated with sympathetic vision not as an extension of the City of York.	9904/24347	
	Objection – significant extension of the village footprint into green belt land. Inappropriate scale of development for a small village. Not sustainable: very limited employment, no useful public transport, full primary school, doctor's surgery at capacity. Inadequate and congested roads and road safety hazards. Increased traffic noise and pollution. City of York housing requirements should be met primarily by extension of the urban area, supplemented by limited development at larger villages and by minor infill at small villages. This site has already been rejected for residential development for several reasons (access, visual amenity and effect on wildlife). The village is a conservation area. Insufficient local infrastructure (school, sewage, roads, public transport). No proven need for the proposed level of existing housing in this area.	9912/21655	
	Objection – opposed to this proposal	9916/24365	
	Objection – land is currently green belt and should not be removed from this status. Would greatly impact on the village. Yorkshire Water is already up to capacity for drainage and the local junior school is unable to accommodate extra pupils. The bus service is sporadic and would be unable to cope forcing people to use cars for daily commute which will increase the already congested B1238 during peak hours.	9917/24369	
	Objection – opposed to taking land out of the green belt. Elvington is a rural village which typifies characteristically the history and style of York and North Yorkshire villages. Plans will have negative impact on this and change the culture of the existing	9920/24375	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village. Pressure on already stretched infrastructure. Doctor's surgery and school already full to capacity. Yorkshire Water have expressed that there are drainage limitations. Brownfield should be used first. Concerns about the health and safety impact. Increased risk of road traffic accidents.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – will have deeply adverse effect on the area and on the quality of life for existing residents. Little thought given to the infrastructure implications. The B1228 is already a busy road, will surely become significantly more dangerous and congested particularly in the centre of the village. The huge number of houses planned is out of proportion to the size of the village.	9930/24423	
	Objection – land will be taken out of the green belt. It is unsustainable without major new infrastructure. Yorkshire Water has already confirmed there is no drainage capacity. The B1228 could not cope with the additional traffic. Unless the B1228 is upgraded the plans are not viable.	9936/24472	
	Objection – this is a huge increase in terms of residential development. There is inadequate development to support this. There are serious concerns over drainage.	9937/24475	
	Objection – inappropriate site. Would almost double the size of the village and be too much for the infrastructure such as available places in the primary school, sewerage capacity, volume of traffic on the main road and through Elvington. 20% increase is on top of already proposed developments at Dauby Lane and Church Lane. Parts of this land have previously been rejected for residential development due to poor access, visual amenity and the detrimental effects to wildlife. All of these original concerns remain.	9943/24487	
	Objection- once this land comes out of green belt and is set aside as safeguarded land, the potential for development would be accelerated and the village's residential size could increase possibly by one fifth very rapidly, totally inappropriate and unsustainable rate of growth. The small road through Elvington could not cope with this increase in usage. The already over stretched infrastructure, school and medical centre could not cope. The character of a rural English village would be destroyed. Elvington has already had significant development over the past couple of years and further development on this scale would far outweigh CYCs local plans suggested growth rate of 7.6%.	9944/20311	
	Objection – Elvington is a small rural village, the school is already full. There is very limited public transport and employment. The village cannot sustain such a large development. The huge increase in traffic would make it unsafe for children to walk, scoot or cycle to school as they currently do. Elvington is a rural village centred around a conservation area with a strong community and would become just another commuter	9948/24209	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	settlement.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objections – this is a huge increase in terms of residential development. There is inadequate development to support this. There are serious concerns over drainage.	9950/24495	
	Objection – see survey 2. The area within the City of York Council is at present reducing employment by at least 1000 jobs per year, so how will be purchasing these proposed properties? Not local people.	9961/21122	
	Objection – scale of development is inappropriate. Cannot be sustainable in a small village that offers very limited employment, no useful public transport, one primary school currently full and one doctor’s surgery at capacity. More care driving no inadequate and congested roads. The centre of the village is a conservation area. Would expand the village by almost double and outstrip the provisions of the local infrastructure.	9981/24153	
	Objection – the scale of this development is neither appropriate, sustainable nor proportionate. This would increase the village by 20%. It will increase road traffic and school place demand. Question how the school will cope with demand. Development should be on a scale of 56 houses. This land has previously been considered for development and rejected.	9991/25941	
	Objection – this will increase the village by 65%. The school is already at capacity, there is no regular bus service and there is no infrastructure to support this increase. The drains are at capacity.	9996/19479	
	Objection – proposals for Elvington would double the size of the village. The infrastructure in the village is already under strain. The proposals for Elvington are disproportionate, unsustainable and inappropriate, as well as being located in the greenbelt. Housing requirements should be met through appropriate expansion of the urban area and appropriated scaled developments in the surrounding villages. Elvington should remain rural in nature and retain its character.	10001/20339	
	Objection – this proposal is not appropriate in size or proportionate to the village. The infrastructure is as capacity already. The site was previously rejected due to access routes. The villages of York are being eroded.	10015/259591	
	Objection – a number of other sites have already been identified for development, another additional site will cause a disproportionate increase in the size of the village. The special character of a rural, friendly village will disappear. The local school is at capacity. There will be an affect on traffic which already causes significant delays. The village already suffers from flooding. It will negatively affect the wildlife habitat. Green belt land should only be used when all other alternatives have been looked at according	10039/24385	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to national policy, has this happened.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – inappropriate and too large for the village. The school is at capacity. The road is in poor state and traffic is bad at peak times. The land is greenbelt and protects the boundary of the village and visibility from neighbouring villages. Housing requirements should be met primarily by extensions of the urban area supplemented by limited development at larger villages and minor infill at small villages such as Elvington. To do otherwise is inappropriate and unsustainable. Elvington is one of only there remaining rural villages. It will ruin Elvington’s rural character and be an urban settlement in a rural setting.	10044/24399	
	Objection – green belt land. Village would increase by 65%. Scale of project is too high. Character of village would change. Site was previously rejected. Traffic congestion issues. Infrastructure cannot handle development.-	10047/21125	
	Objection – the scale of the proposals are inappropriate, increasing the village by 20%. With planned development nearby at Whinthorpe there is no need to overdevelop a small community like Elvington. It is quite right that there is some development in every area, but not a huge plan like this. Elvington recently added a development of affordable housing so there is clear evidence that the village accepts and welcomes considered planning and integration into the existing community.	10052/24414	
	Objection – the site is too large to be safeguarded on top of the land already proposed in the original plan. Disproportionate growth. The village is already running at full stretch in all aspects – the school, the doctor’s surgery and lack of public transport. The lack of anything for teenagers. The current infrastructure could not take it. The sewage works was upgraded but still can’t cope. How does the council arrive at the figures for this amount of rural housing.	10058/24424	
	Objection – the land is greenbelt and should remain so. Too many houses for a village of approximately 900. There is no planned infrastructure. There is no capacity for extra drainage which will put a strain on flood defences. The term safeguarded is confusing.	10072/24442	
	Objection – the land is greenbelt and should remain so. Too many houses for a village of approximately 900. There is no planned infrastructure. There is no capacity for extra drainage which will put a strain on flood defences. The term safeguarded is confusing.	10073/24447	
	Objection – Suggested expansion is not proportional. Traffic will become more congested. Danger to children. Character of the village would be lost. Has the Council established employment opportunities or is the housing to provide commuter housing for Leeds employers. Is this productive for York. Most of the land has already been considered for housing and rejected in relation to access, visual amenity and effect on	10074/21130	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	wildlife. These reasons still stand.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – this site is in the greenbelt. Government state that 90% of residential and industrial development should be on brown field sites before greenbelt. Previous applications have been rejected due to poor access. Elvington will be come a commuter settlement, an urban sprawl. The character of the village and surrounding area will be changed and the rural aspect lost.	10076/24456	
	Objection – the loss of green belt land is inappropriate for a rural village. There will be increased traffic, especially HGV's to an already busy infrastructure, the possible inclusion of B2 use could cause a nuisance to local villagers, loss of privacy and views for a number of residential properties adjacent to the site.	10079/20347	
	Objection – land should not be taken from the greenbelt.	10092/25811	
	Objection – site is in the greenbelt. The infrastructure cannot sustain further development. Impact on traffic, highways and road safety. The village is in a conservation area.	10095/25818	
	Objection – this will dramatically increase the size of Elvington village. It will negatively impact on the community. There is no infrastructure to support this. This takes land out of the greenbelt. There is no drainage capacity.	10109/25836	
	Objection – all the infrastructure in the village is at capacity.	10110/25838	
	Objection – takes precious land out of Green Belt. Village will increase by 65%. Village would no longer be a proper friendly care in community village. No drainage and no infrastructure, just madness. Main Street already too busy at peak times – sometimes dangerous with HGVs. Elvington Primary School is already full.	10116/19356	
	Objection – this level of expansion is unsustainable given the infrastructure and amenities currently available. This village is served by a small rural road which is already heavily congested. Increased traffic will have a detrimental effect on air pollution and increase road accidents. This will have a detrimental impact on the environment and wildlife.	10119/25848	
	Objection – land should not be taken out of the greenbelt. The residential size of the village would rise by 65%. Amenities in the village are already stretched. This number of houses is too large for this rural community.	10125/25856	
	Objection – proposal significantly extends village footprint into green belt land. Scale of development is inappropriate for a small village of fewer than 500 houses – if these plans go ahead the village could almost double in size. Development of this site cannot be sustainable in a small village which offers very limited employment, no useful public transport, one primary school (currently full) and one doctor's surgery (currently at	10164/19361	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>capacity). 100 additional houses will result in 200 additional cars driving to the main urban area on inadequate and congested roads. CYC housing requirements should be met primarily by extension of the urban area, supplemented by limited development at larger villages and by minor infill at small villages such as Elvington. To do otherwise is inappropriate and unsustainable. Most of the land on this site has already been considered for possible residential development and been rejected for several reasons including access, visual amenity and effect on wildlife. It is illogical to reintroduce this land when all the original problems remain. Additional 200 cars will cause congestion and road safety hazards through the village, particularly around the school. Many children walk or cycle to the village green and play area – additional traffic will be a hazard to them. School would require temporary classrooms to deal with additional pupils. Elvington will become a commuter settlement rather than a village full of character. There will be increased traffic noise and pollution, road safety issues around the school, increased congestion at the access to Grimston Bar roundabout. The centre of the village is a conservation area, with its traditional village green and rural aspect. Proposals would outstrip provisions of the local infrastructure. There is no proven need for the proposed level of housing in this area. The local plan has to be based on proven local need.</p>		
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – land should not be removed from the greenbelt. The infrastructure is insufficient.</p>	10169/24201	
	<p>Objection – site is inappropriate development. There is staunch opposition to this plan in the village. If implemented, it would create serious and unwarranted tensions in Elvington. There is little infrastructure to support it, with Elvington having very little access points. New homes would mean an extra 100 or so school-aged children. Elvington Primary School does not have the facilities to cope with such extra numbers.</p>	10173/19371	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Strongly object to this site being taken out of the green belt (safeguarded) for housing. Potential number of houses on this site would totally overwhelm our existing rural community. There is no village infrastructure to support this size of development.</p>	10175/19377	
	<p>Objection – opposed to safeguard the Green Belt should be the primary aim of the Council. There are plenty of unused areas in brown field sites and the city centre.</p>	10176/19382	
	<p>Objection – expansion now proposed is not in proportion and not needed locally. Recent new houses at Conifers and Jubilee Court provide low cost homes and add to the wide variety of dwellings available in Elvington. The school is now thriving – surely further overwhelming expansion of the village would result in the return of temporary</p>	10190/19401	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	classrooms. Elvington is a rural village and not a suburb. Its appeal lies in the character of the village centre and easy access to the surrounding farmland. Virtually surrounding it with new housing would ruin its character.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – proposals are already in place for considerable residential development in elvington. Along with Whinthorpe, this will have massive impact on this area of York. Present proposals are disproportionate. It would have adverse affect on the existing culture of the community. There is no infrastructure to support this. The B118 is already congested. Extra traffic will make this worse and cause a danger to children. The school is full; there is a limited bus service. The main drain and sewers cannot cope with heavy rain now.	10193/26002	
	Objection – object to this land being taken out of green belt and safeguarded for future development. Proposals are already in place for considerable residential development in Elvington e.g. developments on Dauby Lane, Church Lane and at Whinthorpe. Present proposals would be a disproportionate increase which would have an adverse effect on the existing culture of the community. There is no infrastructure to support this development. The B1228 is already very busy and there is congestion backing up from Grimston Bar at peak times. The extra traffic would have to access the development through White House Grove and Riverside Gardens, causing problems for residents and danger to children walking or cycling to school down Main Street. School, medical centre and shop would not cope with the number of people involved. School is already full to capacity; there is a limited bus service and no room to expand the shop. The main sewer / surface water drain in the village cannot cope now when it rains heavily, so would struggle to cope with extra surface water. The valid reasons for rejecting these proposals in the 1990s still apply now and this proposed future residential development is inappropriate and unsustainable.	10196/19408	
	Objection – disproportionate increase of the size of the village. Insufficient school, doctors, utilities and amenities. Site previously rejected for residential development. Congested roads. Adverse impact on the culture of the village community.	10197/21140	
	Objection – land would be taken from the green belt. Increase in houses is disproportionate with the size of the village. Public transport is poor.	10210/20356	
	Objection – land taken out of the Green Belt. Need of major infrastructure. No drainage capacity. Too much traffic. Dangerous roads for pedestrians and children on the village green. Gridlocked.	10211/21170	
	Objection – grossly over-sized development destroying the essential character. Green Belt land. Limited infrastructure.	10214/21175	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – residential development in recent years with a negative impact on the rural character of the village. More pressure in local infrastructure and services. Inappropriate scale of development and detrimental impact on the village. Local services at full capacity. Traffic congestion and road safety issues.</p>	10221/21190	
	<p>Objection – the development could double the size of the village. Very little public transport. School and Doctor's are full. Roads are congested. Previously rejected. Expansion planned is not proportionate with the size of the village. Lack of drainage capacity.</p>	10235/21220	
	<p>Objection – the village is very aware of the pressure that developments of the last four decades has put upon the village and its environment. This village is becoming a dormitory settlement. These proposals will only destroy what remains of its natural character. The increase in population has not yet brought any improvement to the infrastructure. The growth in traffic has severely damaged the environment. To ignore the greenbelt offends villagers, upsets wildlife habitats, and destroys the village status.</p>	10246/26007	
	<p>Support – Site 802 is available, achievable and suitable (in a sustainable location well related to the existing built form and is accessible from the main transport network, and does not warrant Green Belt status). Site considered to be both deliverable and a viable location for future housing development. Scheme will seek to avoid development in Flood Zones 2 and 3. An appropriate strategy can be formulated in respect of connecting to the existing system for foul water and existing system or river Derwent for surface water. Site will be primarily accessed via Riverside Gardens with additional accesses from either Roxby Close and the northern boundary of the larger site. Where feasible, existing trees and hedgerows will be retained and incorporated. Open space framework would focus on improving the quality and accessibility of existing open fields sitting within the Green Belt. Indicative development capacity of 93-143 homes. Site is able to utilise and enhance existing infrastructure in the surrounding area. Site does not perform a Green Belt function: it is built up on two of its four sides, contained on three and would not contribute to urban sprawl. The site would present an opportunity to establish an effective, long-term Green Belt boundary along its eastern edge. The watercourse and associated parking that forms this boundary would be a robust and defensible edge to the settlement.</p>	10272/18507	Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes
	<p>Objection – increase in residents too high. Drainage at maximum</p>	10283/21272	
	<p>Objection – land would be taken from the green belt zone. Too many houses would be built on the land. There is not adequate infrastructure in place.</p>	10286/21279	
	<p>Objection – development would be detrimental to the character of the village. Facilities</p>	10287/21283	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and amenities could not cope with the increase in pressure.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – current proposals are excessive. The amount of land proposed is out of proportion with the rest of the village. Infrastructure would need to be addressed.	10288/21285	
	Objection – development not proportional with the village. Inadequate infrastructure. Green belt land will be used. School is at capacity. Traffic problems will increase.	10289/21289	
	Objection – adverse effect on local primary school and road network.	10290/21294	
	Objection – villages current population is at capacity. Public transport is not reliable. Drainage at capacity. No evidence to show benefit from increase in population. Added danger on the roads. Danger to children and parents going to school.	10293/21302	
	Objection – this would have a dramatic effect on the traffic flows through and endanger the safety of children. The area is presently used as grazing land by local farmer and developing this land would alter the character of the village. The present local infrastructure could not cope with the additional housing.	10298/21312	
	Objection – this site has been rejected for reasons such as access, visual amenity and the effect on wildlife. These problems still remain. The scale is inappropriate and unsustainable in this location. This would almost double the size of the village. The increase in cars would further congest the roads, the school, doctors at capacity with limited bus services.	10305/20358	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope with high volume of traffic. Impact on GP and school. Limited public transport. Proposed expansion disproportionate to the village. Green belt land lost. Village life lost.	10306/21837	
	Objection – this site is disproportionate and this would adversely affect the existing culture of the community. This proposal should not take land out of the greenbelt. Traffic is already congested and there are increased safety hazards. There should be a weight limit for HGVs.	10345/26130	
	Objection – this will spoil the village and cause major problems. The main road through Elvington is difficult and dangerous to pedestrians. There is no capacity for further traffic. Elvington should remain a village.	10376/25121	
Objection –loss of productive agricultural land and priceless natural wildlife habitat – should be considered only where there is a pressing demand, What is the pressing demand in Elvington. This would increase the village by something like half again. Is the local infrastructure going to be able to shoulder the extra demands of homes and people and traffic. Elvington can expand only gradually giving resources of the village time to keep up. Will flood defence pumping system be able to cope.	10382/21859		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – the development would increase the number of houses by 20%, leading to increased traffic and a strain on amenities. The school is full. There is little local employment and no useful public transport. More houses will lead to more cars, congestion, traffic noise and pollution. The site has been rejected for development before because of access, visual amenity and effects on wildlife. It is illogical to consider this site as these issues still remain.	10406/22497	
	Objection- route through Elvington is currently very busy with an increase of 135 houses the current road infrastructure would not be able to deal with this – busier and more dangerous. School – any increase in numbers would result in taking more field space away from the children. Village amenities are not there to support the application.	10413/22508	
	Object – development size is too big. Scale will overwhelm current community and infrastructure.	10423/22521	
	Objection – to have this huge development all at once would be completely unnatural and disproportionate and would overwhelm our very few local amenities. Object because this land is designated as Green Belt. If cannot protect this piece of Green Belt land where will it end and what is the point of having Green Belt land at all?	10426/22086	
	Objection – proposal would double the size of the village. There is a lot of wildlife in the area. Development cannot be sustained without public transport. Character of village will be destroyed.	10443/22525	
	Objection – this would take land from protected green belt. The village is also on maximum good protection – this would increase flooding.	10445/22529	
	Objection – this should not be approved as it takes green belt land, the village would grow by 65%, Elvington does not have the infrastructure to support this, there is insufficient drainage capacity. This is not a sustainable development.	10446/22534	
	Objection – the proposed land is green belt also the infrastructure of Elvington cannot cope with more housing, the main drain is not large enough and fills up within minutes of a downpour. More building will make this worse.	10447/22538	
	Objection – the proposed land is green belt also the infrastructure of Elvington cannot cope with more housing, the main drain is not large enough and fills up within minutes of a downpour. More building will make this worse.	10448/22540	
	Objection – the proposal extends the village into green belt land, leading to an inappropriate expansion of the village. The village could double in size, contrasting with a 2% increase over ten years to 2011. The village must develop at a sustainable rate. There is no demand for further development, destroying the villages' rural character. York's surrounding villages are one of the attractions of visiting the city and need	10451/22553	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>protecting. Development of this site is cannot be sustainable because of the lack of infrastructure and amenities. 100 houses will mean 200 cars leading to congestion. York housing requirements should be met by extending the urban area. Development of this land has been rejected in the past. Elvington could become a commuter settlement rather than a rural village of character. There will be increased traffic pollution, road safety issues, traffic congestion. The village would almost double in size and outstrip the infrastructure. There is no proven need for the proposed level of housing and it will destroy the village character.</p>		
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – detrimental to the visual aspect of the village. Massive removal of green belt land. Traffic issues in the village. School is full. The doctors’ surgery is full. There is inadequate public transport.</p>	<p>10453/22557</p>	
	<p>Objection – the development will lead to a huge amount of additional traffic and will cause road safety hazards through the village particularly around the school. The village already suffers from large lorries cutting though to get down to the M62 at Howden, with the parked cars around the village hall/shop it can be gridlocked at peak hours. The village infrastructure is not able to cope with this volume of traffic. Additional traffic will be a hazard to children and will make travelling by car more necessary, adding further congestion to the roads. The school recently had 2 permanent classrooms built to replace the temporary mobile classrooms that had been there for many years due to village expansion. As York is one of the worst funded LEA’s in the country, expansion would reinstate temporary classroom, this would be a huge backward step for our local children. The residential developments in the initial phase for Church Lane and Dauby Lane and development of this further safeguarded land would mean that Elvington becomes a commuter settlement, urban sprawl rather than a rural village full of character .There will be an increase of traffic noise and pollution, road safety issues around the school, increased congestion at the access to Grimston Bar.</p>	<p>10454/22562</p>	
	<p>Objection – The proposed housing developments for Elvington are very poor and completely disproportionate to the needs of the village. There has been significant local development in the village over the last few years, including the affordable housing schemes on Elvington Lane. I feel that this is a good thing as the village does need to grow and develop. However this needs to be proportionate to the needs of the local area, and with the proposed developments at Church Lane, Dauby Lane and Whinthorpe this is more than adequate to meet the needs of the local population. If this development goes ahead it will ruin the character of the village and effectively gridlock the centre with traffic. The Main Access road to Elvington is very poor quality, no</p>	<p>10455/22564</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pavements, full of pot holes and very bendy. As the villages in East Yorkshire are expanding the amount of traffic on the roads seems to be increasing exponentially. Before long an accident will happen outside he school. The village amenities are in short supply, we have a virtually non existent bus service, no post office/bank, single shop and no real work opportunities.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection - 135 houses is far too many to be built in the village. This will take the village population to well over the amount there should be for a village. There again is not enough drainage to support all the potential flooding. The village infrastructure couldn't support this many people. This would also take land out of the green belt. Why have a green belt at all if you just build on it anyway. The village could support a few more houses and I don't object to a small development such as the one that has just been built on the edge of the village, but 135 houses is far too many.	10456/22092	
	Objection - strongly object to green belt land being used for development. One of the many purposes of designating land as green belt is to protect and preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and villages. Elvington falls very firmly into this category. Moving this land to safeguarded status lays the way for possible future development, and development of 4ha of land will impact the character and setting of this long established village. Will also impact heavily on the local facilities such as the primary school and doctor's surgery, which are already at capacity. The possible development of the land will also negatively impact on access to existing residents and potential new residents. Road infrastructure is not in place to cope with the inevitable extra traffic. Extra road traffic will add to the already growing road congestion and increase road safety issue. There will also be an increase in road noise and pollution and additional congestion issues at Grimston Bar. Green belt land is also very important for allowing wildlife to flourish in the area putting a large section of land under development will have an impact on local wildlife. Concerned about the impact of flood defences. This is a well known area for flooding, building on land which soaks up surface water prior to draining it away will only add to the long term flooding issues. Understand that parts of this land have already been considered for development and rejected for many reasons. It therefore seems illogical that this land should again be considered for development.	10457/22565	
	Objection – significantly extends the village footprint into green belt land. A site of this size would mean an increase in vehicle access and the main road could not cope especially being so close to the village school, sports club, and doctor's surgery with on road parking already being such a hazard during weekend and evening sports fixtures, and school drop off ties. This makes the area hazardous to both pedestrians and drivers	10459/22569	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>as there is not a clear view for crossing the road or driving along the road. Turning traffic will interfere with the free flow of traffic o B1228 thereby creating another traffic hazard. Large lorries and tractors frequently us this route and already create hazardous conditions. Traffic is already a big problem, crossing and accessing the main road is very hazardous for school children, parents with push chairs and the elderly. Development of this site can not be sustainable in a small village which offers limited amenities, one small village shop, restricted public transport, a school that is already full and one doctors surgery – currently all at capacity. City of York Housing requirements should be met primarily by extension of the urban area, supplemented by limited development at larger villages and by minor infill at smaller villages such as Elvington. To do otherwise is inappropriate and unsustainable. Most of the land on this site has already been considered for possible residential development and been rejected for several reasons including access, visual amenity and effect on wildlife. It is wholly illogical reintroduce land when all the original problems remain.</p>		
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - the removal of this area of 4ha from the greenbelt will have a major impact of the biodiversity of the local area. Hedgerow will be lost, will mean fewer habitat for nesting birds, the loss of the hedgerow will vitally interconnect a range of habitats. Grass meadows will be lost which have been established nationally as a need to keep and increase the number. The infrastructure of the village would not be able to cope should the area be removed form the greenbelt and eventual planning is sought for this site. Pollution will increase due to the vast increase of vehicle movements and the very limited public transport that also exists. The potential development would be a large % increase of the village footprint and the population with amenities such as the school and doctors unable to meet demand. Surface water will increase with the potential development therefore potentially increasing the chance of flooding as the flood defences installed by the environment agency did not plan for a development of this size. The traffic for Elvington Lane into Grimston Bar will greatly increase form the current 10min wait at rush hour, this will increase air pollution which in turn will affect people’s health. The removal of this site form the green belt is unsustainable in a range of different scenarios as stated above and environmentally will have a massive impact on the local habitats.</p>	<p>10461/22572</p>	
	<p>Objection – the boundary for this site is shown incorrectly and includes part of my garden. Asks for the site to be removed from the next stage of the Local Plan. The expansion plans for Elvington are not proportionate, appropriate or sustainable. They are not for local needs but for in-migration.</p>	<p>10463/22098</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – against this proposal because it will use a large green field plot of land with 120/150 house is out of all proportion to the size of the existing village. This would change the whole character of the place. The infrastructure is not in place and probably would not be put in place to cope with this sort of development. Yorkshire Water have stated that the drainage would not cope.. It barely copes at the moment with no development. We may need more houses but this is not the place.</p>	10464/22102	
	<p>Objection – most of the land of this site has already been considered for possible residential development and been rejected for several reasons including access, visual amenity and effect on wildlife. This land should not be re-introduced when all the original problems remain. There is also a private equestrian area on part of the site which is used daily used by more than 10 of my friends. No other similar facilities exist in Elvington</p>	10465/22577	
	<p>Objection – need to keep green belt. School doesn't have capacity. Only one pub and one shop. Increase in traffic.</p>	10466/22579	
	<p>Objection – the size of the site is disproportionate. There isn't the infrastructure in place to support such a large scale development. School and doctor's surgery already full and limited other services. Would significantly and detrimentally affect the rural nature of the village turning it into a generic commuter village. Recently had housing development which should meet the development needs of a small community. Use of greenbelt land which has previously been rejected is inconstant. Negative impact on wildlife and the environment.</p>	10468/22583	
	<p>Objection – the size of the site is disproportionate. There isn't the infrastructure in place to support such a large scale development. School and doctor's surgery already full and limited other services. Would significantly and detrimentally affect the rural nature of the village turning it into a generic commuter village. Recently had housing development which should meet the development needs of a small community. Use of greenbelt land which has previously been rejected is inconstant. Negative impact on wildlife and the environment.</p>	10469/22585	
	<p>Objection- village amenities already at capacity so could not support expansion. Would make village lose its quaintness turning it into a commuter settlement. No drainage capacity as confirmed by Yorkshire water. Increase traffic congestion.</p>	10471/22588	
	<p>Objection- infrastructure insufficient to support expansion. No drainage capacity. Not suitable to development. Increased traffic congestion.</p>	10473/22591	
	<p>Objection – local habitat. No infrastructure to support the development</p>	10476/22603	
<p>Objection – character of village would be destroyed. Green belt area development would</p>	10479/22609		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	adversely affect the wildlife. Additional pressure on local amenities could be catastrophic. Would cause road safety issues. Village life should be protected.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – would take inappropriate amount of land out of the green belt. Inadequate site access. Allocation is disproportionate to village size	10483/22621	
	Objection – will totally alter the villages character. Green belt would be destroyed. Would put undue pressure on the existing facilities	10484/22625	
	Objection – site would invade Derwent corridor with detrimental effects on residents and local wildlife. The scale of development is out of proportion to the size of the village, roads, access and infrastructure, including schools and healthcare	10486/22631	
	Objection- against expansion of village to such extent, nearly doubling population. Site of this size would mean an increase of traffic on the B1228 thereby creating a traffic hazard. Traffic is already a problem, pavements are narrow in parts and crossing the main road is hazardous for school children, parents with pushchairs and the elderly. Site of this size cannot be sustainable in a small village which offers limited amenities. Just one small village shop, restricted public transport, a school and doctors surgery currently at capacity.	10488/22636	
	Objection – double the population and footprint into green belt land. Increase of the traffic. Danger for the bridge due to the increase in traffic. Limited amenities.	10489/22643	
	Objection- essential character of the village will be destroyed if residential development to this site is allowed to proceed as the number of homes could double. Infrastructure, schools, drainage, health facilities and public transport are already insufficient. The land should remain green belt.	10492/22654	
	Objection – scale of the development is inappropriate for a village the size of Elvington. The village infrastructure could not cope. Roads are unsafe now, increase in traffic would be unsafe and a health risk due to pollution. The expansion plans are not 'proportionate', 'appropriate' or 'sustainable'.	10498/22664	
	Objection – the size of the land being safeguarded is inappropriate to the current size of the village. Village school is already full. Inadequate public transport. The doctors surgery is running at full capacity. The sewage system is already full. The development is not in keeping with the character of the village. No demonstrated need for the scale of housing proposed. One of the few genuine villages in the CYC area	10502/22672	
	Support – the area behind Riverside Close is the best place to expand the village, as it is close to the centre, but away from the historic parts. The proposed houses would not overwhelm the village. The proposed area would have easy access to the main road. The far side faces the water treatment works, so would have little impact on the open	10504/22677	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	countryside.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – housing development would have a terrible effect on the village. Green belt land. The proposal would alter the character of the village. Cannot cope with increase in traffic. Road safety would be at risk	10512/22691	
	Objection – would impact the green belt land. Would lead to a disproportionate increase in village size. The village amenities and infrastructure cannot cope with this. The changes would alter the nature of the village. Increase in traffic would also be a hazard. The school is full. There will be a huge environmental impact	10519/22701	
	Objection – infrastructure would be overwhelmed with increase in households. Drainage system could not cope. Village school, already nearly at capacity would inundated. Traffic outside school would be adversely affected causing a bottleneck on the main road.	10520/22704	
	Objection – see survey 2. Strongly oppose the extent of the development proposed for Elvington. Will utterly change the character and make up of a rural village. Local services, schools and infrastructure will not be able to cope with such a demand.	10521/26999	
	Objection – too many houses planned for the size of the village. No adequate proposals planned for infrastructure. Too much green belt land taken. Parish Council do not support this proposal. Yorkshire Water confirm there is no drainage capacity for more houses. The proposal puts residents at risk – traffic congestion, flooding. Not sustainable. There are too many houses planned and the development is out of all proportion with the existing village. There is no adequate proposal for infrastructure improvements. The existing road and pavement network are not suitable for the increased traffic expected. The amount of green belt land to be used is too much. The village is prone to flooding and Yorkshire Water have confirmed that there is no adequate drainage capacity for more houses. The local Parish Council does not support the proposal.	10524/21317	
	Objection - Elvington has less than 500 houses. 100 extra houses will destroy the feel of the village. It is unsustainable due to the limited infrastructure. A possible 200 more cars would add to congestion and impact on employment, education, shopping and leisure facilities. Extension to Elvington has been rejected before due to access, visual amenity and impact on wildlife. Increased traffic flow will cause increased danger associated with the increase of children in the village. There will be a need for temporary classroom facilities. The village could become a commuter settlement and victim of urban sprawl, decimating the rural village character.	10527/22714	
	Objection – dangerous possibility of building houses would dramatically affect the size of	10529/22721	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village, whose infrastructure is unable to accommodate such an increase. Full school, too much traffic and serious problem with drainage.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – village cannot stand a huge increase in the number of homes. The school is full, traffic is already too heavy and water running off new hard surfaces would mean that flooding would become a real problem.	10532/22736	
	Objection- greenbelt should not be compromised and any additional development in Elvington area must consider the B1228, already over run with HGVs- farm vehicles and tankers.	10542/22754	
	Objection – although called ‘safeguarded’ land, there is little doubt that it would be developed within a few years into a large and dense housing estate. Increase of around 20% of the village size. Development should be proportionate to that planned for the rest of York, not several times more. Development should be of a measured and modest extent such that it can be readily assimilated. Elvington is one of the very few remaining detached villages within the Greater York area. Its character contributes to the attractive character of the Greater York area as a whole, acknowledged by the Inspector in his report on the large 1992/3 public inquiries into planning proposals. This large development will only look like a large suburban sprawl. Elvington’s character is largely that of a traditional village, with addition of several small modern developments off the main road. Will be a suburban sprawl. It would destroy the rear rural outlook of the existing small developments, along with their identity. The upshot would be that the village character is no longer that of a village, but a dormitory suburb. This development would not serve ‘local need’. It would be a commuter dormitory for the rest of York, and places further afield such as Leeds. There is no evidence that it would serve local need. The village is overloaded with traffic and this will exacerbate the problem. This land is currently Green Belt. That is for a purpose: to retain the rural nature of the community. And this is highly relevant to the identity and character of the York area as a whole. This site (or effectively this area) was rejected firmly in the 1992/93 Inquiry, and deemed Green belt. There is no justification to take it out of the Green belt now.	10543/19198	
	Objection- lack of infrastructure to support this and the residential size of the village would increase by 65% which is a disproportionate increase adversely affecting the existing culture in the village. There isn’t enough drainage on the field, do not feel that this is a sustainable development. Wildlife habitat should not be disturbed.	10581/22775	
	Objection – roads cannot cope with the traffic. The village has limited amenities. There is a large amount of wildlife in the proposed area.	10601/20361	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – this proposal would significantly increase the village footprint into the greenbelt. This is out of scale with the village. The village has limited infrastructure. Most of this site has been considered for development in the past and refused for reasons including access, visual amenity and effect on wildlife. This would turn Elvington into urban sprawl and a commuter village.	10604/26102	
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – greenbelt land should not be safeguarded, there is no need for this. This would result in Elvington doubling in size and no longer being a village. Traffic and pollution would increase. The village does not have the infrastructure to support more houses.	10608/26104	
	Objection – green belt should be safeguarded. Not enough drainage capacity. Increase of the size of the village without any increased infrastructure. Reduction in quality of life in the village.	10627/20403	
	Objection – minimal and overstretched amenities within the village. Green belt land. Utilities in the village at capacity. Concerns about sewerage. Very busy roads. Pollution, diesel fumes and oil spills. Hazardous roads for cycling.	10628/20405	
	Objection – disproportionate to the village. Very limited employment, almost inexistent local transport. School and doctors surgery at full capacity. Safety hazards around the school.	10632/20411	
	Objection – strongly against expansion of the village. It would extend the footprint of the village into green belt land. Also there would be an increase in traffic and the main road could not cope. The site is close to school, doctor’s surgery, sports club and parking causes a hazard during sports fixtures and school pick up and drop off times. Turning vehicles will interfere with flow of traffic, creating another hazard. The single lane bridge over the Derwent was not built to handle the increase in traffic and has already been strengthened a few times. Narrow pavements already mean the road is hazardous for children, parents with children and the elderly. The village has few amenities and development is inappropriate. Housing requirements should be met by extension of the urban area, larger villages and minor infill at small villages. The site has been considered and rejected before. The same issues remain making it illogical for development.	10635/20421	
	Objection - this is green belt land and as such should be kept as green belt land. Why should land be taken out of the green belt and ‘safeguarded’ for what could be an additional 135 houses in a fairly small village with limited facilities. Why would the council want to increase a residential village by 65% - this is a completely disproportionate increase and will adversely affect the existing culture of the	10646/19577	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	community. The village has no infrastructure to support the development of the size proposed. The drainage capacity is already at a maximum and this has been confirmed by Yorkshire Water. The B1226 is already very busy especially at peak periods and another 135 will only add to the chaos outside the school, near the village green/shop and on the approach to the Grimston Bar roundabout. The facilities at Elvington do not support a development of this size with public transport being very limited and the local school already at capacity		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – as the land is currently green belt, safeguarding it would be for future development and therefore not protecting its long term environmental interest. The eastern side of the plot (behind Riverside Close) is ridge and furrow and could be of archaeological importance. Building on this site would be to the detriment of the wildlife. The field hosts many birds in particular the house martins which collect the mud from the furrows for nesting material which they make on many of the houses in Riverside Close. Hare and deer can often be seen in the field. With access via Riverside Gardens this would further add to the congestion in the village, particularly around the village shop, and village hall where there is often queuing traffic already. Inevitably there would be more vehicles at peak times particularly at the start of the school day. The increase in traffic would be a hazard to walking children to school. If the proposed safeguarded land was subsequently developed, access would be required along Riverside Gardens and this would significantly increase traffic on the estate and compromise children’s safety. The village primary school is currently full and recent building work has replaced temporary mobile classrooms. Further classrooms will be required to accommodate more children. There are very few job opportunities in the immediate local area and this would lead to more people commuting from the village. As there are poor public transport links out of the village this will lead to increased car use and traffic congestion especially around the Grimston Bar roundabout. To further add to the safeguarded land would be disproportionate to CYC’s suggested growth of 7.6%. If this site were developed for housing in the future it would signify an increase in the village of nearly three times this amount.	10647/19579	
	Objection - the village already has traffic problems and these houses will add to it. It is impossible to drive through the village already without having to stop/start and going towards York city centre there is always a queue of traffic in rush hour in the morning to join the A1079. Transport links are terrible in the village and inadequate to service yet more houses. The school is also full so any children at these homes would be a burden to an already full school. Keeping green land is very important for wildlife including	10648/19580	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	butterflies and other insects and these buildings would ruin the habitat of that area.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – takes land out of Greenbelt. Too many houses would be built on the land. There is not the infrastructure to accommodate such building. There are already problems with drainage and the water board need to clear the pumping system regularly. Elvington's village status should not be changed.	10649/19739	
	Objection – the small village of Elvington does not have the infrastructure to cater for such large scale development.	10654/19585	
	Objection - the infrastructure in the village is not equipped to cope with such a large number of additional houses. Public Transport links to York are almost non-existent and current traffic levels cause problems at both ends of the B1228. Elvington is also home to rich and varied wildlife. Cannot agree with the proposed site as it extends into green belt land. George Osborne himself stated in his Mansion House speech that 'Councils will be required to put local development orders on over 90% brown field sites that are suitable for housing'. This seems at odds with the City of York Council's approach to Elvington. Queries by Elvington, which has experienced minimal growth over the last decade, should suddenly be transformed in such a way, and where the demand for growth is coming from. The city of York Councils Local Plan indicates an overall growth of 7.6% for the area and Elvington has for some reason been targeted with a disproportionate share of that growth. The plans are not proportionate, they are not appropriate and they are not sustainable.	10664/19603	
	Objection – residential size of the village could increase by 65%. Such a rapid and large increase could affect the exiting culture of the community. No infrastructure to support this. No drainage capacity.	10669/19605	
	Objection – residential size of the village could increase 65%. No infrastructure to support this.	10670/19763	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope. More frequent power cuts. Green belt land would be spoilt forever. People of the village were supposed to get an allotment on the site.	10683/19795	
	Objection – green belt land would be lost. Infrastructure cannot support the development.	10684/19798	
	Objection – expansion out of proportion with the size of the village. Increase in congestion in the village. Children cannot cycle to school. School is at capacity. The character of the village will be lost.	10689/19806	
	Objection – green belt land. Development is disproportionate and unsustainable. Already stretched infrastructure could not cope.	10693/19815	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection - proposal significantly extends the village footprint into green belt land. The scale of development implied (over 100 houses on this site alone) is inappropriate for a small village of fewer than 500 houses and represents an increase of 20% on top of the already proposed developments at Church Lane & Dauby Lane. If all these go ahead, the village could almost double in size. In contrast Elvington grew by 2% over the ten year period to 2011. Will cause congestion and road safety hazards through the village. Many children walk or cycle, traffic will be a hazard to them. As York is one of the worst funded local education authority's in the country, expansion would reinstate temporary classrooms. Development of safeguarded land would mean that Elvington becomes a commuter settlement, urban sprawl rather than a rural village full of character.	10697/19823	
	Objection – there are far too many new houses planned. Too much land will be taken from green belt.	10702/19836	Elvington Action Group
	Objection – disproportionate addition to the size of Elvington. Further development should take place in Elvington e.g. infilling on Elvington Lane but traffic has taken place on their need to be increased. Heavy lorries using the B1228 as a short cut would have to be re-directed to major roads.	10710/19851	
	Objection- not sufficient infrastructure around and in the village of Elvington for any plans on the scale intended. Village doesn't have a regular bus service so to increase its inhabitants on the scale of the proposal is counter productive. Land that floods, insufficient drainage, no road infrastructure, a tiny village shop, no post office and on public house how do you proposed the village can sustain these plans. The planning authority has recently turned down an application for a tea room in the village yet it is considering the above noted plans.	10724/19880	
	Object – land should remain green belt. Disproportionate increase compared to the needs of the village. Scale of development will change the character of the village.	10745/19939	
	Object – Increase in traffic. Increase in noise. No road infrastructure. Industrial estates have empty premises. Green belt land will lead to loss of rural farming.	10756/19983	
	Objection – the population of Elvington will increase by approximately 65%. The proposed development is much too big for the village and local infrastructure will not support this. It would increase traffic. Drainage is at capacity, the school is full and there are very few local amenities and limited local transport. The Conifers proves there is very little need for more housing as a number of these affordable houses are still vacant. Traffic through Elvington is very busy. The roads are not capable of sustaining the current traffic flow and it can be dangerous for pedestrians on the footpath, especially at rush hour. There is little or no regard for the speed limit and this is	10766/20008	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	especially dangerous for children walking to and from school. A new housing development would surely increase the amount of traffic.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection- disproportionate increase to village population compared to the facilities that it is capable of providing. Our linear village barely copes with existing heavy traffic on the already dangerous B1228. Does not object to sympathetic building. This has already been taking place in the village. My objection is to the scale of building which believe will have a negative impact on village life and on the balance and infrastructure of amenities serving Elvington.	10816/21356	
	Objection – misleading use of word safeguarding. There is need for additional housing but it must not be implemented to the detriment of current inhabitants. To double the number of houses in the village over such a short period of time demonstrates an ill-thought out plan. Village school and surgery can't cope with such a massive increase in a reduced timescale, whilst the shop, hairdresser and pub might benefit from the increase in population. It would make sense to increase the size of the village by no more than 10%. The roads will not be able to adapt. Elvington floods after a heavy downpour. The sewage system is already running at capacity. The high street is already congested with traffic. May be better to spread the load over more villages giving the infrastructure more of a chance to absorb the increase.	10818/21361	
	Objection- Elvington does not have capacity for this level of potential development. The character of the village would be lost. Village school is at capacity. The roads would not accommodate increase in traffic. Will also pose further road safety issues around the school, playground and village green. The mains drainage and sewage are already at capacity. Developments on these sites would adversely impact on local wildlife.	10830/21375	
	Objection-Elvington does not have capacity for this level of potential development. The character of he village would be lost. Village school is already at capacity. The roads will not accommodate the increased traffic. Additional traffic will also pose further road safety issues. The main drainage and sewage system are already at capacity. Additional development will increase the likelihood of flooding. Development on these sites would adversely impact on local wildlife.	10832/21380	
	Objection – increasing the site of the village by 65% is totally disproportionate, adversely affecting the existing culture of the community and available amenities. The development would significantly alter a long stretch of the eastern boundary of the village and is unsustainable. There is not infrastructure to support a development of this size, no drainage capacity, and massive traffic impact on Main Street which is already hard to navigate and has safety issues.	10840/21396	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection- potential number of houses to be built here is disproportionate to the needs of the village and would adversely affect the existing nature and culture of a rural community. Potential residential development adjacent to the school will lead to an increase of some 25% of homes in the village which could also be argued as being excessive. Addition of the properties to the rear of Hillgarth is considered completely inappropriate.	10842/21400	
	Objection- potential number of houses to be built here is disproportionate to the needs of the village and would adversely affect the existing nature and culture of a rural community. Potential residential development adjacent to the school will lead to an increase of some 25% of homes in the village which could also be argued as being excessive. Addition of the properties to the rear of Hillgarth is considered completely inappropriate.	10845/21409	
	Objection – due to the lack of amenities and public transport the extra traffic generated will greatly add to the congestion. Need to consider the pollution and road safety when proposing this expansion. The safety of the users of the green would be compromised by the increased in traffic.	10866/25869	
	Objection – the school is at capacity. This would significantly increase the village size. It would further create significant traffic and potential accidents. Development would cause erosion to our conservation and wildlife.	10870/25872	
	Objection- land at present is Greenbelt protected and should remain so. Maintains the rural character of Elvington village. Will all other proposed developments in the village there is no way the already stretched infrastructure will be able to cope e.g. Doctor surgery, school, village shop, roads.	10876/10876	
	Objection- the Greenbelt adds great character to the village. Removing this area will have a negative impact on this food source and home for wildlife in the area including owls and bats. The development proposed would have a harmful effect on the villages overall character and will in turn have an adverse affect on the quality of life for the local residents. Elvington is prone to flooding. Building on this land will have a negative impact on the defences, nullifying the recent work carried out to them and thus causing a greater flood risk to the residents. The bus links to Elvington are poor, no train station, GP surgery at full capacity and the schools are oversubscribed. The B1228 is already an awful road that is poorly maintained. Residents commute out of the village everyday to their jobs, increased traffic flow on Elvington lane will make it an even worse road than it currently is. The proposed development has the potential to bring almost an extra 200 cars to the village daily and it will only make it even worse when	10888/21494	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>commuting in the morning. The original reasons for rejection in previous years still stand to this day. This new development, along with the other proposed developments, and the already built affordable housing and Conifer development threaten to harm Elvington's current village status, turning it into a commuter settlement. An extra 100 houses is inappropriate for a small village. Developments within the limits of the York urban area should be encouraged over these proposals to overcrowd a small village with unnecessary housing.</p>		
<p><b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the scale of development would cause extra traffic through the village. There is limited employment. No regular bus service. The school and gp are at capacity. This is greenbelt land which should remain that way for local wildlife. There is a potential major risk to health if there was a leak at Yorkshire Water's Chlorination plant.</p>	10892/25900	
	<p>Objection – an expansion of more than the suggested 7.6% would be detrimental to the character of the village and as the road access particularly the B1228 is already congested at peak times the infrastructure could not support this development. Any future development which resulted in more traffic would cause difficulties for local residents and may result in an increase in road traffic accidents as there is no speed restriction on the road. If it is decided that there is substantial development at the airfield site, Elvington, Wheldrake and "Whinthorpe" it would warrant the transport department to consider the benefits of a comprehensive co-ordinated transport strategy to create road accesses to the A64 from Wheldrake and the airfield site to the 'Whinthorpe' exit to the A64. This would significantly reduce traffic problems on the B1228, Wheldrake Lane, Greenglass Lane and the A19.</p>	10895/21505	
	<p>Objection – does not want to see this land taken out of Green Belt. The size of the area of land could lead to a disproportionate number of new houses compared with the size and character of the existing village. There is no infrastructure to support development on this scale, especially surface water drainage, but also sewerage, small primary school and very limited public transport and other facilities. Does not object to all development, but would like to see it continue to be gradual, with new housing in small numbers on small sites as in the recent past, so as to preserve the nature and character of Elvington.</p>	10896/21507	
	<p>Objection – Elvington is a small rural village. This proposed development is totally disproportionate for a village of this size, representing a 20% increase in housing. This proposal also significantly damages the green belt around Elvington, which is only supposed to be used as a last resort for development. Development on this scale is not in any way sustainable with Elvington's infrastructure, due to congested roads, a full to</p>	10898/21516	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	capacity primary school, a full doctor's surgery, a very infrequent bus service and a flood defence system which is frequently called into action and a drainage system under strain. Also serious road safety issues with the school on an already dangerous, busy road. Most of the land has already been considered and rejected for development due to problems with access and damage to wildlife. These problems remain. A distinctive rural village would be irrevocably damaged with this disproportionate scale of development and be turned into urban sprawl. Any local authority's plan has to be based on proven need, not on growth ambitions. There is no proven local need for this unsustainable growth. Small scale housing developments such as the recent one at the Conifers, to provide affordable housing is more proportionate for a village the size of Elvington.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – no need to safeguard large land mass. Significantly extend the village footpath into the green belt zone. Village will almost double in size. Most of the land has been previously rejected. Increase in traffic noise and pollution. Road safety issues for all residents. Local infrastructure would not be able to cope. Proportionate amount would be appropriate	10906/21544	
	Objection – land for residential development would mean an overlook of hundred houses instead of fields and greenery. Increase of 100 houses, increases Elvington by 20% potentially doubles village size, inappropriate and would ruin character and rural aspects of village. Detrimental impact on wildlife and environment as a whole. Visually unappealing, more urban feel and look to the village. Village population less than 1000 expansion would mean the population would increase by nearly 50%. School, doctors and sewage system already strained and at capacity. Additional cars because of rural location and lack of bus services. Already busy and congested roads. Increase would mean more pollution, noise and increase in potential number of traffic hazards and add to disrepair of roads.	10926/21569	
	Objection – green belt land, home to a large amount of wildlife. Huge increase in traffic on very busy roads. Travel to school would be unsafe. The quality of road surface in the area is poor. There is minimal public transport. School is at capacity. Doctor surgery is at capacity. The sewerage system is at capacity. Development will lead to village losing it's distinctive character	10935/21582	
	Objection – safeguarded land (802, 97 and 815) for proposed development will result in the village being swamped disproportionately to its present size, and will increase traffic especially HGV's with resulting noise and safety problems. Further housing in Elvington will strain an already overburdened infrastructure – school; surgery; drainage (confirmed by Yorkshire Water); roads etc.	10936/21584	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Object – No need to safeguard large land mass. Significantly extend the village footpath into the green belt zone. Village will almost double in size. Most of the land has been previously rejected. Increase in traffic noise and pollution. Road safety issues for all residents. Local infrastructure would not be able to cope. Proportionate amount would be appropriate	10953/21607	
	Objection – significantly extends the village footprint into the green belt. Scale is inappropriate for a small village, along with other proposals the village could almost double in size. Development cannot be sustainable in a small village that offers very limited employment, no useful public transport, one primary school currently full and one doctor’s surgery currently at capacity. Additional cars on already inadequate and congested roads. Housing requirements should be met primarily by extension of the urban area, then by limited development at larger villages then by minor infill at small villages such as Elvington. Most of the land has already been considered for residential development and been rejected, these reasons for rejection remain. No proven local need. For Elvington to grow by 7.6% as per the whole city that would imply fewer than 40 additional houses.	11157/21652	
	Objection – proposal is too big for the village. Green belt land should be protected. Housing increase will remove it’s character. Housing currently available remains vacant. New houses would increase traffic. Is there a proven need for the housing?	11216/21913	
	Objection - inappropriate use of the word safeguard. Disproportional amount of development for a village of the size of Elvington which would grow by well over 20%. The village must surely be carrying a disproportional level of any required development. City of York’s Local plan suggest a growth rate in the region of 7.6%. Were the village to expand by 7.6% then this would relate to some 30-40 or so additional properties. With the expansion of development of housing at Wheldrake Lane Elvington has already seen a growth in its housing stock. In order to maintain a viable village in favour of limited, proportionate in fill development. Would completely destroy the rural character of the village, destroy the quality of life of its residents and place unmanageable strain upon facilities in the village including the school, doctor’s surgery and would potentially lead to up to 200 more vehicles . The current infrastructure could not cope. Previously the proposed sites have been considered for development. In the 1990s almost all of these were rejected, see no reason why there has been any change in the arguments for development and hence consistency should be maintained.	11217/22109	
	Objection – this proposal takes out even more green belt. Too many houses planned. Village cannot cope with the additional volume of house, cars and trucks. This will affect	11218/22823	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the culture of the village. No infrastructure to support this proposal. No additional drainage capacity. Site not sustainable as a development. Village school cannot accommodate more children.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – this proposal significantly into the village footprint. The small village of Elvington offers limited employment, no useful public transport, the primary school is full, as is the doctors surgery. Additional cars will cause congestion and road safety hazards.	11220/23740	
	Objection – detrimental effect on wildlife and the environment. The main road is already busy, and development would make it more of an issue. Increase in pollution from cars. School and doctors surgery is at capacity.	11295/22859	
	Objection – removes even more green belt land. The amount of houses planned is too high. The village cannot cope with the increase in volume of houses, cars and trucks. There is no infrastructure to support the proposal. There is no additional drainage capacity. It is not sustainable as a development site. Traffic problems. Would put safety of children at risk.	11313/22863	
	Objection - some infill development to bring Elvington together as a whole should be allowed but not the number proposed in Site Reference 802. The amenities, what there are, i.e. school and doctors are full, limited bus services, limited employment. The B1228 road could not sustain the proposed traffic, even now the road is very congested, especially early am and school leaving and work leaving times.	11367/22226	
	Objection – removing area from green belt is inappropriate and spoil beautiful countryside. Development would elongate the village further, therefore parts will be considerable distance from school and park making it inappropriate for families. If development need to bridge the gap between Becksides Estate and airfield end of the village. No benefit to the village, will increase traffic burden. B1228 already busy will cause further safety issues. Scale is disproportionally large to village and will cause problems with facilities.	11380/22908	
	Objection – no need to safeguard amount of land for development. Proposals would extend the village into the green belt and be visible to other villages. Should use brown field and supplement with infill of smaller villages. Most of the development should happen within the outer ring road. Scale out of proportion and unsustainable for the village. No need. Limited employment, poor bus service and primary school no space, roads cannot cope. Congestion and safety hazards. Land previously considered and rejected on reasons above when reintroduce when remain. Believe in proportionate development when appropriate and sustainable, do not believe in such an increase	11381/22910	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	when limited public transport and windy road access only.		
<b>802 Land at Elvington Village (continued)</b>	Objection – lacking in consultation. Massive development will stretch the struggling infrastructure. Large traffic issues. Some increase is expected, but an increase of the size suggested will change the character and spirit of the community.	11382/22913	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be considered first. More urbanised areas should be extended first. Size of proposed development is disproportionate with the size of the village. Is there evidence the houses are needed. The village school is at capacity. Roads could not cope.	11385/21920	
	Objection – the scale of the development is not appropriate. Traffic on the B1228 was a concern before developments were planned. It would be worse if a huge scale development took place. The infrastructure would struggle to cope. A development of this scale would change the character of the village.	11399/22941	
	Objection – disproportionate number of homes. Adverse effect on the rural nature of the village.	11419/21670	
	Objection – this is totally disproportionate for a village the size of Elvington. The use of green belt is not justified.	11646/26124	
	Objection – this expands the village to almost double its current size. It is disproportionate and unsustainable and would adversely affect the existing nature and culture of the rural community. There is no demonstrated need for this level of housing. This has already been proposed for development and rejected. This was based on access, visual amenity and effect on wildlife. There is little amenity in Elvington to support this.	11754/26129	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development.	Petition 5	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
810 Earswick	Objection – loss of agricultural land 88ha. The site has potential for a development of between 1056 and 2112 housing units. In the light of the constraints on the site would not be possible to implement a sustainable development on this scale. It should be deleted, and subject to a formal planning application process if any developer wishes to take it forward.	45/18787	York Environment Forum
	Objection – there has been a failure of the Council to work with the local community and parish council. Have not taken into account the village's parish plan. Two third of respondents of the village questionnaire are against any development in the village. This is due to the village already being over populated, a reduction in green space, increase in traffic pollution, and infrastructure already at capacity. There is no need to remove this land from greenbelt as safeguarded land. This development would change the character of the village forever as it is also 10 times bigger than the present village. There will be an increase in traffic pollution and noise which will have a major impact on the health and quality of life for existing residents. The site at Fossbanks Farm should have been included as this site is more appropriate for development (site ref 569)	60/17881	Earswick Parish Council
	Objection – peak traffic problems for vehicles from Strensall/Towthorpe, when joining/crossing the A1237 at Earswick, are already of concern. Concerns over access and sustainability are already identified and until such time that solutions can be provided to address these concerns then the site should be excluded.	77/18577	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – queries whether the proposals are for allocation years 1-15 (i.e. not safeguarded for future, but rather now) or years 10-15.	91/19634	
	Objection - Green Belt Local Plan Inquiry Inspector considered that there would be serious harm to views of the City from the Ring Road if development were permitted to come right up to the latter and even more so if it passed beyond it. This site lies in the open countryside beyond the northern Ring Road in an area which forms part of the rural setting of the historic City. By extending development beyond the Ring Road, it will not only fundamentally change the relationship which the northern edge of York with Earswick, but also threaten the separation between the village and the main built-up area of the City. By resulting in development on both sides of the Ring Road, it will also alter people's perceptions when travelling along this route about the setting of the City within an area of open countryside (an element identified by the Inspector in his Report as contributing to the special character of York). In addition, the Inspector considered that the relationship of York to its surrounding settlements, is one of the elements which contributes to the special character of the City. This relationship relates to not simply the distance between the settlements but also the size of the villages themselves, and the fact that they are freestanding, clearly definable settlements. The development of this area would lead to a quadrupling in the size of the present settlement	238/18172	English Heritage

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of Earswick, fundamentally altering its character and its relationship with York. Overall, English Heritage consider that the allocation and development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the City and, therefore, would conflict with the saved policies of the RSS and national planning policy.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to all sites in the Further Consultation which are outside the proposed inner boundary of the Green Belt including those which are outside the existing development limits of inset villages (as opposed to proposed development limits for such villages), or are extensions beyond the outer ring road, where the site does not bridge between the existing urban core and an inset village, or is located within a green corridor as identified by the Green Corridors Tech Paper (2011). Location of developments sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban core ie Heworth or Acomb. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.	544/20494	
	Objection – see survey 16. Brownfield sites should be preferred areas for development first and knowing how many premises and plots of land that exist (e.g. empty and disused at Clifton Moor) then surely these should be considered first. Whilst not unopposed to some development it must be based on need, scaled accordingly and supported in parallel by the development of appropriate infrastructure and amenities. The road system is already overcrowded. Congestion when leaving estate to join Strensall Road will increase with the scale of development proposed. Infrastructure development is key, the existing sewerage system reaches capacity on a number of occasions (especially during flooding). This situation can only get worse with the size of development proposed. Towthorpe refuse/recycling is already at capacity so how will it cope with an additional village 5-6 times the current	735/20500	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	population. Unequivocally opposed to the scale of the Earswick Greenbelt development proposed.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – this proposal would be a catastrophe for the village of Earswick which would lose its identity as a pleasant rural village. The proposal to build 2,112 houses in a village of 350/60 houses is totally inappropriate and cannot be justified in any terms. Concern regarding loss of 88 hectares of prime agricultural land. Earswick has already seen large scale development in Fosslands and the Garden Village – more would be excessive. Major infrastructure problems including flow of traffic along Strensall Road and its junction with the A1237 which already has extensive blockages. These create noise and air pollution to the village now and will be greatly increased if the development goes ahead. Have seen no evidence to show the necessity for this parcel of land to be taken out of the greenbelt and no justification for the creation of urban sprawl that will inevitably link Earswick, Huntington and Tolthorpe and ultimately Haxby. There must be other sites more suitable for development without setting a precedent of attacking greenbelt whose purpose was to stop this sort of development.	775/19175	
	Objection – before any more properties are built the roads need improving to allow traffic to flow around York. The schools in Haxby can't cope with the current population. Waiting for a doctors/dentist/hospital appointment can often be a while and they cannot cope with any more. All the drain systems need reviewing to ensure they can cope with more properties. If more people come into York to live where are they all going to work. Is there room to expand the emergency services in York to cope. York is a big tourist city, if this is to continue people have to be able to move around or they will not return and advise others not to come too. The decision to build more houses can't be taken lightly and all of the above and other people's comments need to be dealt or addressed first before the work starts	821/20209	
	Objection – the proposed development is totally inappropriate because of the existing pressure on the local network and it would result in significant loss of open space and habitat.	850/18196	
	Objection – Earswick village has already more than contributed to the provision of new housing for the York area in the recent past. The scale and pace of these developments was such that it was possible to ensure that the village retained its character. Proposed development is outrageous and ill thought out. It will destroy the rural nature of the community, blight the landscape and irrevocably damage the character of York by creating an urban sprawl adjacent to the precious green corridor along the ring road. Proposal is out of scale and inappropriate. Existing village identity and character could not be maintained. Further development of the village needs to be small scale and recognise that the village has already expanded in recent years. Existing local services are inadequate to cope with the	911/23789	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>additional demand for schools, healthcare and other local services. Existing schools are already full. Sewage infrastructure is at its limit. Impact of associated traffic would be harmful to health, well being and quality of life of existing residents. Roads already generate nuisance noise – further traffic will only make this worse. What studies have been undertaken to understand traffic impact. Access and egress from the proposed development onto the A1237 will cause trunk road disruption. Developers propose an additional roundabout on the A1237 which will significantly further congest an already heavily congested trunk road. What modelling has been done to understand this impact? Fire station exits towards the proposed additional roundabout – given the likelihood of queues, what impact will this have on the Fire Service response times. Route for students to local secondary schools requires them to cross the A1237 – concern regarding increased traffic hazards. There is no legal obligation on the council to generate a list of ‘safeguarded’ land. This specific site does not have an urgent need for additional housing and there are more suitable sites available elsewhere. Land is valuable green asset providing productive farmland and natural habitats. Need to protect this land as part of the ‘green lungs’ around the city. Building on it means it is lost forever. Proposal for safeguarding of land for future is contradicted by Council’s own suggestion that this might be brought forward earlier and is undermined by well developed proposals being put forward by the developer. Priority should be given to redevelopment of brownfield sites within existing urban areas – by ‘safeguarding’ greenbelt land the council is inadvertently discouraging the redevelopment of land that should be developed as a priority. Council has a responsibility to protect the character and nature of its local communities. This proposal fails to enact this duty of care. Need to ensure that future development gives due consideration of the impact it has on both the local community and the many visitors who are the greatest source of income to our city.</p>		
<p><b>810 Earswick (continued)</b></p>	<p>Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.</p>	<p>943/20537</p>	
	<p>Objection – against the addition of new sites “safeguarded” for long term future development. Over development of the villages, leading to loss of character, pressure on the small primary schools and increased traffic on small country lanes.</p>	<p>995/20557</p>	
	<p>Comment –due to the size or location of this safeguarded land it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and would be of interest to the Agency. This site is of particular interest to the Agency due to its proximity to the A64 Hopgrove junction. The assessment of this site also indicates that if concerns over access and sustainable neighbourhood could be overcome then this site could be considered as an allocation (1-15 years). This would required detailed assessment to ensure the impact of this site on the strategic network can be managed and mitigated. The Agency has not made any assessment</p>	<p>1264/18596</p>	<p>Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)</p>

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of the potential impact of this, together with other sites, at this stage. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from CYC before proceeding with the mesoscopic		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Comment –the site is crossed by National Grid’s high transmission overhead power lines, specifically YR 400kV route. These overhead lines must remain in-situ and National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground and built structures must not be infringed. National Grid only supports proposals for the relocation of existing high-voltage overhead lines where such proposals directly facilitate a major development or infrastructure project of national importance.	1343/18112	AMEC, on behalf of National Grid
	Objection – fully endorse comments put forward by the Parish Council and Earswick Action Group. This site stands to submerge the existing village. It will have a hugely detrimental impact on the character and setting of the village as well as upon local wildlife populations. Concerned about impact on local infrastructure when combined with other homes proposed in Haxby and Wigginton. Access will be major issue, particularly if it is accessed via a further roundabout off the A1237, which is already suffering from extreme congestion at peak times. The caveat within the recommendation that part of this land could be developed during the 15 year life of the plan if certain concerns can be overcome, creates great uncertainty over its allocation as ‘safeguarded’ land, which is supposed to be for development in the longer term. It also casts doubt on the Council’s willingness to restrict development on other ‘safeguarded’ allocations until a Local Plan review is held. Concern that sites 775 and 777 were rejected on grounds of failing to meet criteria for Residential Access to Services, and yet the two sites taken together make up 75% of Site 810. If two individual sites have been rejected, they should have failed on the same grounds when submitted together as one site allocation. Agents representing developers for this site suggest it would be accessed via a new roundabout off the A1237 between Earswick and Monks Cross. However, in rejecting Site 777 the Technical Report states there is not enough space to add a further junction between existing junctions on the A1237. How is the same not the case for this larger safeguarded proposal. If land is not fit for housing now, it is very unlikely that it will be in the long term future. As a result of these inconsistencies there is an apprehension within the community over potential collusion between the Council and the developers. The Council should make every effort to set the record straight and restore public confidence by removing this site from the Plan.	1355/18630	Julian Sturdy MP

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – concerned with cumulative impact of this and sites ST11, SF4 and ST9. These four sites represent a very intensive scale of development over an extended period of time to the north east of York. Even though some of the land is safeguarded for development, so it should not be developed before 2030, we believe that the cumulative impacts of developing these sites should be thoroughly assessed and planned for within this Plan period. This would be with a view to considering how development can be integrated so that it does not give rise to undesirable consequences, especially in relation to traffic generation and planning for necessary services and facilities. Development of these sites should help to protect the character and setting of the historic City by providing a focus for development away from the urban core and areas where the views require protection. Concerned that the scale of development and safeguarding of land is such that it could still have consequential impact on the character of the historic city. Increases in traffic movements could change the character of the main routes into town which could be harmful if not properly managed. This is a point we raised in relation to Policy T1 in our response to the Preferred Options consultation. New settlements are likely to have a greater visual impact on the landscape.	1592/18823	Directions Planning Consultancy on behalf of the York Civic Trust
	Objection – see survey 16. The ring road should be dualled first. What about the ability of Strensall residents to reach the ring road?	1710/26354	
	Comment – no objections to the development but making the Council aware that that they own a pig farm down Strensall Road and spread slurry on the surrounding areas. If the development does happen, does not want complaints of smell due to the spreading of slurry or from the noise of the alarms which sometimes go off due to heat etc. in the summer. As stated above as long as this does not happen then no objection to the development.	1758/18954	
	Objection – see survey 16.	2486/26358	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to proper planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17941	
	Objection – see survey 16. Commute up and down the road from Strensall which has become very busy no matter what time of day you are on it. The A1237 is at saturation point.	2846/18258	
	Objection – use of the word safeguarded is misleading. Large scale development cannot be justified when there are so many urban sites in the city centre which have not been developed. Government have a brownfield first policy. Out of proportion with the village.	2961/23841	
	Objection – evidence evades the general issue of the impact on the area of the A1237 and on local transport infrastructure that is already under severe pressure. Would also bring greater use of the shops in the village centres and cause further road congestion in the village centres and car parking issues. A sustainable integrated transport plan needs to be in place before planning permission is given for development. Scale of development is far too large for the	3256/23885	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	likely level of new employment. Many of the services, facilities and infrastructures that would be required are not under the control of the Council.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection - assured that the land at Earswick would not be built on for at least 15 years. The plan states that if concerns regarding access and a sustainable neighbourhood can be overcome part of this land could potentially be considered as an allocation for years 1-15 of the plan. The Strensall road is backed up from the ring road roundabout at peak times almost to Towthorpe lane. How could the road system possibly cope with the sort of development that is envisaged.	3799/22045	
	Objection – opposed to removal of land out of the greenbelt.	3875/17959	
	Objection – see survey 16.	4242/26481	
	Objection – this development will overwhelm the village and change its character beyond recognition. The already congested outer ring road in this area will have further problems. The bus service will not be able to cope. Where will these extra children from the proposed new development go to school. Another problem would be drainage in an area already prone to flooding. There is very little mention of jobs in York in the Local Plan or the Further Sites consultation. Strongly object to good farming land providing food being used for these huge developments. The government has said brown field sites should be used first. This proposed development at Earswick is simply too big and I hope common sense will prevail.	4300/21733	
	Support – represents an exciting opportunity for Earswick to grow into a community with facilities being provided that would be expected of a village environment. Happy to let land of 4 acres be included in the proposals having originally objected. Map included, see response.	4341/18932	
	Objection – see survey 16. Strensall is too big now and struggles with congestion in the village. Also, its water supply and sewage is at max.	4394/26483	
	Objection – should not build on green belt land. Will ruin Huntington. Over development, primary schools are not big enough. More traffic and more accidents.	4730/22344	
	Objection – there is a current inadequate supply of infrastructure. The ring road needs to be duelled before development takes place and the council should prioritise brown field sites.	4832/17966	
	Objection – more in keeping with a large city such as Leeds or Sheffield rather than the quaint, jewel of a city like York. Should reconsider the impact that a development of this size would have on existing services and the serious consequences on the infrastructure of the city as a whole.	5228/21759	
	Objection – no serious attention to infrastructure. Transportation, pollution and noise have been ignored. No secondary school. Traffic would be badly affected. No requirement to safeguard land.	5335/21794	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – Earswick is a small village with about 400 houses. This new development would swamp it and the character would be lost forever. The proposed land is green belt – there are suitable brown field sites already in the York area – these should be used before green belt land. There need to be very special circumstances to develop green belt land. Why should this land be made available when there are brown field sites? The numbers and types of housing are out of character with the village. The village is surrounded by green belt land – this gives character to the village and acts as a barrier, to prevent the city of York sprawling out over the ring road. The road system could not stand the addition of close to 4000 cars. The outer ring road (A1237) and Strensall Rd are at capacity and frequently gridlocked. Two extra roundabouts feeding from the proposed development would again lead to greater gridlocking on an already busy road. This may impact on the Fire Station to respond quickly. It could also have an effect on police and ambulance responding to calls from Earswick and Strensall. The Vanguarde shopping park has increased road usage and a huge housing development would add to this. Increase in traffic would increase pollution and noise, detrimental to the quality of life of current residents of Earswick.	5507/20739	
	Objection – the proposal for a development of 200 homes is a gross overdevelopment of the village, adding yet more development on the north side of the city, increasing even more the unbalance between the north of the city and the southern arc between the A19 and the Wetherby Rd, an area lacking in employment and housing.	5601/20775	
	Objection – see survey 16. Site 777 was rejected on the grounds of infrastructure deficiencies, i.e. no roundabout access to A1237, so how can site 810 meet the criteria. This plot of land is prime grade 1 arable land and cannot be replaced. Failed to take into account Earswick’s Parish Plan published in 2012 which had a 60% response rate. If 2000 homes were built on this site alone then that would result in 3000 extra cars around the by-pass. If Nestle cannot get their vehicles to and from their factory they will leave York, resulting in 2000 direct job redundancies, without any knock on effect. The infrastructure cannot take this level of build – a new ring road is needed, a new hospital, schools, doctors surgeries etc. Earswick is a village of some 350 homes and this is not a village extension, but annihilation of an historic village.	5834/19215	
	Objection – see survey 16.	5959/26487	
	Objection – there are not the facilities for all the extra people, the roads are congested and the schools are full.	5962/24058	
	Object – green belt would be damaged. Plenty of Brownfield sites available. Would completely overpower the existing village and have a severe impact on the character and setting of the village. With separation from existing houses there is a risk that two communities will be	6042/20993	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	created separated by Strensall Road the social impact of which is likely to result in higher crime rates and other social issues. Cost of the infrastructure improvements required would be enormous and need careful consideration.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – understand need to build some houses on green belt but when there are so many brownfield sites in York. York has the largest amount of brownfield sites in the UK. Government national guidance is to maximise brownfield sites before greenbelt. Drainage and sewage – already problems and current system would collapse with increase in homes. Traffic – has increased since Vanguard was built, Strensall Road and A1237 will become a huge car park. Understand CYC have included previously rejected sites on the grounds of infrastructure and being unsustainable. Traffic/transport is a good reason to build homes within in the ring road not outside it.	6217/21016	
	Objection – see survey 16.	6501/26488	
	Objection – continue to oppose the creation of the proposed two new townships and also oppose the new further site proposal of up to 2,000 houses on the A1237 at Earswick as contrary to sustainable growth models and inappropriate development within the Green Belt area.	6508/19141	City of York Conservative Group
	Objection – removal of this land from Green Belt which is large enough to accommodate development of well in excess of 2,000 homes would destroy Earswick as a village. This land helps offer a vital barrier in avoidance of coalescence between Earswick and Strensall, which if permitted would speed up these two communities merging towards into a built-up urban dormitory sprawl of a town. There are a host of issues here including drainage and sewage capacity limitations and none more so relevant than access and traffic problems. Two previously proposed and rejected sites which make up the bulk of the land in this new 810 site proposal were previously rejected by the City Council on various infrastructure and un-sustainability grounds. The fact this proposal is reoffered as an even larger site does nothing to address any of the previous reasons for refusal and would question the Council motives for its inclusion. The document makes no promises about significant infrastructure improvement, or whether local schools can accommodate a significant increase of children. Indeed the secondary school at Huntington which serves our older children will already be under extra pressure form potential future housing developments in Huntington and Monks Cross area, as well as potential forthcoming developments in Strensall. There has also been suggestion that the Council might consider having a sixth form college on the development site and losing such a facility at Huntington and Joseph Rowntree Schools. There is more that a good chance that there would be significant opposition to this and questions include what would happen to the viability of any such site if either secondary school decided to opt out of the local authority	6514/19236	Cllr Paul Doughty, Conservative Councillor on behalf of Strensall Ward

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>control. There are no major employers in Earswick, so commuting to work is unavoidable. Aside from pressure on inadequate local facilities and services, there would also be thousands of extra cars on our roads, contributing to existing congestion problems through Earswick village and most notably the neighbouring A1237 ring road which is already at breaking point. There have clearly been extensive talks between the Council and the developers about the land which brings into question the whole consultation process. The project has considerable hurdles to overcome prior to even reaching the starting block. Unsustainable location with infrastructure and amenities that cannot cope. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt with a scale of development which would destroy the setting of Earswick village. It is unnecessary – National Planning Policy has no requirement on local authorities to remove land from green belt by safeguarding for future development.</p>		
<p><b>810 Earswick (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – developing on this scale would essentially be creating a new settlement which would impact on an already overloaded infrastructure and the poor drainage of the area. Nothing in government guidance which requires local authorities to plan beyond the 15 year period and safeguard land. No justification provided that the safeguarded land is necessary.</p> <p>Objection – see survey 16. There is no need for a safeguarding plan. The way this has been approached is also underhand as these areas were not involved in the original 15 year Plan. There is no need now or in the next 15 years for housing development on this scale. Council's own study last year confirmed the original plan met all the needs for the next 15yrs. Impact on the environment, wildlife and quality of life for current residents. We already suffer from lack of school and amenities. The transport congestion on Strensall Road and the North Ring Road are already unacceptable. The character of a village of 360 homes will be damaged beyond recognition by this proposal. there is no central government pressure to safeguard any land. Once this land is removed from green belt it will be immediately subjected to developer's plans. There is no need in the next fifteen years for a housing development of this scale. The impact on the environment and quality of life of current residents. We have a lack of schools and amenities. Transport congestion on Strensall Rd and north ring road are already unacceptable. The character of the village will be changed beyond recognition by this proposal. Can you please explain why this land is still included in both plans when one of the landowners is not willing to sell him land. Can you also assure me that you will make no attempt to compulsory purchase this land.</p>	<p>6516/20327</p> <p>9114/19438</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>810 Earswick (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - not against some future development but only on a modest scale similar to that of the Garden Village this retaining our rural atmosphere A development on the scale proposed would completely destroy the character of Earswick and result in it becoming a part of a Greater York urban sprawl totally soulless as with Clifton Moor. Strensall Road is busy at the best of times, but the ring road is busy all the time, crossing the ring road is extremely dangerous. The proposal to add a further roundabout to access the development will only make the ring road worse and causing backing up and subsequent gridlock. Local services are already stretched to the limit – the schools are full, doctors appointments are difficult to arrange – with so much increased housing the result will be even more pressure on such services.</p>	<p>9291/19500</p>	
	<p>Objection- there is far too much congestion on the north of York and a1237 is a car park. Further development will make matters worse. York's roads cannot cope with present traffic, development should be focused around land south of the a64 as they have good transport links.</p>	<p>9304/18082</p>	
	<p>Objection – no need for development of this scale. The consequences of a massive increase in traffic on already congested roads via an inadequately sized roundabout are unthinkable. No exceptional circumstance to build on greenbelt land when there are many brownfield sites available. Urban sprawl will be detrimental. Overbearing impact visually and economically. Noise, traffic, pollution and sewerage issues. Education facilities inadequate. Local appropriate development at Foss Bank recently turned down.</p>	<p>9308/18050</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16. Land should remain as Green Belt. The infrastructure in Earswick is totally inadequate for any further development, the roads, sewerage, schools and medical facilities are close to capacity. At the moment, there are continual queues at the A1237 roundabout, both to and from York at peak periods. The only way forward to safeguard this land is to accept the status quo.</p>	<p>9317/18053</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16. Willow grove, fronting the site is highly susceptible to flooding and residents contribute to the cost of the upkeep and running of a pump. Traffic congestion in Strensall road is a major problem and this will only make it worse. Brownfield sites should be looked at first. This size of development will lead to an increase in crime and impact on residents' health and safety. There will be a loss of privacy and daylight to existing properties. Retail units in the area will be impacted by the congestion on the roads. The terminology safeguarding means to protect something, and not to destroy a community by building 2000 plus homes, which will increase the village 'ten-fold'. Greenbelt land is being utilised for the supposed requirements of the local plan expansion of new housing requirements, when brownfield sites such as Terry's are more acceptable, ad should be developed before using</p>	<p>9328/18059</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	precious greenbelt which would be lost forever. Access and traffic congestion will be chronic on the A1237/Strensall Road when 10,000 new residents with probably an additional 4000 vehicles, will feed on to the existing narrow congested road. The influx of 10,000 new residents will have an a severe impact on already overloaded facilities such as Doctors, Dentists, School and County Hospital which currently is overloaded regarding appointments, and runs at a significant deficit. The land currently farmed adjacent to our property is susceptible to flooding in wet periods, ad water run off from hardstandings is a problem. If this development is allowed to proceed, the drains into the River Foss are currently inadequate, the water table is high and 2,500 new homes with associated hard standing will cause possible flood dangers. Strongly opposed to the opportunistic plans that the Thirteen Group have already drawn up for the site when the planning process is not yet exhausted.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection- opposed to removal of this land from the Green Belt. If implemented these plans would place in excess of 6000 houses in the area north of the existing ring road A1237. Little wonder that there are concerns over access given that the ring road ad radial access roads to the aforementioned villages are saturated now at he rush hour	9334/18061	
	Objection – this development would completely change the character of the village and increase the already overloaded road system, schools and GP surgeries.	9335/18062	
	Objection – object to the ‘safeguarding’ of this area of Green Belt for future development, and the proposal to build a large number of houses on this site. This would more than treble the population of this small village. There are no plans for infrastructure development, and the volume of traffic would overwhelm the ring road producing massive traffic jams at peaks times and lead to residents being exposed to excessive pollution. The character of the village would be completely changed for the worse.	9407/18312	
	Objection – see survey 16. Opposed to the expansion of Earswick and removal of further sites from the Green Belt, otherwise York will not be a green and pleasant place to reside. The infrastructure in the area is already at capacity, with the Outer Ring Road becoming overcrowded since the new Vanguard Shopping Complex. The drainage system in Earswick also struggles to cope. Schools, Local Medical Surgeries and the York District Hospital are presently overstretched, and more residents needing their services will impact this. Rising crime rates are bound to occur and out of town retail is likely to lead to the closure of long run family businesses.	9418/18341	
	Objection – strongly protest the loss of this Green Belt land around Earswick village. If development is allowed to proceed, it will spoil the peaceful safe environment and at the same time create major problems for the City. Green Belt is there to protect from urban sprawl and prevent small villages such as Earswick being swallowed up. A development of this size would	9422/18348	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>destroy the village and the safe and peaceful environment it holds forever. The current infrastructure will not be able to cope, especially the drainage system which we have problems with at present. Access and traffic will be a major problem with all the traffic created by 10,000 new residents using Strensall Road/ A1237, which is badly congested at peak times without another 4000 cars using it. There are vacant sites on Clifton Moor and Monks Cross, which is likely to be due to the inaccessibility problems caused by traffic congestion on the totally inadequate A1237 ring road. Improving roundabouts will not solve the problem of chronic congestion, only major road widening will suffice. In the mean time the local economy will continue to suffer. The smell, noise, pollution and crime will be the future for the village, if this development is allowed to proceed. What will happen with new schools, doctors, dentists? York Hospital is already overstretched and has no room for expansion.</p>		
<p><b>810 Earswick (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – see survey 16. Traffic density is already a major issue in York. Development will have a major impact on commuting times on pollution and noise and will cause distress to many and deterioration of the environment. York District Hospital is already at full capacity and schools are already full with high class sizes. Local GPs and local education will not be able to cope with such an increase in population. Other physical infrastructure will be stretched to the limit and drainage will be just one example of this. Development will have an ecological impact. York is already prone to flooding and felling of trees and reduction of the Greenbelt will have a detrimental effect on the environment. A big development at this proposed site will affect the visual impact of the city of York. The proposed development will have consequences which could adversely affect health and safety levels and crime levels. It will have an Economic Impact on York as a whole. These numbers of households are more likely to be an economic drain on the resource of the city rather than to increase economic viability. The developer must demonstrate very special circumstances to alter Green Belt status, do not see that such circumstances exist, especially as there remain several Brown sites in central York which have not been developed.</p>	<p>9423/18351</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16. Traffic density is already a major issue in York. The ring road cannot cope with the increased traffic. Development will have a major impact on commuting times on pollution and noise and will cause distress to many and deterioration of the environment. Earswick amenities will be overrun. York District Hospital is already at full capacity and schools are already full with high class sizes. Local GPs and local education will not be able to cope with such an increase in population. Other physical infrastructure will be stretched to the limit and drainage will be just one example of this. Development will have an ecological impact. York is already prone to flooding and felling of trees and reduction of the Greenbelt will have a detrimental effect on the environment. A big development at this</p>	<p>9426/18358</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>proposed site will affect the visual impact of the city of York. The proposed development will have consequences which could adversely affect health and safety levels and crime levels. It will have an Economic Impact on York as a whole. These numbers of households are more likely to be an economic drain on the resource of the city rather than to increase economic viability. The developer must demonstrate very special circumstances to alter Green Belt status, do not see that such circumstances exist, especially as there remain several Brown sites in central York which have not been developed.</p>		
<p><b>810 Earswick (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – inclusion of this land in the Local Plan runs counter to the general trend that land should only be taken out of the greenbelt for development in exceptional circumstances. The site is wholly inappropriate for a development of this size as it would swallow up the existing community of Earswick village, overload overstretched infrastructure and adversely affect traffic flows and road safety. Detrimental impact to the character of the area - the village community of Earswick would be effectively destroyed. Adverse effect on ecology, landscape and trees – light pollution, noise and air pollution would destroy the present ecology. Excessive pressure on currently overloaded amenities and public services – surface water runoff from hardstanding, increased demand for sewage disposal, implications for medical centres, hospitals and schools. Traffic chaos on roads to the north of York – road width is inadequate, junctions are restrictive and have poor sight lines, slow turning vehicles are a hazard to other road users, roundabout junction of Strensall/Huntington Road and the A1237 ring road could not cope with traffic volumes, increased levels of air pollution in residential areas. Compromising of road safety along Strensall Road – narrow Strensall Road not design for existing volume of traffic, cyclists using this road are in constant danger as there are no cycle lanes, increased vehicles would increase the danger for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians.</p>	<p>9432/18447</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16. Greenbelt was designed to protect the community from urban sprawl. Once destroyed it is gone forever. Will destroy the status of the ancient village transforming it into a satellite town for York. Amenities will be over stretched. Congestion on Strensall Road is substantial. Will lead to major increase in traffic and attendant consequences in terms of noise, pollution and safety issues. Not clear on how current social resources are expected to cope. No national requirement to safeguard land.</p>	<p>9433/22241</p>	
	<p>Objection – this land is greenbelt and as such there should be very special circumstances in order for it to be developed. Strensall Road is already stretched to capacity now, and with the proposed developments in Strensall, creating even more traffic on Strensall Road, I don't think this location would be sustainable. The development would have an overbearing impact on the existing properties, affecting privacy, daylight, sunlight and values. Also there is the</p>	<p>9440/18463</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	question of sewerage, as existing facilities are already stretched to capacity. There is also the question of junior and senior school provision. Currently there is no safe crossing at Earswick roundabout, and as more children would be expected to use this route, how would this problem be addressed.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 16. Removal of land from Green Belt will result in ‘Urban Sprawl’ and completely change the character of Earswick village. Have not demonstrated ‘very special circumstances’. Growth should be based on need. It has not been demonstrated that this size of development at this particular site is needed. Proposal will increase the village footprint 5-6 times, creating a new town and overwhelming the existing village. Village Design Statement proposes small scale development which can be assimilated into the community. Brown field sites should be developed first – there are plenty of empty business premises to let in Clifton Moor and Monks Cross. Traffic congestion on the scale resulting from this proposal could damage employment prospects in the city as people will have difficulty getting in to the centre. Problems with infrastructure – long waiting times at the roundabout at peak times, problems with sewerage at full capacity, waiting times at GP surgeries and hospital. Extra capacity will only exacerbate these problems hugely. Other objections on grounds of sustainability, ecology, pollution and health and safety.	9442/20076	
	Objection – vital swathe of green providing a habitat to a vast variety of wildlife. Once this Green Belt is lost it is gone forever. This is not a village it is urban sprawl providing housing but not for local people, providing more revenue for the Council, vast profit for developers and a bleak outlook for existing residents. How many social homes will be provided for those who don’t have them and who could never aspire to buying a property. Strensall Road cannot take anymore traffic. The site is unsustainable, unnecessary, inappropriate and highly detrimental to York and its character.	9443/24104	
	Objection – will have a devastating impact on local infrastructure. Has there been any consultation with the North York Schools cluster to ascertain the possible implications of this. The stretch of road by the Hopgrove roundabout would not be able to cope with the increased traffic. Would support a development of up to 100 dwellings, the impact of which could be absorbed into the existing local infrastructure. A smaller development would not too dramatically alter or change the very nature of the village.	9444/24106	
	Objection – see survey 16. Valuable green belt land must be preserved. Impact of development would decimate the village and add congestion to Strensall Road and the Ring Road. Development on this site will have a devastating impact on local infrastructure, schools, traffic and GP surgeries, in addition it will change the character of this area forever. It is inappropriate, unsustainable and unnecessary. Suggest that the Council look to developing	9453/18478	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the abundance of 'brownfield sites' that are available for development in the York area before bulldozing the 'greenbelt' for no good reason other than short term gain.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – traffic along Strensall Road is already over capacity. Already plans to build more houses in Strensall adding to this problem. Ring Road often at a standstill. Will potentially cause delays to the bus service. Public services already overstretched – police, fire, ambulance and hospitals. Schools cannot accommodate anymore children.	9457/24117	
	Objection – urban sprawl would turn Earswick into another Haxby or Strensall and would ruin the character of the village. Traffic along Strensall Road is already over capacity. Productive farmland, food production should be taken into account due to the growing population. Would be excessive pressure added to the already overloaded amenities (water supply, surface water, sewerage and electricity). Pubic services already overstretched – police, fire, ambulance, hospitals and schools. Removal of land from the Green Belt is not necessary.	9459/24118	
	Objection – the massive development option of over 2000 homes would dwarf the existing village of approximately 350 and goes against the whole purpose of green belt limiting urban sprawl. The existing transport infrastructure of Strensall Road and the current roundabout on the A1237 which is already busy most of the day would not be able to cope with the large influx of traffic this development could pose. This quantity of proposed dwellings would need health care, shops, new schools and development and growth of the current high schools. This would contradict the village charter. The size is akin to building a city next to York itself and changing the character of the place. There is likely to be an increase in crime in the village. The council has created a magic number of 16,000 jobs created in York by 2030 and a wonderful prospect of all the employment land required but how have these figures been invented. There is plenty of opportunity for developments for both employment and housing use if the realistic figures for York's growth over the next 20 years are taken into account. There are plenty of brownfield sites which could be used to create this volume of houses but obviously the green belt is seen as an easy target for the council and the developers. The brownfield sites should be considered in full first. History has shown us that safeguarding is a complete misnomer and developers could try to develop on this land at any time within the 15yr proposal. There has been no recommendation from the government to safeguard land for use in the future, only for plans to develop. Looking at the proposed sites there seems to be a clear lack of understanding about the locations of these developments such as congestion at Clifton Moor. How will the hospital cope with these 50,000+ residents when it has no space for development and already caters for those as far as Scarborough.	9471/18487	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
810 Earswick (continued)	Objection – proposal is inappropriate, unsustainable and unnecessary. The Outer Ring Road A1237 is not able to take the additional traffic from this and other proposals. Perhaps a proposal to spend money duelling and underpassing the A1237 before proposing an additional 2000+ houses. Traffic on the Strensall Road is reaching saturation at peak times. If you want to turn York in to urban sprawl add another 2000 houses and call it Greater Earswick because you will have changed the Earswick we know and value.	9479/20079	
	Objection – the infrastructure and road network cannot support the already congested traffic area. Traffic along Strensall Road regularly backs up onto the congested northern ring road around York. The area suffers from land drainage problems. Serious investment would be required in the area's infrastructure to meet the increased demands. The proposed development would change the Earswick community beyond all recognition.	9480/18739	
	Objection – development would have devastating effect on local infrastructure including traffic congestion, GPs surgeries and will change the character of the area forever. Strensall / Earswick Road have seen increased traffic in recent years. Additional houses and cars will create unsustainable situation, is inappropriate and will result in misery for all. Since 1971 there have been four additional housing estates in the village and a ring road and feel the village has had its share of development.	9489/18754	
	Objection – removal of this land will result in 'Urban Sprawl' and will completely change the character of the Earswick village. It will create a new town that will increase the size of the existing village by 5 or 6 times. There is a village design statement which is proposing a small scale development. Traffic Congestion and gridlock will occur if the development takes place, which may damage the employment prospects in the City. Existing problems with the infrastructure will be exacerbated enormously: there are already long waiting times at the roundabout and it is difficult to cross the A1237 on foot or by bicycle; there are problems with sewerage in the area; waiting times at GP surgeries and hospital are considerable; no space to expand York District Hospital and so where is the extra capacity needed going to come from. A development of this scale is not viable. On grounds of ecology, sustainability, health and safety, it would be extremely unwise to remove this land from the Green Belt.	9499/18650	
	Objection – opposed to the proposal to take 220 acres of Greenbelt out of the Earswick Area. Given the possible Brownfield development sites, this is unnecessary and incredibly extreme. The consequent increase in traffic along the Strensall Road would only add to what is already a nightmare.	9504/18659	
	Objection – Green Belts designed to prevent neighbourhoods from merging, assist in safeguarding countryside from encroachments, safeguard agricultural land an encourage regeneration of brownfield sites. This is urban sprawl. Implications for the strain on	9522/24139	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	infrastructure, GP surgeries and schools. 20 years ago we were 87% self sufficient in food production, this has dropped to 65%. This land is viable agricultural land and more than ever should be kept as such.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection- a development of this size will completely alter the village of Earswick. The area cannot cope with this volume of houses being built, the roads can barely cope as it is let alone the lack of schools, local shops and GP surgeries are already overrun. Green land should be treasured not removed.	9523/19504	
	Objection – Strensall Road is already very congested, not to mention the local schools and doctors surgeries. It would also result in a dramatic change in the area. Need to protect the Green Belt. There are areas within York which need redeveloping and re-using before the Green Belt is destroyed.	9525/19260	
	Objection – infill and redevelopment is sufficient to meet housing needs, we do not need to take more Greenbelt	9531/19263	
	Objection – the proposed development is totally out of proportion to the infrastructure (road congestion, schools, doctors). The Council seems to think that everything should end up at Huntington/Strensall without providing any infrastructure, another example being the Football Stadium. The character of the neighbourhood should not be destroyed any further.	9534/19268	
	Objection – if any consideration at all had been given to the impacts on transportation, water pressure, sewage outlets, local schools etc. then this proposal should not have moved passed the scoping document stage. There are still plenty of brown field sites available in and around York and would expect these to be totally exhausted before even considering changing the designation of Green Belt land.	9543/19046	
	Objection – strongly object to the council's plans to allow residential development on this site. It will have a devastating impact on the local infrastructure including school places, traffic . It will change the character of this area forever. It is inappropriate, unsustainable and unnecessary. Suggest the council look to developing the abundance of 'brownfield sites' that are available for development in the York area before bulldozing the 'greenbelt' for no good reason other than short term gain. congestion, GP surgeries and will undoubtedly make a significant change to the character of the local area forever.	9549/19057	
	Objection – see survey 16. Local sewerage system needs upgrading and northern ring road needs improving to cope with increased traffic. A sensible development for the village would be a further 50-100 houses built in the Willow Grove area. York has a large acreage of brownfield land, building on green belt land runs counter to government policy. The green belt must be retained to avoid urban spread.	9557/19077	
	Comment – some development would be acceptable in Willow Grove area - up to 200 houses.	9557/26497	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – the Council should adhere to the intent of government proposals, and so protect the greenbelt from urbanisation rather than removing areas of land from greenbelt. Green areas must be protected from development for the sake of our children and our wildlife. The Council should stick to persuading developers to build affordable housing for our young people in areas close to and within the city centre, so also relieving the already overstretched infrastructure. The roads will not be able to cope. The A1237 is already over capacity and this would make the situation more intolerable. The development would spoil the rural nature of our village and spoil our enjoyment of life and amenity. Nobody wants these houses to be built as there is no local need.	9560/19066	
	Objection – this is a terrible suggestion that is not necessary and will damage the area irrevocably. The local plan should be to protect the greenbelt and ensure development is maximised on brownfield land. The proposal is contrary to this aim and is promoting urban sprawl contrary to government policy. York Council should ensure any building proposals are on brownfield sites closer to the city centre. The A1237 outer ring road is not able to cope with any more traffic and already often has standing vehicles. Please to not try to suggest public transport or Park & Rides would help, they would not as the traffic is caused by movement of local people from local point to local point, not out of and into York. There is no demand for these houses at the scale proposed, particularly on this land and represents a size of uncontrolled growth beyond the ability of the community to absorb without permanent damage.	9561/19067	
	Objection - there is no requirement to open up this greenbelt land, and there appears to be plenty of new housing developments already completed or underway in the York area that is not yet occupied, and plenty of additional brown field sites that would benefit from redevelopment. We have no infrastructure to support his development. No church, no school, no shop, no pub – will you build all of those as well. Strensall Road is already treacherous, without adding more traffic. Queries why a site has been chosen for this development that has already been deliberately and appropriately protected in the past, when there is plenty more space around York that is in need of development, and would benefit from it in many ways. By making the road busier we are putting all our children in greater danger.	9562/18935	
	Objection- scale of development unsustainable and inappropriate for such a small community. Development of this scale would change the character of the village and have a devastating effect on infrastructure. Existing concerns regarding traffic on Strensall Road which Council already recognises. Development will further increase traffic in peak times, especially on the A1237. Suggest more modest, sustainable extensions to the village.	9565/18934	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection –concern regarding size of proposed development area. The character of the village will be change irrevocably if this many houses are built. Does not believe the removal of this much green space will have a positive effect on the village. No doubt crime rate will increase and insure how the ring road will cope with potential increase of 3000 cars.	9566/19088	
	Objection – object to this proposal as there is no requirement for local councils to ‘safeguard’ land. Cannot identify ‘very special circumstances’ (or anticipation of need) to justify the development of greenbelt east of Earswick. Why is the Council not developing and maximising the existing brownfield and urban sites in the north of York. The local plan seeks to develop the city in an excessive, disproportionate manner over the immediate years. The very aspects that make York an attractive city to live and work in will be lost by these puzzling plans for expansion. A lack of jobs and investment is likely to result, unemployment may increase, and income from tourism will fall when people realise they cannot travel to or within the city due to crowding, congestion and lack of underlying investment beyond simply house building. Earswick would become a satellite of a small town, subsumed within the new development. The existing transport and local infrastructure precludes large-scale development. Strensall Road cannot be widened at the narrow point where the bus stop and first mini roundabout are sited. Even if a new local primary school were built, the large secondary school (Huntington) has no room for expansion. Increases in rush hour traffic would risk children being late for school or unable to safely cross the road to get on the bus in Earswick. Existing sewage and drainage is struggling to cope with the current village size. There is no underpass at the ring road which makes crossing the ring road into Huntington impossible for children and risky for adults who walk or cycle. How is it possible for a developer to publicise their plans in this way when the consultation period and the next steps including independent review of the Plan have several months to go. This suggests a total disregard for reasonable appraisal of the plans.	9567/19089	
	Objection –the development on this site will have devastating impacts on local infrastructure, schools traffic and GP surgeries, in addition it will change the character of this area forever. It is inappropriate, unsustainable and unnecessary. Suggest look to developing the abundance brownfield sites that are available for development in the York Area before bulldozing the “greenbelt” for no good reason other than short term gain.	9568/18950	
	Objection – there is no requirement to safeguard Greenbelt land for development unless absolutely necessary. There are many brownfield sites available in the York area and it remains questionable as to how much further housing is needed and whether the local economy can provide sufficient employment. Once this land is safeguarded it is ripe for development. The present road infrastructure is at breaking point already, any further traffic	9576/18939	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	from any development would bring it to a standstill. Would seem that dualling the A1237 would need to be a condition on the developer. Will put a strain on local schools, doctors and the local bus service. It is unlikely that the present infrastructure could cope with such a momentous increase in housing. What is being proposed is a new town.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – failed to work closely with the Parish Council. Not a village extension it is the creation of a new village or small town. Informed that the site could be considered as an allocation in years 1 – 5 of the plan. Incompatible with the very reason the land was designated greenbelt in the first instance. Should develop brownfield sites before any incursion onto green belt land. Has any consideration of the environmental impact been taken. Obliteration of habitat. Traffic volume will balloon on roads that are already dangerous.	9577/18938	
	Objection – the overwhelming feature of this proposal is its scale...2,000 dwellings wrapped around the existing 350 houses is totally off the scale. It is urbanisation, it is city sprawl, it is the antithesis of greenbelt ideals. The associated expansions of road traffic, schooling, medical facilities and all utility functions are simply not attainable. Where can you put new infrastructure to cope with this increase. It will simply take up more greenbelt on an ever increasing expansion.	9578/19117	
	Objection – neighbourhood is not equipped for change. Amenities and services could not cope. The additional traffic that is on our roads already has increased noise and pollution not to mention road safety for the many senior citizens and children. If you want land go build on all your brownfield sites and leave our green belt as it is we don't want to be victims of urban sprawl.	9580/18951	
	Objection – opposed to use of the green belt. Traffic is already bad.	9584/18945	
	Objection – strongly object to any building on green belt land in Earswick. Main reason for objection is the fact that Strensall Road and the York Outer Ring Road are both heavily congested and cannot take all the extra cars that this development would create. Local schools could not cope with the increased numbers of children this building would cause.	9590/19284	
	Objection – the scale of this project is out of all proportion to the area in either aesthetic or practical terms. The roads will become a giant car park. At present Strensall Road has a long tailback on to the ring road at peak times and the ring road likewise is very congested. Any further access on to it on this scale will cause further tailbacks. The ring road has particular implications when this development is coupled to proposed building at Monks Cross. There are ongoing issues for cyclists and pedestrians in crossing the ring road. With this proposed development it will be almost impossible. The government has stated it does not want Green Belt sacrificed for housing, let alone on this scale. Concern regarding the proven need for this number of new houses and concern about jobs. The local infrastructure is hard out to cope	9605/19304	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	with the present demands. All roads, sewers, drainage networks, schools, doctors and policing will need to be completely overhauled to cope with the scale of this proposed development. This huge development would severely change the quality of life in Earswick. The Green Belt was given its designation for a reason. Ecology and wildlife would be changed for the worse. The levels of pollution and noise, not to mention safety would deteriorate.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – at the meeting with the proposed developers they could not explain which part of east Earswick was ecologically and unusually significant. It could not be explained why the amount of houses could not be dispersed into the wider safeguarded area. Strensall Road is blocked up in the morning now at school rush hour times. It would not cope with the volume and a new roundabout will not cope with an increase in traffic going left and right on the A1237 with the Vanguarde and Leeds/Scarborough traffic – Gridlock. The major concern is the amount of houses per hectare. Our total investment has been to do with the space between houses, proximity to greenbelt and the city. Use brownfield sites.	9607/19306	
	Objection – why, when there are many “brownfield sites” not yet developed do we have to consider removing Greenbelt land for future development. The additional traffic created on the A1237 ring road will bring an already congested road to standstill, it already is a serious problem for the local bus services to cross the ring road at the Strensall Rd. Roundabout. The A1237 is already heavily congested, further roundabouts and the possible additional 2 – 4,000 vehicles using the stretch before and after Strensall Road roundabout will cause major problems. Strensall Road is currently massively used, not only at peak rush hours but during the day as well. Traffic often bypasses the A64 to use Strensall Rd to Flaxton to avoid the A64 congestion. Again adding to the possibility of 2-4,000 vehicles will bring Strensall and other surrounding villages to a grinding grid lock. York Hospital which also services Scarborough, Malton and Bridlington is already stretched, a further significant increase of 5,000 plus persons will stretch resources to breaking point. The fire station on the ring road and the Ambulance Station in Haxby will become severely compromised due to the surrounding road congestion.	9608/19308	
	Objection – the proposed further development of Earswick (2000 properties) will further enhance problems in Haxby and the A1237. It is well know the residents of Earswick use Haxby facilities.	9609/27512	
	Objection –totally inappropriate for this village. Proposal is both unnecessary and unsustainable. Proposed development is disproportionate to the existing village There is no proven need for a development of this magnitude. National Planning Policy states that the use of Green Belt land for development is unnecessary. The local infrastructure cannot support	9611/19309	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>such a development: access roads to ring road are inadequate to cope; sewerage/ drainage are already inadequate; local schools are already full; insufficient facilities i.e. shops, meeting places, village doctors etc. Loss of productive arable land. Many Brownfield sites around York which should be used first. The site is not sustainable with extensive investment in infrastructure. The visual impact on the environment will be extensive. In addition, excessive noise will be created during and post-construction, and there will be a significant increase in pollution and emission of Greenhouse gases. Police resources will be insufficient to patrol such a large additional area. Public transport will not be able to cope with the additional need. The ring road will be gridlocked. Creation of a new roundabout on the ring road will provide additional access, but the ring road cannot cope with the volume of traffic. Primary school in Huntington is already oversubscribed and there has been talk of the need to build a new secondary school to cope with existing demand. Increase in population will require serious investment in services including doctors, dentists, hospitals, schools and police. The cumulative effect of all the proposed developments to the north of York will be devastating to the environment and well-being of the local population. Road safety is currently of great concern.</p>		
<p><b>810 Earswick (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – see survey 16. Why would the Council agree to move such a massive acreage of Green Belt land when there are many Brownfield sites in York begging for re-development which would enhance our lovely city. Cannot imagine the traffic chaos that will quite obviously result with the addition of another roundabout on the A1237 between Earswick and Monks Cross. This section of the ring road would be grid locked in a very short space of time. York District Hospital is already under pressure to provide a quality service to its residents and visitors. The number of homes within this development will make the matter worse. Our village is a small community. This proposal multiplies the size of Earswick approaching 10 times. We do not want to be a town. Lastly the present government has made available a substantial amount of money for urban development to protect Greenfield locations. The Council should be sponsoring plans to build on urban sites, not taking out land external to the ring road.</p>	<p>9612/19310</p>	
	<p>Objection – Thirteen Group et al have already put forward a so-called 'master plan idea'. How has this been allowed to happen as the proposal itself has only been in the public domain for two months and is part of a draft Local Plan. See no indication that the NPPF has been followed. An entirely new village/small town which will have no connection whatsoever with the existing village, particularly as they will be separated by an extremely busy road. This totally contradicts the Council's own conditions for allowing such a development which should 'represent growth in a controlled organic manner which would enhance the existing cohesion</p>	<p>9615/20084</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and sustainability of the community'. Even at this present time the local infrastructure is struggling to cope. Where are all the people coming from. It is disquieting in the extreme to envisage thousands of extra vehicles from the Earswick site alone attempting to enter a minor road with mini roundabouts. Strensall Road is already grid-locked at peak times. The idea for this development should surely have been developed hand-in-hand with the local community and Parish Council.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – object to removing land from the Green Belt. Disproportion to the existing village. No proven need for this size of development in this area. National policy says the use of Greenfield is unnecessary. The local infrastructure can not support such a development – access roads, sewerage/drains, local schools and doctors. Loss of productive arable land, trees, greenery and local ecology. The site is not sustainable without extensive investment in infrastructure. Many brownfield sites that should be used first. Visual impact is extensive. Excessive noise and increase in pollution and emission of greenhouse gases. Police resources will be insufficient. Public transport will not be able to cope. The ring road will be gridlocked. The cumulative effect of all the proposed development to the north of York will be devastating to the environment and well being of the local population. Road safety is currently of great concern.	9619/19703	
	Objection – proposed development is disproportionate to the existing village. There is no proven need for a development of this magnitude. National Planning Policy states that the use of Green Belt land for development is unnecessary. The local infrastructure cannot support such a development: access roads to ring road are inadequate to cope; sewerage/ drainage are already inadequate; local schools are already full; insufficient facilities i.e. shops, meeting places, village doctors etc. Loss of productive arable land. Many Brownfield sites around York which should be used first. The site is not sustainable with extensive investment in infrastructure. The visual impact on the environment will be extensive. In addition, excessive noise will be created during and post-construction, and there will be a significant increase in pollution and emission of Greenhouse gases. Police resources will be insufficient to patrol such a large additional area. Public transport will not be able to cope with the additional need. The ring road will be gridlocked. The cumulative effect of all the proposed developments to the north of York will be devastating to the environment and well-being of the local population. Road safety is currently of great concern	9620/19315	
	Objection – greenbelt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances, which is not the case here. The A1237 cannot cope with additional traffic. Development here would be overbearing, and there would be impact on the privacy, crime and sewerage. There should only be small sustainable development in this area.	9625/20483	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – affects on schools (primary and secondary at capacity) roads (Strensall Road and Ring Road congestion and pollution), A1237 can't be widened at out point and the affect on surgeries and the hospital is full. Not sustainable growth. Should use brownfield land. No government charter to safeguard green belt. Expansion is not based on a need for housing, just an aspiration. The character of the village would be lost.	9641/24157	
	Objection – the whole point of a green belt is to safeguard an area of green natural environment around a city, both to provide its vital lungs and to prevent creeping outward urbanisation. Do not believe good agricultural land should be sacrificed before brownfield sites within the city have all been developed. Yet to see evidence of special circumstances that removing land from the green belt is a necessary requirement for the number of new homes required. Would put yet more pressure on infrastructure and completely alter the character of the small, sustainable and integrated community, which is at present in keeping with its green belt surroundings. An addition of a minimum 1,500 homes to the existing 350 cannot be called a 'village extension'.	9642/20103	
	Objection – wrong to develop Greenfield land unless there is absolutely no viable alternative. Britain is overcrowded and in danger of being steadily covered in concrete. York has several brownfield sites which could be made to provide entirely suitable alternatives for housing development. The infrastructure to the north-east of the city is already at breaking point and cannot sustain further housing development. Particularly the Huntington/Strensall road and adjoining sections of the outer ring road could not cope with more traffic. It would be many years before other services such as schooling, medical services etc could be brought to a level that would support the proposed increase in local population. Opposed to increase the population six-fold as proposed and so change the whole character of the environment is unacceptable.	9644/19106	
	Objection – see survey 16. Who is going to pay for the extra infrastructure necessary such as schools, health care, roads etc. There is not the infrastructure for such an increase. The present sewerage system is running at capacity. What about the run off from fields after heavy rain. This can be a problem for those living directly on Strensall Road, causing puddles which are a danger to road traffic. Strensall Road and the Ring Road are already heavily congested. Who will pay for and build the extra roads. Who will pay for and build the extra doctor's surgeries and hospital capacity so many new people will need. York Hospital is already running flat out. There will surely need to be a new Comprehensive School, as neither Huntington nor Joseph Rowntree will have the capacity to take in hundred more children. There is also loss of productive farmland. We ask that brownfield sites be used not Green Belt. If the number of houses proposed are built it could mean nearly a tenfold increase in the	9645/20105	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	population of Earswick.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – allowing development on 220 acres of prime agricultural land near Earswick will have a highly detrimental impact on the ecology and landscape of the area. It also seems totally unnecessary given the amount of brownfield space already available within the York boundary.	9646/20107	
	Objection – the case for not developing brownfield sites within York has not been made convincingly. Such land appears to be available within the city and, due to its proximity to likely sites of employment, development of brownfield sites would allow for an increase in residential dwellings with a far less dramatic impact on traffic and infrastructure than the proposed development in Earswick. The new roundabout between Earswick and Monks Cross proposed by Thirteen Group would actually make matters worse and create a rat run through the proposed new development area and directly onto Strensall Road. The scale of the proposed development, both that initially (and rather prematurely) being suggested by Thirteen Group and that which follows, would irrevocably transform Earswick to an urban rather than rural community. What are the ‘special circumstances’ that require greenbelt land to be used at Earswick and by what criteria will the Council be satisfied that access and sustainability issues have been met.	9648/20109	
	Objection – the visual impact of such a large development akin to the size of a small town such as Malton located on this land adjacent to the existing village of Earswick will have an overbearing impact and be visually unacceptable. The land is home to many wildlife species, some protected, such as birds and badger, which it will have a severe impact upon. By going ahead with the development, you will destroy the status of this ancient village, transforming it into a satellite town for York. The proposed housing developments will lead to a major increase in vehicular traffic and noise, pollution and will be a danger to children and other pedestrians. The proposals for vehicular access to and from the A1237 ring road will further add to the problems on this already congested stretch of road and will cause utter chaos and complete gridlock. How are social resources e.g. schools / doctor’s surgeries expected to cope with the planned influx of people. How will York Hospital, which is already at maximum capacity, cope with calls for use from the additional population.	9652/20113	
	Objection – opposed to removal of land from the greenbelt which should be protected from development. Disagree with the continued building of large housing estates on the outskirts of York. Will cause noise and disturbance for many years. Not aware of any need for development of this scale. Concerned that this will increase traffic and cause more pollution and danger to pedestrians.	9654/19320	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 16. It is unnecessary to safeguard Green Belt for development when brownfield sites are available in the York area that are currently not developed. In fact the Government have stated that Councils will be required to put local development orders on 90% of brownfield sites. Also current legislation requires ‘very special circumstances’ to build on Green Belt. There are none apparent. Development must be driven by demand. It is difficult to see from where the demand for the 2,000 to 3,000 houses that could be constructed on this land will come. It is not about something that might happen in 15 years, as the proposed Thirteen development shows. The current road infrastructure is completely unable to cope with any such development. It barely copes now with the recent increase in retail opportunities in the Monks Cross area. The Thirteen proposals suggest a new roundabout on the ring road with no suggestion of dualling the road. Whilst any development would no doubt include proposals for new schools, the record in Strensall is not too good. No additional primary school has been built despite the large development that has taken place there.	9655/19321	
	Objection – the size of the proposed development is totally unsustainable, and entirely inappropriate for a small village such as Earswick. There are many urban sites in the city centre which have not been developed. There is no employment in York to support an increased population. The existing infrastructure and roads are insufficient to meet existing traffic needs even without an additional 2000 homes. The additional traffic will result in huge levels of increased congestion on the ring road and Strensall Road. There is no need for the additional housing which is being proposed. The additional congestion will cause an increased level of pollution. There is already a severe strain on local services which would be greatly exacerbated by additional housing.	9660/20119	
	Objection – there is no central government pressure to safeguard land. Once removed from the green belt it will be subjected to development. No need for development of this scale. Impact on the environment, wildlife and quality of life. Area already suffers from pressures on infrastructure and amenities.	9663/19612	
	Objection – existing status of the land as green belt, insufficient consideration has been given to the importance of keeping this designation for the particular advantages it provides. Do not accept that very special circumstances exist in this instance to justify any proposal to support a change of use to permit development.	9664/20125	
	Objection – there are brownfield sites in York yet Earswick threatened with land grab from the greenbelt prior to these sites being developed. Not adhering to the NPPF. Site 777 was rejected on the grounds of infrastructure deficiencies i.e. no roundabout access to the A1237, how can Site 810 meet the criteria. Ignored the Arup report on jobs, therefore these	9665/20126	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>proposals cannot have a firm foundation. This particular plot of land is prime grade 1 arable land and cannot be replaced. If 2000 homes were built on this site alone it would result in 3000 extra cars on the ring road. If Nestle cannot get their vehicles to and from their factory they will leave York, resulting in 2000 direct job redundancies. The infrastructure cannot take this level of build. A new ring road is needed, a new hospital, schools, doctors surgeries etc. Earswick is a village of some 350 houses and this is not a village extension, but annihilation of an historic village.</p>		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Support - in favour of safeguarding the land and subsequently making it available for housing. Feel there is room in Earswick for more housing and the provision of school and local facilities would be of benefit to the community. It would mean not having to cross the ring road to a local shop, nor getting in a car to drive to services at Strensall. At the moment Earswick has no such facilities. Greatest concern is transport, understand that measures will be put in place to spread the flow of vehicles and to improve public transport. Be good if there was a joined up cycle network linking York and the villages without cyclists having to share the road with vehicles.</p> <p>Comment - there is room in Earswick for some new houses to be built, but not so many.</p>	<p>9681/19517</p> <p>9681/26501</p>	
	<p>Objection – there is no central government pressure to safeguard land. Once removed from the green belt it will be subjected to development. No need for development of this scale. Impact on the environment, wildlife and quality of life. Area already suffers from pressures on infrastructure and amenities.</p>	<p>9683/19614</p>	
	<p>Objection - failure to take into account the villages Parish Plan. The scale of development is unsustainable and totally inappropriate for a small community such as Earswick. Character of the village would change irrevocably and with 50% social housing increase in local crime rates. Hugely detrimental impact on traffic loading on Strensall Road. Increase in noise and traffic pollution would have a major effect on the health and quality of life for existing residents. An unprecedented increase in traffic on the A1237 outer ring road which already cannot cope with the existing levels of traffic. Loss of over 200 acres of productive farm land. Inadequate infrastructure to cope with such a massive development with intolerable burdens placed on already over-stretched public services(police, fire, ambulance, doctors, hospitals, schools etc). Compromising road safety along Strensall Road with extra pedestrians, cyclist's and motorists adding to the hazards of narrow and congested roads. Excessive pressure that will be brought to bear on currently overloaded amenities such as water supply, surface water drainage from hard standings and sewers. Adverse effect on ecology, landscape, and trees with loss of habitats and natures balance.</p>	<p>9693/19525</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – it will destroy the character of the village, we will lose that village feel and will become swallowed up. The village we love in has a design statement, which will also be completely compromised by such a development. Do not think that Strensall Road will stand any further traffic on it anyway. The infrastructure, drainage, sewerage etc is not in place to sustain more dwellings. Will the road and roundabout on the ring road be expanded to cope with all this extra traffic. The existing roads are already struggling under the amount of traffic on it. The Hospital is already at capacity, no plans to build another with all the extra people who potentially will move into the city. What about the already busy public services, will ambulances, fire engines be able to get through when needed. Crime rates are also a consideration. We enjoy a relatively low rate of crime at the moment and this will no doubt increase with the influx of people, especially if these are family homes, there will be a lot more children hanging about looking for somewhere to explore.	9708/20163	
	Objection - see survey 16. This is Green Belt Land, need to use the Brownfield sites first. 2112 houses is a ridiculous amount. Building a roundabout to enter an already congested system will cause congestion and more pollution. Building a care home may be a positive step. The village will be unrecognisable, and will just be a sprawling mass like Haxby and Strensall. There won't be enough agriculture to sustain populations. Nature will be more endangered. <u>Would not oppose a smaller development.</u>	9709/20165	
	Objection –would completely dwarf the existing village of Earswick and nearby houses. The Council's proposals are not in line with the Government's policy on Greenfield or Green Belt. York has many, many Brownfield sites screaming for development – in fact it has the largest area of Brownfield sites in Europe. The Council should not even be considering using an Green Belt land until all Brownfield sites have been exhausted i.e. old Terry's site, Nestle Land and the Barbican Land. The destruction of the Green Belt would also harm wildlife, the ecology, trees and the city landscape. Added volume of commuters. Building at Earswick would just make it a commuter belt for those working in other towns as there are no jobs to sustain further people living in York. Where Are all these people going to work. People will be forced to commute, leading to further congestion, Unemployment leads to social unrest and crime. More housing in this area would overwhelm the schools. How safely can children live in an area where more and more cars will be driven, not to mention all the construction traffic. It is extremely difficult to cross the A1237 – proposed development will just exacerbate this problem. Turning York into an urban jungle together with all the people and vehicles that it would bring will deter tourism. The outer ring road, the A1237, will just become another M25 where traffic grinds to a halt. Please think of the next generation and the long term environmental impact of removing the green Belt.	9715/20179	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – recognise the need for additional housing such development should be appropriate to the needs of the local community and proportionate to retaining the essential character of York and its semi-rural orbital communities. Would completely destroy the village community which would be subsumed by the new development and is therefore neither proportionate nor suitable to need. Goes directly against the NPPF and current central government policy as it fails to recognise the importance of developing brownfield sites before greenbelt when there are many urban sites in the city centre which have not been included in the local plan for housing development and fails to recognise the importance of maintaining the character of York village communities. Local infrastructure already struggling to cope with current levels of demand and at peak times capacity is matched. Additional burden from houses at Site 810 and others proposed at Strensall will add to this congestion, increasing air pollution and adding to safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly those trying to cross the A1237. Increasing journey times may also have a detrimental economic impact, making York an unattractive proposition for large businesses and deterring investment. Will have detrimental effect on water drainage and will add to problems of high water table and propensity for flooding. Strain on existing public services will become more pronounced. Proposals are unnecessary and will have irrevocable detrimental impact on the historic character of York and its environs. It will completely destroy the character and community of Earswick village.</p>	9716/20180	
	<p>Objection – releasing greenbelt for urbanisation should only occur under special circumstance. No sufficient reason given for the release this land for development. It would destroy local ecology, wildlife and greenery. The supposed requirement for an increased number of houses in the York area is not substantiated by fact. The predicted increase in jobs in the area is unfounded. The recent development at the Vanguard Centre has not created jobs just for York residents. In reality many of the vacancies have been filled by people from outside of the York area. There are plenty of brownfield sites across the city which could be developed before pillaging the natural resources in Earswick. It would be more suitable to develop housing nearer the city centre as this can reduce traffic on the roads and also supports city centre businesses. City locations already have the infrastructure in place to support additional homes. The size of the proposed development is overbearing. The current unique character of the village will be swallowed up by urban sprawl and the charm that made us buy our house will be eradicated. The likelihood of integration into the existing village is highly unlikely. Traffic congestion on the north side of the ring road is appalling. An increased number of cars will exacerbate this problem. There will be increased noise and light pollution. Local resources in York are at maximum capacity. Doctors and dentists are stretched. Local schools are full</p>	9718/22475	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and secondary schools are stretched beyond belief. Don't believe the Council has considered the impact the development size will have on the area. Concerned that development could increase the risk of flooding. Considering this land has only just been proposed to be safeguarded, it is very clear that there has been 'back room' discussions, as this safeguarded land already has a detailed development plan by Thirteen Group. These new developments across the city will fundamentally change the character and attraction of York city to future residents.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – loss of over 200 acres of arable farmland. Additional problems with road safety along Strensall Road. Adding further chaos to the current traffic problems to the North of York and particularly Strensall Road's inadequacy, the ring road congestion post Monks Cross and now Vanguard Shopping Mall, cycle problems and bus delays. Additional burden will be placed on already overstretched public services, doctors, fire service, schools, hospitals and police. Already problems with overloaded sewers and surface, water drainage from current developments, and this will bring, additional pressure to this utility. Detrimental impact to the character of the Earswick area with further northward urban sprawl of York as we have seen with Haxby and Wigginton, there is further danger that Earswick will become infill as development moves towards Haxby. There will be major loss of natural habitats plus additional noise, light and air pollution with the obvious adverse effect on the ecology. The use of "brownfield first" is supposed to represent the basis of the Government's planning policy and there are many urban sites in the existing York city area which have not yet been developed. Contradictory to National Guidelines. Developer must demonstrate "very special circumstances" in order to develop Green Belt land there is no basis for this at all.	9721/20189	
	Objection –current village would be subsumed into urban sprawl and the character of the village would be totally destroyed. The country needs to preserve Green Belt areas not destroy them and the proposal to remove the Green Belt area is Earswick would appear to be directly contrary to central government policy which supports development of Brownfield Sites between Greenfields area. Building beyond the ring road will inevitably lead to more road congestion, increased pollution and increased noise, not to mention the change it would do to the landscape and wildlife.	9725/20194	
	Objection – should be rejected. Agree with the various documents already submitted opposing the development. No information on the running costs for first time occupiers/buyers of normal council tax and a parish precept with possible management charges to maintain a leafy green environment when transport costs are included as well. Alternatives to dualling the A1237 should be consulted on, such as rail travel.	9727/19527	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
 Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection - the infrastructure can't cope at the moment never mind with building hundreds and hundreds more houses. Access for Strensall Road and the A1237 is at maximum already, this development will just cause gridlock. All land outlined on site 810 is a natural drainage area. I have lived here for nearly 20 years. About 5 years ago 2 houses were built behind me on concrete rafts, my hose was never flooded before these were built, it does now.	9728/19528	
	Objection – local infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic. Special circumstances are required to build on the green belt.	9737/19546	
	Objection – opposed to removal of land from the greenbelt. Negative impact on the environment, site is currently well loved and appreciated and one of the best characteristics in Earswick. Would affect animals as well as people, destroying their habitats. Lots of light, noise, air and visual pollution. Would overload already stretched infrastructure.	9738/19547	
	Objection – Earswick would become a town rather than a village. Infrastructure is already at capacity. The Government promotes house building on brownfield sites and to protect the greenbelt. There are many brownfield sites in York, should develop these.	9739/19548	
	Objection – will destroy the greenbelt and impact on the small, semi-rural village of Earswick creating a faceless suburb of York. Likely to have major ecological issues. Already congestion, will add to noise and pollution and the roads will be unable to cope. Visual impact will have an overbearing impact. Social resources will not be able to cope. Rise in anti social behaviour and criminal activity should low cost housing, shared ownership and others that would be used by housing associations were built.	9740/19550	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – development would lead to an increase in noise and light pollution, water table and drainage, loss of Greenbelt land, impact on the wildlife, and an increase in traffic leading to Strensall Road becoming more congested and very dangerous. The proposal would have an adverse effect on the ecology and landscape. It would be a loss of acres and acres of arable farmland. It would have a detrimental effect on the character of Earswick village. The village would be engulfed by this huge development and disappear amongst a sprawl of houses. I find the development inappropriate, unsustainable and unnecessary.	9772/20224	
	Objection – not opposed to further housing developments per se, however proposed Site 810 will completely change the character of the current Earswick village. Would be extremely concerned about the impact on traffic in the village, since the Strensall Road and Ring Road are heavily used at peak times. Ensuring adequate safety facilities particularly for school children crossing the ring road when attending schools in Huntington are paramount.	9777/20230	
	Objection - protest very strongly over the proposed building on green belt land at Earswick. It wouldn't seem so bad if all York's brownfield sites had been used up but that is not the case. The scale of the development is massive and will dwarf the small village of Earswick. Strensall Road can't stand any more traffic plus the extra pollution it would bring. The A1237 outer ring road gets heavily congested. More houses proposed in Strensall which will also have an impact. What will the impact of all that concrete be regards flooding and loss to wild life habitat. Can't afford to lose any more farm land. The rural setting will be spoilt forever.	9781/20239	
	Objection –strong objection to taking greenbelt and overpopulation of village. Economically the increase in this number of properties is not sustainable. Where are all the jobs for the people who will occupy these houses. Without having the employment already in place more often than not leads to an increase in crime, and has a devastating effect on the surrounding area. Concerned about increase in pollution. Noise level from extra properties, cars and construction vehicles will be unbearable. Ring road will be nightmare to cross and constant traffic jam. Strensall Road from the roundabout is already dangerous, with the sheer volume of cars. With all the extra properties we will be unable to allow our children to cross any parts of this road. Both Huntington and Strensall primary school are at full capacity. Also Huntington Comprehensive school will be unable to handle the proposed increase in properties. The Doctors surgeries and York Hospital are bursting at the seams. With the increase in property numbers around York we will soon have the same problems are most large cities. There is no Government requirement to 'safeguard' or remove our greenbelt land. The Council is looking to increase our village from 350 to over 2000 - maybe more!	9783/2024	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	This will have a detrimental impact both visually and culturally. The impact will be overbearing. This is not an organic increase that the village understands will happen and follows our current planning history in this area. Do not believe the long term sustainability of such a development has been thought through.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – strongly oppose the size of this development. Without the necessary improvement in the road infrastructure the additional pressure on the north bypass, which is already woefully inadequate, would result in gridlock and key times of day. Alternatively smaller developments adjacent to the villages of Strensall, Huntington, Earswick and Haxby which do not fundamentally change and ultimately dwarf an existing village would be preferable. There are many urban sites within the city centre which have not yet been developed. The council’s proposals run contrary to central government policy. Does not believe that the developer has demonstrated “very special circumstances” why they should develop on green belt land north of the By-pass. The local road infrastructure is inadequate for such a development and the increased traffic will result in increased congestion on the bypass.	9784/20241	
	Objection – Council's plans do not represent growth in a controlled organic manner which would retain the existing cohesion and sustainability of our community. Inappropriate for a small village such as ours and will have an irreversible impact on the character of the area. Will cause traffic chaos to the roads north of York. The ringroad is already consistently congested and roads are already hazardous. Excessive pressure on currently overloaded amenities including water supply, sewage, etc. Intolerable burdens will be placed on the already over-stretched public services including health, fire, schools, police. There will be an adverse effect on the ecology through loss of landscape and trees leading to loss of habitats and noise, light and air pollution. I understand that under the current law a developer must demonstrate "very special circumstances" in order to develop green belt land. No special circumstances relating to the Earswick site. There are a number of brownfield sites in the city which could be developed instead. Surely your policy is contrary to the Central Government's policy. We should protect our beautiful landscapes for the next generation. The disruption caused in the process of building such an enormous development will make our lives and those of the community a misery. York Council should listen to the residents of Earswick and Strensall and reconsider this proposal.	9792/20256	
	Objection- the traffic onto the ring road can be backed up from Earswick to Strensall. If anymore commuter traffic is introduced at these times early morning traffic problems will be	9799/20269	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	created with all the resulting consequences.		
	Objection – against green belt land being used when brownfield sites have not been exhausted. Irreversible change to the village through increased traffic and massive strain on the local amenities (roads, schools and shopping area). Will any granted plan insist upon the local amenities being scaled up alongside the population. Needs to be considered upfront.	9802/24167	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – misinterpretation of government policy, brownfield sites should be used not green belt. Plans have already been refused twice. Decimation of countryside and effect upon the ecology. Removal of productive arable farm land. Increased pollution, poor air quality and additional light pollution. Increased flooding. Unprecedented demand on water supply, sewage and other utilities. There is inadequate infrastructure amenities and services. Increased volume of traffic, road systems insufficient now to support the volume of traffic. Subject to months of construction traffic. Character destruction and setting of the village. Unnecessary, there are plenty of brownfield sites which could be developed. This not an extension of the village but a completely new town. Increased council tax for established residents. Increased house and car insurance. Unemployment is 1.6% and rising fast where is the employment to support this volume of inhabitants. They will become a drain on the welfare system. Where are all the inhabitants being shipped from, isn't York/UK full already.	9806/24175	
	Objection – Green Belt is there to protect the local environment. Many other urban sites or brownfield sites which have not yet been developed. Insufficient local infrastructure. Traffic congestion and increase in the noise levels. To the removal of Green Belt land at Earswick. The Green Belt land is there to protect the local environment. There are many other urban sites within the city centre which have not yet been developed. There are many brown field sites which could be developed creating extra housing to meet shortages. How will the existing infrastructure cope with such a huge development. Local schools, doctors, roads, etc., are already stretched to their limits. The land should not be removed from the Greenbelt as it was put there to protect the village and it is important that it remains under this designation. The A1237 ring road is already a congestion point at peak times, and as a cyclist find it increasingly difficult to negotiate crossing this road. There are already increased noise levels which will only get worse.	9811/20271	
	Objection – unacceptable to grow a small village so much. The character of the village would completely disappear. The infrastructure cannot cope. It is already hard for cyclists to ride on the road which would be made worse. There is enough brownfield land that can be used for housing first.	9821/24221	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – already problems with sewage and drainage. Anymore traffic will become unbearable. The village will soon be swallowed up. Should be building on brownfield land of which there is plenty.	9826/24224	
	Objection – inappropriate use of green belt which is there to protect urban sprawl. There are many brownfield sites that could be developed. Agricultural land is there to provide food for the nation. Over development of the site which is inappropriate for a village the size of Earswick. Increased traffic on the roads. Noise, pollution and road safety issues from the increased traffic. The insertion of a new roundabout, there are already too many. Why insert into a village, it could be a stand alone village. Concerns about increased crime rates, antisocial behaviour, insurance rises and fall in house prices.	9838/24244	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – great concern over the size of the development. Totally disproportionate, an imposing town rather than an extension of the village. Appearance and unique feel of the small community would be damaged. There is no current or anticipated need for such additional housing to justify sacrificing the green belt. Land designated green belt for good reasons. Disruption from increase traffic. No possibility of widening the road due to the River Foss. Concerns over road safety. Council should be supporting national government guidelines requiring development on brownfield sites of which there are plenty in York. Strain on existing services.	9843/24249	
	Objection – opposed to the use of green belt land. Will create many additional problems not least traffic congestion on the ring road and access to Strensall and other villages. Many delays will occur and pollution nd accidents.	9844/24250	
	Objection – current infrastructure cannot cope, inadequate drainage is a major concern, over capacity for local schools and doctors and heavy traffic on local roads. The Council has a duty to protect wildlife and local fauna and flora. Opposed to the loss of green belt, farm land and the natural break from the other nearby communities creating urban sprawl. Would increase carbon footprint. Should use brownfield sites which would more than meet current housing demand.	9853/24259	
	Objection – development will dwarf the village. Traffic is already an issue and will prove dangerous and create traffic chaos. Traffic and noise pollution will prove unacceptable for residents. The removal of green belt is not necessary as there is significant brownfield land ripe for development. The land is green belt for a reason. The word safeguarding is being abused. The plan for 22,000 houses is overestimated and not necessary. No adequate schooling. Extensive sewage issues already which would be made more severe. The river is	9854/24261	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	polluted and development would make this untenable. Already antisocial behaviour on the Foss Islands site. Already a health and safety issue on the Lock House Lane field with dog waste. Proposals are against national guidelines which say development should be on brownfield land. Plans are unrealistic. If a sustainable development of 20-25 houses were proposed to enable integration into the community and not unbalance the village this would be more reasonable and acceptable.		
	Objection – development will dwarf the village. Traffic is already an issue and will prove dangerous and create traffic chaos. Traffic and noise pollution will prove unacceptable for residents. The removal of green belt is not necessary as there is significant brownfield land ripe for development. The land is green belt for a reason. The word safeguarding is being abused. The plan for 22,000 houses is overestimated and not necessary. No adequate schooling. Extensive sewage issues already which would be made more severe. The river is polluted and development would make this untenable. Already antisocial behaviour on the Foss Islands site. Already a health and safety issue on the Lock House Lane field with dog waste. Proposals are against national guidelines which say development should be on brownfield land. Plans are unrealistic. If a sustainable development of 20-25 houses were proposed to enable integration into the community and not unbalance the village this would be more reasonable and acceptable.	9876/24295	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – totally unnecessary as York reputedly has one of the largest acreage of brownfield land in Europe. National targets for brownfield development being ignored. Scale of the development is totally inappropriate and will dwarf the existing village. 60% of villagers attended presentation by developers, no visible support. Utilities are already stretched, evidenced by the Council previously rejecting requests for limited new properties based on lack of adequate utility support. The existing road to the ring road is congested. Transport proposals are unrealistic. It is already almost impossible for cyclists and pedestrian is to cross the ring road, this development will exacerbate this. All the congestion is likely to cause motorists to attempt to find alternative routes through residential areas. No details on job creation. Not all the land identified is available as some land owners have stated they will not sell.	9897/24338	
	Objection - green belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl and should be protected to maintain the sustainable development of York. Removal of Green belt land is contrary to central government policy. Concerns that York doesn't need this volume of houses, and if they are why brown field sites can't be used. Concerns from an infrastructure perspective.	9898/20306	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Strensall road and the Ring road cannot manage the current volume of traffic on the North side of York. Building more houses will exacerbate an already dangerous situation and building outside the ring road will increase the need for more cars. Water levels and flooding risks will only increase with more homes and strain the already challenged drainage system. Water table is high and Strensall road, Earswick has regular standing water. Concerns about the ecological impact that any development will have. Earswick benefits from some excellent bio-diversity with a great variety of field, trees and hedgerow that serve a variety of wildlife.</p> <p>Objection – land could be developed during the plan period over 15 years. Alternative boundaries proposed for housing allocation and smaller area of safeguarded land. Proposed site for housing allocation is available, the development is achievable and the scheme can deliver a range of affordable and market housing that will make a significant contribution to addressing housing need. Council's transport concerns are unfounded, transport issues technical report undertaken, suitable, safe access to the site is feasible and deliverable. Detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	9908/18511	O'Neill Associates
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – will have a detrimental effect on the infrastructure that is already at capacity – doctors, schools and roads. How will the Council manage the additional residential areas when there are already failings in existing areas. Health services in this area are already stretched. Land is currently greenbelt land that is open land that adds to the landscape, wildlife habitats and lush green spaces. Should be fighting to save the green belt not allowing urban sprawl. What is the justification for using greenbelt land when there are brownfield sites available. Use of term 'safeguarded' is confusing. Where will the people who are wanting this new housing coming from and where will they work. York does not have the employment capacity, this new development will become a home for commuters. The outer ring road is already exceptionally busy and more houses will increase traffic and strain on this road. If approved, what provisions would be made to provide better facilities for local residents. Public transport is often unreliable.</p> <p>Object – detrimental impact on the character of the village. Burden on already busy roads. Road safety hazards, especially for cyclists. Excessive pressure on amenities, including school provision. Loss of 220 acres of farmland. Removal of green belt when Brownfield land exists. Will substantially alter the character of the village.</p> <p>Objection – vital green belt, would overwhelm a stable community with no regard to traffic, school provision and associated local services.</p> <p>Objection – opposed to development of greenbelt land. The roads in York in are already at</p>	9911/24355  9915/24362  9918/24372  9919/24373	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	capacity. Schools are overcrowded. There is no infrastructure to support such an increase in population. Brownfield sites should be used and empty spaces above shops in the centre of York.		
	Objection- very little thought has gone into how this area will support such an increase in housing with regard to road congestion and all that is entailed with extra vehicles on the road; to the schools which would be affected, as even if another primary school is built there is still the difficulty of finding places for secondary school children as both high schools will not be able to cope. The road from Strensall to the ring road will not be able to cope. There is the potential for 6000 houses along the corridor of the ring road and Clifton Moor. The increase on traffic will be huge. Currently the buses from Strensall do not travel to Monks Cross or Clifton Moor so taking the car is the only option. Even if services were put on, the increase in traffic would cause traffic disruption on a ring road and an arterial road which were never designed to cope with such a volume of traffic. There will be pressure on the school system.	9921/24376	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – will impact heavily on the beauty of the local area. Would impact on Strensall as well as. There is already far too much traffic. Will impact on how much of the area can be enjoyed by so many residents including dog walking, cycling, horse riding and walking.	9922/24393	
	Objection – opposed to destroying the beautiful green belt. York will become just another sprawl of houses and shops like many countless other cities. Should build on land that is available close to the city which is unused. Obliteration of friendly community life.	9223/24410	
	Objection – see survey 16. Opposed to green belt land being used for new builds. Opposed to the ten fold increase in the size of picturesque village of Earswick. There is already major congestion. There are no local amenities which can be accessed easily, everyone would have to use their cars. Bus services are sparse and unreliable. Traffic volume is too great already which puts off potential cyclists. Already road safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists. The local schools (which can only be accessed by car) are already at capacity.	9224/24461	
	Objection – removal of green belt land is unnecessary. National guidance is clear that there is no requirement for authorities to safeguard land for future development. York has lots of brownfield sites which should be developed first. Green belt should only be used in very special circumstances which is not the case in Earswick. Infrastructure is insufficient. Roads are at capacity. Quality of life and the health of both existing and new residents would be damaged. Sewerage, gas and water utilities are already at maximum capacity. Development would be out of proportion with the existing village. This area of green belt is vital in	9925/24462	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	protecting the character of the village. Agricultural land that is still being farmed should not be used for housing.		
	Objection – opposed to removal of land from the green belt. Against government advice which is to develop brownfield sites first. York has lots of brownfield sites. Scale of the proposals will completely ruin the existing village, one of York’s original satellite villages. The last extension to the village doubled the site of the village and brought services under strain. Would add additional load to the already overloaded northern ring road. Will add to the urban sprawl of York to the north.	9927/24463	
	Objection – concerned about plans to remove substantial part of land from the protection of the green belt. Will result in urban sprawl which will irrevocably change the character of Earswick village. The size of the proposal is totally unsustainable and inappropriate for a small village. Concerns about how the infrastructure will cope. GP services are stretched. There will be increased congestion causing problems of access to work and more generally a potential loss to local business. Impact not only on traffic flow but also on the safe and effective operation of the fire station as well as the ability of ambulances to reach Earswick. Will also result in increased levels of both noise and pollution as well as increased road safety issues. The quality of life for existing residents will be permanently and severely disadvantaged. Schools are also at capacity. Concerns about physical infrastructure coping such as drainage. Justifiable concern over increase in crime especially if there are insufficient local jobs and no corresponding rise in police presence. The ecological impact on wildlife and landscape cannot be ignored. Have responsibility to protect for future generations. There are brownfield sites currently unused or housing empty business premises.	9928/24464	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – concerned about plans to remove substantial part of land from the protection of the green belt. Will result in urban sprawl which will irrevocably change the character of Earswick village. The size of the proposal is totally unsustainable and inappropriate for a small village. Concerns about how the infrastructure will cope. GP services are stretched. There will be increased congestion causing problems of access to work and more generally a potential loss to local business. Impact not only on traffic flow but also on the safe and effective operation of the fire station as well as the ability of ambulances to reach Earswick. Will also result in increased levels of both noise and pollution as well as increased road safety issues. The quality of life for existing residents will be permanently and severely disadvantaged. Schools are also at capacity. Concerns about physical infrastructure coping such as drainage. Justifiable concern over increase in crime especially if there are insufficient	9929/24465	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	local jobs and no corresponding rise in police presence. The ecological impact on wildlife and landscape cannot be ignored. Have responsibility to protect for future generations. There are brownfield sites currently unused or housing empty business premises.		
	Objection – an additional 20 houses is all the neighbourhood and infrastructure is capable of sustaining. Would be out of character and would irrevocably change the neighbourhood. Green belt land would be lost which was meant to prevent urban sprawl. Is the council putting the cart before the horse by creating a massive supply of houses before there is the demand for them. There is no urgency or local requirements to remove land from the green belt to safeguard it. No justification for the plans especially when there are acres of brownfield land that under current government guidelines should be developed first. Northern ring road is congested and decades away from dualling. The sewerage system is at full capacity.	9935/24470	
	Objection – opposed to removal of land out of the green belt. Will change the area forever and become part of urban sprawl. The A1237 is already heavily congested and inadequate for the amount of traffic already using it. Gridlock is inevitable. The scale is completely unsustainable, unnecessary and inappropriate for a small community. The village will be completely dwarfed destroying the village community. Will mean the building of a new village/small town not connected in anyway to the existing village making the concept of an integrated neighbourhood highly unlikely. There are no very special circumstances to warrant building on green belt especially when there brownfield sites available. Estimates for future job opportunities and creation is unrealistic. Job opportunities should exist first before new houses are built. With 50% affordable homes and probably lack of suitable jobs the potential for crime and disorder should be carefully considered.	9939/24480	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to using green belt land. The fields currently act as a barrier and provide a wildlife habitat and a sense of heading into the country after leaving York. Would lead to more congestion. Strensall and surrounding villages will become suburbs and urban sprawl would creep even further out.	9941/24481	
	Objection – green belt is designed to prevent urban sprawl which should be protected to maintain the sustainable development of York. Removal of land from green belt is contrary to central government policy. There is conflicting information about whether York needs so many new houses. Why aren't brownfield sites developed first. Building new homes closer to town will reduce the impact on traffic and the climate. The plans will dwarf the current village and change its nature. Concerned from an infrastructure perspective. The roads	9951/24499	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cannot manage the current volume of traffic building new homes will exacerbate this. Water levels and flooding risks will only increase and more homes will strain the already challenged drainage system. Concerned with the ecological impact, currently Earswick benefits from some excellent bio-diversity.		
	Objection – destruction of Greenfield land when many brownfield sites remain undeveloped. Will have significant detrimental impact on traffic, pollution and road safety in the immediate vicinity of Earswick and the outer ring road. Concerned about the problems the extra population will have on education infrastructure.	9957/24505	
	Objection – detrimental impact to the character of the area, road safety hazards, further traffic chaos, excessive pressure on already overloaded amenities and over stretched public services, loss of highly productive arable farmland, adverse effect on ecology, landscape and trees. Removal of greenbelt land when brownfield sites already exist.	9958/21117	
	Objection – opposed to use of green belt land. There will be a massive increase in traffic on already busy roads. Opposed to any plans to close the sixth form.	9962/24507	
	Objection – shocked by traffic levels on daily commute which will be made worse. Strensall Road can be extremely hazardous. There is no major employment in Strensall and Earswick. Also the issue of pollution and major implications for local schools, GPs and other amenities.	9964/24508	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – not suitable for development as it is a Greenfield site. The local infrastructure cannot support the plans. The sewer system and transport systems would need upgrading. Local schools are already at capacity as well as health facilities and social venues such as community halls, local shops and amenities.	9968/24514	
	Objection – this development will totally destroy this small village and will become over developed and completely changed from a small village to a massive housing estate.	9987/25936	
	Objection – will change the rural character of the village.	9990/25939	
	Objection – strenuously object to development of Site 810. Submission supported by Legal Counsel Opinion and petition containing 536 local resident signatures. Detailed comments provided. See response.	10002/18582	Earswick Action Group
	Objection – will adversely affect the character of the village which has already been doubled in size since the early 1990s. The local road network is already at capacity which will be exacerbated which will adversely affect the quality of life for both existing and future residents. Will put intolerable pressure on local schools, most of which are already close to capacity with little ability to expand. Will put pressure on the NHS system which is already	10010/25953	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	struggling to cope. Council's estimates of the need for new housing is based on faulty data about inward immigration. Allocation of the site is not necessary as there is no established need. All brownfield sites should be developed before any green belt site is considered. The land has considerable amenity value for wildlife and as a feature in the landscape of Earswick.		
	Objection – the principle of taking greenbelt land for new development is wrong as it will significantly change the character of the village. It is unsustainable and will put serious strain on the infrastructure (roads and schools). It will therefore devalue properties in the parish.	10014/25957	
	Objection – the principle of taking greenbelt land for new development is wrong as it will significantly change the character of the village. It is unsustainable and will put serious strain on the infrastructure (roads and schools). It will therefore devalue properties in the parish.	10017/25961	
	Objection – see survey 16. Totally disproportionate urbanisation. Will not enhance the area but totally swamp it and cause a huge detrimental impact on the northward side of York. The current road infrastructure struggles and could not sustain the additional traffic. Schools are at capacity, dentists, doctors and emergency services. 50% affordable housing is out of proportion and would lead to concerns of social unrest and increases in crime.	10043/24396	
	Objection – schools, doctors, hospitals and dentists are oversubscribed. The roads cannot cope with the current volume of traffic. The frequency of road accidents can only increase. The green belt should not be built on when there are so many brownfield sites. Public transport is inadequate. Will not be in keeping with the highly desirable village of Earswick. There are currently no shops or social gathering spots in the village, the proposals will attract youths and the local crime rates will be no more. The highly desirable affluent area will lose its reputation. Will increase air, noise and light pollution impacting on the health of the people in the area. There is currently a nature reserve which will be destroyed, the ecology of the area diminished. Will only worsen flooding issues and create new ones. Significant loss of agricultural land which would be detrimental to the local farming industry.	10045/24402	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Support – welcome and support the identification of the site as safeguarded land however also request that the site is considered for allocation for housing. Objection - the site is suitable for allocation for housing as it would not harm the historic setting or character of the city. It is deliverable. It is located within the main urban area and accords with the spatial development strategy. Low probability of flooding. Reasonably	10068/18649 10068/26160	Carter Jonas

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	accessible and sustainable. The loss of the site would not harm the five purposes of the greenbelt. Detailed comments and maps provided, see response.		
	Objection – this will result in the removal of 220 acres of greenbelt. The village will be swamped without proper thought for infrastructure. The site will cause further traffic problems on the A1237. The scale of development will cause more pollution and noise.	10133/25901	
	Objection – see survey 16. This land is in the greenbelt, it is essential that it is maintain to protect the character of the village and local environment. The current infrastructure is insufficient to cater for the size of the proposed development. The outer ringroad is already gridlocked. More inhabitants will put even greater strain on the infrastructure.	10135/25905	
	Objection – see survey 16. Little regard has been paid to the total lack of sufficient infrastructure to support the proposals. The road network cannot cope with additional traffic.	10140/25910	
	Objection – the Association is unanimous in its wish to object to the proposal to remove 220 acres of productive farmland from Earswick’s Green Belt off Willow Grove and “safeguard” it for future development because it would destroy the character of the village, create a dislocated unsustainable community, and swallow up Earswick within York’s urban sprawl. Consider that there are enough brownfield sites around York to satisfy housing development well into the next few decades. Premature development plans from a consortium consisting of Strata Homes (Doncaster), Thirteen Group (Hartlepool) and Southern Homes (Halifax) have already been proposed and opposed by the Earswick community. It is clear that any move to declassify the Greenbelt land would lead to further predatory approaches for immediate development that would put pressure on the Council. This situation is contrary to the “safeguarding” option which we believe is intended to permit further consideration of change of land usage. Of critical importance is the strain it (Site 810) will place on the already overloaded transport infrastructure. The ring-road is well beyond its design capacity and development outside its limits will lead inevitably to gridlock, pollution and traffic chaos. By contrast building affordable homes within the city centre on brownfield sites will prevent traffic pressure on congested routes, avoid unacceptable delays on public transport routes and encourage cycling. The preferred option must be to build housing close to where jobs are available in the city rather than in the Greenbelt where transport issues will cause intolerable problems.	10146/19358	Willow Grove Residents’ Association
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection- the current infrastructure is already in dire straits, inadequate drainage being a major concern. Development would impact upon the protection of the environment and the protection of wildlife and local flora and fauna. The Council has a duty to protect woodland	10152/25989	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and the wildlife under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. It would also mean a loss of the Green Belt and farm land and the loss of the natural break from other nearby communities, creating an ugly urban sprawl. Development would mean an over capacity for local schools and doctors and more heavy traffic on local roads which are not suitable for the amount of housing proposed. More excessive housing would increase the carbon footprint. Brownfield sites should be utilised before Green Belt or farmland.		
	Objection – Strensall has grown massively over the years. Earswick will not cope with increased traffic which more housing will bring. A development this size will have a massive impact on the local infrastructure. The whole character of the village will change. Pollution would increase massively. There would be increased pressure on the emergency services.	10155/25995	
	Objection – green belt land. Prove need for extra housing. Clarify that key infrastructures can cope. Development will permanently alter the size, shape and nature of the village. Traffic is extremely congested. Roads are a danger to children. Wildlife would be in danger of being wiped out. Noise and light pollution would increase. Development could increase the risk of flooding.	10161/21136	
	Objection - see survey 16	10163/26947	
	Objection – traffic along Strensall Road and on the bypass between Earswick and Monks Cross is already very heaving. Additional families plus extra buses will completely choke both routes which will create accidents. There will be chaos if emergency services are ever required in the area at peak times. Doctors' surgeries will not be able to cope. York Hospital and ambulance services are already struggling with the number of patients and emergencies. We often hear that people are unable to get mortgages so why is there a necessity to build so many houses. Where are the people coming from who are ear-marked to fill the 'affordable homes'. Sewers and drains will be unable to withstand the surge of so much additional use. Telephone, broadband, gas and electric services will be over-stretched. Power cuts and phone lines have been disrupted a number of times in the area. Will be upheaval and noise to residents during construction, particularly of the proposed large roundabout off the bypass. Daily vehicular travel will add so much traffic it will be a nightmare trying to get around the area. Why is it necessary to build on green belt land? We are losing a precious commodity. We need the rural farming land and wildlife conservation areas. These areas are vital to us. We all require personal space and peaceful surroundings for a happy and healthy existence. The 'stealth' of green belt must be halted.	10177/19385	
<b>810 Earswick</b>	Objection –unnecessary and there is no requirement for green belt land to be safeguarded.	10178/19387	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>(continued)</b>	<p>It is known that the City of York has more land that is denoted as brownfield than any other city in the country. Why is this not being developed first. Increase in this number of properties is not sustainable. Where are all the jobs for the people who will occupy these houses. With no jobs there is a greater burden on public services, these clearly cannot be met. Increased properties without employment in place often leads to an increase in crime. Infrastructure is already at capacity and there are problems of congestion on the A1237 ring road. This development will lead to further gridlock, increased pollution, air quality and noise. Safety issues associated with residents try to cross the A1237. Development would further increase the traffic and pose greater risk to pedestrians and other road users – therefore it is not sustainable. Concerns over drainage and sewage as current infrastructure is at capacity. Huntington and Strensall Primary Schools are at full capacity. Huntington Comprehensive School will be unable to handle the proposed increase in properties. Doctors surgeries in the area and in York are near to capacity. Do you want the great City of York with all its valuable tourism to become a typical inner city with urban sprawl. Plans will have a detrimental impact on the village both visually and culturally. Understand the need for growth, however this site is not the right one. The long term sustainability has not been thought through.</p>		
	<p>Objection –unnecessary to remove land from the Green Belt outside the ring road where there is clearly an abundance of both greenfield and brownfield sites available for development of all types within the ring road. Creates a dangerous precedent for the potential removal of land from the green belt in other areas surrounding the city. Likelihood of greater traffic congestion on the A1237 due to creation of another roundabout and large volumes of extra journeys crossing/using the ring road and interfering with the flow of traffic trying to travel around it. What is being proposed is another development, like Haxby outside the ring road i.e. overdevelopment. The character and appearance of Earswick and its surroundings would be irrevocably damaged as it would be completely overwhelmed by such a substantial development. In terms of affordable housing, the developers will simply do as they please and ignore any affordable housing requirements.</p>	10182/19392	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – this green belt land is there to protect the local environment and setting of our village. Earswick would no longer be a village but just another stretch of urban sprawl. There are many other urban sites within the city centre which have not yet been developed. It would be better for the City Council to regenerate life back into the centre by creating homes and infrastructure in the city. There are many ‘brownfield’ sites which could be developed</p>	10183/19393	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	creating extra housing to meet shortage. Where are the 'very special circumstances' which need to be demonstrated by a developer in order for green belt land to be developed? Concerned about how existing local infrastructure will cope – local schools, doctors, roads etc. already stretched to their limits. A1237 ring road is already congested at peak times and cyclists find it increasingly difficult to negotiate crossing this ring road. Increasing noise levels will only get worse.		
	Objection – object to proposed declassification and development of Earswick's greenbelt. Concerns relate primarily to size of proposed development and potential impact of such a development on the existing community and services. Proposed development is 10 times the size of the existing community and will produce a detrimental strain on the facilities and the proposed new facilities which inevitably will be unsustainable to provide for subsequent naturally progressing requirements in the immediate short and long terms. Increased traffic levels and commuting times on the roads through the existing communities with the associated danger of congested roads and inevitable increased pollution. Secondary educational requirements of the development will lead to a detrimental effect on education within York. Primary healthcare facility provision will suffer with an increasing and anticipated growing demand for the services provided by the existing General Practitioner facilities. These impacts will inevitably lead to increased crime and antisocial behaviour within the existing and proposed development and in York. The proposal is unacceptable.	10194/19404	
	Objection – see survey 16. Huge amount of brownfield sites, waste and farming land available within the ring road. Overloaded road network. Secondary schools are full. Reduction of existing house prices.	10201/21146	
	Objection – strongly object to the way the council has gone through this development. Transformed a small village into an urban sprawl.	10205/21156	
	Objection – very difficult and dangerous cross at the bypass for pedestrian/cyclist.	10206/21158	
	Objection – will completely change of the village community and roads cannot cope. Not such a large development. Brownfield sites first and Green Belt protected.	10208/21162	
	Objection – Green Belt should be preserved. Insufficient infrastructure. Totally unnecessary development removing land from green belt.	10218/21186	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – not demonstrated a need to any additional housing development. Proposal not proportional to the needs of York. Insufficient services and flood/water table.	10220/19616	
	Objection – see survey 16. No to new houses adjacent to Earswick. Safeguarding is a proactive term which means the Green Belt is being attacked – it should be changed to	10223/21196	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	something else. The roads are full. The proposed housebuilding east of Strensall Road will ruin / destroy the environment of Earswick village. It is too big and will overwhelm all local facilities. Wrong size, wrong place, wrong time and nobody wants it. see Have not worked with the parish Council developing the plan. Disproportionately large and inappropriate housing development. Traffic congestion, noise, air pollution, spoiling the environment and raising health issues.		
	Objection- scale will overwhelm a small, semi-rural village by removing green belt and imposing new town development of over 7 times its current size. Cannot see any special circumstances why this development should be in this particular area. Current problems of overloaded roads and sewage systems would be increased by the 4,000+ people. Strensall road is overloaded at peak times. No solutions to the overloaded sewage and water surface systems which already exist. Scale of development is unsustainable. Special circumstances required have not been identified. Several parts of the site have been previously rejected. Councils own report states that the amount proposed is unsustainable. No solutions to the overloaded sewerage systems. Doctor's surgery at capacity. Develop the heart of York, and sustain and protect the green ring around York.	10230/20636	
	Objection – the site is the merging of two previous smaller sites rejected as unsuitable. Impracticable additional roundabout on the ring road. Completely unsustainable and inappropriate scale of development. Detrimental impact on the character of the village. Adverse impact on the ecology, increase noise, air and light pollution. Local amenities overloaded. Traffic chaos. Loss of great amount of highly productive arable land.	10231/21210	
	Objection – there is enough Brownfield in York for houses. Character of village would be destroyed. Roads cannot handle extra pressure. Difficult for cyclists to use the roads.	10237/21223	
	Objection – land is inappropriate for the level of development proposed. Proposals were originally rejected. Potential development is too big, and would drastically effect pollution, traffic and infrastructure.	10238/21224	
	Objection – land is designated as green belt to prevent urbanisation. The economy thrives due to the visual aesthetics of the city. Destruction of this will have a long term negative effect on York	10239/21226	
	Objection – village would be dwarfed by the development. Planning officer would not allow extra roundabouts with current traffic levels. Lack of consultation. Detrimental effect on the character of the village. Adverse effect on the ecology. Excessive pressure on amenities. Overstretching public services. There are Brownfield sites which should be considered	10241/21230	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – roads are already dangerous. Disruption to the bus services. Site is currently green belt. Currently farm land, and offers a habitat for wildlife.	10251/21234	
	Objection – questions the expected population increase. Village will be swamped. Vulnerable people at risk due to extra traffic. No place of worship in village. Doctor surgery full. Risk of flash flooding	10252/21235	
	Objection – the infrastructure is already strained. Traffic will only get worse. Develop Brownfield first. Detrimental effect on landscape and wildlife.	10258/21241	
	Objection – the infrastructure is already strained. Traffic will only get worse. Develop Brownfield first. Detrimental effect on landscape and wildlife	10267/21259	
	Objection - the removal of the majority of this land together with the proposal to build some 2000 houses will have a detrimental impact on the area, change the character of the village, and encourage the northern urban sprawl of York. Earswick has it's own Village Plan, published in 2012, which has completely been ignored by the City of York Council. In July 2013 the Parish Council did support an application for a small piece of land to be removed from the greenbelt and used for development, around 25 houses, at Fossbank Farm at the edge of the village so this is not a case of the village being NIMBYs. This Site (569) was subsequently rejected in the Further Plans document. The Council itself recognises that there are problems with Site 810 with regard to access and the creation of a sustainable neighbourhood. As the existing village lies to the west of the main Strensall Road the construction of a much larger development on the east side of the main road is in effect creating a completely new village/small town which will be impossible to integrate into the existing community. The infrastructure in Earswick and the surrounding area is insufficient to cater for this scale of development, particularly when considered alongside the projected new homes in Strensall, Haxby and Clifton Moor. The subsequent increase in traffic pollution and road noise would have a major impact on the health and quality of life for existing residents within Earswick. Detailed comments provided about the Technical Appendices and three sites in Earswick, 755,776 and 777, see response.	10278/22077	
	Objection – concerns about excess traffic that development will lead to. Concerns of losing small village feeling. Affordable housing more suited closer to the city centre.	10282/21270	
	Objection - negatives not considered during planning.	10294/21305	
	Objection – the village would be dwarfed by the proposed development of 22,000 houses. There are existing traffic problems on the roundabout and Strensall road. There is significant brown belt land available for development in and around York without the need to remove	10299/21313	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	green belt land. There is already no adequate primary school facility and not enough secondary school places in the area. There will be unacceptable levels of traffic and noise pollution for the residents of Earswick. There are extensive sewage issues on the Fosslands site in Earswick and this development would make it more severe. This is against the national guidelines that state 90% of development is to be on brownfield. CYC have selected developers to work with Housing associations which have stated their interest in profit. 20 - 25 new houses would allow for families to integrate into the community and not unbalance the village.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – concern that Earswick is an inappropriate community to withstand the development of this size. Agree with the Parish Council that a development would change the character of the village and increased pressure on strained route A1237. Current infrastructure of the area will not support any development of the of the size proposed.	10319/21851	
	Objection – this is greenbelt land which must be protected. This land is part of the landscape for Earswick. There has been no prior consultation on this site. There is hope that the council looks at developing sites that are in need of development first rather than destroying the beautiful land around York.	10325/25110	
	Objection – the roads are frequently congested and the infrastructure is already stretched.	10327/26015	
	Objection – a development of this size adjacent to such a small village is quite out of character. It will totally be submerged into Strensall and Huntington. There are no amenities in the village to cope with this. The road network is gridlocked. There are issues with electricity supply and drainage.	10330/26020	
	Objection – a development this size would disgorge onto Strensall road and the north part of the ring road. Both this roads are at a standstill at peak times. This land has been turned down for development in the past. There are brownfield sites would should be developed first.	10332/26024	
	Objection – the proposed development is disproportionate to the existing village. There is no proven need for development of this magnitude in this area. The local infrastructure cannot support such a development. There are many brownfield sites which should be used first. The visual impact on the environment will be extreme. There will be excessive noise and pollution created during development. This will put a strain on emergency services in the area. The ring road will be gridlocked for the large part of the day. Safety issues with an increasingly busy roads.	10335/26026	
	Objection- Earswick is a tiny village without amenities. It cannot support a development of	10336/26029	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	this size. Concern regarding the amount of Green Belt development that is proposed to be developed. Developments like this completely remove the character and look of countryside villages. None of the residents support developments like the one proposed as if people wanted to live in a suburb they would have bought properties there. Strensall Road is already far too busy.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – the scale of this development will dwarf the village. The removal of the greenbelt is not necessary. There is significant brownfield land ripe for development. The need for 22,000 house is over estimated. This number is not needed. There is no adequate schooling. More houses will make this worse. The increase in traffic and pollution will be unacceptable. There are extensive sewerage issues. There are anti-social behavioural issues as well as health and safety issues with dog fouling. Question why there is a need to build on greenbelt when there is plenty of brownfield sites in York.	10348/26044	
	Objection – the scale of this development will dwarf the village. The removal of the greenbelt is not necessary. There is significant brownfield land ripe for development. The need for 22,000 house is over estimated. This number is not needed. There is no adequate schooling. More houses will make this worse. The increase in traffic and pollution will be unacceptable. There are extensive sewerage issues. There are anti-social behavioural issues as well as health and safety issues with dog fouling. Question why there is a need to build on greenbelt when there is plenty of brownfield sites in York.	10349/26045	
	Objection – Strensall and Earswick already have a big population. More traffic will make journeys harder. Should be trying to decrease traffic pollution. What will the new people do for jobs. There are plenty of brownfield sites. Huntinton school will be ruined.	10355/22481	
	Objection – opposed to this site.	10356/22482	
	Objection – the scale of this development is too big. It will dwarf the existing settlement. There are other brownfield sites available. The roads are congested already. Question why there is a need for more sites. York will become an urban sprawl. The environment and people's quality of life should be put before profit and developers greed.	10357/26050	
	Objection – there is no requirement for land to be safeguarded for future development. The greenbelt enhances rural villages and these plans will swamp villages. Traffic is far heavier since the opening of Monks Cross. The infrastructure of Earswick is coping at present, however the building of more houses would cause problems. Adding urban sprawl will change the whole feel of the city.	10358/26051	
	Objection – large scale development in the greenbelt land before brownfield land is a	10366/26062	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	contradiction of the governments policy. The council should be encouraging urban regeneration and sustaining the greenbelt, avoiding city centre decay. The character and nature of the village will be changed forever. There will be no benefit to the current village. The traffic on Strensall road and the ring road is often congested, development will make this worse. The infrastructure cannot cope with further development. Greenbelt should be protected for future generations to enjoy.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – the existing drainage system within the Earswick area are currently at breaking point. Question whether the environment agency has been consulted in the development of the local plan. The ring road to the north of York is heavily congested. The council should insist on duelling of the A1237 as part of the S106. The wildlife deserves some consideration, the sheer scale of the proposed development would irreversibly destroy biodiversity in the area.	10371/26067	
	Objection –loss of over 200 acres of arable farmland. Additional problems with road safety along Strensall Road, already had one fatality in recent years. Adding further chaos to the current traffic problems to the North of York and particularly Strensall Road's inadequacy, the ring road congestion post Monks Cross and now Vanguard shopping Mall, cycle problems and bus delays. Additional burden will be placed on already overstretched public service, doctors, fire service, schools, hospitals and police. Already have problems with overloaded sewers and surface water from current developments, and this will bring additional pressure to this utility. There will be a detrimental impact to the character of the Earswick area with further northward urban sprawl of York, as seen with Haxby and Wiggington, there is further danger that Earswick will become infill as development moves towards Haxby. There will be major loss of natural habitats plus additional noise, light and air pollution with obvious adverse effect on ecology. Environmental impact assessment will need to be actioned by the authority to see what flora and fauna are affected by the proposal. The use of "brownfield first" is supposed to represent the basis of the Government's planning policy and there are many urban sites in existing York city area which have not yet been developed. Also under current law a developer must demonstrate "very special circumstances" in order to develop green belt land there is no basis for this at all.	10378/21857	
	Objection – question how people will be able to afford a new house with the lack of employment in York. There is no need to build on greenbelt land. Greenbelt is needed for growing crops. The village would be cut in two with a build up of traffic. Increased pollution is an issue along with the sewerage which is at capacity. Further development will put strain	10379/26072	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>on the emergency services.</p> <p>Objection – the size and type of the proposed development is such that it will destroy the character of the village and turn it into a small town. Smaller schemes have been turned down in the past on the basis that the road, water and gas infrastructure is hardly able to cope with the existing load. Green belt should not be used when York has so many brownfield sites that are stood empty.</p>	10383/21863	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – see survey 16. Scale of proposals will dwarf the village. There is already a traffic issue. Removal of greenbelt is not necessary when there is significant brownfield land in York. Use of work safeguarded is being misused. Number of houses is not needed. No adequate schooling. Traffic impact will prove dangerous. Traffic and noise pollution will prove unacceptable for Earswick residents. Existing sewage issues. Already antisocial behaviour at the Foss Islands site which would be used by new residents. Already a health and safety issues on the Lock House Lane field which will become untenable. Against national guidelines which states 90% of development is to be on brownfield sites. If a sustainable development of 20 – 25 houses were proposed to enable integration into the community and not unbalance the village this would be more reasonable and acceptable. Current plans are unrealistic.</p>	10385/22234	
	<p>Objection – the greenbelt should be protected. Question that there are brownfield sites within the city that should be utilised first. Further development will have a detrimental effect on the tourism of York. There will be an increase in congestion.</p>	10386/26079	
	<p>Objection – this land is in the greenebelt. The peaceful locality could be subsumed by new homes, which will over load the infrastructure, additional traffic congestion and pollution. The area should not sprawl unsustainably at the expense of greenbelt when brownfield sites are available for urban regeneration.</p>	10398/26094	
	<p>Objection – would damage the character of Earswick village, the local infrastructure is already overloaded with traffic congestion on the Strensall Road and the outer ring road, .the increased traffic from this housing development would make matters much worse, increasing air pollution and traffic noise and extending journey times and decreasing quality of life for local residents. Does not represents a sustainable development and should be removed from the local plan in favour of developing brownfield sites and urban regeneration within York city.</p>	10415/22082	
	<p>Objection - see survey 16</p>	10418/26957	
	<p>Objection – totally unsustainable and entirely inappropriate for a small village such as</p>	10422/22518	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Earswick. It will not only have a detrimental effect to the character of the area by swallowing up Earswick village, but also the northward urban sprawl of York. It will have a huge adverse effect on the ecology, landscape and trees, not to mention the noise, light and air pollution. It will bring excessive pressure to the current overloaded amenities (water supply, surface water drainage from hard standing sewers). Intolerable burdens will be placed on already over-stretched public services (police, fire, ambulance, doctors, hospitals, schools etc). It will result in traffic chaos to the roads north of York. It will also compromise the road safety along Strensall Road. It will mean the loss of 200 acres of highly productive arable farmland.		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – this is a terrible thing to happen to an amazing, calm and safe place. The traffic would be awful. This will add to global warming. Brownfield sites should be developed first.	10425/22523	
	Objection – opposed to proposed housing on the green belt. The congestion is bad enough on a morning, it will be a disaster for the area. Buses are packed at that time also.	10427/22084	
	Objection –the ring road and Strensall road already cannot cope with the level of traffic, the proposed development would gridlock the roads. There’s is no underpass on the A1237 so crossing it at any time is hazardous. There would also be the devastating impact on wildlife – deer, owls etc. This proposal has to been thought through and is dreadful for the Earswick community	10428/19099	
	Objection – opposed to buildin 1,500 houses on greenbelt land at Earswick. Understand that as part of the plan, Huntington and Joseph Rowntree sixth form will close. This is terrible for our children’s future. The current infrastructure is already under strain and increasing the population in this area will just break.	10432/19098	
	Objection – the existing site is agricultural land and countryside which acts as a natural buffer between urban York and its outlying villages which each have their own individual characteristics. Developments such as that proposed for this site fundamentally changes the area from a village into an urban environment. Such an irreversible and significant impact appears to be unjustified for this location. The site itself has no employment provision, no health provision and no educational provision. It can therefore not be properly justified. It is obviously attractive to the Council as it is a big site and it is attractive to developers as they will be able to build premium price properties. But these are not fair and properly justified reasons to safeguard such a significant site for development. The transport assessment on 777 is quite damning and applies fully to site 810. On 777 the assessment quite rightly concludes that without a dualling of the north A1237 this site is not suitable for	10436/18940	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>development and indeed could not be justified.</p> <p>Objection – indicative number of houses is 2112. This is neither a sensitive, acceptable, practical or wise proposal. Same would be true if 50% of the land was included. In the past 33 years the village has grown and maintained it's character. It is in the greenbelt area. Removal of the green belt at Earswick will encourage urban sprawl and would be a significant encroachment on the character of the villages of north York. Once Site 810 has been "safe guarded" development proposals are likely to put forward immediately. City planners should priorities factors such as access, infrastructure and sustainability. There are present traffic problems at peak times of day when motorists are crossing the ring road, also for pedestrians trying to cross. The development of site 810, if safeguarded, will add to that with the significant increase in volume of traffic. There will be an increase of traffic on the ring road between Earswick and the main shopping areas of Monks Cross, Vanguard Park and Clifton Moor and a new roundabout will be needed to allow site traffic safe access to site 810. Increased travel time is expected. Local schools are already struggling to meet demand and there is no guarantee that " safeguarding" site 810would lead to potentially large community of school children having access to current or new local school provision, or to other local amenities.</p>	10444/22526	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection- lack of an adequate infrastructure to cater for such a large increase in vehicles along an already congested single carriageway ring road.</p>	10467/22575	
	<p>Objection – should develop Brownfield, rather than safeguard green belt land. Increase in traffic pressure. Possible tripling or quadrupling the population. Would destroy the rural nature of the village. Enough Brownfield to meet demands.</p>	10480/22614	
	<p>Objection – green belt should be given protection to allow people to benefit from open spaces and countryside. Council document recommends the site as safeguarded land, but indicates development could be within 1-15 years. Earswick parish council has its own development plan, which York council has not taken heed of. Traffic pollution has detrimental effect on the health and wellbeing of existing residents. Current infrastructure is insufficient</p>	10485/22629	
	<p>Support- land east of Earswick indentified for possible development has no amenity value and no particular environmental value. The outline proposal by the Thirteen Group seems admirable. It would bring facilities into area that currently has none. Would have minimum impact on the present village, in the form of an access road onto an existing roundabout on Strensall road. If provision of the proposed facilities could be guaranteed, then Earswick</p>	10494/22658	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	children would not have to travel to school & residents would no longer have to use the car to access shops. Haxby group of surgeries may be interested in a new base in Earswick.		
	Objection- Greenbelt should not be built on when there are brown sites available. The character and charm would be ruined by proposed development. Existing roads would not cope with increased traffic. Not enough facilities in the village and surrounding areas for proposed development. Proposed roundabout would cause gridlock on an already over-congested road system.	10497/22663	
	Objection – infrastructure already struggles to manage the current level of traffic. Increase would lead to large increase in noise and volume of vehicles. The area is semi-rural, and the open fields are part of the essential character of the village. 300% increase in residents would change the area irredeemably. The development should be separate from Earswick village, and should not have access to Strensall Road so the infrastructure and character of the village are maintained and protected. More appropriate sites in Brownfield areas	10514/22694	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection- Green belt should remain to prevent towns merging into one another, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, preserve the setting and character of York. Removing the greenbelt would ruin the character of Earswick village, overcrowd the area and potentially devalue the area and create further crime for the area. Cannot see any good reason to remove greenbelt.	10541/22751	
	Objection – houses in this area are not needed in such large numbers. The majority of people cannot afford new homes. There is a problem with the infrastructure being overburdened. There is no money to address this issues.	10554/26097	
	Objection - will substantially alter the village. Will add a huge burden to local schools. Further chaos on A1237, with the addition of another roundabout. Will increase the likelihood of accidents and fatalities as cyclists and pedestrians try to cross what is already a very dangerous road. Will lack safe access to secondary schools and wider community facilities in Huntingdon.	10575/22768	
	Objection – the Government planning policy states 'brownfield first' and not to sacrifice greenbelt land for housing. The ring road will not be able to cope with the increased volume of traffic. The large site near Clifton Moor plus additional houses in Haxby and Strensall will have an enormous effect. Additional roundabout on the ring road would mean months of disruption on an already busy stretch. Can the current sewerage and drainage networks cope. Understand that a large proportion of the housing will be rented. The cost of public transport and restricted bus services (i.e. unable to get into Clifton Moor or Monks Cross	10584/22483	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>without having to go into town first) would mean that low income families would struggle to get to work. Can the local services cope. Building a new primary school would solve only one of many problems – Secondary education, GP services, York Hospital (no room for expansion on current site) Dentists. The plans sent to each household and the ones displayed in the public consultation evening differed dramatically. What exactly are they proposing to build.</p> <p>8. The plans do not appear to have any provision for public open spaces. Will all the residents be expected to use the current facilities (designed for 350 homes not 2000+). The village green in the centre of the Fosslands development is owned and used by the Fosslands residents only. Any other resident would not be able to use this facility.</p>		
	<p>Objection – strongly objects to the plans in the north of the city, where no consideration appears to have been given to infrastructure and services, particularly the road network. The proposed development would have an adverse impact on amenities of the properties adjacent to the site, due to a loss of privacy. Site access proposals would lead to safety hazards. Internal circulation would create conflicts between pedestrian, cyclist and vehicular movements. The size represents an un-neighbourly form of development. The siting of the development would lead to an unacceptable loss of open space, greenbelt land, and adversely affect the amenities. The amount of legitimate parking would decrease. It would lead to vehicles overhanging the adopted highway verge/road, to the detriment of other road users. It would result in noise, disturbance and nuisance to the existing residents. Development could potentially lead to increased flooding</p>	10589/22799	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – very busy road. Prerequisite to any further development would be further infrastructure improvements. Re-opening Strensall and/or Haxby railway station, allowing better use of resources and reduction of buses on the local roads.</p>	10614/20374	
	<p>Objection – brownfield sites first.</p>	10616/20377	
	<p>Objection – large vehicles and tractors use this route – already hazardous. Increase in cars would escalate the danger. The single lane bridge over the Derwent cannot handle increase in traffic and has already been strengthened a few times. Traffic is already a problem, pavements are narrow in parts and crossing and accessing the main road is hazardous for children, pushchairs and the elderly. The development cannot be sustainable in a village with limited amenities. Housing should be extended in the urban area. This land was already rejected for development. It is therefore illogical to consider it again.</p>	10641/19725	
	<p>Objection – scale of development is unsustainable. Site would be built completely on green belt land. Development will be hugely detrimental on traffic.</p>	10675/19773	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Objection – see survey 16. This Plan is not for local people, builders will cherry pick prime sites like Earswick. Green belt is set in place for a very good reason – to protect and maintain the character of our beautiful city, and stopping urban sprawl from turning villages like Earswick, with their character into small towns. Site is totally unsuitable from a traffic management point of view. Strensall Road and the northern ring road are already gridlocked, the roads could not possibly cope with the traffic from this proposed development. It is very productive farmland and with our ever growing population and decreasing land bank it is very important to protect these sites.</p>	10700/19831	
	<p>Objection – concerned the village would be completely swamped by such a large area of new development and the current transport network, which is already overloaded at peak times, would not be able to cope with the potential number of new cars on the local roads.</p>	10708/19848	
	<p>Objection- unnecessary, ill thought, impractical to want to build houses on open greensite which will add even more congestion to an already overburdened area. Amenities such as doctors, dentists, schools and transport links. Cannot keep building and taking away open spaces what about the wildlife that will lose their habitat, this must be protected.</p>	10714/19864	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – total opposition to the proposed rape and pillage of the green belt with the three proposed new housing estates in and around New Earswick. The old school playing field offers a visual and environmental lung. Principal objection is the greatly increased volume of traffic on Haxby Rd accessing on the bend opposite Hartrigg Oaks within village and trying to get onto the ring road via roundabouts. Green belts are important - they are there to be protected and not sold off to the highest bidder.</p>	10729/19891	
	<p>Objection – opposed to removal of greenbelt land for the development of houses.</p>	10748/26113	
	<p>Objection – the additional increase would put extreme pressure on the area with much increased congestion on an already busy ring road and services.</p>	10774/19608	
	<p>Objection – the developers show off a new roundabout and access to the A1237 but fail to comprehend that this does not reduce the amount of traffic there will be should the development go ahead. This causes congestion not only for Earswick but for all who use the A1237. High levels of air pollution and noise will all be to the detriment of current residents.</p>	10778/21871	
	<p>Objection- no logical reason or explanation why this land has been targeted for development and would like to understand and review the decision making materials that have enabled such decisions as Greenfield verses Brownfield development sites; selection criteria and costing; selection of the target site; location, cost, environmental and</p>	10808/20663	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	infrastructure impacts; road safety access to the A1237 and surrounding roads; safety, congestion, noise and pollution criteria; and consideration to the detrimental effects to a local village community culture.		
	Objection- sudden excessive push to build new housing is not sustainable or balances development. The infrastructure (roads, schools etc) will not cope with this level of building. The house builder will struggle to resource such plans. This will result in poor labour force and poor house quality.	10817/21359	
	Objection – will add to congestion on Strensall Road and the outer ring road. Scale of the proposals is too much, no more than 300 houses.	10821/21364	
	Objection- would destroy Earswick village. This land helps offer a vital barrier in avoidance of coalescence between Earswick and Strensall, which if permitted would speed up these two communities merging towards into a built up urban sprawl. Drainage and sewage at capacity limitations, access and traffic problems. Two previously rejected sites. Document makes no promises about any significant infrastructure improvements or whether local schools can accommodate significant increases of children. Commuting to work is unavoidable, pressure on inadequate local facilities and services.	10837/21393	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – Earswick village has already more than contributed to the provision of new housing for the York area in the recent past. The scale and pace of these developments was such that it was possible to ensure that the village retained its character. Proposed development is outrageous and ill thought out. It will destroy the rural nature of the community, blight the landscape and irrevocably damage the character of York by creating an urban sprawl adjacent to the precious green corridor along the ring road. Objection is on the following grounds: Proposal is out of scale and inappropriate. Existing village identity and character could not be maintained. Further development of the village needs to be small scale and recognise that the village has already expanded in recent years. Existing local services are inadequate to cope with the additional demand for schools, healthcare and other local services. Existing schools are already full. Sewage infrastructure is at its limit. Impact of associated traffic would be harmful to health, well being and quality of life of existing residents. Traffic on Strensall Road is already heavy with associated rises in emission pollution. Further housing and traffic will exacerbate this problem. Roads already generate nuisance noise – further traffic will only make this worse. What studies have been undertaken to understand traffic impact. Access and egress from the proposed development	10857/19417	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>onto the A1237 will cause trunk road disruption. Developers propose an additional roundabout on the A1237 which will significantly further congest an already heavily congested trunk road. What modelling has been done to understand this impact. Fire station exits towards the proposed additional roundabout – given the likelihood of queues, what impact will this have on the Fire Service response times. Route for students to local secondary schools requires them to cross the A1237 – concern regarding increased traffic hazards. There is no legal obligation on the council to generate a list of ‘safeguarded’ land. This specific site does not have an urgent need for additional housing and there are more suitable sites available elsewhere. Land is valuable green asset providing productive farmland and natural habitats. Need to protect this land as part of the ‘green lungs’ around the city. Building on it means it is lost forever. Proposal for safeguarding of land for future is contradicted by Council’s own suggestion that this might be brought forward earlier and is undermined by well developed proposals being put forward by the developer. Priority should be given to redevelopment of brownfield sites within existing urban areas – by ‘safeguarding’ greenbelt land the council is inadvertently discouraging the redevelopment of land that should be developed as a priority. Council has a responsibility to protect the character and nature of its local communities. This proposal fails to enact this duty of care. Need to ensure that future development gives due consideration of the impact it has on both the local community and the many visitors who are the greatest source of income to our city.</p>		
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	<p>Objection - residents of Usher Lane are already subjected to excessive speeds and volumes of passing traffic and this will significantly increase should the housing estate proposed be built. Access to the ring road during rush hour is already a significant issue and this would become even more of an issue with the increase population. The loss of greenbelt land will also detract from peoples quality of life. The villages infrastructure simply would not cope without investment in facilities such as schools, shops, libraries, doctors and dentists. The local primary schools are already heavily subscribed and over subscribed. The local secondary schools are very well established and are doing well, short sighted not to see the implications of the estate on the schools in the area.</p>	10858/21472	
	<p>Objection – there are enough brownfield sites around York to satisfy well into the next few decades. The infrastructure along the A1237 already struggles to cope with this volume of traffic. There will be increased fuel consumption, noise and pollution and serious road safety issues. Increased congestion will occur along the A1237. There will be detrimental impact to the quality of the area, with adverse effect on the ecology, landscape and trees. There will</p>	10872/25874	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be excessive pressure on infrastructure and the emergency services.		
	Objection – in 20 years Earswick has doubled in size. This proposed increase will overwhelm the village and its limited facilities. It will become a dormitory settlement for York or Leeds. Roads cannot sustain the level of traffic or pollution, this will only become worse. It will also be more dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Development should be targeted at the A64 which is a duel carriage way.	10873/25875	
	Objection- the congestion of Strensall Road and the A1237 as the ring road will then become a car park. Increased amount of traffic will cause pollution/increase noise and road safety especially for the children and elderly. Will have a major impact on the effective running of the fire station and the ambulance service attending this area. York hospital and local schools will struggle to cope with the huge amount of houses. No employment opportunities for new residents. The houses will also put increased pressure on the existing infrastructure which is already stretched. Crime will increase in the area. There are plenty of existing brown belt sites available around York are for this use. <u>Why destroy greenbelt.</u>	10885/21490	
	Objection – 220 acres of green belt land would be lost when other sites are available. Environment would be permanently damaged. Traffic is too heavy already. Current infrastructure would not be able to cope with the increase in houses.	10921/21563	
	Objection – if all the building goes ahead Haxby, Earswick, Strensall and Huntington will gradually merge into one conglomeration.	10930/21575	
	Objection – no more houses are needed. Overpopulating village. School over capacity	10943/21595	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the village. Further traffic chaos from development. Loss of 220 acres of farmland.	10950/21601	
	Objection – see survey 16. In relation to the Strensall site, the area is already heavily congested, especially during peak times – eg. Strensall Road, Ring Road, Hopgrove, Monks Cross. There is no infrastructure in place to support a massive increase in development which would impact also on wildlife & services (schools, GP's).	11027/20207	
	Objection - see survey 16	11030/26955	
	Support - see survey 16	11034/26953	
	Objection - see survey 16	11036/26958	
	Objection - see survey 16	11038/26595	
	Objection - see survey 16	11041/26965	
	Objection - see survey 16	11043/26967	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection - see survey 16	11045/26969	
	Objection - see survey 16	11048/26973	
	Objection - see survey 16	11050/26974	
	Objection - see survey 16	11052/26977	
	Objection - see survey 16	11054/26979	
	Objection - see survey 16	11056/26981	
	Support - see survey 16	11058/26984	
	Objection - see survey 16	11060/26988	
	Objection - see survey 16	11061/26992	
	Support - see survey 16	11062/26993	
	Objection - see survey 16	11064/26995	
	Support - see survey 16	11066/27016	
	Objection - see survey 16	11067/27027	
	Objection - see survey 16. The proposed developments on 'safeguarded' land at Earswick is laughably disproportionate – some modest development east of Huntington Road might be acceptable, given adequate infrastructure (say + 15% of present village population).	11068/27035	
	Objection - see survey 16	11069/27036	
	Support - see survey 16	11071/27038	
	Objection - see survey 16	11072/27040	
	Objection - see survey 16	11080/27042	
	Objection - see survey 16	11082/27043	
	Objection - see survey 16	11085/27050	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection - see survey 16 – all brownfield sites should be used first. Earswick is a small country village and should stay like that.	11087/27502	
	Objection - see survey 16	11091/27055	
	Objection - see survey 16	11093/27057	
	Objection - see survey 16	11095/27059	
	Objection - see survey 16	11097/27060	
	Objection - see survey 16	11101/27063	
	Objection - see survey 16	11102/27067	
	Objection - see survey 16	11103/27165	
	Objection - see survey 16	11104/27171	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection - see survey 16	11106/27173	
	Objection - see survey 16	11107/27175	
	Objection - see survey 16	11108/27177	
	Objection - see survey 16	11109/27184	
	Objection - see survey 16	11110/27190	
	Objection - see survey 16	11111/27197	
	Objection - see survey 16	11112/27200	
	Objection - see survey 16	11113/27214	
	Objection - see survey 16	11114/27215	
	Objection - see survey 16	11115/27216	
	Objection - see survey 16	11116/27218	
	Objection - see survey 16	11117/27220	
	Objection - see survey 16	11118/27222	
	Objection - see survey 16	11119/27223	
	Objection - see survey 16	11120/27225	
	Objection - see survey 16	11121/27227	
	Objection - see survey 16 – Its outrageous the proposed development of houses in Earswick would cause chaos on Strensall Road, traffic is busy anyway to and from Strensall.	11122/27229	
	Objection - see survey 16	11124/27230	
	Objection - see survey 16	11126/27232	
	Objection – no explanation as to the need to remove the land from the green belt, when York has the largest number of Brownfield sites in the country. Ten times as many houses as there currently are in the village. The construction would create a huge disruption in the village. There will be an increase in noise and pollution.	11165/21657	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection - the current infrastructure is not equipped to deal with that amount of new vehicles. There appears to be no mention of intentions to ease the traffic pressure. Has consideration been given to a cycle track between Strensall and the by pass to make it safer for cyclists and offer an alternative method of transport. Has consideration been given to improvements to the Towthorpe/A64 junction as there will no doubt be an increase in people using that route as an alternative to being caught up in the already gridlocked traffic at peak times. Accept houses have to be built but do it where there isn't already infrastructure issues and over sized schools	11249/22204	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – should remain green belt land. Will dwarf the current village. No provision made for the affect on the existing infrastructure. Sewage and draining systems struggle to cope currently. Traffic issues. Bus services are not on time. The people moving in would need work, but not enough in the area to facilitate the number of houses. Many Brownfield sites.	11296/22860	
	Objection – concerned about effect on character and identity of the village. Developer must demonstrate the special circumstances required for development. The current infrastructure cannot handle the extra pressure. Size of development too large. Existing services adversely affected.	11318/22876	
	Objection – no improvements made to the road network to facilitate new houses. Infrastructure not capable of meeting the extra demands.	11347/22885	
	Objection – the proposal to develop Site 810 would destroy this wonderful village. The volume of house building which has been proposed is overbearing and will result not in an enhancement of Earswick but the village being consumed by the new development. Vast majority of Earswick residents accept that the national housing stock is in need of development both in terms of quality and quantity. However, York and its surrounding communities must stand out for very special and careful attention, this cannot be met by ripping up the green belt. It can, however, be realised by careful, targeted and selective regeneration of city centre brown field sites. Residents of Earswick would not be opposed to development of the village in a controlled, modest and organic manner which would retain the existing cohesion, character, proportions and sustainability of our community. The current proposals go way beyond that. Similarly, there are numerous other sites that track the ring road which appear far more suitable for development. Detailed comments provided, see response.	11365/22224	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope with increased traffic. Immense impact on the local economy.	11379/22907	
	Objection – green belt land protected to maintain the sustainable development of York. First develop of brownfield sites. New homes closer to town will reduce the impact on traffic and climate. Actual roads cannot even manage the current traffic. Flooding risks. Problems with surface water removal. Ecological impact.	11388/22925	
<b>810 Earswick (continued)</b>	Objection – will ruin the environment and character of the area. Chaotic traffic. Serious pollution. Fire station effected. No Senior School for all these people. York facilities cannot cope with that much people.	11392/22930	
	Objection – rumour of houses to home immigrants. No EU country proposes to build	11403/22947	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	immigrant townships.		
	Objection – concern about removing land from Green Belt. Extreme pressure on local infrastructure and facilities. Adverse environmental consequences. Poor local bus service.	11421/21678	
	Objection - completely unsustainable and inappropriate scale of development. Change of the character of the village. Hugely detrimental impact for traffic. Traffic pollution and noise. No details about infrastructures such as drains, sewage treatments, roads, cycle paths, etc.	11423/21680	
	Objection – this will destroy the semi rural village. This will lead to a major increase in vehicular traffic, noise, pollution and danger to children. It will have a serve impact on wildlife. The greenbelt should protect the community from urban sprawl. Once this is gone, it is gone forever. It will have a major strain on social resources.	11519/24186	
	Objection – it would be better to improve the tourist experience in York and to develop brownfield sites. Question how the local plan has included assumptions regarding the growth of jobs and requirement for 22,000 new houses. The scale of development is unsustainable and inappropriate. The plan lacks any detail as to the basic requirements of infrastructure. This will produce unprecedented levels of congestion which will impact on health and quality of life for existing residents.	11647/26125	
	Objection – use of greenbelt for housing, over development of the site, loss of agricultural land, increase in traffic, noise, pollution and safety issues, increased pressure on local infrastructure, lack of employment. There are brownfield sites available in York for development.	11648/26126	
	Objection – opposed in strongest possible terms to allocation of this land for housing development. Request that the allocation as safeguarded land be deleted from the Plan.	Petition 1	
	Objection – oppose plans to build houses on the Strensall Road site.	Petition 2	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington</b>	Comment – various development sites proposed are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. The Council is currently working with the Highways Agency and the City of York Council to assess the cumulative impact of both Authorities' Local Plan development aspirations on the interchange. It is therefore important that the modified/additional sites, in particular, are likely to have an impact on the interchange: Site 97, ST7, ST15, SF3, 811, 802, 815, 22, 747, 794. These sites in particular, should therefore, be carefully factored into the transport assessment for the A64 interchange.	10/18964	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – loss of agricultural land 5ha	45/18784	York Environmental Forum
	Objection – previously expressed views remain unchanged. This land is adjacent to the land proposed for housing H31 and H35 and stretched down from Eastfield Lane to the rear of cottage gardens on Intake Lane. There is no access from Intake Lane – assume that all access would have to be from Eastfield Lane. Development will have a significant impact on Eastfield Lane, a relatively narrow road that has reduced to a narrow country lane at the point of access to the proposed Safeguarded Land. Alteration of this lane will be detrimental to the character of this part of the village, by reducing the open character of the land in either direction and result in damage or loss of long established native hedgerows. It would exacerbate an already hazardous junction where Eastfield Lane meets Church Balk, and its configuration will be difficult to improve without major changes to the road layouts. The site is not sustainable in regards to public transport. It is further from a bus stop than at least one other site that was ruled out because of poor access to public transport. The provision of at least 106 houses on this land, in addition to the 60 houses at H31 will generate a significant increase in vehicular movements along the relatively narrow Eastfield Lane. Land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. Development in open countryside will significantly impact the open character as you approach the village and cannot be justified on land previously proposed for allocation as Green Belt. The new proposal could result in over 100 extra houses being built in the village, in addition to the 147 at H31, H33, H35 and H44, already proposed. If the proposed safeguard land were to be developed in addition to that already proposed it would be a very significantly additional development of the village. The is judged likely to significantly alter the village character of Dunnington by having a major negative impact on traffic, parking, school capacity, and drainage in the village.	59/19148	Dunnington Parish Council

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Comment – Eastfield Lane is used by pedestrians and cyclists, as such it is inadequate, even though traffic is supposedly restricted. Similarly for Intake Lane. These lanes and the footpath that crosses this site would benefit from provision of green corridors to enhance their use and separate them from any housing.	91/19632	
	Objection – opposed to all sites which are outside the proposed inner boundary of the Green Belt including those which are outside the existing development limits of inset villages (as opposed to proposed development limits for such villages), or are extensions beyond the outer ring road, where the site does not bridge between the existing urban core and an inset village, or is located within a green corridor as identified by the Green Corridors Tech Paper (2011). Location of developments sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban core ie Heworth or Acomb. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.	544/20492	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20534	
	Objection – the plan would double the number of houses built in Dunnington since 1970/80. The sewage and drainage systems need to be seriously considered as does road-widening. Twinham court was a good idea in terms of scale, to assist younger people to settle in. The type and number of homes can be built again. The buses through Dunnington could be re-sited along to Eastfield lane and down through Horsefield, back along Intake Lane to Common Road. This would alleviate flow issues on Church Street. Unfortunately Green Belt is being used up, should work closely with Dunnington Parish Local Plan for further proposed development.	945/18198	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – against the addition of new sites “safeguarded” for long term future development. Over development of the villages, leading to loss of character, pressure on the small primary schools and increased traffic on small country lanes.</p>	995/20558	
	<p>Objection – with the increasing population cannot afford to loose prime agricultural land which in the future will be urgently needed for food production. Access to this site along Eastfield Lane, which to the east is by a narrow single lane which could not be enlarged without loss of ancient hedgerows, and to the west leads to a junction with Church Balk which is already dangerous due to poor sight lines and which would not support increased traffic.</p>	996/20561	
	<p>Objection –the site is located in the Green Belt and any development would detract from the open character of the landscape and conflict with the purposes of Green Belt policy. It would lead to excessive overdevelopment of the village, changing the character and nature of the open surroundings. Ancient hedges would be despoiled and could not possibly cope with the huge increase in traffic. The extra traffic generated along Eastfield Lane would add to the hazard of the already dangerous junction with Church Balk, at the perimeter of the Conservation Area. The infrastructure of the village is not sufficiently developed to allow such massive expansion, i.e. schools, roads, parking space in the village centre, bus routes.</p>	1109/21681	
	<p>Comment – due to the size or location of this safeguarded land it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and would be of interest to the Agency. The Agency has not made any assessment of the potential impact of this, together with other sites, at this stage. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from the council before proceeding with the mesoscopic modelling exercise to assess the cumulative impact of local plan development on the SRN.</p>	1264/18593	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	<p>Objection – survey has revealed strong opposition towards this proposal within the community. It is already facing major extensions to the urban footprint of the village and there are concerns over the sustainability of adding a further 105 dwellings to the village.</p>	1355/18627	Julian Sturdy MP
	<p>Objection – site is farmland in the green belt, change of use if inappropriate, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify any change. Changes to access would involve the destruction of country lanes. Would significantly add to traffic load which is bound to create further hazards for young children. Will add to congestion. Would</p>	1723/22960	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	overload existing infrastructure. The primary school is at capacity.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – would severely compromise vital infrastructure because of so many houses. The existing historic lanes would be unable to cope with the increase in traffic. Destruction of Green Belt land which is good agricultural land. Over development will permanently destroy village life as we know it.	1913/23801	
	Objection– see survey 5. Will make the village overdeveloped. The land is used for agricultural use. Increase in traffic causing more problems.	1939/27250	
	Objection – ironic title of ‘safeguarded land’ removes it from any updated Green Belt categorisation. Land is in productive agriculture use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. It is in open countryside, any future development would have a significant adverse impact. Access is unsuitable. Alteration of the land would harm the character of this part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient native hedgerows.	2349/23807	
	Objection – see survey 5	2406/27252	
	Objection – the land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant there change in status. The development of the site will have a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane from where access to the site would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane, in either direction, will cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient native hedgerows.	2429/20466	
	Objection – this land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant a change from its greenbelt status. It is not sustainable in terms of public transport.	2430/20467	
	Objection – see survey 5. Until the supporting infrastructure of drains, sewers, roads etc are brought up to a standard to support additional housing then the ‘Further Sites’ proposals should not be made. Since Eastfield Lane is at the highest point in Dunnington, all drainage will go towards existing village facilities which will struggle to cope.	2467/27254	
	Objection – surely a decision should be taken on the housing sites of H35 and 31 before safeguarded land is decided.	2505/20472	
	Objection – see survey 5	2506/27256	
	Objection – a site of this size is an overdevelopment of the village. The village community would be stretched too far if more houses were built. Eastfield land is a busy road with significant safety issues. Roads cannot be altered without destroying ancient native hedgerows. The site is a long way from any public transport. Sites	2511/20475	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	which are nearer to bus stops have been “red lighted” for being too far from a bus stop.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – development will destroy the rural nature of the area. Extra traffic will be added to unsuitable roads. Land was designated green belt. Application was turned down because it was on green belt land. Roads in the vicinity cannot support construction vehicle access. A lot of development has already taken place, and any extra would alter the shape of the village. Land is in productive agricultural use. The site is not sustainable in terms of public transport.	2517/20587	
	Objection - see survey 5. The site is unsuitable primarily because of limited means of access. Eastfield Lane would have to be widened, cutting into the bank. The junction with Church Balk has poor sightlines and would need to be enlarged, preferably incorporating the roundabout. Extensive drainage work would be needed, as existing properties are already affected by run-off. If access from Intake Lane were considered, additional traffic movements would exacerbate the parking safety issues adjacent to the infant play area.	2551/18233	
	Objection – see survey 5	2561/27260	
	Objection – see survey 5	2563/27262	
	Objection – see survey 5	2624/27264	
	Objection - the site is considered to represent inappropriate development in the draft green belt area and size, scale and location especially on the field directly adjacent to Kerver Lane as this is land locked and has a public footpath running through it which would mean having to significantly alter access points on Eastfield Lane and Intake Lane, thus impacting on the open character of the village and approach to Hagg wood. Changing /widening the access on Kerver Lane would significantly impact the visual approach to Hagg wood and character of the lanes with direct access to this special wood/reserve. Increased traffic along these lanes will create safety issue for pedestrians. Will generate significant increase in vehicular movements and exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk. Junction cannot be improved without impact on the character of the village and setting of conservation area. The fields form an important and open natural gateway / vista to the Wolds providing an important habitat for many rare / protected and endangered animals.	2628/22250	
	Objection – see survey 5	2635/27266	
	Objection – see survey 5	2647/27269	
	Objection – there will be a big increase in vehicles along Eastfield lane which would exacerbate a hazardous junction. This land is proposed as agricultural land and the	2657/20476	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	status of this can only be changed in exceptional circumstances. The proposed site isn't sustainable for access to public transport due to the lack of proximity to bus stops. This site should remain in the greenbelt.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 5	2677/27271	
	Objection – see survey 5	2679/27273	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to proper planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17938	
	Objection – see survey 5	2682/27275	
	Objection – this represents a further intrusion into and an erosion of the greenbelt and is totally inappropriate. This proposal would mean destroying good productive agricultural land and seriously detract from the village's rural character.	2731/20478	
	Objection – the proposed expansion would harm the character of the village and have a severe impact on the greenbelt area of the village. The access along Eastfield land is very narrow, any alternation leading to damage to ancient native hedgerows. Extra development will cause problems with vehicular access to an already dangerous junction where Church Bulk joins Eastfield Lane. The proposed site would also have restricted access to public transport.	2750/20482	
	Objection – main concern is lack of access and the potentially large number of vehicles using that access. Could create a genuine danger. The lane is very narrow often with many parked cars and bordered on one side by a very diverse, native, ancient hedgerow which should not be uprooted to allow widening of the road, causing detriment to the rural character of the village. The site is home to many species of wild British birds and other wildlife. Development will have a significant impact on the rural character of the entire area and Green Belt.	2771/23824	
	Objection – see survey 5	2794/27277	
	Objection – see survey 5	2816/27295	
	Objection – see survey 5	2835/27297	
Objection – the character of the village will be significantly changed, the land is greenbelt and should be sacrosanct. There are no exceptional circumstances warranting an alteration in use. Extra traffic would entail harmful changes to the character, layout and appearance of the village including the rerouting and widening of roads, the consequent destruction or damage to ancient hedgerows and the ambience of the village.	2842/18257		
Objection – see survey 5	2847/27299		
Objection – land is in productive arable use and within the greenbelt. There are no	2931/23855		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	exceptional circumstances to justify a change of status. Access would result in the need for significant alterations to the narrow country lane with loss of damage to native hedgerows and wildlife habitat. Would have wider impact in terms of vehicular movements and parking within the centre of the village. Vital infrastructure would be severely compromised.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – productive agricultural use of the land. No exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status; it must be preserved for food production. Further development would seriously impact on the rural setting of the village, destroying its very nature. Protect Green Belt to preserve the countryside. Roads cannot deal with any increase in traffic.	2942/20697	
	Objection – see survey 5	2947/27301	
	Objection – see survey 5	2957/27304	
	Objection – see survey 5. Green Belt should not be used. This development will produce urban sprawl – losing the individuality of the village. Further removal of Green Belt / farmland will adversely affect the village. Productive agricultural use of the land. No exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status; it must be preserved for food production. Further development would seriously impact on the rural setting of the village, destroying its very nature. Protect Green Belt to preserve the countryside. Roads cannot deal with any increase in traffic.	2958/20698	
	Objection – see survey 5. Against using land on Eastfield Lane for any housing development.	2974/27347	
	Objection – see survey 5. Against using land on Eastfield Lane for any housing development	2975/27349	
	Objection – see survey 5	2980/27352	
	Objection – would ruin rural nature of the village. Green belt land. Public footpaths would be lost. Shape of village would be altered. Services would be too far away, causing crowding on the roads. Site is not sustainable in terms of public transport. Drainage is a constant problem. Significant overdevelopment of the village. Land is in productive agricultural use.	3027/23708	
	Objection – important to preserve the historic character of the village for future generations but accept there should be more growth to meet housing need. Proposals for Site 811 are a significant departure and affects a large area of land still in agricultural use which contributes to the open character of Eastfield Lane and beyond. An unreasonable intrusion into the open countryside. Land was formally proposed as Green Belt and there can be no justification for its exclusion now. Will have a	3056/24536	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	significant impact on the extremely narrow country land from which access to the site would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient native hedgerows. Significant increase in vehicular movements and exacerbate an already dangerous junction which cannot be improved without impacting on the character of the village and setting of the conservation area. Will have wider highways, parking and drainage impacts. This site is not sustainable in terms of public transport.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 5	3090/27354	
	Objection – absence of the facilities to accommodate further building and sustain current level of services within the infrastructure. Too much traffic for the roads.	3123/22275	
	Objection – see survey 5	3147/27357	
	Objection – development on either Intake Lane or Eastfield Lane will create traffic problems. Both lanes are in open countryside where they would be developed; such development would alter the character of the roads and the eastern side of the village. Intake Lane goes passed the play area and, being a dead end, almost all traffic that would go to the new housing would have to go passed the play area. The road is also on a national cycle route, chosen because it is not busy. There must be better places to develop in the City of York, without having to build in the green belt.	3176/18270	
	Objection – a huge increase in congestion will make the area busier and more dangerous. The school is already over subscribed. This site is in the greenbelt and development will be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.	3179/23868	
	Objection – see survey 5	3225/27359	
	Objection – the fields are in the green belt and could be used to grow food for sheep and cows to graze on prior to joining the food chain. Houses should be built near to where the work is and there is very little in Dunnington. This will only lead to heavily congested roads leading to York, Leeds and Hull. Houses should be built on the many brownfield sites where the jobs are. Area can only be reached by very narrow country lanes. Widening either of these would be a danger to the public and a serious threat to wildlife. Dunnington does not have the infrastructure to cope. Primary school is already full to capacity. The character of Dunnington would be completely altered.	3259/23886	
	Objection – would alter the unique character of the village. Open character would be spoilt. There is significant traffic congestion already which will be increased. The need for considerable infrastructure road works along the narrow country lane could seriously impact on and harm the character on this part of the village. Would seriously affect surface and sewerage drainage capacity. Public transport does not go	3262/23887	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	near the proposed site.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 5	3290/27361	
	Objection – see survey 5	3335/27363	
	Objection – important to preserve the historic character of the village for future generations but accept there must be some growth to meet housing need. 100 extra houses to be removed from the Green Belt is a significant departure and affects a large area of land still in agricultural use which contributes to the open character of Eastfield Lane and beyond. An unreasonable intrusion in to the open countryside. No justification to exclude the site from the Green Belt. Will have a significant impact on the narrow country lane from access to the site would have to be gained. Alternation to this lane would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient narrow hedgerows. Will generate significant increase in vehicle movements and exacerbate an already hazardous junction. Junction cannot be improved without impacting on the character of the village and setting of the conservation area. Will have wider highways, parking and drainage impacts on the village. The site is not sustainable in terms of public transport.	3402/24555	
	Objection – would open up the risk of development on this extensive site which would substantially change the existing rural character of the village along the existing single track parts of Eastfield Lane and Intake Lane. Would cause considerable traffic congestion and damage to ancient native hedgerows. Will cause urban sprawl into the green belt. Should be retained as greenbelt. If further housing sites are needed, land to the west of Church Balk behind the existing Nissan huts adjacent to A166 should be considered, but only if traffic flows are moderate and well designed.	3431/18272	
	Objection – no spare capacity of the village amenities. Full school. Dangerous traffic. Irreparable damage the rural character of the village and remove from use productive agricultural land.	3446/22312	
	Objection – see survey 5	3453/27365	
	Objection – site cannot be accessed from Intake Lane unless additional land were available giving access to the adjacent Potential Allocation. The track between the two allocation sites is just a track, it cannot be anything else. The proposed developed is fraught with difficulties. Very significant vehicle traffic using the lane, water pressure, mains drainage/surface water problems, need to widen the road, inevitable increase in traffic to the primary school and street lightening are some of the issues. The proposal is seriously flawed.	3464/17792	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)	Objection – would represent overdevelopment. Massive increase in traffic.	3509/22321	
	Objection – see survey 5	3515/27367	
	Objection – see survey 5	3530/27369	
	Objection – see survey 5	3534/27371	
	Objection – there are no circumstances warranting an alteration in the use from its current agricultural status. The character of the village will be significantly changed by the addition of 100+ houses to those already suggested. The land is in a green belt area and so should not be built on. The extra traffic generated by such a building proposition would entail harmful changes to the ambience, layout and appearance of the village. Among harmful changes would be the necessary rerouting and widening of roads around the junction of Eastfield Lane and Church Balk, and the consequent destruction of ancient hedgerows.	3537/18544	
	Objection – no circumstances to change from agricultural land. Character of village would be altered. Green belt land. Extra traffic would be harmful to ambience, layout and appearance of the village.	3537/18544	
	Objection – the existing infrastructure along Eastfield Lane and in the wider community of Dunnington could not cope with extra housing on this site. This area should be regarded as inappropriate development and there should be no change to the existing boundary of the Green Belt. Detailed comments provided, see response.	3582/22023	
	Objection- see survey 5. It would be better to safeguard other sites in the city. Dunnington cannot take more use of sewage, water, electricity or roads without considerable investment.	3610/17956	
	Objection – see survey 5	3636/27374	
	Objection - the access along Eastfield Lane is narrow and both construction traffic and new residents traffic would make it unsafe for children, and intolerable for existing residents The stratum is boulder clay, and glacial deposits have left numerous springs which already cause cascades of water across the lane without new hard landscaping and building there is already an overstretched road network in the village, and inadequate parking. development on the proposed safeguarded land would aggravate those issues.	3686/22032	
Objection – see survey 5	3688/27376		
Objection – see survey 5 – the additional 12.5acres of lands at Eastfield Lane has appeared with no clarification as to access, drainage impact etc. Must be resisted until more info is known.	3765/27380		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)	Objection – see survey 5	3789/27382	
	Objection – would be huge impact of traffic down a quiet leafy lane leading to a nature reserve and a well used cycle track. The land is good agricultural land. Would impact on the peaceful village and the infrastructure would struggle to cope.	3834/24538	
	Objection – would be huge impact of traffic down a quiet leafy lane leading to a nature reserve and a well used cycle track. The land is good agricultural land. Would impact on the peaceful village and the infrastructure would struggle to cope.	3835/24537	
	Support – see survey 5	3843/27387	
	Objection – potential negative impact on local services. Particularly concerned about the impact on country roads and the significant increase in traffic. Whilst accepting that some new housing will have to take up Green Belt this allocation would represent an unacceptable incursion into a highly valued resource.	3906/24533	
	Objection – see survey 5	3940/27391	
	Objection – there is already significant planned in Dunnington. It will totally alter the character of the village. Cannot be justified development in the Green Belt. Land it currently productive agricultural land. Access to the site will have huge impact on a very narrow country lane, any alteration of this lane will result in loss of habitat and ancient hedgerows and harm the character of this part of the village. Would generate a huge amount of traffic along Eastfield Lane which is already dangerous with speeding traffic. The site is not sustainable in terms of public transport. The infrastructure of the village (roads, drainage, schools) cannot cope.	3945/23938	
	Objection – encroachment into open countryside, land currently productive agricultural use. No exceptional circumstances that justify a change to the status of this land. Adverse impact on the character of the village. Insufficient drainage system. Traffic congestion. Danger at the hazardous junctions. Electrical power outages because of insufficient infrastructure. Not suitable site in terms of public transport. Dunnington is full and overdeveloped.	3952/20727	
	Objection – see survey 5. Substantial detrimental impact to the historic character of the village. Overdevelopment. Would alter the village's character. Productive agricultural land in the green belt. No special circumstance to warrant a change in use. Destruction of ancient native hedgerows. Wider highway and parking impacts. Will seriously affect surface and sewerage drainage capacity. More flooding will occur. Site is not sustainable in terms of public transport.	3955/21700	
	Support – see survey 5	4045/27396	
Objection – it would be a significant over development of the village. Such a large	4069/21708		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>percentage increase in the number of dwellings would totally alter the character of the village. Development of this site in open countryside will significantly impact on the open character of the village and cannot be justified in Green Belt. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. The development of the site will have a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane from which access to the site would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane, in either direction, would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient hedgerows. A significant increase in vehicular movements along Eastfield Lane will exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets with Church Balk. In excess of 100 dwellings will have wider highways and parking impacts on the village. This site is not sustainable in terms of public transport. It is further from a bus stop than at least one other proposed site in the village which was given a 'red light' for access to public transport</p>		
<p><b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – if this site were developed in addition to those already proposed it would be a significant over development of the village. Such a large percentage increase in the number of dwellings would totally alter the character of the village. Development of this site, in open countryside, will significantly impact on the open character of the village and cannot be justified in the Green Belt. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. The development of the site will have a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane from which access to the site would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane, in either direction, would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient hedgerows. Will generate a significant increase in vehicular movements along Eastfield Lane and exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets with Church Balk. The junction cannot be improved without impact on the character of the village and the setting of the conservation area. Will have parking impacts on the village. The site is not sustainable in terms of public transport. It is further from a bus stop than at least one other proposed site in the village which was given a 'red light' for access to public transport.</p>	<p>4187/21717</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5. This so called 'Safeguarded Land' would no doubt in the future be released for building, again overcrowding the village.</p>	<p>4265/27400</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5</p>	<p>4507/27402</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5. Developing this area of land in addition to the areas</p>	<p>4533/27405</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	already proposed will lead to overdevelopment of the village changing the character of the village. This area of Green Belt should not be developed and would have an adverse effect on the village as a whole.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection - it would be a significant over development of the village and would alter the character of the village. Developing this site, in open countryside, would have a significant impact on the open character of the village and it cannot be justified in green belt. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no circumstances to warrant any change in its status. There would be a significant impact on the extremely narrow Intake Lane and alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of that part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient native hedgerows.	4547/19680	
	Objection - it would be a significant over development of the village and would alter the character of the village. Developing this site, in open countryside, would have a significant impact on the open character of the village and it cannot be justified in green belt. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no circumstances to warrant any change in its status. There would be a significant impact on the extremely narrow Intake Lane and alteration of this lane would cause serious harm to the character of that part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient native hedgerows.	4548/19681	
	Objection – see survey 5	4557/27407	
	Objection – will destroy the rural nature of the area. Will add extra traffic along a lane that is totally unsustainable. Green belt given as a reason for refusal for a barn, reasons for refusal still hold good today. Drainage is a constant problem. Network of public paths used by residents would be ruined. Over development. Further development on this site of the village would alter the shape of the village. Public transport, the primary school and shops would be a lot further away and would lead to people using their cars. Will significantly impact on the open character of the village. Land is in productive agricultural use, there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant its change in status.	4747/22341	
	Objection – if this site was to be developed it would be significant overdevelopment of the village. It would alter the character of the village and put unnecessary demands on local services. Development within green belt is not acceptable. The city needs to look at brown field sites first. The extra traffic created would not be sensible. It is not sensible in terms of public transport. It will impact on the junction near the church which is already a difficult junction. This level of development in Dunnington cannot	4798/22350	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be believed.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 5	4804/27411	
	Objection - already substantially expanded. Total sacrilege of the agricultural heritage. Stretched to capacity with school places and traffic congestion.	4818/22352	
	Objection – see survey 5	4827/27413	
	Objection – see survey 5	4863/27415	
	Objection –significant overdevelopment, significant impact on open character of the village, land is in productive agricultural use, impact on narrow lane needed to access the site, 106 houses will generate an increase in vehicular movements, not sustainable in terms of public transport.	4930/22356	
	Objection – it would be a significant over development of the village. Such a large percentage increase in the number of dwellings would totally alter the character of the village. Development of this site in open countryside will significantly impact on the open character of the village and cannot be justified in Green Belt. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. The development of the site will have a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane from which access to the site would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane, in either direction, would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient hedgerows. A significant increase in vehicular movements along Eastfield Lane [will] exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets with Church Balk. In excess of 100 dwellings will have wider highways and parking impacts on the village. This site is not sustainable in terms of public transport. It is further from a bus stop than at least one other proposed site in the village which was given a 'red light' for access to public transport	4931/22359	
Objection – the land which has been earmarked for development is agricultural and is a barrier between the village and the A166. Access from A166 is not really wide enough to take existing traffic let alone works traffic or eventually residential traffic. The junction by Church Balk is already dangerous, many children cross here on their way to the village schools a few hundred yards away. Grimston Bar roundabout is gridlocked morning and evenings, more traffic will just exacerbate the situation. Dunnington surely has reached its limit with gas, electricity, and sewage supplies. This results in more flooding, especially on Eastfield Lane, water runs off fields in heavy rain. Disturbing the land there will mean more flooding. The village can only just cope with parking in the village	4937/18367		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)	Objection – see survey 5	5031/27418	
	Objection – danger to children. School is close to capacity. Dentist isn't taking any more NHS patients.	5127/22362	
	Objection – see survey 5. The Eastfield side of the A166 is not a good idea. A lot of water is just one thing of importance.	4987/27417	
	Objection – see survey 5. Allowing further development would cause significant overdevelopment completely altering the character of the village. The development of the site will have a significant impact on the extremely narrow country lane from which access to the site would have to be gained. Alteration of this lane, in either direction, would cause serious harm to the character of this part of the village and result in damage or loss of ancient native hedgerows. The provision of at least 106 houses on this, in addition to the 60 which will have been built next to it if this site is used, will generate a significant increase in vehicular movements along Eastfield Lane and exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk. This junction cannot be improved without impacting on the character of the village and the setting of the conservation area. This site is not sustainable in terms of public transport. It is further from a bus stop than at least one other site proposed in the village which was given a 'red light' for access to public transport. The land is in productive agricultural use and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change in status. Development of this site, in open countryside, will significantly impact on the open character of the village and cannot be justified in Green Belt.	5187/21743	
	Objection – designated Green Belt land should be protected. Dunnington is at maximum capacity and insufficient amenities and road infrastructure. Change of the whole village and destruction of its rural feel. No evidence of such demand for housing to scarify this food agricultural land. Congestion and crossing problems.	5212/20731	
	Objection – this new site in Dunnington is a further erosion of the Green Belt. Despite large numbers of objections having been made by local residents to three new housing allocations in Dunnington in the Green Belt 12 months ago, far from scaling back its plans, the Council is now apparently proposing to increase its destruction of the Green Belt. The new area of so called 'safeguarded land' amounts to nearly a doubling of the size of the possible development in Dunnington. The Council is not taking its duty to protect the Green Belt seriously. Together with adjacent sites H31 and h35, this new site would moreover create major traffic problems in the village. The main access to this large combined site would appear to be down Eastfield Lane. This is a narrow lane, and the rout along it to the village centre, via Church Balk and	5219/21757	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Church Street, involves very tight corners. There is no possibility of widening the road at this point since houses are built very close to the road and it is in a Conservation Area. This is a bottleneck at which there is hence inevitably going to be severe congestion.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection –too much land which has been considered greenbelt in past years has been set aside in the draft local plan and in the further sites document for development. The proposed location currently has inadequate road access and any development would increase traffic on narrow country road. The site is at a distance form the primary school and the village shops and amenities such that the traffic across the village and around the school would increase.	5230/21771	
	Objection – see survey 5	5241/27421	
	Objection – see survey 5	5377/21802	
	Objection – special circumstances required for building on green belt have not been demonstrated. Development is too big for the size of the village. Character of the village would be damaged. Agricultural land would be lost. Insufficient access to the site. Drainage systems are problematic. Water running off hard ground would cause greater problems than soft ground absorbing some of it. Traffic would increase significantly. Low water pressure in the village. Further from a bus station than at least one other proposed site.	5377/21802	
	Objection – if developed this would mean a significant overdevelopment of the village and the percentage increase would alter the character. Cannot be justified in Green Belt. The land is productive agricultural land and there are no exceptional circumstances that warrant its change. The site will have an impact on the narrow country lane from which access would be required. It would cause serious harm to the character of the village and damage or loss of ancient hedgerows. It will generate a significant increase in vehicular movement along Eastfield Lane and exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk. Wider highways and parking impacts on the village. This site is not sustainable in terms of public transport.	5649/20791	
	Objection – with the allocation in the local plan, the total number of new houses within Dunnington will increase by 254 – a massive change in the size of the village, leading to loss of character and overdevelopment. Open character of the village will be threatened and cannot be justified in green belt. This is existing well used agricultural land. There are no exceptional circumstances warranting the change. A significant impact on the narrow lane from which the site is accessed. Alteration would cause serious harm to the character of the village and damage or loss to	5650/20792	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	ancient hedgerows. Wider highways and parking impacts on the village which already has issues. The site is not sustainable in terms of public transport.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 5	5984/27426	
	Objection – see survey 5. This lovely village will no longer be so if plans to overload with more buildings and will be spoilt.	5989/27430	
	Objection – see survey 5	5990/27432	
	Objection – see survey 5	6098/27433	
	Objection – see survey 5	6113/27435	
	Objection – increase in vehicle movement. Roads cannot cope. Future developments puts balance of services at risk	6140/21005	
	Objection – significant overdevelopment of the village, will alter character and put unnecessary demands on local services. Do not want development in the greenbelt, introduced to prevent urban sprawl. Need to look at brownfield first. Extra traffic created on Eastfield Lane would not be sensible or in terms of public transport and the number of children at the primary school. Impact on the junction near the church which is already a difficult junction.	6242/21026	
	Objection – in addition to the Eastfield Lane site significant overdevelopment and will alter the character of Dunnington. Land is currently productive agricultural land – government require brownfield sites to be developed rather than Green belt and removing land from agricultural production. Eastfield Lane only road access to both sites is single track and access to Church Balk is hazardous now 150 extra houses will make this junction extremely dangerous. To alter the junction would alter the character of the village and setting of conservation area. Great strain on the infrastructure – local primary school and doctors.	6252/21028	
	Objection– see survey 5	6257/27437	
	Objection – see survey 5. Further development would seriously affect the village character and identity. Infrastructure and amenities already overstretched & potentially 2 cars to each house built would be disastrous and chaotic. The entrance to the village along Church Balk is the most picturesque, with views across the Wolds – if this site is developed the sense of openness would be lost. Green Belt should be kept as such to keep nature close.	6259/27439	
Objection – no need to increase pressure on the infrastructure by building extra houses. Development will remove natural farmland. Schools and doctors surgery are at capacity. Plenty of Brownfield sites which can be developed. People of York don't want to live in urbanisations.	6268/22409		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – wildlife must be taken into account. Agricultural land is a top priority. Village needs a far better road system. Too much traffic in the village already. Drainage is not very good. Water and power supplies are susceptible to failure.	6454/20135	
	Objection – see survey 5 – Dunnington is full to capacity	6460/27442	
	Objection – the council's housing numbers are aspirational and more houses should be built on brownfield sites. This is greenbelt. Development here would be significant over development of the village. The access to the site is a narrow lane. The site is not sustainable in terms of public transport.	6519/24071	
	Objection – designated greenbelt and should be protected. Dunnington is at maximum capacity and the amenities such as the school and local parking and existing road infrastructure could not cope.	6959/21058	
	Objection – potential negative impact on local services. Particularly concerned about the impact on country roads. Whilst accepting that some new housing will have to take up Green Belt land this allocation would represent an unacceptable incursion into a highly valued resource.	8406/24534	
	Objection – see survey 5. Local infrastructure i.e. shops roads, leisure / sports provision is not in sufficient supply to cater for increased housing numbers / population.	8596/27445	
	Objection- see survey 5. Fought against it in one part of the village, reasons against it same now. Should not be removed from the green belt. I feel this decision to build more housing in Dunnington will have a negative impact on the environment. It will affect the character of this village. This is agricultural land and should be used for this. This will have a negative impact on the school.	9281/17850	
	Objection- the building of so many houses would significantly affect the character of the village and the green belt should not be built on. The facilities in the village will not be able to sustain such a large influx of families arriving. The site is not sustainable in terms of public transport and the drainage in the area is not good.	9415/18333	
	Objection – the lane leading up to this site is too narrow for traffic. It will impact on the open character of the village. The land should be left as green belt. The village will be overdeveloped.	9451/18476	
Objection – it would be overdevelopment of the village and detrimental to wildlife as this is where the barn owls hunt and flies in the field, also newts, toads etc at the side. The village roads over the last 2 to 3 years have become congested due to parked cars on the streets as families seem to have 3 cars or more. Feel further development would be a strain on the road structures and would ruin the hedgerows	9626/19505		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and no building should be allowed on the green belt.		
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection - this agricultural land and as this is happening nation wide it can only worsen the ability of the UK to provide sufficient food to feed an ever increasing population. 100 more houses will mean at least 100 more cars and vehicles using this narrow country lane which will make the crossroad at the entrance to Eastfield Lane more dangerous than ever. It would put a terrible strain on the school, medical services, parking near the village shops and all the drainage services. The exit from the village to both the Stamford Bridge and Hull Road would be death traps. There would be an adverse effect on the environment and traffic pollution.	9635/20097	
	Objection – inappropriate development. Access would be via a narrow lane that is totally inadequate for an increase in traffic. The lane can be widened but this would make it even more dangerous than it is now. Dunnington Primary School has already been extended, proposals will only add more pressure on the school and the roads. Only basis bus service. Access to the bus stop from the site will involve a considerable walk which will result in yet more care use.	9910/24354	
	Objection – the school is already full, Eastfield lane is a very narrow street and not suitable for any more traffic. A huge increase in cars will make crossing the road more hazardous, the village does not have capacity for more housing. There are more brownfield sites in York which would be better served to be redeveloped.	10137/25906	Tenet Group Ltd.
	Support – support site’s release from greenbelt and designation as Safeguarded Land. Site is considered suitable for delivery of c.150 homes. Site is in sustainable location in close proximity to facilities available in Dunnington. Have undertaken a number of technical reports (for the adjacent site H31) and have not identified any technical matters that would preclude development of this site. Site is currently available and achievable for immediate residential development. Site does not serve purpose for including land within greenbelt – it does not currently perform a role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area and will not when developed and does not perform an important role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Measures could be put in place to mitigate against any impact upon local or national conservation designated areas where relevant. Believe there could be a shortfall in housing across the City Region as allocated housing sites could potentially be delivered at lower capacities than predicted. As such, additional sites may be required in sustainable locations that can help meet this shortfall. Site 811 would enable the delivery of additional significant social and economic benefits to Dunnington.	10272/18503	Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to using greenbelt land when there are brownfield sites all over the city. Village infrastructure is at its limit.	10416/22083	
	Objection - accessed off Eastfield Lane, lane is not currently wide enough for two way traffic at the site proposed for housing. The lane is used widely by pedestrians and its current use by road vehicles is unsafe. The road should be closed to traffic from the A166 entrance, as the Holtby Lane opposite has been, and is certainly not suitable in any way shape or form for the consideration of two way traffic or even access for up to 300 more homes. A recent application for a travellers site at this location was turned down due to the potential traffic demands on the lane, it cannot cope with the traffic associated with the two cars of each modern household, certainly not wide enough for the vehicles used and required by the emergency services to access (fire engines, ambulances etc). Productive agricultural land should be preserved by the local authority. Jobs provided by house building are short term and transient in nature. As greenbelt planning applications made by the Market Garden/Contract Landscapes business have been considered with the land as greenbelt and decisions made accordingly. A precedence has been set and the greenbelt land should continue to be protected as it currently provides a natural habitat for deer, owls, newts and other endangered species. Drainage for the hill to the north west of the proposed sites. Flooding and drainage problems for the houses on Holly Tree Croft. Some parts of Kerver Lane are also affected. Further hard standing of such a large proportion of the land will significantly increase the problems associated with flooding already experienced by the community.	10706/19843	
	Objection – land previously rejected. Construction traffic would be a danger. Additional houses would create a health and safety risk on the roads. Rising bollards is a possible solution. The school is near capacity. Sewerage and drainage are at capacity. Agricultural land would be destroyed.	10751/19945	
	Objection – this side of the village has had the most development. Can school handle extra children. Can the drainage handle the extra houses?	10780/21874	
	Objection - an increased amount of traffic will take if the houses are built. This is already a dangerous road with a very busy junction in the middle of Dunnington which will only get worse if more traffic is allowed to travel along it. Will end up with the village losing its character and village feel. Greenbelt should be for livestock and enjoyment of people rather than constantly being encroached upon by building developers. Brownfield sites and redevelopment is the way forward not by permanently destroying large areas of the countryside.	10851/21447	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – there is an assumption that access will be from Eastfield lane. The land is in productive agricultural use. Development will significantly impact on the open character of the village. It will impact on the narrow Eastfield Lane. Alteration of the lane will be detrimental on the established native hedgerows. Eastfield Lane and Church Bulk junction is already a hazardous junction. This is not sustainable in terms of public transport. The development will have a negative impact on the traffic, parking, school capacity and drainage in the village.</p>	10871/25873	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5</p>	10913/27448	
	<p>Objection – land should remain green belt. Drainage services are at capacity. Undeveloped land used by residents for recreation. Increase in use of road not suitable for heavy traffic would cause a health hazard. School and doctors surgery are at capacity. Brownfield sites available to develop in the city.</p>	10920/21561	
	<p>Objection - character of the area would be destroyed forever – enjoy the idea that can walk less than 5 minutes around the corner and be in the countryside. No justification for increasing an area by 1.5 times. If need for houses, build on brownfield sites there are plenty of those. No infrastructure to support development. No secondary school, oversubscribed primary school, appalling bus service and only one shop. The roads cannot take it. Who wants these houses - people who work in Leeds wanting to live there as it will be an easy commute which will clog up the roads even more. There are no extra jobs or any new industry in York. Picking to build in this area but not in areas where they are Labour councillors.</p>	10928/21572	
	<p>Objection – development would damage the character of the village. Site is not sustainable in terms of public transport. Village would be overdeveloped.</p>	10952/21606	
	<p>Objection – significant overdevelopment. Would alter the character of the village. Cannot justify the use of green belt</p>	11315/22871	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5. Has the Council considered the effect on existing facilities i.e. schools, traffic, sewage.</p>	11327/27450	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5</p>	11329/27452	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5</p>	11334/27454	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5</p>	11337/27456	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5</p>	11343/27458	
	<p>Objection – see survey 5. Views of the Wolds in attractive countryside. site is currently enjoyed for its wildlife. Development detrimental to local amenity value. Access issues. The land is used agriculturally already. Land used for hunting and roosting by owls</p>	11348/22886	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
811 Land at Intake Lane, East of Dunnington (continued)	Objection – see survey 5	11350/27461	
	Objection – see survey 5	11358/27464	
	Objection – see survey 5	11359/27466	
	Objection – see survey 5	11361/27468	
	Objection – see survey 5	11364/27470	
	Objection – see survey 5	11368/27472	
	Objection – see survey 5	11372/27474	
	Objection – no increase in the demand for housing and no increase in employment opportunities. Hazardous junctions to be negotiated for access and egress. No immediate access to public transport. Hazardous for walkers and cyclist. Drainage under great strain.	11376/22905	
	Objection – concerns about the green belt land with wide field edges. Poor access to the site. Sewerage and waste water problems. Excess of traffic and parking problems. Lack of school places.	11377/22906	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>813 (SF3) Whinthorpe</b>	Comment – various development sites proposed are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. The Council is currently working with the Highways Agency and the City of York Council to assess the cumulative impact of both Authorities' Local Plan development aspirations on the interchange. It is therefore important that the modified/additional sites, in particular, are likely to have an impact on the interchange: Site 97, ST7, ST15, SF3, 811, 802, 815, 22, 747, 794. These sites in particular, should therefore, be carefully factored into the transport assessment for the A64 interchange.	10/18963	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – loss of agricultural land 141ha	45/1870	York Environment Forum
	Objection – opposed on the basis of the loss of the site's valuable agricultural land, loss of land of Green Belt land and impact on the historic setting of York and impact on the setting of the SSSI. Also the need to work with statutory consultees to resolve the issues of traffic, flooding and impact on the SSSI. With regards to traffic implications, Common Lane should not be used as a route through to York. The disruption, noise and pollution from cars, trucks and buses passing through Main Street from Whinthorpe and A64 is considered to be unacceptable. The proposals for fallible ANPR technology and proposals to allow Buses along Common Lane and the Main Street, made by the Halifax Estate are not acceptable. The alternative to direct traffic to Hull Road and Fulford Main Street is also not acceptable, as both roads currently run at capacity and additional development will add significantly and unacceptably to levels of air pollution. Residents of Heslington do not want to suffer considerable damage to the quality of the peaceful, semi-rural environment. There is also a need to address the possibility for Whinthorpe becoming a commuter town for Leeds.	46/18095	Heslington Village Trust
	Objection – the total potential of 7900 dwellings plus schools, shops and business premises will be a devastating incursion into York's green belt and the setting of York. This is unacceptable.	48/18600	Heslington Parish Council
	Objection – this allocation would certainly make Long Lane into a suburban road and spoil a well used cycle route from York to Elvington that avoids the dangerous Elvington Lane	91/19630	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Objection -in the 1994 Report on the Green Belt Local Plan Inquiry the Inspector did not consider that the elements which contributed solely to land lying within the Ring Road and that the special character of York could be harmed by development which goes beyond it. The Inspector reaffirmed his opinion that development of sites in the open countryside beyond the Ring Road would harm the rural setting of the historic	238/18169	English Heritage

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>city Site SF3 lies to the south of the area considered by the Inspector in his 1994 Report. Consequently, many of his conclusions apply to the allocation. Site SF3 lies in open countryside to the south of the Ring Road. This forms part of the rural setting of the historic City. By extending development up to the southern Ring Road, in combination with Site ST15, it will fundamentally change the relationship which the southern edge of York has with the countryside to the south (development will still only be 0.7km from building's at the new University Campus. It will also alter people's perceptions when travelling along the A64 of the City's setting within an area of open countryside (an element identified by the Inspector in his Report as contributing to the special character of York). Notwithstanding the above, even if an incursion of this size into the countryside was acceptable in principle, the relationship of this area to the City does not reflect the way in which settlements have traditionally developed around York. English Heritage remain of the opinion that safeguarding and development of this area would be likely to harm the special character and setting of the City and, therefore, would conflict with the saved policies of the RSS and national planning policy.</p>		
<p><b>813 (SF3) Whinthorpe (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - notes that Elvington Airfield has been discounted as an allocation, after the Technical Officer Assessment identified the major ecological impact of any such development. Elvington Airfield lies to the south and east of the proposed Whinthorpe Site. At its closest point, the boundary of the site ST15 is no more than 50m from the airfield boundary, whilst the newly designated area of 'safeguarded land' abuts the airfield with a common boundary of approximately 300m. Given the importance of Elvington Airfield for wildlife (as assessed by CYC Technical Officers), believe that a substantial buffer zone is required, not only to protect the Tillmire as previously stated but also to protect the wildlife of Elvington Airfield. This would have major implications for the proposed Whinthorpe development (ST15) and also for the proposed SF3 'safeguarded land' adjacent to this site. The designation of land at the southern end of SF3 is entirely unacceptable.</p>	<p>401/18103</p>	<p>York Ornithological Club</p>
	<p>Objection – opposed to all sites outside the proposed inner boundary of the Green Belt including those which are outside the existing development limits of inset villages (as opposed to proposed development limits for such villages), or are extensions beyond the outer ring road, where the site does not bridge between the existing urban core and an inset village, or is located within a green corridor as identified by the Green Corridors Tech Paper (2011). Location of developments sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with</p>	<p>544/20490</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban core i.e. Heworth or Acomb. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.		
<b>813 (SF3) Whinthorpe (continued)</b>	Objection – this is totally excessive and greenbelt should be protected. This development would harm the openness of the greenbelt and cause a visual intrusion. A second exit off the site would be necessary. There is no proven need for this level of housing in this area.	657/23783	
	Support –agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20530	
	Objection – this site is in Green Belt land and would be totally inappropriate as it would be in conflict with green belt policy of maintaining an open aspect to the countryside. The land is good quality agricultural land which should not be developed and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify the change in status. As there is no infrastructure whatsoever then for this reason alone it is unsustainable.	1109/21682	
	Comment – due to the size or location of this safeguarded land it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and would be of interest to the Agency. The Agency has not made any assessment of the potential impact of this, together with other sites, at this stage. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from CYC before proceeding with the mesoscopic modelling exercise to assess the cumulative impact of local plan development on the SRN.	1264/18591	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	Objection – site considered much too excessive. Housing allocation at Whinthorpe already being proposed for 5000 new homes and this safeguarded allocation is	1355/18623	Julian Sturdy MP

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	capable of achieving an addition 4200 homes. If all of these were to be developed Whinthorpe would dominate what is currently a very rural landscape. It would also encroach onto Elvington Parish, which is already facing large scale expansion as a result of the Further Sites proposals.		
<b>813 (SF3) Whinthorpe (continued)</b>	Objection – concerned that proposed Strategic Greenspace at ST15 does not represent an appropriate buffer that will fulfil its various functions, so we ask that the boundary is revised. In particular, the width of the Strategic Greenspace needs to be increased along the boundary with the A64 in order to establish an appropriate depth of separation between the proposed new settlement and the ring road. Especially as there may be further pressures from the University in the future to expand, so it is necessary to ensure ST15 and SF3 are distinctly separate from the urban edge of York and the expansion of the university is not prejudiced. ST15 and SF3 should also be pushed further away from York in order to ensure development appears as a separate village. If the gap between the proposed development area and the urban edge of York is compared with the distance between the urban edge of York and other standalone settlements around York then the gap is much wider elsewhere. We do not see that there is a special case for a narrower gap for site ST15, especially given some of the comments about landscape quality.	1592/18826	York Civic Trust
	Objection – the scale of the initial Whinthorpe proposal is already over-aspirational and would in itself lead to a major infrastructure problems. The site lies within the greenbelt. Future housing needs for York should be primarily be met through provision within the urban area with similar proportionate expansion in the outlying villages. It is irresponsible of the council to even propose this for the City of York. The proposed safeguarded section of land is not required with the 15 year plan period.	1666/20444	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to robust town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17918	
	Objection – this site simply magnifies the proposed incursion into green belt and spoliation of the setting of York and Heslington. The site is not required and the proposal is unsustainable.	4222/21722	
	Objection – this land is designated green belt, to protect the countryside from urban growth and maintain areas of agriculture and outdoor leisure. There is wildlife which needs protecting.	5146/22369	
	Objection – this land was designated as green belt to protect from future development, and prevent the character, beauty of the countryside being taken over	5147/22378	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	by urban sprawl. Safeguarded land is a misleading term. Brownfield should be used first. Impact on unique city surrounded by historical countryside – plans would change this. Land surrounding Elvington is an area of outstanding natural beauty and of historical and wildlife significance, it is important that this is preserved. There is no mention of plans to improve the transport network – many local roads cannot cope at peak times. New residents will commute to Leeds as employment opportunities low in York.		
<b>813 (SF3) Whinthorpe (continued)</b>	Objection – landscape and livelihood of the local farming community will be destroyed. Impact on wildlife, flora and fauna will be devastating. Will be another dormitory for commuter to west Yorkshire rather than for those employed in York. Will not be social housing but expensive for those who can afford mortgages. The local community of Heslington will suffer from increased noise and pollution from increase traffic and the possibility of buses running through the village and loss of amenity as common road will no longer be a pleasant walk or cycle ride.	5151/22381	
	Objection – the whole area proposed for the Whinthorpe development is in the Green Belt and environmentally sensitive. Allocating this site for development at all is in direct contradiction to the government policy of allocating brown-field sites first, before even considering land in the Green Belt. The whole scale of this proposal is ill-conceived and unwarranted. It all falls within the Green corridor known as Elvington Tilmire, containing a mosaic of habitats including wet and acid to natural grassland, relict heath, ancient hedgerows and woodland as well as extensive arable land. It is of particular importance for the extensive grassland belt of Elvington Airfield, part of the former Lanwith Stray which links Heslington Tilmire to the Derwent Valley., This area provides habitat for many bird and invertebrate species. It should be kept for its primary functions – agriculture, forestry and wildlife. There is no proven need for a development of this size, and Local Plan proposals must be based on need, not on aspirational growth ambitions by the Council nor on the desire of local landowners to maximise their assets by selling land for residential development instead of farming it. The ARUP report commissioned by the Council stated that 850 houses were needed per year over the 15 year lifespan of the current plan. By proposing 22,000 houses, the Council is almost doubling the number of houses recommended in its own ARUP report. This whole proposal for Whinthorpe should be abandoned.	5259/20063	
	Objection – detrimental effect on Heslington village and the surrounding wildlife. Enormous strain would be put on infrastructure. Develop Brownfield land first. Expansion will destroy the quiet country lane. The area will become more urban than	5838/20930	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	rural. Risk of further traffic through the village, increasing noise and pollution.		
<b>813 (SF3) Whinthorpe (continued)</b>	Objection – too big for York. Will ruin the small intimate feeling of the city. Will ruin the character of the city. It is a green field site which should not be used along with all green field sites until all brownfield sites have been used. Will create huge amounts of traffic on already busy roads. Promise of no private traffic through Heslington just means a quiet tranquil village will become a very busy bus and taxi run.	6168/24060	
	Objection – wildlife must be taken into account. Agricultural land is a top priority. Traffic worse than originally stated.	6454/20138	
	Objection – the safeguarded land should be removed from the plan.	7523/24086	
	Objection – the revised safeguarded land has moved closer to Dunnington Grange Farm, increasing the likely impact on this property and increasing chances that a secondary vehicular access will be required at this location. The local authority should confirm whether a secondary vehicular access is required via Elvington Lane.	9115/24211	
	Objection – flora and fauna are abundant, huge increase of the proposed development of this land would eradicate this permanently, together with the massive increase from the volume of traffic and related pollution, severely impacting on the adjacent Green Belt environmentally. Adjacent land would be impacted with a higher flood risk. Flood Risk for the surrounding area is a real concern.	9390/24102	
	Objection - this will turn this area into a commuter suburb and lose the character of surrounding villages. Increased traffic congestion at this huge development site, it is disproportionate to the capacity of the road infrastructure. It's unclear where roads would exit onto and access the A64 effectively. Destruction of green belt – very little green belt area left.	9528/22434	
	Support – would prefer to see purpose built development at a 'new village' where investment in facilities and infrastructure could be optimised. This site with ST15 looks sensible and should be maximised with appropriate facilities provided.	9575/21830	
	Support – agree with allocation. The site is deliverable and viable. One of few geographic locations around York where new town could be built avoiding York's Ings, Strays and Green Wedges. Landscaped buffer between Whinthorpe and A64 will ensure visual separation (whilst dealing with noise and air quality impacts of A64). Representation supported by Illustrative Masterplan, Ecology Assessment, Heritage Impact Assessment, Contextual Landscape Appraisal, Air Quality/Noise evidence, Highways and Access evidence, Flood Risk and Drainage evidence, Energy/Utilities evidence. Representations to be read alongside representations made by Turley	9895/19333	Savills on behalf of Halifax Estates

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Associates on behalf of Halifax Estates at the Preferred Options stage. Proposes additional revision to boundaries of ST15 to enable site to be sited on land within a single ownership (Halifax Estates) and thereby significantly enhancing deliverability. Combined ST15/SF3 area is same size as that currently proposed. The revised SF3 would be in third party ownership and has not been technically assessed to establish its ability to accommodate development. These representations demonstrate that Whinthorpe can be developed as a sustainable town pattern without the land within SF3 ever coming forward for development. They also demonstrate that any future development on the safeguarded land could be readily accommodated without any significant change to the existing town pattern of Whinthorpe. Detailed comments provided, see response</p>		
<p><b>813 (SF3) Whinthorpe (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – earmarks further green belt land. Object to the scale of the proposal. Where is the evidence for housing need. Government guidance indicates brownfield first. Will have an effect on environmental assets. Impinges on the designated corridor number 5 Elvington Tilmire. Also abuts Elvington airfield. Where there are two sites of importance to local conservation interest which should be retained as buffer zones.</p>	<p>10047/21127</p>	
	<p>Objection – large amount of land removed from the green belt. Development would detrimentally affect York’s historic character. Special nature reserves would be threatened.</p>	<p>10453/22560</p>	
	<p>Objection - there is a wealth of wildlife across the proposed development site which would be completely displaced. This large scale development with thousands of houses planned is of great concern with regard to the increased flood risk. The water table is high resulting in drainage difficulties. If building on the proposed safeguarded land were to be approved , there would surely be a severe increase of flood risk to the greenbelt and surrounding properties over a wide area given the large number of homes planned</p>	<p>10657/19592</p>	
	<p>Objection – barn and tawny owls, deer, hares, moorhens, woodpeckers etc are all resident in this habitat development of this land, which would include destruction of important trees, hedgerows and vegetation crucial their survival here will result in the biodiversity of this area being destroyed and ultimately result in the displacement of these species. The biodiversity of this area would also be compromised by the massive increase in pollution caused by the huge number of cars generated by this proposed development and extension of the plan to the Greenbelt boundary could alter the delicate balance for nature survival within the Greenbelt. The locality would</p>	<p>10666/19757</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be at risk from an increase in flooding if this development is permitted. Removal of trees, vegetation& hedgerows, along with current drainage dykes would increase the risk of potential flooding to the surrounding land and residences.		
<b>813 (SF3) Whinthorpe (continued)</b>	Objection- support view of Heslington Village Trust. Don't want to lose any more green belt land and have more traffic in the village.	10843/21406	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4)</b>	Objection – loss of 141ha of agricultural land. Should be deleted as Haxby has reached the limit of sustainable development.	45/18781	York Environment Forum
	Objection – opposed to this and other allocated sites in Haxby. Understood that rationale behind increase in employment would be supplied through immigration and organic job growth, however Haxby Town Council do not believe that either of these drivers have the capability to provide jobs of either the volume or quality needed to allow local people to afford homes of the level that are likely to be built should the plan go forward. Believe the York Plan is fundamentally flawed as it places the main areas of development in localities that do not have the infrastructure to cope with expansion of this scale nor do they offer the transport links to areas where there are likely to be jobs to support the purchase of these homes. Concern regarding cumulative effects of development of this and other sites in Haxby on traffic and road safety. Inadequate public transport means car remains an attractive alternative. Site SF4 would result in traffic increase of 1,440 cars. Drainage concerns including Westfield Beck being at capacity with a history of residential flooding. Highlights archaeological evidence of Neolithic and Romano-British activity beneath sites ST9 and SF4. Concern regarding impact on amenities and that any new facilities will be aimed at meeting needs of new residents as opposed to current deficits. Concern regarding impact on secondary school provision and level of parking in the village. Need for housing to be accessible to employment. Development should either be in the city centre or close to roads which allow traffic to flow freely and can cope with additional demands. Housing should be built to west of York. Until northern ring road is sorted out, building more houses to the north of York will only lead to greater problems with traffic congestion.	63/18722	Haxby Town Council
	Objection –the proposed 4,800 homes for North of Haxby (ST9 and SF4) and north of Clifton Moor (ST14) will increase traffic problems beyond the current road network capacity. Potentially there will be up to an additional 20,000 traffic movements per day in an area already suffering from poor road infrastructure. Developers should be required to improve all existing roads to cope with the demands. Access to the Clifton Moor and Haxby North developments appear to be from existing highways. These currently cannot cope with the existing levels of traffic let alone a massive increase as is undoubtedly going to occur.	80/18705	Wigginton Parish Council
	Objection – the land between Towthorpe Road and railway should remain in the green belt, unless a wide green corridor is provided from Haxby and Haxby Lock to Towthorpe bridge via The Nesses with public right of way for The Foss Walk, The Ebor Way and The Centenary Way, as well as local walking use. The Crookland Lane area	91/19631	Ramblers Association (York Group)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	has a footpath that needs protecting by provision of a green corridor, rather than just a footway alongside a road		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – there is not the infrastructure in place to support this development.</p> <p>Objection – opposed to all sites which are outside the proposed inner boundary of the Green Belt including those which are outside the existing development limits of inset villages (as opposed to proposed development limits for such villages), or are extensions beyond the outer ring road, where the site does not bridge between the existing urban core and an inset village, or is located within a green corridor as identified by the Green Corridors Tech Paper (2011). Location of developments sites as identified above do not facilitate the establishment of green belt boundaries that comply with national policy, as set out at paragraph 84 of the NPPF of the higher order development plan policy in RSS. No evidence exists in the Urban Capacity Study that quantifies what capacity exists for development within the inner boundary. In the absence of this essential evidence sites outside the inner boundary are not justified by the evidence. The historic growth pattern is the progressive coalescence of out-lying settlements with the urban core ie Heworth or Acomb. The proposed allocations do not respect that important aspect of the historic character. Urban capacity within the inner boundary should also seek to identify the sequential appropriateness of the areas thereby identified as a basis for the determination of all allocations whether for development sites, open space allocations or safeguarded land. The approach is fundamentally flawed as to the application of green belt policy in the NPPF and the application of higher order development plan policy, other allocations than those identified are likely to be inappropriate. The technical support work also suffers from the same deficiency and therefore cannot be regarded as forming a reliable, credible or robust evidence base for the plan proposals.</p>	502/20668 544/20491	
	Objection – opposed to the future development of land identified as ST9 (and SF4) to the north of Haxby. Council has not acknowledged initial concerns and is now increasing the size of the land removed from the Green Belt for development. This amount of development will lead to a 45% increase in the population of Haxby. How will the infrastructure of Haxby and Wigginton Cope with this near doubling of the community. The roads struggle to cope already and there are serious issues with parking and drainage, particularly along Usher Lane. The Green Belt land protects against flooding for the immediate community and is one of the reasons for refusal of previous applications. The increased amount of cars would lead to already congested roads being at a stand still, increasing air pollution, noise and causing major disruption	549/18191	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to access into the village. The noise would be unbearable and this would be worse during the construction phase. Access to the Ring Road would be even more difficult than now. There is no mention of how the educational, health and social needs of the increased population will be met. Having had one primary school demolished there is already a shortage of school places. No green space is mentioned and there is a need for an extension to the Haxby and Wiggington Cemetery. The character and history of Haxby is of a village community, not as part of a city's urban sprawl.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to proposed development at ST9 and SF4. Haxby and Wigginton is already suffering greatly from over-development. The roads are regularly grid locked during rush hours, with vehicles seeking access to the Ring Roads. To consider building on a Green Field site is ill-conceived. The road, sewerage and general amenities infrastructure cannot cope. This Plan is completely unsustainable and unsuitable. Would suggest that Brownfield areas around York are exhausted first before any development on Green Belt land takes place.	551/18194	
	Objection – land is agricultural. Once houses have been built on this land can never be returned to agricultural. Haxby is already at breaking point with regard to Doctors, school facilities, surface water and foul sewerage, not to mention the terrible state of the roads. The matter has not been given enough thought.	656/20498	
	Objection – the plans seem to be ill considered in terms of their effect on the character of the town, the implications for its existing community, educational, and retail facilities, nor does it consider the lack of capacity within the existing urban infrastructure to cope with such a vast increase in population. The Existing land use of the development area is non-intensive agriculture that is rich in biodiversity. It is not clear that the threats to protected species that may inhabit these areas, such as bats, great crested newts and rare plant species has been adequately considered. Detailed comments provided, see response.	715/19091	
	Objection – before any more properties are built the roads need improving to allow traffic to flow around York. The schools in Haxby can't cope with the current population. Waiting for a doctors/dentist/hospital appointment can often be a while and they cannot cope with any more. All the drain systems need reviewing to ensure they can cope with more properties. If more people come into York to live where are they all going to work. Is there room to expand the emergency services in York to cope. York is a big tourist city, if this is to continue people have to be able to move around or they will not return and advise others not to come too. The decision to build more houses can't be taken lightly and all of the above and other people's comments	821/20210	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	need to be dealt or addressed first before the work starts.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20531	
	Comment - land North of Haxby is crossed by National Grid’s high transmission overhead power lines, specifically YR 400kV route. These overhead lines must remain in-situ and National Grid prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath its overhead lines. The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground and built structures must not be infringed. National Grid only supports proposals for the relocation of existing high-voltage overhead lines where such proposals directly facilitate a major development or infrastructure project of national importance.	1343/18111	AMEC
	Objection – while boundaries of the safeguarded land have been amended, the overall footprint remains very similar. Great concern within communities of Haxby and Wigginton over strain that the proposals for 813 new homes will have on the infrastructure in the community, in addition to the further homes on safeguarded land in the future. Community does not consider it to be organic growth of the existing settlement, but a major and unsustainable expansion of the existing urban area.	1355/18624	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection - concerns surrounding the expansion of Haxby, road and drainage infrastructure and schools and green infrastructure provision. In relation to road infrastructure, current rush hour traffic in Haxby brings York Road and Wigginton Road to a standstill. Development of ST9 could result in an increased congestion within the village, with an additional 700 dwellings and associated cars using the road infrastructure. This will be exacerbated if SF4 and H37 are developed. Concerns also surround where new cars will park when using Haxby’s shops; there is currently not enough parking within Haxby and this is exaggerated by use of the village as a Park and Ride. In relation to drainage, there are currently problems with the existing drainage network surrounding Usher Park (adjacent to SF4). Development has been rejected in the past due to drainage, and there are concerns that the existing network is already at breaking point. With regard to schools, considers that local provision is already at capacity and this needs to be recognised. In addition, the area is considered to have a significant deficit of recreation space, but there is a notable need to provide land for a cemetery, for allotments and for a buffer zone of playing fields. The rail halt will need careful planning to reduce the impact of traffic coming from all directions.	1392/18116	
	Objection – concerned with cumulative impact of this and sites ST11, ST9 and 810. These four sites represent a very intensive scale of development over an extended period of time to the north east of York. Even though some of the land is safeguarded for development, so it should not be developed before 2030, believe that the	1592/18822	Directions Planning Consultancy

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	cumulative impacts of developing these sites should be thoroughly assessed and planned for within this Plan period. This would be with a view to considering how development can be integrated so that it does not give rise to undesirable consequences, especially in relation to traffic generation and planning for necessary services and facilities. Development of these sites should help to protect the character and setting of the historic City by providing a focus for development away from the urban core and areas where the views require protection. Concerned that the scale of development and safeguarding of land is such that it could still have consequential impact on the character of the historic city. Increases in traffic movements could change the character of the main routes into town which could be harmful if not properly managed. This is a point we raised in relation to Policy T1 in our response to the Preferred Options consultation. New settlements are likely to have a greater visual impact on the landscape.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – the scale of the development is unsustainable and will overload the local services. Not only will this destroy the quality of life in the area but will also have financial impact on present residents. The main road into York from Haxby was not designed for the current volume of traffic and is not suitable for the increased volume that this development will create.	1764/20675	
	Objection- opposed to the revised proposals for development of land to the North of Haxby. Both SF4 and ST9 are designated Green Belt and therefore it is unacceptable to forfeit Green Belt to the detriment of wildlife and the surrounding population, especially as there are still Brownfield sites in York. The development will massively increase the local population and totally change the nature of Haxby and Wigginton to an area of Urban Sprawl. Development will swamp local resources, such as drainage, schooling, parking, shopping, doctor and dental resources. The local parts of the York Ring Road are brought to a standstill every day at rush hour – development will cause really long traffic jams every day. The Haxby and Wigginton area is currently a strong communal area which still retains a good ‘village’ way of life.	2334/18217	
	Objection – there needs to more information as to how this massive increase will affect the local infrastructure.	2342/20463	
	Objection – Haxby Town Council are strongly opposed to development on Green Belt land. There is enough traffic already, and there infrastructure, drainage, parking and amenities is not in place for development. Please leave the Green Belt alone.	2359/18220	
	Objection - no infrastructure. Problem of sewerage, surface water or waste disposal. Lack of amenities. Encroach on the small green belt.	2404/22249	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection- the council have not addressed any problems with infrastructure which development would cause. It is developer driven and roads and drainage are not being considered properly. Haxby has existing congestion problems. The possible dualling of the ring road would not remedy the traffic problems it would make it worse. The green belt is being developed due to the fact the number of houses being built has increased. The greenbelt should be protected from this kind of huge expansion as it affects everyone and also the wildlife of the area. Detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	2421/18083	
	<p>Objection- the roads and infrastructure cannot support such development. There is not enough car parking around the local shops which limits what people can carry home on foot. The buses are overcrowded and often full before it gets out of Haxby.</p>	2523/23810	
	<p>Objection – concern over the building of a significant number of dwellings at site 814, alongside site 757 and ST9. Question whether the sewers were updated sufficiently to cope with this number of dwellings. Surface drainage has proved to be an issue in recent years. The local schools are full and the local health centre is at capacity. Major issue regards traffic. What about the congested ring road, recent work suggests there are no plans to turn it into a dual carriageway. Traffic issues will be compounded if site ST14 at Clifton Moor is built.</p>	2538/18228	
	<p>Objection – why was ST9/SF4 chosen in an area with no employment and only two small back roads out. When the cars finally get to Haxby how will they then move on. Haxby is fundamentally a village with very few facilities. Drainage (clean water and sewage) is at present a problem in Haxby. Blocked sewage drains up to 6 times a year. There are no jobs in York.</p>	2549/18231	
	<p>Objection- extra families would increase congestion in the village alongside extra traffic from the development of ST14. There is concern with air pollution when children are going to school. There is limited capacity for school places at existing schools in the area. There is limited parking and access to shops alongside limited places at local health services. There is concern over playing space/leisure services and police services. Sewerage and drainage is an existing issue as some houses flood. Questions over plan to preserve wildlife.</p>	2586/18235	
	<p>Objection – opposed to new housing in Haxby. Please exhaust all the Brownfield sites of Haxby first. Increase in traffic in Haxby over the last 10 years and because Haxby is situated between Monks Cross and Clifton Moor Ring Road, the traffic is almost grid locked. Building new housing will make this worse. For every house built, there is likely to be 1 to 2 cars per household.</p>	2619/18237	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection - the area is a bog and a confirmed flood plain which would need extensive drainage capability above the existing household drainage to overwhelming the current system. Concerns over congestion as vehicular access to the area is by two narrow country lanes and two estate drives, 1500 extra cars trying to get from north- south Haxby is ludicrous and the A1237 is already a nightmare. Existing Schools for both primary and secondary couldn't cope with the influx, the same goes for the Medical Centre. Open areas which are already lacking in Haxby need to be considered. Before development goes ahead, the whole of Haxby will insist that schools are built, the rail station is in operation and a new medical centre is built, all after new roads and larger capacity drainage are installed and open areas secured.	2643/18242	
	Objection - sewerage would be a massive problem as the drains cannot cope currently. Gardens which back onto the proposed sites often flood in winter. Parking in Haxby is up to its limit now and the local schools and doctors cannot take any further residents. There is concern regarding congestion as getting of Haxby at peak times is a bottleneck to the ring road. Question raised over where these extra people are going to be employed. There are better areas in York that could be built on like Poppleton.	2672/18244	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to proper town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17919	
	Objection – schools do not have the capacity for extra pupils. York Road cannot take increased traffic. Sewage and drains are a major concern. Traffic already backs up from the ring road to the level crossing causing problems on the A1237. Village amenities are currently at full capacity.	2684/20678	
	Objection – schools are at capacity. Roads are full to capacity. Sewerage and drainage are issues. Traffic backs up to ring road. Village amenities are at capacity.	2685/20593	
	Objection- Haxby is unable to cope with the volume of traffic and parking is very difficult. Green Belt land should remain as Green Belt. New houses should only be built on Brownfield land. An increase in the population will put more strain on roads, parking, medical centres, schools, policing and emergency services. Another major concern is drainage.	2729/23823	
	Objection- concern regarding the impact on local services and infrastructure (schools, health care, roads, parking and drainage).	2756/18246	
	Objection- concern regarding the impact of development on infrastructure on health services, schools, drainage, road congestion etc.	2759/18250	
	Objection – see survey 14. Totally opposed. Haxby has massively increased in size in the 1970's - very little green space, no park and a few tatty swings, nowhere to walk.	2763/20480	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	One primary school has already been demolished and the other two are full. The health centre is severely understaffed. The infrastructure is at full capacity, when the crossing gates are closed the traffic backs up across the ring road.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – the drainage in Haxby and Wigginton struggles to cope now. There is a problem with parking now in the village with no area available which could be used to relieve the overflow. The health centre would not be able to cope with the extra patients. The local schools would not be able to cope with the increased demand for places. There would be a large increase in the volume of traffic which would be problematic at busy times.	2775/18253	
	Objection – no provisions for extra traffic. Roads will be congested. No provision for additional school places. No provision for healthcare services. Wildlife will be destroyed.	2797/20619	
	Objection – scale of potential housing. Infrastructure will struggle to cope – traffic, parking facilities, schools, medical services, drainage and public transport.	2799/23707	
	Objection – in addition to damage caused to the Green Field areas, there would be a considerable increase in the population of Haxby and Wigginton. This will no doubt increase the number of vehicles moving around our area. Road accesses to the proposed areas are currently adequate for the number of local vehicles. It would be a particular problem with regard to heavy vehicles initially required in the construction of the new housing. The roads leading through the Haxby/Wigginton areas and to the outer ring road and into York are already heavily congested at times. Congestion is exacerbated by railway crossing gates and having to cross and enter the outer ring road. The drainage and sewage systems are working at their maximum at the moment and would be over loaded without considerable expenditure on improvements. Local Medical services would be even more stretched than they are now. A new school (s) would be needed. The shopping and other facilities in Haxby and Wigginton would also have to be upgraded. Where are the people coming from to fill these proposed houses and where would their place of work be.	2828/20060	
	Objection- the proposed developments are far to large and will destroy the atmosphere of haxby. Haxby already has poor drainage and the infrastructure of the village (shops, roads and amenities) will not be able to cope. Green Belt land should not be built on until all Brownfield sites have been utilised.	2937/23837	
	Objection- development would have adverse impacts on the environment, roads, drainage and sewage systems and local services. This development is too large for the current infrastructure. There is insufficient road access and there will be noise, damage	2940/23840	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and dirt impacts to residents during construction. The site is greenbelt and should stay that way. The plan should examine more closely the potential for using more Brownfield sites.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection –the place just simply isn't big enough to accommodate any further major housing projects.	3086/21966	
	Objection – the infrastructure is struggling to cope at the moment and until changes to this are made no further development should be considered.	3114/18267	
	Objection – until infrastructure is in place, this development should not commence.	3115/18269	
	Objection - the community will change. Very busy roads, schools and surgery. Increase in demands on the local infrastructure.	3130/22277	
	Objection- certain sections of the York outer ring road experiences terrible traffic congestion at various times of the day. None of the issues have really been addressed with the city as drivers try to avoid the problem. The roads around and in the city are not in a very good state of repair and if development goes ahead would a worse service and quality of repair be experienced on the roads. Nobody has mentioned the Brownfield sites which are inside the outer ring road boundary. No mention has been given about hospitals and cemeteries. With all the proposed dwellings to be developed on 'Green Belt' land, there is a potential for 7612 extra vehicles if there is only one per household. In real terms this may be over 15,000 extra vehicles trying to traverse a road system that cannot cope with the volume of traffic using it currently. Question regarding the need for such huge developments in and around York when there is limited job opportunities.	3210/23866	
	Objection – would be unacceptable for any development to start before necessary work had been undertaken to ensure that the extra volumes of sewerage could be handled. Evidence evades the general issue of the impact on the area of the A1237 and on local transport infrastructure that is already under severe pressure. Would also bring greater use of the shops in the village centres and cause further road congestion in the village centres and car parking issues. A sustainable integrated transport plan needs to be in place before planning permission is given for development. Scale of development is far too large for the likely level of new employment. Many of the services, facilities and infrastructures that would be required are not under the control of the Council.	3256/23881	
Objection – too many houses planned. Changes in the village's character and great strain on the infrastructure already under pressure. Increase of traffic. Major health and safety problem. Air quality and road safety will be exacerbated by the massive increase in traffic. Health centre and schools at capacity. Insufficient green space in	3257/22298		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the village. Inadequate sewage system and problems with surface water.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection- the number of houses proposed will be detrimental to Haxby. There are not the facilities to accommodate such vast amount housing. Schools are already working at full capacity. Recently one of the school in the area was closed down. The health centre is struggling already and drains currently overload the system. Development will mean Haxby becomes part of the urban sprawl of York. The Green Belt must not be encroached upon. People do not want to live in a concrete jungle. The road system is another great concern. The ring road is totally inadequate to cope with the volume of traffic currently. Brownfield sites should be used first. The universities should have been encouraged to provide their own resources before expanding their own buildings.	3319/23890	
	Objection - ring road should be made into a dual carriageway before building is considered. Traffic congestion. Full primary schools. Problems with drains. Full doctors' surgery. Not enough employment for new people.	3344/20725	
	Objection – cannot understand the rationale of increasing the population by 40% without taking into account the impact this will have if no additional infrastructure is to be put in place. Should this result in people being unable to access GP surgeries, schools, parking and the increased volume in traffic resulting in increased delays will we be in a position to obtain a refund in Council Tax? Has any form of study been carried out into the planned lack of infrastructure?	3346/21973	
	Objection- opposed any developments in the Haxby and Wigginton area. The roads, the surgery, the schools are already overstretched in addition to the constant drainage problems.	3370/23893	
	Objection- too many houses are planned to be built. Concern regarding the volume of traffic and the facilities that will be needed for so many more people. Concern whether a new doctors surgery, schools, work places or more shops are planned.	3407/23899	
	Objection - the entire infrastructure is already affected by the number of properties within the area. Roads, Drainage and Parking, support services and amenities are already beyond capacity. The surgery practice also expresses concern with any increase in patient numbers.	3520/18277	
	Objection- there should be no further large scale development in Haxby and Wigginton until the railway station is re-opened, the drainage problems are dealt with and the A1237 has been dualled.	3588/23914	
	Objection- development will have adverse impacts on the environment, roads, drainage and sewage systems. Development will impact upon local services e.g. schools. Health centre, local shops and parking. These developments are too large for	3606/23925	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the infrastructure to cope with. There is insufficient road access to these proposed developments. The site is in the Green Belt. The plan should use brownfield sites.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 14. The situation has got worse. Haxby cannot accommodate such an enormous population increase. Roads, drainage, parking, village amenities generally cannot cope. Life in Usher Lane during construction would be a nightmare.	3619/27064	
	Objection – strongly object to the proposed siting of residences in areas ST9, SF4 and H37. The very large increase in housing in the areas, probably as much as 1700 dwellings, will impact massively on the infrastructure of Haxby and Wigginton i.e. roads, drainage, parking, and amenities. There will be insufficient places in the schools for a large increase in numbers of children and increased pressure on the Health Centre. Will the Centre be able to take more patients. Haxby and Wigginton have a high water table, so further building will exacerbate flooding. Also, building should not be allowed on Green Belt land, please consider brown field sites e.g. the site of the old Vickers/Bio-Rad plant on Haxby Road. Why do we need so many more houses. Are employment opportunities in York and surrounding area really that good.	3632/22028	
	Objection- drainage is already a problem and the main road is congested at times. There is a lack of amenities for more people e.g. parking, shops and community facilities.	3651/23935	
	Objection – strongly protest against the Local Plan for Haxby (ST9 and SF4). The existing houses on Oaken Grove already suffer from flooded gardens following heavy rainfall. Where would the exit roads be from the new estate? Oaken Grove is already a ‘rat run’ as drivers avoid Haxby main street. I realise that Haxby is classed as a town based on population numbers but the facilities are more suited to the village it was. There are no public parking areas at all. The surrounding ring road is already heavily congested with traffic often at a stand still. If the Haxby plan goes ahead how are these roads expected to cope with the extra traffic. Oaken Grove school was closed for the land to be used for housing. The existing schools are oversubscribed. The dental practices and health centre are also under pressure to deal with existing patients and unable to cope with an extended community.	3683/22031	
	Objection – road network cannot cope. Doctors are full to capacity. Parking is full to capacity. The water table is quite high, where is the extra water going to go. Where do the Council think people are going to work. Green belt land will be lost forever, increased population and a third of food being imported means we should guard against giving up precious greenbelt. Must identify brownfield sites. Solution to alleviate housing shortage is to build more student accommodation on campus rather	3851/19491	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	then housing students in the private rented sector.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – the village is virtually unable to cope, and now you are proposing to build a further 1,500 homes. The village will need a new additional drainage system as the one now can hardly cope. It is permanently blocked, and it is like a river when it rains. The schools are overflowing with children – juniors and secondary. The doctors' surgery is full and an appointment is virtually impossible to get. The dentists are also full. The roads are also congested and Moor Lane and Usher Lane will be impossible to get out of onto the Main Road into the village. There is also a good plan at the back of Lowfield Drive where you are proposing to build all the houses.	3872/20062	
	Objection - the proposed number of houses is far an excess of what the infrastructure can cope with. Currently there is congestion at Eastfield Avenue roundabout which causes traffic to back up to the village. A further 1600 homes would bring the area to a standstill. Schools are already over subscribed. The vase increase in traffic will be dangerous for children walking to and from school. Heavy rainfall causes gardens and roads to be waterlogged as drainage is already poor. Mass house building will exacerbate this and cause increased flooding. Parking in the village is already at capacity.	3956/23941	
	Objection –appalled at the number of dwellings proposed. Such a large development will ruin the nature of the village and the increase of population will seriously impact on roads, sewerage, schools and shopping. Please substantially reduce the size of the development to safeguard the amenities of our village.	3987/21697	
	Objection – should build a new town elsewhere with good infrastructure near to the ring road. Haxby Road and the level crossing will not cope along with drainage, parking and amenities.	4016/23737	
	Objection – drainage pipe work cannot cope at present, upgrading it would be expensive. The same applies to water, electricity, gas and telephones. Existing roads are not suitable. Parking is already difficult. More doctors would be needed and an extra density. There are electricity lines crossing the site. It is subject to flooding. There is no capacity at the school.	4028/23946	
	Objection – area already prone to flooding. Unsolved problem with drains and sewage. Excessive traffic congestion. Insufficient parking. Full doctor surgery and schools. Untenable project in such a large numbers. The area should retain green belt land.	4129/2729	
	Objection – Haxby and Wigginton maintain a village atmosphere, and any expansion to the levels proposed would swamp the existing amenities to a point where further development of shops, schools, doctor's surgeries would be required. Roadways	4149/18755	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>leading to the area are inadequate for current levels of traffic. Existing traffic problems in the surrounding area. How will Council get building material on site without causing problems to residents. Sewerage/drainage is existing problem which will be further exacerbated. The Council need to insist that the developers provide cash in advance of any development to fund the necessary infrastructure.</p>		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – Haxby already has an historic problem with sewage and drains. The increased trauma caused at peak hours by the traffic from the ring road/level crossing to Haxby roundabout. The already constant problem of trying to get a doctor's appointment will be a nightmare. It will cause irreparable damage to the Haxby community. In order to get construction traffic on site an order will probably have to be made to remove all cars on usher lane.</p>	4151/21714	
	<p>Objection – the impact on the green belt around Haxby will be disastrous. Brown field development areas should be exhausted first before any development of green belt land is considered. The regional spatial strategy was revoked by the coalition government except for policies YH9 and Y1C. These policies relate to the York Green Belt. In respect of these policies the York Local Plan has to be in general conformity. To do this York would need to assess the urban capacity of the central core that could be achieved without significant adverse impact on the character and setting of the historic city. A long term evaluation would reasonably cover a period of 30 years. The Council have not done this and so they do not have an adequate and relevant evidence base for this purpose. Haxby/Wigginton and Strensall (where there is currently a major housing application pending) are outside the inner boundary. I believe it is implied by the policy that the capacity within the inner boundary should be the first areas to be developed on a sequential approach. Because the council have not assessed the inner boundary capacity they cannot resolve that there is no capacity to place the major allocations within the inner boundary. Thus the proposals are not 'justified' as required by the NPPF.</p>	4158/21716	
	<p>Objection – object to land being safeguarded for future development to north of Haxby. Believe that Haxby should be protected from development by the rural greenbelt land which surrounds it. What has been proposed in the area is absolutely inappropriate and completely unsustainable. The proposal will undoubtedly put immense strain on the existing amenities of both Haxby and Wigginton village which already are unable to cope with the existing population. The Council have given no indication or guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded to cope with the additional strain such development will put on the local area. Without huge</p>	4159/21736	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	investment in the infrastructure Haxby will be unable to cope with such a dramatic increase in the number of people requiring things such as access to schools, GP and medical services, local public transport, traffic access and suitable road systems, parking, drainage, shops, employment, entertainment, facilities and activities for young people, facilities and support for older and more vulnerable people, potential for increase in crime and anti-social behaviour without a local resident police presence.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection- the infrastructure is already stretched. Air quality is one of the main concerns. It is well known that there are times in Haxby when congestion causes problems. York road often has slow moving, stationary traffic. This is at the time when children are walking to school along the road therefore are exposed to vehicle emissions. Research shows that vehicle emissions can have irreversible effects on children's lungs.	4200/23949	
	Objection- development will have a detrimental impact on the infrastructure of Haxby and Wigginton. Development will impact upon roads as at present Haxby is very congested. If proposals go ahead the traffic and air quality will be significantly worse. question raised over how the 3 schools in the area will cope? Development would place extreme demand on doctors, drainage and parking.	4216/23952	
	Objection- the drainage system is already overloaded and problematic. The roads struggle to cope and there is no sign of the station re-opening. The schools are oversubscribed and further development will push the services in north Haxby beyond their sustainable limit.	4282/23954	
	Objection- the number of proposed houses has risen from 749 to 813. This will result in facilities in Haxby village being grossly overstretched. The local schools are likely to be oversubscribed and the local health centre unable to cope. Parking is already dire and there are problems with the drainage and sewage in parts of the village.	4283/23956	
	Objection – there doesn't seem to be a plan for increasing the capacity of the drains/sewers in the area, and we frequently have seasonal problems with flooding. The water table will be affected directly by the removal of hedgerows and large trees. At the moment Haxby Village is very busy with local traffic, in addition people from the surrounding villages try to park here (in side streets) for shopping and to catch buses into York, and it is a rat run for part of the York Ring Road. Cannot see any mention of school buildings and the schools we have at the moment are full. There will be a need for an expansion of the health care facilities. We do need to build more housing but at the same time we must avoid destroying the very things that both residents and visitors value. As an alternative, has consideration been given to the old Vickers'	4285/21730	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Instrument site. It would be large enough to accommodate a number of different types of housing. Access would be via York Road, and that would relieve congestion in Haxby because an entry point to the Ring Road would be from the south rather than from the north. Has consideration been given to creating a heritage area between the current housing and the new. Such an area would preserve the heritage features mentioned above and would give local people from all parts of Haxby a recreational space. Assets such as this would make York City Council seem very futuristic and caring.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection - problems will be traffic, sewage, surface water, schools, doctors and hospitals. York road, Haxby is a night mare in the morning and evening more development will make it unusable. York has still got a considerable amount of brown field sites that have not been developed so why use green belt land that is needed for food production and the conservation of wildlife. This area is waterlogged already. The Sewerage system is always causing problems. There is a considerable amount of wildlife in the fields such as foxes, dears, water foul. Problems will be traffic, sewage, top water, schools, doctors, hospitals. York has still got a considerable amount of Brownfield sites that have not been developed, so why use green belt land. Consider the development of all the proposed sites will have a detrimental impact on the total area of York. In the last few years there has been an inordinate amount of flats and houses built in and around York with no regard for infrastructure or were the new people are going to get jobs.	4297/18286	
	Objection – Haxby’s current infrastructure cannot take any more developments. Front and back gardens are known to flood. The drainage system is old, inadequate and overloaded. Traffic comes to a standstill in Usher Lane when the level crossing is closed at Haxby Road. Parking spaces are totally inadequate in the village. The pollution damaging the local environment by these traffic jams in the village and down the local lanes and streets including Usher Lane is totally unacceptable.	4317/19652	
	Objection – the A1237 is very busy with traffic queuing throughout the day. How can the Council consider huge development around the outer ring road without improvement the infrastructure. This road should have been made into a dual carriageway years ago and the proposals are continually shelved. Housing development would make more sense along the A64 to the East of York which is already dualled. Concerned about raised levels of pollution and the effect on health with standing traffic on the York Road, Haxby. This would be made significantly worse with the proposed development of up to 1500 houses. Haxby has known problems of	4321/19654	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>flooding and drainage problems with sewage backing up. This needs to be addressed before any consideration for an enormous housing development. Usher Lane is not a suitable access point for a large housing development. It is a narrow lane and residents park on both sides, making it difficult to pass parked cars safely due to being unable to see past them. Haxby and Wigginton services, schools, doctors and nurses, shops and dentists, etc all cope with the present population but would not cope at all with an increase of up to 40%in the population. Please reconsider taking away our protected Green Belt and instead develop lower levels of new housing on Brownfield sites.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection –this will increase the population by about 30%, which is unacceptable. There is no room to expand Haxby Health Centre and parking is currently difficult. Waiting time to get an appointment will increase to an unacceptable level. School children and students will be placed at even greater danger because of the increased traffic. The centre of Haxby as is a Conservation Area. Additional shops cannot be built and parking is already very difficult. The proposals will only make this situation worse. There are long-standing drainage and sewerage issues in Haxby, further building can only exacerbate these issues and worsen the environment for everyone. Usher Lane is a narrow road where residents park on both sides. The proposed development is on Green Belt land. This is totally unacceptable and against government policy. There is no shortage of Brownfield land available around York, and yet there are no proposals to use this land. It is not desirable for Haxby or York to become a dormitory settlement for Leeds. The ring road is already working well beyond peak capacity. The proposed development will not be affordable to young people on average incomes; it will damage the environment; it will significantly add to congestion and over-crowding and there is not one single sensible reason to build here.</p>	<p>4322/19656</p>	
	<p>Objection – already difficult to park at the shops in Haxby. It is a conservation area and more parking spaces cannot be provided within the present footprint. The roads which connect Haxby to the A1237 are very busy with tailback at peak times and tailbacks on the A1237 due to the level crossing on York Road. Access roads to Haxby (i.e. the A1237) are at capacity. Usher Lane is not a suitable access area for a massive housing development and nor is Moor Lane. Until the A1237 is dualled, this plan should be shelved as it would have a negative impact on the existing residents of Haxby and Wigginton. There are regularly problems with flooding and drainage in Haxby and no development should take place until these have been resolved. Further building would affect the flood plain and bring up the height of the water table – there are many</p>	<p>4323/19658</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	underground streams in this area and the River Foss regularly floods. To significantly increase the volume of traffic on York Road would increase the air pollution and have a negative impact on health.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection- concern regarding what plans there are to upgrade the outer ring road. Access to the new homes will have to be down Usher Lane which is not wide enough. There are already problems with drainage and sewage and both are at capacity. There are also problems with flooding. There is a lack of amenities in the area. York Hospital is at capacity as are local schools. The surgery will be stretched and there is a lack of parking spaces in the village. Haxby is a protected area. There are electric pylons in the area which pose a health risk therefore this land is not suitable for housing. The level of houses proposed will impact on the environment which will be devastating for wildlife. Fumes and pollution will also be detrimental to humans.	4332/23963	
	Objection- concern regarding what plans there are to upgrade the outer ring road. Access to the new homes will have to be down Usher Lane which is not wide enough. There are already problems with drainage and sewage and both are at capacity. There are also problems with flooding. There is a lack of amenities in the area. York Hospital is at capacity as are local schools. The surgery will be stretched and there is a lack of parking spaces in the village. Haxby is a protected area. There are electric pylons in the area which pose a health risk therefore this land is not suitable for housing. The level of houses proposed will impact on the environment which will be devastating for wildlife. Fumes and pollution will also be detrimental to humans.	4333/23966	
	Objection - there is an undisputed need for some housing in York, but Brownfield sites and infill should be used rather than Green Fields. The facilities, services and infrastructure in the town will not be able to cope. Access concerns. Haxby has inherent problems with water and drainage, due to outdated sewers that would be unable to cope with increased population – what would the effects be of removing mature trees together with concreting over the ancient fields have on a present high water table. Before the Local Plan can be implemented in any form, there must be new construction and repair of existing infrastructure. To encourage pedestrians, North Lane and lane alongside hospice shop will need to be resurface, the flooding at the east end corrected and adequate drainage installed, a pavement constructed together with a one way system for vehicles. Cycle racks need to be installed as well as bays for Disabled Badge holders. Any new such development should be in small development of 10 or so houses, if that number could be absorbed without destroying Haxby.	4359/19668	
	Objection - strongly object to the proposal to increase the number of houses to be built	4385/21983	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	north of Haxby because it will lead to over-development of the area. The character of Haxby village will be destroyed and the area around it turned into a huge housing estate. The road network will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic and the local infrastructure- schools, medical services etc – will be unable to cope with the population rise.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection - changes actually exacerbate the issues raised in response to the previous proposals and are inappropriate and unsustainable. Drainage, congestion, school capacity, impact on existing services and road safety are main concerns. Detailed comments provided, see response.	4396/22325	
	Objection –at risk of flooding. Usher Lane is not a short cut to Strensall with cars travelling at speed. There is a danger when pulling out to overtake parked cars. The drains are already in a perilous state. There are parked cars for the studios at the top Usher lane, double yellow lines frequently ignored, and school parking. It will be dangerous with more traffic. Have not considered the infrastructure that is needed.	4465/18289	
	Objection – this is green belt land which should be protected from development. The local road network would not cope with any additional traffic.	4637/17794	
	Objection – such a massive increase will put strain on drainage, roads etc. The schools are at capacity now so where are all the children going to go. Doctors are full, so what happens when new houses are built. We haven't got any allotments or allotted Green Space per person as it is in Haxby Getting out of Haxby at peak times is a nightmare now, so an large scale developments will just make it worse. Usher Lane is just not wide enough for this development, getting out will be terrible. We should build on Brown Sites and leave our Green Belt alone.	4687/19694	
	Objection – traffic and parking are currently big issues in Haxby. An addition of in excess of 1,500 cars onto the roads should the development go ahead, will significantly add to the problems residents already experience. The roads are already inadequate. Residents in Haxby regularly report problems with drains. To preserving the peaceful environment in that area. When the developments at Clifton Moor, Haxby and Earswick go ahead, it will place approximately 10,000 vehicles on the road. Everybody living in these new developments will have to travel to work. Surely it makes more sense to focus on areas where homes and places of work are closer together or where there is access to viable public transport or roads where the traffic is able to flow faster than 5mph. The developers will not finance current deficits in Haxby – everybody living north of the ring road will suffer more than they do already if this Plan goes ahead.	4690/19696	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Objection - in addition to the “damage” caused to the green field areas, there would be a considerable increase in the population of Haxby/Wigginton – some 40-47% increase. This would no doubt increase the number of vehicles moving around. Road access to the proposed areas is currently adequate for the number of local vehicles. It would be a particular problem with regard to heavy vehicles initially required in the construction of the new housing. Afterwards the current roads would be inundated with private cars and goods vehicles plus a possible bus service. Thus roads to the new “estates” would have to be upgraded with subsequent destruction of hedges, etc. The roads leading through the Haxby/Wigginton areas and to the outer ring road and into York are already heavily congested at times. Congestion is exacerbated by railway crossing gates, and having to cross and enter the outer ring road. This would be greatly increased by the addition of a new huge population. The drainage and sewage systems are working at their maximum at the moment and would be “over loaded” without considerable expenditure on improvements. Local medical services would be even more stretched than they are now. A new school(s) would be needed. The shopping and other facilities in Haxby/Wigginton would also have to be “upgraded”. Where are the people coming from to fill these proposed houses and where would their place of work be.</p>	4701/20102	
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection- if the proposal goes ahead it will increase the population by 40%. The existing amenities and infrastructure could not possibly cope. Traffic is already congested and development would mean more cars. Parking in Haxby is a problem. Sewage treatment is also a concern.</p>	4717/23986	
	<p>Objection – Haxby’s current infrastructure cannot take any more developments. The garden floods at the back of my house. The roads flood in front of my house. The drainage system is old, inadequate and overloaded. Traffic comes to a standstill in Usher Lane when the level crossing is closed at Haxby Rd. Parking spaces are totally inadequate in the village. The pollution caused to our local environment by these traffic jams in the village and down our local lanes and streets including Usher Lane is totally unacceptable.</p>	4817/18293	
	<p>Objection – development will put huge pressure of local roads, schools, sewerage, surface water, drainage, parking and other local amenities.</p>	4822/17965	
	<p>Objection –there is sufficient brown field development areas without building on our green and pleasant land which should be preserved. The increased pressure this will put on the infrastructure in the area will affect the area greatly. How are the drains supposed to cope, how are the people meant to get in and out of the village at peak</p>	4826/18296	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>time the roads are already jammed up solid when people go to and from work. We have insufficient public transport to be able to relieve this problem as it is. Where are people meant to send their children to school and what about the health provision in the area both essential services and the village is well populated by people who need these services already. Haxby Hall is due to close yet another nail in the coffin of the elderly before they have reached this point. Even leisure services and particularly provision for teenagers will suffer and that's another area where we are already failing as a community.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – latest plans for building around Haxby allow for even more houses than previous consultations. Such massive expansion would seriously increase pressure on the facilities including Health Centre and dentists. There is limited parking and the banks already serving surrounding villages. The local schools are full. The demolition of Oaken Grove school was very short sighted. Haxby is low lying and floods easily. Drainage system is under severe pressure now. Whole sewage network probably needs replacing. Traffic already queues on York, Haxby and Wigginton Rd. A1237 is often at a standstill towards Clifton Moor. Usher Lane is a rat run. This makes it difficult to understand why you are considering more housing before sorting the infrastructure to support it. Haxby is an area with older people, often living alone, who require additional social services, medical care and support from voluntary organisations.</p>	<p>5112/22361</p>	
	<p>Objection - the existing infrastructure e.g. drains, sewers, roads, schools, parking, medical facilities will be unable to cope with the scale of development that is planned. The ring road (A1237) is already 'nose-to-tail' for most of the day. How is it planned to integrate the new traffic generated not only by the Haxby developments but also the other proposed housing expansions along its route.</p>	<p>5139/1870</p>	
	<p>Objection – Haxby and Wigginton is already a very large centre of population and it is unreasonable to allocate a further large area of land to make it even bigger. The Infrastructure - in particular the road network is already overloaded. The two proposed site accesses to the east and west are onto existing 'lanes' which have limited scope even with local improvements to take the additional traffic. For traffic heading south from the site, the Usher Lane/Station Road junction will be inadequate to take the extra traffic and will become particularly dangerous, being so close to the Ralph Butterfield Primary School. York Road Haxby which will be the main route for traffic wishing to travel east on the ring road – is already overloaded with traffic at its junction with Eastfield Avenue, at the railway level crossing and at the roundabout to the Northern Ring Road – the proposal will only make this worse. For those that need to</p>	<p>5210/21752</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	commute out of Haxby & Wigginton at peak times, the road network is already overloaded as traffic on the Northern Ring Road, York Road Haxby and Wigginton Road daily backs up to at both Haxby and Wigginton roundabouts and regularly causes gridlock at the roundabouts themselves. As there is limited scope or significant road improvements, the proposed development will compound the problems and is most inappropriate,		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – more in keeping with a large city such as Leeds or Sheffield rather than the quaint, jewel of a city that is York. Should reconsider the impact that developments of this size would have on existing services and the serious consequences on the infrastructure of the city as a whole.	5228/21761	
	Objection – overloading of local infrastructure. Already on a morning cars back up on the York Road sometimes for half a mile with a 20 minute wait to the ring road now common. As a resident of the village I would also expect more traffic in the vicinity of the shops which is already noisy and troublesome. Loss of green belt and open countryside amenity. The areas between Moor Lane and Usher Lane are currently beautiful open spaces and building so many houses would be ruinous to the appearance and character of the open country side in that area. Loss of character of the village. Already the village is surrounded by extensive built up estates. A significant increase in the size of the estate would damage the character the village even further. We would effectively be detracting still further for the very appeal of Haxby and an old farming village.	5260/21778	
	Objection – opposed to plans that have still not been carefully considered or revised given the clear and obvious problems it will create in the area. The infrastructure will not support such a large development. The schools, doctors and dentists are at full capacity. Parking in the village is not sufficient and the roads are gridlocked. The increase in traffic, noise and pollution will have devastating consequences for all residents new and old. The drainage and sewerage system is not sufficient to have increased usage. Greenfield sites should not be considered until Brownfield sties have been used first. York's character, charm and appeal is being ruined and it will end up being a massive sprawling city. I would like to register my opposition yet again at the plans to build an unrealistic number of houses in Haxby and surrounding area. The impact on the schools and lack of primary school places has already been highlighted in my previous email however; the vast number of additional secondary school places that will need to be catered for will cause massive problems for the local secondary schools. If the existing sixth forms at these schools are under threat of closure to	5266/18007	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	accommodate the extra students		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection –village lanes simply cannot cope with the traffic an additional 1,500 dwellings will create. Concerned that the council are not consulting National Grid and Northern Power grid regarding the two tower lines which dissect the site SF4. Furthermore the council have increased area of SF4 which is again dissected by 400kv and 66kv tower lines which only an irresponsible council or developer would build housing near. The councils overall building programme was ridiculously optimistic and it is extremely unlikely if not impossible that developers will ever build 22,000 homes in the York area over the next 15 years as the demand will not be there. There should not be any safeguarded land in the local plan until all Brownfield sites in York have been developed, dualling of the outer ring road and extensive infrastructure upgrades in areas of development. The proposed two large scale developments to the north (Rawcliffe) and the south east (Heslington and Elvington) of the city, whilst not ideally located would be a reasonable compromise assuming no land is available to the west of the river Ouse and that direct access from both sites would be straight onto the outer ring road. It is of course assumed that a guarantee would be put in place that the entire length of the outer ring road would be dualled before an approval was given to the site to the north of the City.</p>	5274/18372	
	<p>Objection – all brownfield sites within York and spaces above shops should be utilised before any new housing is built. The ring road is already a nightmare around the Haxby turn offs and potentially adding 1600 (if each household has two cars) cars to this will have further negative impacts on traffic. There is already enough strain on the facilities and drainage within Haxby without adding this many houses. You will also be destroying beautiful countryside and the habitats of many animals, the green spaces you have set aside cannot make up for this as they are islands within housing developments (even though you left them aside for wildlife rather than building parks for children and or green spaces). If the land is indeed a green belt then it is there and in place for a reason, this should be respected. Would also question where the jobs for the proposed 1,600 (or so if there are two adults in each house) will come from as to afford a two or three bedroom house they will need to be on suitable wages. If these houses are bought and let to people this will just help inflate already high rental process within the city.</p>	5277/18379	
	<p>Objection- the town infrastructure will no longer be able to bear the extra strain regarding drainage, traffic, school children and medical care. Haxby will not be able to cope without these problems being adequately addressed.</p>	5281/23997	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – strongly object to the revised plans as they have increased the proposed area of development of ST9 and SF4 without making appropriate commentary on the impact to local amenities and services that are already under strain. In favour of smaller targeted developments.	5288/21782	
	Objection – the infrastructure is struggling to cope with the traffic. There are not enough playgroup, school, doctors and dentist places. Gardens do become water logged and drains overflow.	5310/17969	
	Objection – opposed to such large scale housing plans now or in the future. Haxby is a flood risk area. Such a massive amount of additional houses would cause irreversible damage to our local community. The current infrastructure couldn't cope – our vital infrastructure is already under pressure and further housing would push it way beyond its current over-stretched limits particularly the current sewage and drainage. The traffic and parking situation in Haxby is currently inadequate – further housing would cause chaos Our local health care systems and schools would be stretched well beyond capacity.	5324/21786	
	Objection – Haxby is a village and as such the roads in and around are not designed to accommodate large construction vehicles that will be present during the construction. Once completed there will be an additional 800 cars on the road. Haxby is busy enough without these extra vehicles being present. Haxby Town is already a bottle neck on a Saturday as there aren't sufficient parking spaces. The Doctors surgery is already at full capacity support both Haxby and Wiggington residents. 800 additional houses will mean a minimum of 1600 additional patients adding to the strain. This may overspill onto York hospital that is already struggling under NHS cut backs. The local primary schools of Haxby and Wiggington are already at full capacity without, what are the implications for Joseph Rowntree Secondary School, will this be able to cope with the extra burden. Will the education of our children suffer. Haxby is notoriously bad for drainage. Additional homes will only increase the burden on a suffering system and cause misery for a lot of residents. During the construction phase and once the houses are built there will be increased noise and traffic pollution which will affect all sufferers with breathing difficulties. Adding additional houses in the area is going to increase crime in the area. Haxby will no longer feel like a village with nice community, it will feel like a suburb of York with no identity.	5330/21789	
	Objection – these villages have grown considerably over recent years and the now proposed massive 1800 housing growth will be a disaster. All of the roads, drains, gas, water and electrical services will be unable to take the additional load without	5331/21793	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	substantial reinforcement. The existing roads are already inadequate for the number of people. There are always long queues of traffic during the morning, lunchtime and evening rush hours on all roads in and out of the area. The large number of children walking and cycling to school in the village and this level of traffic is dangerous. There is adequate parking near the village shopping areas and no space to develop a result of poor long term planning.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – would dread the impact of heavier traffic on an already busy and narrow road, with outdated smelly drains. The ring road already struggles to cope at peak times – visitors dread coming this way. Extra traffic would surely delay their journeys and can York hospital cope with such a population increase. The village street is gridlocked gridlocked at times and parking at local shops is woefully inadequate for those who need it.	5346/21797	
	Objection – unclear why this area has been taken out of the green belt to increase the size of Haxby.	5364/21799	
	Objection – Haxby and Wigginton have suffered a 300% increase in population. No attempt has been made by the City Council to provide facilities to keep up with the increase and many of the facilities in the area are already at capacity. A development of this size would overwhelm them. Other developments have been proposed around York totalling many thousands of dwellings. See no evidence of local demand of the housing of this scale. There is demand for a modest amount of housing in Haxby and Wigginton for low-cost housing affordable housing for young people on the first rung of the property ladder, as evidenced by the number of young people in rented accommodation. Detailed comments provided objecting to the site, see response.	5379/17798	
	Objection - covering this area in houses represents overdevelopment in several ways. Does not think that the two boarding roads can cope with any more traffic with safety or economically. Where is the sustainable traffic plan in this. Haxby does not have a railway station, it does have a good bus service but most people choose to use cars. The road system is already congested, especially at peak times. Drainage in Haxby is already an issue since surface water flooding is common. The Haxby Health Centre has been inadequate in size for years but there is no NHS money for expansion and this plan would require new doctors, nurses, ancillaries and clerical staff who at present could not be accommodated. The two primary schools remaining in the area are full, the local secondary comprehensive at Joseph Rowntree School in New Earswick is also full. Area ST9 is already too much for the existing educational infrastructure to cope with and SF4 would really be excessive. There is no room for expansion of either	5381/18387	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	primary school in Haxby or Wigginton it would lead to loss of playing space for the school.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – no proposed increases in the infrastructure or amenities: school, doctor surgery, shopping facilities. Necessary assessment of the roads, power and water supplies, drainage, broadband, bus routes, etc.	5386/21804	
	Objection – uncontrolled development of Haxby and inadequate infrastructure. York should be looking to mid-rise developments in or near the city centre where there is access to jobs and facilities. Shortfall of amenity.	5444/21809	
	Objection- green spaces must be protected for future generations to use and enjoy. There are currently traffic problems in the village, limitations on existing healthcare, a lack of infrastructure and an impact of local amenities which already struggle.	5465/24027	
	Objection- the road network is at capacity. The drainage, parking and amenities will not be able to cope. Brownfield development areas should be exhausted before building on the Green Belt.	5471/24460	
	Objection – this amount of housing in Haxby will destroy the existing community. Rural environment as a habitat for wildlife. Unsuitable current road infrastructure for that population increase. Current facilities unable to support this magnitude of people.	5481/20737	
	Objection – Haxby, Wigginton and Strensall villages cannot take anymore. Try parking in Haxby now, it is impossible. The bypass is now a smaller version of the M25 and is gridlocked every evening around the junctions that serve this area and you want to increase the traffic? There is need for extra homes then there is plenty of land around Strensall barracks which is half the size it was and the area opposite the tip is never used. There are links to the A64 and A1237 without ruining our village.	5545/20743	
	Objection – land is green belt which should be protected, not built upon. The traffic on Haxby Road currently cannot cope with existing volumes. Who is going to build the additional primary schools and health centres required. Why not build on land adjacent to Nestle (currently for sale) as this is brownfield, perfect for developing ‘affordable housing’. The Haxby housing market has not historically offered ‘affordable’ housing, why is it now expected to. Parking at the Ryedale Shopping Centre and Sainsbury’s is already at capacity, especially at weekends, how is this going to be expanded.	5549/19208	
	Objection – the water company said it cannot cope with the proposed plan. The drainage system has not been able to cope in the past. These will not be affordable houses – affordable by the average person who works in a shop/office. New shops cause traffic jams. New housing will add to this – the roads cannot cope.	5561/20748	
	Objection - this is a small community with small roads, small shops, very limited free	5568/20755	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	public sports facilities and limited infrastructure. The bus services are good for the centre of the community but from Usher Park the nearest bus stop is 0.7 miles/1 km. New buildings would be further away and would have to be accessed by car. Neither Usher Lane or Moor Lane are big enough for more traffic. Traffic calming was suggested for Usher Lane but plans were abandoned.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection - village do not have the infrastructure to withstand the impact that building those proposed houses would have – especially as the number has increased from 749 to 813 since the previous consultation. If this were to go ahead then the number of cars would increase by around 1072. Already have existing problems with top water and sewage, particularly around Haxby. Primary schools are under pressure. The sensible alternative is to develop brown field sites and infill areas around the A1237. Development here would enable new residents to use public transport and relieve pressure on busy roads.	5582/20768	
	Objection- the local road network will be unable to cope. The local health services are already under pressure. There will be a problem with education provision. Local shops will be unable to cope with increased demand. The sewage system is already under pressure and Haxby is suffering from surface water caused by the high water table. Development would destroy the natural wildlife.	5583/24031	
	Objection – highlighted in the previous consultation the problems Haxby already has with drainage and sewerage. Not clear on where or how drainage will be accommodated. Plans are not sustainable. Roads will be overwhelmed. GP and schools cannot accommodate such a large increase in the population.	5585/24034	
	Objection – the infrastructure cannot cope with further developments. Entering and exiting Haxby at busy times is already a problem. Roads could not cope with more traffic resulting from further development on the scale of this and other proposals. On leaving Haxby the situation is aggravated by the totally inadequate, gridlocked, pathetic excuse for an outer ring road – A1237. Development of green belt sites should not be considered before the development of all existing brown field sites has been considered.	5588/20770	
	Objection – the huge increase in housing will have a massive impact on infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton, creating problems with congested roads, poor air quality, lack of parking, over burdened drainage systems, overcrowded schools, long waits for health care and overstretched local amenities. Brown field sites should always be developed first before any building on green belt land.	5594/20774	
	Objection- the road system adjacent to the proposal is narrow and unsuitable for	5596/24039	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	further volumes of traffic. York road and the Village are congested during the day. There is insufficient parking in the village. Extra volumes of traffic will increase noise and air pollution. The surface water and sewage system is inadequate. The provision of school places is inadequate. There will be a loss of Green Belt amenity and there is inadequate capacity at the local health centre.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – there are three electricity pylons with overhead wires in this area which are inspected by helicopter. This alone makes this site unacceptable for housing on the grounds of health and safety. Land on this site behind Usher Park Road is liable to flooding and has a serious drainage issue. Usher Lane is already congested with parked cars and with a slight bend in the road, towards the village, oncoming traffic can be un-sited. With the inevitable increase in cars accidents would be more likely. New access/ exit roads would have to be installed for the sites. The sewerage system in Haxby is already on the limit and a new system would have to be installed to cope. The same with gas, water supplies and phone connections. The infrastructure in the village could not cope, with more doctors, dentists and schools required. There would not be enough parking in the village for the facilities and it would be advisable to have a police station, and seriously look again at reopening the train station. At peak times drivers queue at Haxby and Wigginton road roundabouts to gain access to the A1237 ring road. Drivers often queue between roundabouts on the ring road probably looking at little used, recently installed, cycle way and wondering why the money was not better spent on dualling the A1237.	5600/19210	
	Objection – this massive addition to Haxby housing will turn it into a dormitory town. The station has yet again disappeared into some mythical future. The road through Haxby already has massive tailbacks to the York bypass in the morning, this will make it much worse.	5605/20779	
	Objection – the infrastructure is just not there to support these houses. The main drainage in the village is poor, the traffic congestion is a big problem and we just don't have the schools to cope. Should concentrate on providing good quality services for the existing residents rather than trying to sell the land around us.	5607/20782	
	Objection – proposed development takes no account of the stress already put on local infrastructure by existing development. Local land and drainage systems are prone to overloading. Driving will be the preferred option. Haxby has excellent facilities but limited parking and very narrow roads, further restricted by on street parking. Buses are already not able to make the journey into York easily and it's difficult to see how increased pressure on bus services will make them any more efficient. Schools are	5617/20786	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	nearly full. Access to Joseph Rowntree from Haxby is via a heavily congested main road with little segregated cycle route. Cycling is already a nightmare. There are no really safe and segregated cycle routes from Haxby. The failure to press for the reinstatement of Haxby Station makes further pressure on infrastructure even less desirable. It is difficult to envisage York becoming more attractive to inward investment and an already congested artery may lead to an infarction.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection –local infrastructure of roads and drains has become inadequate. The roads out of Haxby via Wigginton, Towthorpe Road and York Road are overloaded. The north side of the ring road is inadequate and shopping developments and the enlargements of other villages exacerbates the problem. Yet more growth is not sensible. The sewage system is inadequate. To burden it further would be unwise. Haxby should stop expanding.	5627/20788	
	Objection – this proposal will force approximately 1000+ more vehicles to travel through the village. Moor Lane and Usher lane already have high usage level, beyond what they were intended for. The likelihood of accidents will increase. This would create congestion. This will have severe implications for ambulances and other emergency vehicles. There are infrastructure inadequacies, drainage, sewerage system and flood risk issues, brownfield sites should be developed first. The impact of any potential wind farms in Haxby has been overwhelmingly understated.	5631/24042	
	Objection – even more houses to be built, more land taken and such an increase in size of town as to make it unrecognisable. The roads are already clogged, parking is at a premium. Too much rain and the York Road is flooded as are other areas. Brown field sites are the ones that should be used. We need the green belt protected as much as we need it. The people of Haxby and Wigginton should have a voice that is listened to.	5672/20795	
	Objection - Haxby should be protected from development. Proposals are inappropriate and unsustainable. Will put immense strain on the existing amenities which are already unable to cope with the existing population. No indication or guarantees that the local infrastructure will be upgraded to cope.	5673/20797	
	Objection- Haxby is already congested; the road is very busy and can be impossible to parking order to use the local amenities. The new development represents a massive increase in population and traffic. The character of will change to the detriment of the people who currently live here. This is green belt land and therefore should not be developed.	5692/20811	
	Objection – Haxby cannot cope with hundreds more houses and the residents. I am unable to find any explanation of how infrastructure is going to be planned, managed	5724/20847	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and financed to prevent the residents of Haxby and Earswick being massively adversely affected by these plans. The impact on the congestion in and through the village is a concern. Is the train station going to be built? Is the railway crossing near the ring road going to be re-engineered to enable residents to get out of Haxby on weekday mornings? Is the traffic flow on the northern ring road going to be dramatically improved? Will drainage be upgraded to cope with existing issues and run off from concreted fields? And will it be paid for? Haxby needs more park land not 800 more houses and families. This plan is not holistic, York needs a sustainable future plan that will address transport, managed green space, drainage, road safety, cycle routes and building land.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – local infrastructure cannot cope. Will destroy green belt land and would make village a small town. Green belt should be protected indefinitely.	5727/23714	
	Objection – building over 700 new properties in a flood risk area; irreversible damage to the environment and the nature of the local community; infrastructure, including drainage and sewage, will be pushed beyond its limits; local healthcare systems will be stretched beyond capacity; increased pressure on local schools to accommodate additional pupils; loss of green land and associated negative impact on wildlife, the environment and personal well-being; loss of character of the area.	5736/20865	
	Objection –the village infrastructure can not take it. The village way of life will be destroyed. Traffic is horrendous at times and the buses congested. While there is a need for more housing eroding the green belt is not the way to go, brown field sites should be developed first.	5757/20878	
	Objection – Haxby is an established community which is already stretched to the limits. There are only two main roads into Haxby and Wigginton which are already gridlocked with commuters at peak times additional vehicles would be completely unsustainable. The town centre is already at capacity with regards to parking in the daytime. There is an existing ageing population in the village with the additional requirements that they have of medical services.	5777/20886	
	Objection – ring road cannot cope. 40% increase in population will cause traffic congestion, adverse air quality, parking problems, drainage issues, school capacity issues	5796/20893	
	Objection – there is no room within the central conservation area of Haxby Town for new central facilities that will be required. These include shops, primary and secondary schools, doctors and dentists. There is already major congestion on York Road and the ring road. Consider the safety of children walking, cycling and travelling	5831/19213	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>by bus to the Joseph Rowntree school using this route. The small roads of Oaken Grover are entirely unsuitable to heavy construction traffic and thereafter the flow of 815+ cars in and out of a new estate. Haxby has well known and acknowledged drainage problems relating to sewage and surface standing water. The water table is inches below existing gardens. The proposed site is even wetter. Existing drainage will be unable to cope with the needs of new households. Within the proposed building area there are bats, owls and migrant cuckoos – a red listed bird – there have been no surveys carried out to evaluate the ancient field system for ecological and historical value to the community. Within the immediate area there are circa 300 businesses who would not support employment for new households without extensive commuting. It is unclear who the target market will be for new houses in Haxby and the York area. There is an argument for supporting the local economy for York residents and not promoting a dormitory town.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – irreversible destruction of the green belt, loss of farming land and loss of amenities for residents. Haxby has optimal balance between population and facilities. Planning must take into account adverse effects on quality of life</p>	<p>5833/20926</p>	
	<p>Objection – inclusion will increase population by 40%. Scale of development is unsuitable. Extended safeguard seems spurious. Given objections, the proposal to extend is surprising.</p>	<p>5840/20933</p>	
	<p>Objection – amount of houses proposed is too high. Traffic would be worse. Schools and medical facilities are full. Have business been consulted. The main justification for the expansion of ST9 is that it will enable the developers to build at lower densities than those proposed at Preferred Options. The changes to strategic sites document however does not include figures by which original and proposed densities can be compared. The local roads are not adequate to support the increase in traffic resulting from the proposed development of ST9 and SF4. The ring road resembles a very slow moving rolling road block rather than a ring road. This will be made worse by further development. The A1237 cannot cope currently and significant improvement seems very remote. There are known problems with drainage in Haxby. The three primary schools in Haxby and Wigginton are full. The secondary schools are virtually full. The Local plan implies Haxby is well served by public transport. It is not. Development can only result in further car journeys on the already inadequate A1237. It is imperative before any large scale development that the existing doctors is able to recruit new staff. There is no room for expansion of the Local Centre and it will prove even more inadequate if development goes ahead. The provision of leisure and community</p>	<p>5848/20938</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	facilities and green spaces is inadequate.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – roads can barely cope with traffic currently. Local secondary schools are at capacity. York hospital is not big enough.	5854/20957	
	Objection- Haxby and Wigginton has been the subject of massive expansion over a number of years. The expansion already proposed within ST9 will expand the population of Haxby by around 20%. Inclusion of an expanded SF4 would increase the population by 40%. This scale of development is unsustainable and undesirable. The reason given for an extended allocation to safeguard land SF4 seems spurious. It seems an arbitrary expansion of SF4 for no reason. Given the number of respondents to the scale of SF4 in the Local Plan Preferred Options this proposal is surprising.	5860/24054	
	Objection – population increase would increase pressure on services. Travel and transport at risk of being overwhelmed. Infrastructure was an afterthought the last time Haxby was increased.	5865/20960	St. Mary's Parochial Church
	Objection – infrastructure cannot handle the increase. Congestion is a nightmare. Railway halt has been rejected numerous times. Primary school recently closed.	5867/20963	
	Objection – infrastructures cannot cope. One school knocked down for houses. School would be needed if extra houses were built.	5873/20967	
	Objection – risk of floods. Traffic issues. Green belt land would be removed	5898/20975	
	Objection – the building of so many more houses will put great strain on the way people live. The increase in traffic will be unbearable and resulting from that will be more pollution of the atmosphere. That will mean more illnesses and strain on the GP services in Haxby/Wigginton (already overstretched). That will result in a longer waiting time for people needing to see the doctor. Objection – Schools are already overstretched with class sizes larger than they should be....where would extra children be accommodated? More schools would need to be built. That is more money from the public purse. There is not enough green space locally now so we don't want to lose what we have. We don't want an "urban jungle". Buses – at certain times they are already overfull, more people... more buses needed. No building on green belt land. Brownfield development must be exhausted before even thinking about developing green belt land.	5968/19219	
	Objection – roads not big enough, Building more houses would increase traffic. Floods would be more likely. Local doctor's surgery doesn't have the resources available.	5976/20991	
	Objection – Haxby has been developed constantly since the 1970s and is now at full capacity. The impact of increasing the population by several thousand will bring enormous pressure on the A1237 – already totally congested at several times during	5981/19222	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the day. York Road is constantly busy and crosses a rail line which holds up the traffic a number of times during the day and there is only one road through the village. Adding several thousand vehicles to these roads will also inevitably increase pollution. The three junior schools are full and the health practice is overloaded. None of these issues have been addressed in the proposal.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – limited services and no guarantee of new services. Brownfield land first. Impact on wildlife. Flooding risk with naturally high water table. Problem with surface water drainage. No room for expansion of the existing shopping facilities and very restricted parking. Air pollution.	6041/21820	
	Objection – roads cannot cope. Traffic causes air pollution. Parking issues. Schools and services at capacity. Designated green belt land. Drainage issues. Danger to pedestrians	6130/21003	
	Objection – taken together, the proposals for Haxby would mean that the area would grow by 29% when it is already the largest York suburban area. This is an attempt to turn the area into a suburban sprawl. Would cause irreparable damage to the social fabric. The road network is adequate. No developed should proceed without dualling of the northern ring road. General facilities and services could not support a development of this type.	6135/19103	
	Objection – concerned about impact on infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton i.e. roads, drainage, parking and amenities of which are already inadequate. Recommend that Brownfield sites used first and commit to protecting the greenbelt.	6171/21008	
	Objection – number of cars in Haxby, drainage problems have not changed and will get worse with more houses. Only two primary schools in Haxby. Whole environment will be damaged. Do not understand how land is to be changed when there are brown field sites in York should be used before any development of Green belt land.	6201/21013	
	Objection – since the first consultation the number of proposed properties has increased. At no point has any affordable housing been mentioned on these sites. The infrastructure required for this project i.e. roads, drainage, schools, medical facilities and amenities is nearly all already at full capacity. There is no mention of how this problem will be solved. Or is it just a matter of build it and sort it out later as always with York Council. There may be a short term gain in employment while the building is going on, but York has no real industry to support this influx of new people, where will they work.	6233/19231	
	Objection – Usher Lane/Station Road junction exit is difficult now with more traffic it will become impossible to exit. Bus travel difficult at busy times. Cannot cope with	6278/19233	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>increased volume. Water stands on road after heavy rain. Drainage cannot cope. Currently difficult to get an appointment at health centre, they are over stretched and unable to cope with extra patients. Schools now full. The building of more houses in this area would be intolerable for residents. Constant noises, extra traffic, more pollution. The character of this area would be ruined. The original village of Haxby has already been over-stretched. More houses and more people would ruin the area. There is no more room for shops.</p>		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – traffic on A1237 horrendous already. Proposed development would increase traffic on York Road. Parking in the village is already difficult. Volume would cause illegal levels of pollution.</p>	6286/21036	
	<p>Objection – very poor drainage system. Traffic congestion. Full local facilities. Lack of parking.</p>	6436/21049	
	<p>Objection – wishes of residents from previous consultation have been ignored. Haxby and Wigginton has already been expanded beyond what is desirable or practical. Green field should stay as green fields. Ring road is heavily congested.</p>	6456/21827	
	<p>Objection – accept that there is a need for new housing in York however believe that the number of houses indicated for this phase is far too large for the community, retail and business facilities in the centre of Haxby. Increasing the housing stock in one fell swoop would have a major impact on the area as a whole. Concern regarding limited parking in Haxby and limited potential for provision of additional parking. No possibility of development a village centre in Wigginton without major reconfiguration. Concern regarding impact of the proposed developments adjacent to Clifton Moor retail park and to the east of Strensall Road at Earswick on the already congested ring road and other surrounding roads. Concern regarding surface water drainage – replacement of main sewer must be addressed and understood prior to commencement of development. If any additional development is to be undertaken, it should cover a smaller area and include a much smaller number of houses. The design, quality, type, mix and construction of any proposed housing must take account of the character of existing housing and its social/demographic mix. Provision for a variety of ages and social groupings is needed to ensure that this community remains attractive to existing as well as new residents and that it moves forward in a harmonious way. Priority must be given to provision of detailed sustainable transport plan. Haxby and Wigginton must have improved access to the road network. Provision of additional health care facilities and community-led support must be included in planning from the outset. Need for sports and leisure facilities should also be considered. Publically accessible green open</p>	6522/18552	<p>Haxby &amp; Wigginton Ward Liberal Democrat Councillors and Haxby &amp; Wigginton Liberal Democrats</p>

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	space would also be essential were development to proceed. Sufficient space for further extension of Haxby and Wigginton burial ground must also be allowed.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection- the combined community of Haxby and Wigginton is already big enough. If development goes ahead, the strain on local infrastructure would be huge, specifically health services, local primary schools and local roads.	7045/24077	
	Objection- development will lead to more flooding and haxby already suffers from drainage and flooding problems. The additional 1500 houses will mean at least 2000 cars. Parking for short term shopping in the village is already a problem and will get worse. There is no room for extra parking in the shopping area. The crossing of York road and the A1237 is already congested at busy times. There are often road delays that produce large quantities of pollution including CO and CO2 and other pollutants. The health service will be placed under greater strain. A new school will be required as the existing school is already full. Concern regarding if there is provision for new school and enlarged cemetery in the plan?	7060/24080	
	Objection – such a massive development would put a huge strain on the infrastructure. Concern about the pollution caused by extra traffic.	7064/21067	
	Objection – already blocked roads and dangerous crossings. Limited parking space. Impossible expansion of the shopping area. Not enough school places. Problems with drain and sewage provision.	7084/21071	
	Objection – no desire for the village to be spoiled by building more houses on unspoilt green belt.	7130/21073	
	Objection – insufficient infrastructure. Traffic congestion. Insufficient parking available. Protect Green Belt.	7174/21077	
	Objection – deeply concerned about the proposed development plans in Haxby. There are parking difficulties when visiting the shops, banks and other businesses and no space is available for increasing these facilities. It is essential that the green belt is preserved. The green spaces are very necessary for family recreation. It would be disastrous if there was a large increase in population. The schools would not cope. Not convinced that the concerns of Haxby Town Council have been adequately addressed.	7175/18028	
	Objection – traffic is already very heavy. Only one school, which is full. Parking is difficult. Waiting times for the doctors is an issue. Drainage system wouldn't be able to cope.	7176/21080	
Objection - the parking of cars within the area around shops in Haxby is often very difficult and having to park in side streets in front of private houses has become the "normal" practice. Additional housing in Haxby will result in even more motorists	7178/19248		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	having to park in the street in order to use the towns shops and other facilities etc.. Where is the area that you have earmarked as additional off street parking for local shoppers.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – dismayed to hear that the proposal is now to increase the size. Strongly agree with Haxby Town Council's concerns about roads, drainage (a problem already), parking and amenities. All brownfield development areas should be exhausted before any development of green belt land. Need to save our green spaces and our wildlife or risk reducing everyone's quality of life.	7195/18030	
	Objection – Haxby does not have the infrastructure to support a development of this size. The existing drains, car parking, roads and amenities can barely cope with the current population.	7198/23716	
	Objection – increase pressure on facilities. School is at capacity. Land is easily flooded. Traffic volume would increase	7908/21097	
	Support – shortage of houses in the area. Rail station should be reopened. Always been intended to carry on the roads.	8398/21104	
	Objection – problems with drainage and sewerage and traffic currently. There needs to be drastic improvements to the infrastructure prior to any development.	9323/18057	
	Objection – opposed to scale of residential development in Haxby. Concerned about the strain on local infrastructure: primarily the roads and parking the area, the overflow of parked cars from the village centre, impacts on schools, shops and local library. The facilities will not support an increase in populous of up to 40%. Concerns that value of property will fall and social housing may have a detrimental impact on the local area.	933218398/	
	Objection – opposed to the development of land identified in Haxby. Haxby is already struggling to cope with the traffic in the area and there is insufficient parking at the present time without increasing demand. The main road through the village is inadequate and will not safely carry more cars. There is no evidence of policing of traffic speeds or parking – additional development will worsen an already dangerous situation. Crime statistics are also likely to increase when the population increases and there is not enough Green Space or facilities to occupy young people. Heavy traffic disrupt television and broadband and increase in population has resulted in loud, unsociable behaviour on the Main Street. Proposals will increase noise pollution beyond acceptance. The school and medical centre are already at capacity. Recognise that there is a shortage of housing in York, but infrastructure cannot adequately service existing houses.	9339/18406	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection- strongly opposed to further growth of housing in the Haxby/Wigginton area unless significant improvements in the existing infrastructure are made, in particular drains and roads are matters which require attention.	9340/18409	
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – object to the scale of the proposed development at ST9, alongside SF4 and ST14. Schools, shops, drainage and parking facilities are all at capacity and the village is only just coping now.	9344/18414	
	Objection – impact of development on infrastructure in Haxby. Larch Way and Lowfields could not take the volume of traffic if opened up to access and Usher Land is already heavily congested. If no further schools are planned this is likely to increase congestion due to the distance of the new estate to local schools. Would there be plans for a new school. Lost Oaken Grove School and this has filled two nearby schools.	9345/18417	
	Objection – to the plans for more housing on proposed sites. Drainage is already a problem in Haxby and the facilities would have to be increased – there have been no recreation infrastructure improvements in 42 years.	9346/18420	
	Objection - the numbers of additional dwellings proposed would have a great impact on the twin villages and infrastructure. Concerns about impact on schools, old people's homes, medical facilities and roads. Would welcome further plans and information for infrastructure provision prior to growth.	9388/18151	
	Objection – serious problems with flooding, drainage and long term wet ground need resolving. Access by road into Haxby is already fraught by queues at critical times which causes unacceptable dangers for cyclists and pedestrians, makes public transport unreliable and creates busy roads which become problem areas for living and constant cut through racing by drivers to avoid the congestion. Haxby shops are already becoming overcrowded with too few parking spaces. There needs to be major investment in the infrastructure if Haxby is going to cope with the number of houses planned. Not convinced that the Council have genuinely thought through the consequences of the housing proposed and has not offered solution to well known local problems.	9389/18155	
	Objection – the existing infrastructure can't cope with the current volume of traffic let alone a potential increase of 800-1200 cars and also school pupil place already stretched to capacity.	9393/23718	
	Objection – oppose any development in Haxby.	9394/23721	
Objection- Haxby town Centre is already above capacity. Car parking is already difficult and many residents are of pensionable age therefore walking to the centre is not an options. The bus is irregular and does not cover all areas. At peak times the	9395/18426		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	access/egress by the three main routes is difficult and time consuming. The bypass which is only single carriageway is congested at peak times and weekends. Development would swamp the shop and facilities already there.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – strongly oppose the revised proposals for Haxby. The services and amenities are currently at capacity. Parking in Haxby main street is currently inadequate and cars use surrounding residential streets. The Haxby and Wigginton Health Centre is oversubscribed. The A1237 is heavily congested, especially at school times and rush hour.	9400/18432	
	Objection –support of Haxby Town Council’s objection to the proposed housing development in Haxby. This would result in further erosion of the Green Belt, strain on roads and parking places that are already becoming overcrowded and a drainage system which is in some places problematic.	9402/18299	
	Objection – the massive increase in housing will impact on the infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton with regard to roads, schools, drainage (which is a particular problem in the area), parking and other amenities. Brownfield land should be exhausted before development of Green Belt land is considered.	9403/18302	
	Objection – this new development is going to be bad for Haxby due to the traffic on York road – a journey which takes approximately 20 minutes already to get to New Earswick. Gardens already flood bad enough now without the proposed development. There are also not enough doctors or schools to take this amount of people.	9404/18306	
	Objection –concerns about the increase in traffic, the lack of schools, doctors, parking, sewage and drains. I accept the need for people to have homes locally, however, houses cannot be built without improvements to infrastructure.	9405/18309	
	Objection – the proposals indicated in ST9 and SF4 will have an adverse effect,, due to the scale of the proposed development, in terms of infrastructure, roads, parking, schools capacity, amenities and drainage. Agree with Haxby Town Council’s efforts to stop this development, until all potential Brownfield development has been exhausted.	9408/18314	
	Objection - there are already enough people living in Haxby and it is already bursting at the seams. There is a long waiting for a Doctors appointment, Haxby shopping centre is already very congested with cars and it is hazardous to drivers and pedestrians and there are drainage problems in Haxby already.	9409/18319	
	Objection – the roads are inadequate and dangerous. There are not enough spare places in existing schools. Drainage is bordering on insufficient capacity. Lack of parking for shopping in the village. Poor recreational facilities, especially for children.	9410/18323	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection –increase in the size of Haxby and Wigginton as Haxby would lose village feel. There are significant traffic problems already on York Road, there are parking problems in Haxby and there are already issues with drains. Where would the increase of shops go.</p>	9412/18326	
	<p>Objection – whilst there is a desperate need for more houses, despite so many residents objections, the Council appear to have increased the number of houses under the smoke-screen of strategic green space. There is no information about any proposals to increase the infrastructure of the area or to accommodate these new dwellings, in particular, the levels of schools, GPs services, drainage, sewage and all the other requirements that an increase in population of this magnitude would need. Main concern is the amount of traffic into and out of Haxby and should the development go ahead, has consideration been given to another access onto the outer ring road.</p>	9413/18328	
	<p>Objection - Haxby has grown enormously since 1983. Appreciate people have to have places to live, but here in Haxby, and Wigginton, there always seems to be a healthy number of houses for sale. Do not therefore see the need to build in Haxby, and the number of proposed houses seems to increase with each letter. There is no room for the thousands of extra cars in the village or on the connecting roads.</p>	9414/18331	
	<p>Objection – there is not the infrastructure in place to facilitate the building of more houses.</p>	9416/18336	
	<p>Objection – the present size of population is at the limit of the capacity of the roads and parking in the village centre. Whilst there is a need for housing, its not as if there are any major employers left in the town, so it is assumed that people are living here but working elsewhere. Don't turn Haxby and York into a dormitory town for Leeds or London. Haxby now needs a ring road of its own. Trying to exit the area going west on the A1237 is a slow and frequently traffic comes to a complete standstill. Almost any time of the week, the traffic is crawling. Parking in the village has become very difficult. Disabled Parking is inadequate also. This development would tip Haxby over from a big and barely manageable, but otherwise nice place to live, into just another overcrowded sprawl.</p>	9417/18339	
	<p>Objection – totally disagree with the plans for new homes on Green Belt Land in Haxby. The traffic would be disastrous, it is bad enough now in the morning.</p>	9419/18344	
	<p>Objection – not only is the drainage system at full capacity, and not always coping, but the whole infrastructure is not geared up for these houses. Experienced drainage and surface water problems already in the last year.</p>	9421/18347	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)	Objection – concerns about the proposed development in Haxby and whether it can be sustained. York Road is already congested at certain times, and a question is raised about what could be done to change that. A further question is posed about whether Haxby has the schools, doctors, dentists to cope with a huge influx of people.	9425/18356	
	Objection – opposed to building on these Greenfield sites. Haxby does not have the facilities for such an expansion, for example, when will there be enough doctors. Haxby traffic is bad enough now, with the additional housing there will be gridlock.	9427/18362	
	Objection – Haxby and Wigginton have already taken a disproportionate amount of housing development over recent decades and from an infrastructure point of view are at saturation point. Schools in the area already full to capacity. Road traffic already experiences ‘grid lock’ at peak traffic times. Would effect medical facilities i.e. doctor’s surgeries, hospitals, dentists and Air pollution as a result of traffic density. Local ‘amenities’ (currently there are none) – what guarantee is there that provision would be made for these if Haxby / Wigginton were to almost double in size.	9434/184500	
	Support –support the plan around Haxby.	9439/18462	
	Objection – although would not object to a very limited development at these sites, the current proposals are far in excess of what is sensible and reasonable with respect to the local community. The service roads (Usher Lane and Moor Lane) are already busy and could not reasonable accept this additional load of traffic. Also Haxby amenities (schools, medical centres etc.) are already overstretched and would be excessively overloaded by the new needs.	9446/18466	
	Objection – the A1237 is already congested for most of the day, causing traffic to back up into Haxby and along Wigginton Road. This is further exacerbated when the level crossing is closed, making it almost impossible to get out of Haxby at rush hour. The proposed new development will significantly add to this congestion. The two secondary schools (Huntington and Joseph Rowntree) are already at full capacity, with very few places remaining in the 3 primary schools. There are already problems with surface water and foul water drainage which can only get worse if the development goes ahead. These proposals will increase the size of Haxby by one third. There is no available space for expansion of shops/community buildings and very little open space. Parking in Haxby is already a problem. A lot of people, particularly the elderly, live too far away from the shopping centre to walk in, and have no option but to use their cars. Air pollution will increase. Extra cars can only add to this. The existing health centre would have to expand in terms of further staff, buildings and parking, but there is no space to do so.	9450/18475	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection- the land has a high watertable so development will lead to more flooding. The additional development will create at least 2000 more cars. Short stay car parking in the village is a nightmare and there is no room for extra parking there. The crossing of York road and the A1237 is already badly congested at busy times. Frustrated drivers cause accidents. The excellent health services will be under even greater strain. The existing primary school is already full so a new school will be needed. The secondary school may not have the capacity to take more pupils. Concern raised over if provision has been made for an enlarged cemetery and health centre.</p>	9455/24116	
	<p>Objection- the road system is narrow and unsuitable for further volumes of traffic. York Road and The Village are congested. Extra volumes of traffic will increase air and noise pollution. The development will result in a loss of Green Belt amenity. There is inadequate capacity at the local health centre and insufficient parking in the village. The surface water and sewage system is already inadequate. The provision of school places is inadequate. Further development will exacerbate the problem. The proposed land is on a floodplain.</p>	9461/24120	
	<p>Objection – opposed to such a large amount of housing, where access is from Usher Lane to the site, concerned that the pollution and noise will be far too great and unbearable. The infrastructure required is not available, including drainage and sewerage. We have not the required health care facilities i.e. Haxby and Wigginton health centre will not be large enough to cope. The village itself is now a nightmare to park in. There are not sufficient school places in the local schools for the amount of children that this housing will create. The traffic on the outer ring road is almost nearly always running at a snails pace. The York Road at Haxby, between 07.00 and 08.30 is again nose to tail. Where are the jobs for all the people in the new properties. Extra policing will be needed. Haxby is at full capacity for the facilities that we have. Leave our green fields and wildlife alone.</p>	9468/18484	
	<p>Objection – very concerned about the plans to build a large number of houses on the areas ST9 and SF4. The traffic in Haxby at morning and evening peaks causes major congestion caused by the large volume of entering and leaving Haxby and meeting up with the standing traffic on the A1237 bypass. This is aggravated by having to cross a level crossing on the York/Scarborough line. Haxby and Wigginton have bore the brunt of major development over the years, which has caused the infrastructure and services to reach capacity. A further 800 dwellings would 'break the back' of our roads, schools, health centres and drainage/sewage systems. There is no more space</p>	9472/18490	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	available for expansion of the shops and services that would be required for this development and the two roads that would feed it (Moor Lane and Usher Lane) are totally unsuitable for any increase in traffic.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – in recent years there has been a strain on local infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors surgeries, and maintenance of roads and streets. There has also been an increased volume of traffic and parking problems. Object to building of 1,500 more houses.	9477/18733	
	Objection – proposed level of growth is too much for the area. The infrastructure cannot sustain that many houses and the roads, transport, services, flood risk and doctors surgery would not cope.	9478/18735	
	Objection – sewer drains are at maximum capacity. The rivers are at maximum when in flood. The roads are unable to cope with traffic. The ring road at peak times is already at capacity and at the weekends when there is least traffic. Parking in Haxby is at saturation point.	9481/18740	
	Objection – no obvious demand in Haxby/Wigginton or in the York area generally for such a large number of new houses. Aim must be to attract new residents from elsewhere but see no economic or social need for this. Haxby and York itself in danger of losing their essential character by overdevelopment. Traffic will be significantly increased due to size of existing population and those using the area's roads to cut through from A19 to A64. Existing local facilities are limited and will be put under increased strain.	9486/18750	
	Objection – car parking on the main street and neighbouring roads are now full to capacity. Area suffered drainage issues in the past. Schools have recently been downsized and will mean a large under-capacity of places for school children. Medical facilities and doctors surgeries are stretched to their limit. Shopping facilities are adequate for current population but more will be needed. Why is an incursion on Green Belt land proposed when there are a number of brownfield sites available for consideration.	9494/18760	
	Objection – schools in the area can't cater for an ever increasing number of children. Pressure on car parking at village shops, particularly on main street. Existing congestion on roads leading to the ring road. Inadequate drainage. How will these cope with additional houses.	9495/18762	
	Objection - Haxby not suited to further development. In recent years it has become congested in the village. It is difficult to get appointments at the doctor's surgery. Very difficult to park in the village and schools won't be able to cope with large influx	9496/18764	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	of children. Very concerned how this massive increase will impact on the infrastructure of the village. Also worried about the Green Belt and ask the Council to consider brown field sites before spoiling Haxby and the surrounding area.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – existing road network insufficient for existing population without introducing a further 800 homes. Parking congestion in local shopping centre. Infrastructure drainage facilities are already struggling to cope and schools are already overstretched. Consider it more viable to utilise the numerous derelict / empty properties throughout the city and surrounding suburbs rather than impose such a massive burden on an already stretched district. Recognise there is a need for more housing but would have considered a more proportionate increase.	9497/18766	
	Objection – increased demands on Haxby and Wigginton for roads, drainage, parking and amenities. Prior development of brownfield areas before any development of existing green belt land. Existing health centre is already stretched to capacity and there is no room for development on the present site. The existing primary and junior schools are already working at capacity. Growth of car traffic will seriously impact on an already overstretched road system, particularly at peak periods. Moor Lane Cemetery will be landlocked, with no room for development. Where else in this area can this facility be reproduced. Water table in the area is already too high with problems caused by flooding of gardens and property. Development will have dramatic negative impact on what is now a very pleasant and manageable place to live, and will adversely react on our existing quality of life.	9498/20081	
	Objection –there is insufficient infrastructure to cope. The drainage and sewerage system cannot cope, there is no parking apart form that to the rear of Sainsbury's, the roads cannot cope, public transport is unreliable, can't get a doctors appointment when needed and there are insufficient school places.	9510/18672	
	Objection - strongly against the proposed development at Haxby North. This development uses 6 or more hectares of strategic green space and this development will have a massive impact on the infrastructure in and around Haxby (roads, traffic, drainage, parking amenities, etc).	9516/18685	
	Objection – strongly against the proposed development at Haxby North. The development has increased in size since the original consultation and the development will have a massive impact on the infrastructure in and around Haxby (roads, traffic, drainage, parking, amenities).	9517/18689	
	Objection – at present, the infrastructure of the two villages will not support the increase in housing and population that is in the plan. Not convinced that there are	9519/18697	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>sufficient job opportunities within the York for that number of people. The case, then the area will become a commuter area for the region. The northern ring road and the route to the ring road will be even more congested. In addition, there would be increased traffic in the direct area as it is assumed that there would be access to the ST9 area from Oaken Grove via Larch Way or Lowfield. These areas are currently safe areas for children to play; concerned that the increased flow of traffic would increase the risk of accident. There are clearly issues with drainage in the area and this would increase with further housing. The current level of primary school education in the area is just sufficient for the current population. With the additional population, further school space would be required which realistically means a loss of green space in the current schools.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – object to these significant developments being made on existing green belt land due to the massive impact they will have on the infrastructure of road, drainage and amenities. This estate has always had drainage problems ever since it was built in the early 1970s. Larch Way, which would lead directly onto ST9, still has drainage problems. Road congestion would be another major problem. What is the point in having a Green Belt in the first place if it is going to be removed later. Suggest that brown field sites be used and no further building be proposed in Haxby.</p>	<p>9521/19258</p>	
	<p>Objection – far too many new houses when the facilities of schools, drainage, shops, parking etc. in the villages of Haxby/Wigginton do not facilitate it.</p>	<p>9526/19255</p>	
	<p>Objection – concerns about the impact on existing amenities such as schools, doctors</p>	<p>9537/19272</p>	
	<p>Objection – the traffic will increase, schools will be affected and the community will be affected</p>	<p>9540/19278</p>	
	<p>Objection - objects to development of sites to north and south of Haxby (ST9, SF4 and H37). Please put a stop to destroying our beautiful village. Exhaust brownfield areas before building on our beautiful green belt.</p>	<p>9544/19052</p>	
	<p>Objection – object to development of sites to north and south of Haxby. All brown field land should be exhausted first, for example on Haxby Road, the former Vicars site and Nestle etc.</p>	<p>9545/19049</p>	
	<p>Objection – increased demand on Haxby and Wigginton for roads, drainage, parking and amenities. Brownfield areas should be developed prior to the development of green belt land. The health centre is stretched to capacity.</p>	<p>9555/19436</p>	
	<p>Objection – Haxby town centre has adequate shops for the amount of people now and there is no space for any more. There is limited parking. Lack of employment for new residents. Roads are in very poor state and ring road is congested. Also concerned</p>	<p>9563/19064</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	regarding capacity of schools, doctors, sewage network.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – greater efforts should be made to find brownfield sites, such as those that have been scandalously bought up by supermarket chains ‘just in case needed’. If the developments do go ahead, every service and facility in Haxby town will be put under intolerable strain. The character of this delightful town will be ruined.	9582/20628	
	Objection – the revised proposals appear to represent a 40% increase in the population of Haxby and Wigginton. This is wholly unsustainable. We already have major issues with all services, with particular emphasis on sewers (at capacity now), roads and commuter traffic, schools, medical services and amenities. There is very little information on how you intend to support the proposed dwellings.	9585/22436	
	Objection- the infrastructure cannot sustain the proposed development and thus quality of life of the current residents will be adversely affected. All brownfield sites should be exhausted before any consideration of Green Belt sites. They were designated Green Belt sites for good reason.	9586/24144	
	Objection – totally opposed to developing this green belt land and believe there are plenty of other sites and on brown sites.	9591/19286	
	Objection – concerned about how the massive increase will impact on an already over populated area, this will almost double the amount of vehicles on the local roads causing even more traffic delays. There are already many drainage problems, parking problems, also the effects this will have on the amenities a lot of which are over subscribed now. The will be tremendous increases of heavy building site traffic on our local roads which are already gridlocked especially between the times people are going to work and coming home from work. Brownfield development areas should be used for development before using any of our green belt areas, thus utilising infrastructures that already to some extent exist	9593/19288	
	Objection - Haxby cannot sustain the amount of development you are proposing – we do not have the infrastructure available to support the huge numbers of increased cars, children (i.e. school places are already at bursting point), shoppers etc. The drainage in Haxby is already fit to burst. We are seeing more flooded gardens, taking several weeks to drain adding the number of houses on our green belt is only going to make it worse. The amount of houses you are proposing are almost a village in itself. Fill up the current brownfield sites around York before destroying beautiful countryside. Who would want to buy a house with pylons running through their back gardens. It serves no purpose to the people of Haxby and indeed York; all that happens is that you will get an influx of people moving into York from Leeds and	9596/22443	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	surrounding areas and our village cannot cope with the additional volumes. You talked about Haxby station re-opening if this Plan develops. Haxby station will only re-open if the rail network want to invest in the station. Build the extra schools and the station before you build the houses.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – object to the proposed developments for the village of Haxby. The village is already at breaking point in terms of traffic congestion, school places and additional facilities including the medical centre. York Road can become very congested especially at peak times due to the train barriers at York Road which increase the risk of gridlock. The impact on local drainage systems and local amenities would also have a very adverse effect on the area.	9599/19295	
	Objection – astonished at the revision to the local plan. Will have an impact on Haxby and Wigginton that the area is unable to sustain. This plan appears ill-conceived, ill thought-out, against the wishes of the residents and it's elected representatives and flies against all common-sense judgment. This says development should concentrate on brownfield sites in the York area, many of which are an eyesore and could be improved enormously by development.	9600/22451	
	Objection – strong objection to the proposed housing development. This is an encroachment on green belt land with significant implications for nature within this area but also on local amenities which at present are stressed. Most people who live in Haxby choose to because of the green area available and 'village' feel. I personally do not want to see the town losing its identity and becoming over crowded by houses when there are areas around York, currently undeveloped which could be used. The town is surrounded by fields and a small wood. The area is now coming into fruition with a range of wildlife. A housing development would ruin this and have adverse effect on the population of wildlife. Drains are under stress and when heavy rain falls often struggle to cope – this will only be exacerbated. Many years ago one primary school was closed due to reduced pupil numbers. More housing would mean more school places – both schools have limited capacity. Some roads are in terrible condition and are extremely busy every day. Poor traffic measures are in place. Surely it makes sense for houses to be built in open spaces in currently undeveloped fields and create new areas (outskirts of Monks Cross) rather than on top of an area which is well developed.	9601/22455	
	Objection – would be extremely detrimental to the infrastructure of the town as well as the appearance and attraction of the place. The roads are already very busy, the schools overcrowded and there are many drainage problems. Parking is also a	9603/19298	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	problem and the condition of the roads is deteriorating. Would it not be better to improve these services instead of building more houses that would make everything worse. Please consider using other sites – brown field sites before green belt land		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection - concerned about how such a massive increase in buildings will impact upon the infrastructure of both Haxby and Wigginton villages i.e. roads, drainage, parking and amenities. Haxby village centre will need to grow thus spoiling our village appearance and atmosphere. Already have parking and drainage problems. We enjoy our rural setting and do not want to live in an urban sprawl which seemingly will soon extend to Strensall and Earswick's borders. Strongly of the opinion that brown field development areas should be exhausted before any development of green belt land takes place.	9604/19302	
	Objection – proposed size of plan is unjustifiable on green field sites which must be preserved to stop the spread of York's green belt being eroded when there are plenty of brownfield sites and numerous unoccupied properties in York. A1237 is so congested and cannot cope with more traffic, no further plans for the building of large scale developments should even be considered until the A1237 is dualled along its full entirety. Haxby infrastructure has reached saturation point. There are no parking facilities within the centre of Haxby, on street parking totally clogs the main street and shopping area and has to facilitate surrounding villages. Any further influx of traffic caused by the building of 1533 additional properties would create huge congestion on both sides of the level crossing. Increase in traffic going past Joseph Rowntree School at peak times and need for complete alteration of B1363/Mill Lane junction. Only main entrance to site would be Usher Lane which is single carriageway and in proximity to Junior School. New school would need to be built. Health service facility is already at full capacity. Where are the jobs for these new residents. There is a recognised drainage and flooding problem in the Haxby area. Haxby has a very few sports facilities and does not have its own village hall.	9609/22464	
	Objection – this area has had to take a huge house-building programme which has taken up valuable agricultural land. How can you justify adding 2000 people to the use of facilities and amenities that currently exist, many of which are overstretched already. The main street and Usher Lane in Haxby could not contemplate any increase in vehicular traffic without serious disruption and danger to its residents. Not to mention, additional pressure on parking which is most difficult to find now. Jobs would need to be found within the area for new residents, as there are not many places of employment. An increase of travelling to new work would be required which would	9618/19314	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>add to vehicle use. Not all will resort to cycling. I have personal problems with drainage, sewage and surface water as do many local residents- caused by lack of sufficient infrastructure and a high water table. Changes in weather predicted for UK mean that it is not too difficult to imagine a similar situation to the Level last year of efficient drainage isn't installed. Local Doctors and treatment are currently struggling to cope, another increase of 2000 people and these would be a complete break down for the existing authorities and patients. Our existing Green Spaces are needed and are very valuable to us for recreation and pleasant living and I ask you do not fence us in with concrete. Green Belt should be preserved at all costs. Please consider your housing requirement to fully explore Brownfield areas before attempting blight an area that its residents love and value.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the existing infrastructure in Haxby is inadequate; the Ring Road is struggling in Wigginton, Haxby and Strensall junctions. Existing roads in Haxby leading towards the by-pass already struggle to cope with existing traffic volumes, often backing up across and well beyond the level crossing on York Road. Suggest that at least 80% of people from all new developments will all exit along York Road over the level crossing. Bus service struggles to cope with passenger numbers at peak times and service is already unreliable due to traffic volumes – how will this cope with an additional 1000 properties. All three existing junior schools in Haxby and Wigginton are already full most years; again how will the Council address this issue, which will also bring traffic around local schools. And how will the additional numbers be catered for in the secondary school. Parking in Haxby centre around the local amenities is already at times stretched and the feel of the community will struggle under such a sheer volume of increase. Should consider significant improvement to road infrastructure out of York Road across level crossing and improvements to by-pass roundabout, full or partial funding towards the railway station often proposed for Haxby (and housing not permitted to start until station open. Should consider improvements to the by-pass from Haxby, past both Clifton Moor and Monks Cross and improvements to the existing problems of poor drainage and surface water. Why can't these houses be built on brownfield land inside the ring road instead of using valuable Greenfield areas. There would be little additional pressure on main arteries of the commuting roads, it would have a community feel and wouldn't choke local schools and facilities around the area.</p>	<p>9622/19705</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection - Haxby and Wigginton's services are already stretched by its current population. The ring road is heavily weighted by the volume of traffic. The village centre is already short of parking, with significant congestion problems, particularly at weekend. The schools are heavily subscribed, and would not support the increase in children. School would also be unable to cope with the increase in demand. The drainage system struggles to cope with the existing population. The character of this historic village would be completely altered for the worse. People live in areas such as Haxby and Wigginton as they wish to live in a village, surrounded by Greenbelt land. This development would entirely change this way of life for many people. Understand the push from central government policy to build new houses, however, this has to be done in a more considered way than expanding areas that cannot cope with the development. Huge expanses such as un-used car parks and waste land should be highlighted initially. Also the Clifton moor proposal is more considered as it creates amenities, therefore not draining other saturated resources.</p>	9630/20087	
	<p>Objection – strongly opposed to proposal.</p>	9632/20092	
	<p>Objection - the road network could not cope with this increased level of housing/people/cars. Especially given how many would be coming out through Usher Lane which is a bad junction and very close to the primary school.</p>	9633/20095	
	<p>Objection - the access roads, Moor Lane and Usher Lane are both relatively narrow roads. Traffic travels extremely fast along both roads towards the village. Greater risk of accidents and more difficult access to the other roads feeding off Moor Lane and Usher Lane. Will not be in easy walking distance from a bus service - forcing people who live in the development to use their cars. People living in this area will not be encouraged to use public transport. Oaken Grove School closed some years ago due to the lack of pupil numbers. It is extremely difficult to get a place at the schools in the village for people moving into the area. The new development will need a new school. The development is too large for the infrastructure of the village. More cars coming down into the village to use the shops will only create more congestion in the village and there is nowhere to create more parking for these extra cars. Increased traffic inevitably leads to poor air quality. The amount of traffic on the roads not only creates a noise impact but reduces the quality of the air. There are already drainage issues on Moor Lane. Extra strain put on the sewerage system and the surface water drainage system will only lead to further flooding for the properties on Moor Lane, who are already affected by this problem. It is a greenbelt, farmland area and a development of this size will turn scenic countryside into an urban sprawl.</p>	9637/20100	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The graveyard off Moor Lane is a quiet, contemplative area of the village. This quiet area will be destroyed by the increase in traffic and noise from the people living there. The graveyard will also need to be extended in future years and if there is no land available, this will create a further problem. Great strain on the shopping area, the schools, the medical practice - which is already extremely busy. There are many brownfield sites that can be developed around the city before spoiling beautiful villages and countryside around the City.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – access roads are narrow. Traffic travels fast into the village. Increase in risk of accidents. Bus service no longer exists. School is full. High levels of flooding. Extra strain on sewerage and drainage will make it worse. Green belt land. Development would ruin visual impact of the village.	9638/21115	
	Objection – traffic is at capacity. Local services would not be able to cope with the extra people. Schools at capacity.	9649/21111	
	Objection – traffic can't get out of Haxby 8am till 9am. Can't get back 4pm till 6pm. Shops in the village are busy with no car parking – would be too many people. Drains always have trouble. Not enough schools. Have to wait to get a doctor's appointment.	9651/20112	
	Objection – object to proposed development on greenbelt land in Haxby. Schools are already near to full capacity. Understand Lowfield Drive has been recognised as a flood plain. The ring road is already hugely population. Further houses in Haxby will only increase this problem and result in bad air pollution and congestion. Should consider the wildlife in the fields.	9661/20122	
	Objection – the amount of traffic on Usher Lane and Moor Lane will greatly increase. Difficult to get onto Station Road and The Village. Oaken Road could very easily become a dangerous short cut. Local School are already working to capacity. Parking in the centre of Haxby for shops, banks, chemist and dentist is already inadequate. There is not enough employment within Haxby & Wigginton to satisfy such a large influx of people. Drainage and sewage systems are inadequate now. The cost of upgrading and replacing, of connecting new dwellings will be horrendous. If building is allowed on this scale and on Greenfield sites the damage will be unthinkable. Human quality of life will suffer. Flora and fauna will suffer	9679/19513	
	Objection – loss of wildlife habitat.	9680/19515	
	Objection – Haxby is large enough already having taken its share of development in the past. Building on a floodplain is a risk. How will the extra traffic get into and out of the area. Existing primary schools are already full. Is a new primary school proposed. Sewers are at capacity. Already difficult to get a doctor's appointment, will	9687/22237	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	new facilities be planned.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – concerns about infrastructure, drains, sewage, traffic problems, schools, doctors’ surgery or community centres. Poor roads and no room for more shops or banks. Full parking.	9690/22474	
	Objection - brownfield sites must be exhausted before any development of Green Belt land.	9698/24166	
	Objection – both towns have grown dramatically over the last 30 years. An expansion along the proposed line would be disproportionate to such a community that lacks the infrastructure to take the increased traffic, pupils and other services. Effectively the two towns are dormitory towns enjoying few employment possibilities and a large elderly community. This places a burden on traffic management regarding commuting and safety of increasingly vulnerable community. The increased commercial activity on the ring road adds to the volume of traffic which already exceeds capacity at peak times. Narrow Lanes and the proposed development will result in difficulties in parking and increased pressure on other spaces to provide more room for motor vehicles. There are concerns for the sewerage and the ability of the current system to cope with increased demand. Whilst this letter might be construed as nimbyism, the scale and use of Green Belt size should encourage the authorities to explore other options.	9712/20171	
	Objection – the Plans indicates extensive development of this area where the existing infrastructure is already under pressure. Haxby is crowded: there is little Green Space, very limited parking, issues with flooding and sewerage; primary and secondary schools are at capacity and at peak times the access to the ring road is difficult and air quality is compromised. Without addressing those problems first, proposals to develop the area to a possible 40% of its existing population seems foolhardy. The development of Monks Cross and proposals for a new village north of Clifton Moor will certainly add to the pressure of the already slow moving, single carriageway by-pass. Crossing York Road is already problematic, especially for the elderly. As there are few opportunities for employment within the immediate area, residents will need to travel out for residents. The egress junctions area already problematic and there is little room amongst the existing housing to remedy this. Parking is very limited and lack of space makes the likelihood of additional parking being found seem unlikely. Suggestions that a station be developed have been raised which would require parking. There is a pressing need to attend to the issues of sewerage, surface water and land prone to flooding, How would development of the	9713/20173	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Green Belt impact on those already affected by these unpleasant problems. There has been considerable development of Haxby over the years – both large estates and infill building. Further development would be damaging to the existing community – for example how would the health centre cope with the considerable increase proposed. The need for housing is pressing, especially for young families, but to build in an already extensively developed area, putting strain on the amenities of the existing community should be reconsidered. Efforts should be made to considered brown field development before moving onto the Green Belt. Once lost, the Green Belt, its wildlife, history and the amenity provides to local people will be lost.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – surface water drainage is already a problem. Existing roads are already overloaded. Health centre is very busy and car parking facilities are inadequate. Retail outlets are limited and local car parking is inadequate. What considerations have been given to the need for employment. Schools are close to capacity.	9729/19531	
	Objection – brownfield land should be built on not green belt land. Will have a massive impact on Haxby, affecting schools and medical facilities, roads, sewage, drainage, transport and parking. Environmental impacts will also be bad.	9733/19540	
	Objection – Haxby already has massive problems with traffic, especially on York Road near the level crossing. Adding an extra 1500 houses to the village will only make this problem significantly worse. Development in Haxby should not happen until the outer ring road is made into a dual carriageway and a train station is built for the village. Impact on Drainage – Adding 1500 houses to this area is only going to make this worse on drainage. Impact on services – Currently the schools in Haxby and Wigginton are virtually full, doctors and dentists are also full. Adding a further 1500 homes will place a significant impact on the services in the village. These service issues need to be addressed before any development work commences. Parking for the shops in Haxby centre is very limited.	9747/20214	
	Objection - these ill-judged plans will ruin both Haxby and Wigginton. York Road is completely congested every Monday to Friday between 8 and 9 am and it is not uncommon for the parking at Haxby shops to be full on a Saturday morning. The Council should protect the Green Belt and there are huge brown field development areas within York that could accommodate the new houses required.	9750/20219	
	Objection –increase in population would mean the rush hours, especially between 8 – 9am would see a massive build up of vehicles trying to exit the town. More houses means more cars. Facilities: When Haxby was extended, no thought was given for additional shops, pubs, and other amenities so the same thing will happen in Haxby	9752/22480	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>and Wigginton and very importantly, a school was closed and turned into a Community Centre as it was considered to be no longer needed. Oaken Grove families fought hard to stop the School closing, and now, where will the school go if it is needed? Flooding: I pointed out before that the land south of Hilbra Avenue is prone to flooding. Car Parking: even now is difficult in Haxby, so I hope that something can be done to stop or at least reduce these proposals. There is plenty of land near the Huntington Super Stores which may be more suitable for new housing. There was a proposal for the re-opening of the Railway Station, which would help the movement of people if the trains are time properly.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – Moor Lane and Usher Lane are unable to cope with the volume of traffic already. There is insufficient car parking in the village now. Where are extra cars to go. When the rail barrier is down traffic approaching Haxby is queued beyond the A1237 roundabout on to the New Earswick road. More cars would add to this. The present sewerage system should be able to accommodate more than the present number of properties in Haxby/Wigginton but is failing to do so. Drainage is inadequate when there is heavy rain. More built up areas will mean less land for natural drainage. More properties, more people, more pressure on already overworked doctors and nurses. Already long waits for appointments.</p>	<p>9755/19711</p>	
	<p>Objection – the existing schools in Haxby / Wigginton have limited spare capacity. Haxby and Wigginton Medical Centre and NHS Dentistry are already stretched. An appointment with a doctor can involve a waiting time of up to a fortnight. Parking is already inadequate, especially near shops and schools. At peak periods, access to the Ring Road causes long tail backs into the village. Due to the high water table there are, at present, serious issues re. Ground water discharge. Further large scale housing developments will escalate the problem. The existing sewerage system is already approaching full capacity. Any further developments would require a new sewage system to accommodate the additional volume.</p>	<p>9757/19713</p>	
	<p>Objection - the Ring Road is constantly blocked with traffic and needs to be avoided especially at peak times, with these extra movements of traffic both the village and the ring road will be constantly at a stand still. The drainage in the village already causes problems with flooding to properties and Haxby Town Council are in constant communication with Yorkshire Water regarding this. The extra properties will only exacerbate the situation. The schools in the area are at maximum numbers although we are told one of them is to have four extra classrooms. The plans do not include any extra infrastructure regarding health, social or pastoral care.</p>	<p>9761/19719</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – there is inadequate foul and surface water drainage in the area and a creatable infrastructure should be put in place, as well as road access, power supply, schools, medical provision.</p>	9764/19556	
	<p>Objection – the extra traffic attempting to leave Haxby at peak times will cause so many problems and they are not suitable for such volumes. It is impossible to park in the centre of Haxby and would be so much worse with more people. People will choose to shop at Clifton moor creating more traffic issues.</p>	9765/19558	
	<p>Objection – the infrastructure already struggles to deal with high volumes of traffic, schools are over subscribed and parts of the town are prone to flooding. Health care provision is a concern. Building further homes will swamp this already overstretched infrastructure, including increasing flood risk.</p>	9770/19568	
	<p>Objection – do not have the infra-structure, more houses would put strain on schooling, sewage and drainage and public transport. Building hundreds of homes will radically alter the nature of the area. Parking problems exist already and traffic density has increased to a scale which is undesirable. Let the developers use the brown field areas before any houses are built in Haxby and Wigginton.</p>	9771/20223	
	<p>Objection –accept there is a need for increased housing in the UK and within York, not convinced Haxby is the right location for the proposed new housing developments. Traffic queues will massively increase with 1500 plus new homes. A1237 is always busy at peak times – this will massively increase. Level crossing add to the delay – this will increase and could become a significant safety risk. Surface drainage to the north of Haxby is poor. Drainage is discharged to surface open systems which are prone to blockage and back up. Additional schools will be required within Haxby to accommodate the new housing. Provision of a new railway station has been discussed by the council but is not included in the plans and could help alleviate some of the traffic issues. Usher Lane is a narrow road accessed from Station Road and will become the main route in and out of the development and without upgrade could e congested throughout the day but especially at peak times.</p>	9779/20237	
	<p>Objection - concerned that such a massive increase in housing will impact significantly on the infrastructure of Haxby and also Wigginton. In particular the additional drainage/sewerage needed as Haxby already is at its limit, the Environmental Impact on the area, the loss of further Green Belt land and the effect on wildlife. Why not use the available brown belt land in York. The effect on the Health Centre resources in additional provision required. The effect on the traffic density on the town especially parking in the village, and congestion at the junctions on Usher Lane and at the</p>	9794/20258	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	railway crossings. The additional need for primary school provision created.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – this will have great effect on the roads in the area. Question if the electric, gas, water and sewerage system will be able to cope. More school places are necessary. There will be no countryside left.	9817/19115	
	Objection – this proposal is in the greenbelt. This will cause increase traffic. The roads are already congested. The drains cannot cope already. There are no proposals for new schools or medical services. Those present cannot cope.	9830/24230	
	Objection – this site, alongside other proposals in the area would have a high impact on the town and the existing green belt. The size of new infrastructure required is huge – new roads, existing roads to be resurfaced to cope with the increase in number of cars and surge in HGVs. Increased air pollution. New schools, shops, doctors and dentists would be required. Higher levels of security with a need for police in the town. Would require huge amounts of money which will not come in full from central government and therefore fall on the local residents.	9835/24239	
	Objection – there are issues with congested roads, drainage, parking, amenities in Haxby and Wigginton. Brownfield should be developed first. There is no evidence that thought has been given to where people will work to enable them to pay their mortgages. The ringroad needs to be addressed also.	9836/24241	
	Objection- houses should be built where flood risk exists. The existing roads in Haxby are stretched to their limits now. Disabled people have great difficulty crossing the roads. The proposed development will increase the pollution and cause more chaos. The drainage and sewage systems are at breaking point, any further development will make the problem worse. The local health care systems are not coping now. The ring road cannot cope with the traffic at the moment, and it will get worse. This area does not have opportunities for employment so people will have to travel to work causing problems on the roads.	9837/24243	
	Objection – this site is on a floodplain and the roads cannot take any more traffic. There is not enough room for more children in the village schools. The drains are at capacity. The parking in the village is not enough. There should be more traffic wardens.	9840/24246	
	Objection- concern as to what the benefits of this development for residents of Haxby. The Council cannot refund Green Belt land, prevent flooded homes due to inadequate pre-existing sewage and drainage nor reimburse residents for lost time in standing traffic. The aspect of transport must be dealt with now before any increase in housing. The inevitable escalation of cars will lead to a serious impact on public	9880/24299	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	health. The necessary infrastructure must be in place to meet demands.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection- the proposal will mean additional traffic on a very busy Usher Lane. The additional population will require additional school places which the present schools could not cope with. There are several empty sites in the area, namely Vickers old factory site on Haxby Road and the site next to Joseph Rowntree School. These sites should be built on before Greenfield sites are used.	9881/24301	
	Objection- Haxby is already highly populated. There is heavy congestion in and out of Haxby. Development would have a further negative impact on this. Parking in the village is already over subscribed disruptive traffic, especially on South Lane and Station Road. Doctors appear over subscribed. York Hospital appears under resourced, how will the plans address this. Drainage in the village is already poor. There are few facilities offered by local authority for young families. Seems absurd to be providing further dwellings when current ones are not fully supported. Bus services are poor and unreliable which development would impact upon. The revised boundary does not address the negative impact on existing residents who have paid a premium to live in a village location which is subject to compromise.	9890/24329	
	Objection- there is nothing in the plan that makes reference to how the Council are going to deal with the increase in traffic as a result of additional housing. There are serious safety concerns for cyclists and pedestrians. Concern regarding the risk of building housing on an existing flood plain. There should be no housing on Green Belt land. Brownfield sites should be utilised first. The roads in and around Haxby and Wigginton are already heavily congested. There is a lack of available parking for local amenities. There is a lack of available parking for local amenities. Cars regularly abandoned for periods of time in random places which is not safe.	9892/24332	
	Objection – concerns over cyclist and pedestrian safety with the increase of traffic. There is no evidence in the local plan to suggest that the existing traffic issues will be resolved. Much of Haxby is at risk of flooding.	9893/24335	
	Objection – the local infrastructure is already over-stretched and does not have the capacity to accommodate the demands of an additional 1,500 homes. The volume of traffic heading into the city on Haxby Road and Wigginton Road during the morning rush hour already exceeds the capacity of the roads, especially during school term time; increasing the number of homes in the villages would only exacerbate the situation, since it is likely that many of the new residents would work in the city centre. Many of the new residents would be likely to have school-aged children. Do the local schools have the capacity to absorb those children? Given the distance of	9905/19342	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>the proposed new houses from existing schools, is it not likely that many of the children would be driven to and from school, further increasing the volume of traffic on already over-crowded roads. Neither the shops nor the car park in Haxby would be able to accommodate a significant increase in people wishing to shop there on Saturday mornings. Would strongly encourage the council to accept that building on green-field sites should only ever be considered as a very last resort. There are many brown-field sites which could, and should, be used for development before any further encroachment on the green belt is permitted (for example, most of the site formerly occupied by Clifton Aerodrome is currently derelict and should be developed in preference to areas which are currently green fields).</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this development will lead to increased traffic and parking chaos. This will caused irreversible damage to the environment. Haxby town council are committed to protecting the greenbelt.</p>	9942/24483	
	<p>Objection – the greenbelt must always be protected and only considered when there is no other alternative. Not all brownfield sites have been given consideration. An additional 1500 dwellings would have an impact on the local infrastructure. The character and local environment would be adversely affected for forever.</p>	9949/24493	
	<p>Objection – all the primary schools in Haxby and Wigginton are full. The infrastructure does not meet the needs of the community.</p>	9970/24518	
	<p>Objection – the road network in and out of haxby is at capacity. The drainage, parking and amenities will not be able to cope with further development. All brownfield development areas should be exhausted before building on the greenbelt.</p>	9972/24520	
	<p>Objection – in a flood risk area. Will cause irreversible damage to the environment and local community. Will push vital infrastructure beyond its limits. Potential traffic and parking chaos. Local healthcare systems will be stretched beyond capacity.</p>	9974/24522	
	<p>Objection – the roads will become more congested, causing further delays and damage to the roads. The existing drainage/sewers cannot cater for hundreds more houses, there is limited housing. The schools and medical practices are full. The people will bring more crime. There is no benefit for existing home owners.</p>	9977/25917	
	<p>Objection – this massive increase will impact upon the infrastructure of both Haxby and Wiggin, roads, drainage, parking and amenities. Brownfield development should take place before any greenbelt land is developed. A clear commitment to appropriate and parallel investment in infrastructure should be enshrined with in contractual agreements between city of York council and developers.</p>	9979/25921	
	<p>Objection- there is an abundance of wildlife to be seen and heard which would all be</p>	9997/20335	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	destroyed if plans go ahead.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection- roads are already incredibly busy and dangerous at rush hours and cannot take more traffic. The roads are small and already congested. There are not enough facilities in Haxby or Skelton to accommodate the huge surge in local population. Construction of the housing would create noise and pollution in a protected Green Belt area and close to Moorlands Nature Reserve. Brown Belt options should be fully explored before Green Belt. All Green Belt proposals should be abolished.	10007/25949	
	Objection – will adversely affect the character of the village. The local road network is already at capacity which will be exacerbated which will adversely affect the quality of life for both existing and future residents. Will put intolerable pressure on local schools, most of which are already close to capacity with little ability to expand. Will put pressure on the NHS system which is already struggling to cope. Council's estimates of the need for new housing is based on faulty data about inward immigration. Allocation of the site is not necessary as there is no established need in Haxby. All brownfield sites should be developed before any green belt site is considered. The land was and always has been green belt and has considerable amenity value for wildlife and as a feature in the landscape for Haxby. There is evidence of important archaeological remains on the site and a full survey should be undertaken.	10010/25054	
	Objection – there is no infrastructure as regards to roads, drainage, parking, amenities. New school children are having to travel outside the village for school places. Brownfield sites should be chosen.	10021/25968	
	Objection- Haxby has not got the infrastructure to deal with the increase in residents and volume of vehicles. Schools are already at maximum capacity, parking for vehicles in the village is insufficient. There is a great deal of animals in the area. Haxby is a village and its roads, schools, sewer system, shops and access have been built as such.	10028/25977	
	Objection- the number of houses proposed would choke the existing road infrastructure. York road already has heavy traffic at peak times. The air pollution levels are probably high and would increase affecting children walking to school. Crossing York Road can be difficult. The increased housing density is inappropriate and will result in Haxby changing from a small town with its own identity to a suburb of York.	10029/25979	
	Objection – strongly opposed to the proposals.	10040/24388	
	Objection – would bring a large amount of children, where would they go to school.	10060/24430	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The traffic out of Haxby at rush hour is already saturated. The railway lines contribute to this congestion. The further increase in traffic will be unmanageable. Pollution will increase. What about car parking. Should build in brownfield sites that are currently derelict not on green belt.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection- this is greenbelt land and should remain so, the road or general infrastructure cannot support the volume of proposed development. There is enough vacant housing stock within Haxby to accommodate those wishing to live in Haxby. The type of developments proposed are on the wrong side of the city for commuters to other work locations such as Leeds. The railway line should be built in advance of any proposed development. Objection – Green Belt land should remain Green Belt land. There isn't the road or general infrastructure to support the volume of proposed development in Haxby or the surrounding areas. Brownfield site and reclaimed land need to be used first. The argument that the road and infrastructure of Haxby and the surrounding areas would be upgraded when the developments are built, is flawed. It is flawed because they are needed before development, not after. There is enough vacant housing stock within Haxby currently to accommodate those currently wishing to live in Haxby. The type of developments proposed are the wrong side of York for commuters to other work locations who are likely to occupy them. I still cannot see anywhere the provision of a new primary school for the area. There would need to be a railway station built in advance of any proposed developments being built.	10070/20344	
	Objection- Haxby and Wigginton are almost fully developed as they are. The addition of 1500 homes would be a disaster for village life. Development would mean at least 1500 additional vehicles and the roads, parking places and infrastructure are already full to capacity. New homes would be better placed on sites to the south-east of York, near the university where major roads like the A1079 is capable of handling extra traffic.	10080/25791	
	Objection- roads in the area are already very busy. If more houses were built that means more traffic. Concern raised regarding the station being re-opened if new properties have to be built.	10081/25792	
	Objection – brownfield and derelict housing should be used to meet the housing shortage. Greenbelt land around villages should not be used. There is no infrastructure for this. It will create enormous problems for the area. The bypass is intolerable. It is very short sighted to build on green field when we will need them to grow food.	10083/25797	
	Objection – developments in this area amount to an increase of one sixth of the	10091/25808	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	current population. This will have severe impact on the local infrastructure and facilities.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – brownfield sites have not been exhausted. It is vandalism to build on the greenbelt. The sewers and drains are over whelmed. Services are at breaking point.	10093/25814	
	Objection – facilities and parking in Haxby are already overcrowded and any new housing would cripple the village. The road system is terrible and more development will cause the whole northern ring road to grind to a halt. Local primary schools are unable to accommodate any more children and there are no activities for young people to do. The current sewerage system is insufficient.	10099/19459	
	Objection – there should be no building on the greenbelt. More brownfield sites should be found. The roads around Haxby are already congested. The schools, drainage, parking and doctors are at capacity.	10111/25840	
	Objection – concerned that this number of houses will be built on green belt land when brownfield sites within the ring road are available. There are no plans for infrastructure (e.g. schools, doctors, dentists) which are currently at full capacity. The effect on local roads has not been thought through. Currently York Road and Wigginton Road are full during rush hour and these new developments will just add to congestion. There is no plan for another feeder road onto the ring road. Parking in Haxby village is currently at full capacity. Where will all these additional cars park to use local services. This has not been thought through.	10112/19351	
	Objection – this is short sighted. Build a new town with good infrastructure near to the ring road. Haxby struggles to cope with queuing traffic. More development will put more stain on the infrastructure. The needs of an aging population should be considered.	10113/25844	
	Objection – medical facilities, schools and car parking needs addressing. The roads are already over used, there is no opportunity to widen them. This area has doubled in size in the last 25 years.	10115/25846	
	Objection – the town cannot sustain this level of development, roads are over crowded and badly maintained. There is a need for more primary and secondary school provision. The village lacks parking and facilities. The current drainage system frequently floods.	10129/19466	
	Objection – the number of houses has risen since the last draft of the plan. All brownfield sites should be explored before greenbelt is used. The villages are unable to deal with the increased population as the infrastructure is at capacity.	10134/25903	
	Objection – the number of houses proposed to be built on the Haxby North ST9 and	10136/18500	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>SF4 sites would increase traffic by at least 1.500 cars, with a possibility of this being as many as 2,500 as Usher Lane will back up to the main road. There also appears to be no provision for a new school on the site so how will the local schools absorb the extra children. As with many surgeries it is not always easy to get a doctors appointment at Haxby doctors so what is the provision for extra patients.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection –area susceptible to flooding. Development of roads, roofs and other paved areas will increase the runoff rate dramatically, thereby increasing the risk unacceptably of localised flooding. Foul drainage – All foul sewage has to be pumped from the area to remote treatment works. Question the ability of the existing foul drainage network to accept an increase in foul sewage flows from a further population increase of approximately 2,000 people on site ST9 alone, which could amount to around 400m<sup>2</sup> per day. It is inappropriate to propose this development in a locality with very limited employment opportunities in the immediate area. The result would be an unacceptable increase in traffic flows, particularly at peak periods. Traffic from these areas would only be able to exit via Moor Lane and Usher Lane. These roads would experience surges of traffic flow at peak periods, leading to unacceptable tailbacks at their junctions with the village and Towthorpe Road respectively. The A1237 York Outer Ring Road is often severely congested between the Clifton Moor roundabout and the York Road (Haxby) Roundabout. A further increase in traffic on roads approaching the ring road would inevitably exacerbate the problem to gridlock proportions at peak times. Development could introduce 1500 additional cars from area ST9 alone. Car parking in Haxby and Wigginton is already inadequate and an increase of this magnitude would completely swamp available existing car parking. There is no land available in the vicinity of local shops and amenities to develop into more car parking spaces. Cars would be forced into residential streets near the village centres causing great inconvenience to residents.</p>	<p>10165/19363</p>	
	<p>Objection –Haxby is a small town and has all the amenities needed by present population, but does not have the infrastructure to cope with a big increase in population. Usher Lane, one of the proposed access roads, is a narrow road with houses on either side so could not be widened. It leads to an even narrower country lane. This is not a suitable access road for a large development. Towthorpe Road access would bring all the traffic across the level crossing on Station Road, past Ralph Butterfield school, where cars and buses cannot pass for much of the day already and where there are inherent problems with parking and through traffic at school times. Moor Lane, another proposed route, is also a narrow country lane. Objection is not to</p>	<p>10166/19365</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>a development per se but to the large scale of this proposal. Such a development would have a massive impact on traffic, local services, the main road through the village. Parking is becoming impossible due to lack of space and double parking is common. Traffic at level crossing on York Road at peak times also backs up onto the A1237 causing further congestion there. There are problems with drainage with sewage backing up and flooding in areas of Haxby which are not being addressed. A large development would only exacerbate these problems. The A1237 does not have the capacity to absorb further traffic until such time as it has been dualled. Concerned about effect on health of increased traffic pollution in the York Road area which would also impact on children travelling to school. Leisure facilities are inadequate for the existing population. York District Hospital does not have the capacity to cope with significant increase in the population. The development will not provide homes that the young people of Haxby and Wigginton could afford to buy. The Council should preserve green belt land and develop brownfield sites.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection –infrastructure (roads, amenities parking and drainage) cannot cope with any further developments. Entering or exiting Haxby from the roundabout on the A1237 at busy times i.e. morning and evening commuting times is already a problem and the roads could not cope with any additional traffic resulting from further development on the scale of this and the other proposals. Situation is aggravated by the totally inadequate and often gridlocked outer ring road (A1237). Development of Green Belt sites should not even be considered before the development of all existing brown field sites has been fully exhausted. The historic city of York will grind to a complete halt if this and/or the other proposals in the City of York Local Plan are approved, indeed a common sense approach should have prevented this totally ridiculous plan ever being embarked upon.</p>	<p>10167/19571</p>	
	<p>Objection – this development is too big. No account has been given to the impact that this huge increase in houses and therefore people will have on the infrastructure of the village. The roads and access into the city are stretched at present and couldn't cope with extra demand. Public transport is only just adequate. No proper thought has been given to parking, amenities and drainage, school provision and medical services. The density of housing proposed is also a factor.</p>	<p>10168/20352</p>	
	<p>Objection – proposal is fundamentally flawed. Over the last 40 years Haxby has had more than its share of new building. There has been no improvement to the access roads into York. Traffic backs up from the bypass to Holly Tree Meadows and sometimes to the Scout Hall. Any large scale building will just make this worse. The</p>	<p>10171/19369</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>18 inch wide cycle path is dangerous and inadequate. It also stops at Joseph Rowntree School which makes cycling into York very dangerous especially on the narrow roads through New Earswick. Haxby falls woefully short of the Government recommended amount of open space. The open spaces in the proposed development will not rectify this. The proposed siting of green space in the new development is unusable for any ball games as it is under a pylon line. It is there because the developer could not sell any houses there. The infrastructure in Haxby is at capacity. Parking is a problem in the village. Even if a new junior school is built, where will the pupils go for secondary education, as Huntington and Joseph Rowntree Schools are at capacity. Usher Lane in Haxby is already congested with parked cars and struggles at peak times. The access onto Station Road is unsatisfactory, being between a roundabout and a junior school.</p>		
<p><b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – opposed to expansion of Haxby. Village is overcrowded now. You can never get a parking space in the village. The schools are already over-subscribed and are already large for primary schools.</p>	10180/19389	
	<p>Objection – development of ST9 and possibly SF4 will have a damaging effect on traffic and road conditions in Haxby and Wigginton in general and on Main Street Haxby, Usher Lane Haxby, York Road Haxby and Wigginton Road in particular. The quality of life as it relates to traffic and moving around will be damaged severely. These developments will increase the size of Haxby substantially. Sense of community will be at risk if Haxby develops into a very large urban area.</p>	10195/19406	
	<p>Objection – concerns about road structure, drainage system, parking or pollution and its adverse effect on the environment.</p>	10209/21164	
	<p>Objection – strongly opposed. Impact on the resources (roads, parking, drainage, school, medical facilities). Assurance that buildings in the future should be on the basis of home for rent and “starter homes”, so local and young people may have a chance of finding somewhere affordable to live.</p>	10217/21183	
	<p>Objection – will have a major impact on a village which has already grown in size since 1979. Building on this scale will have a disastrous effect on both Haxby and Wigginton. The traffic alone will multiply. Parking can already be a problem which will only become worse. Recently closed a school and the other schools in the area are full. These proposals will warrant a new school being built. Will change the whole ethos of the village.</p>	10219/21188	
<p>Objection – local infrastructure under immense pressure. Road system blocked. No school or amenities. Local plan is a disaster for Haxby and York as a whole.</p>	10229/21208		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)	Objection – inadequate roads, difficult junctions, extremely busy. Need of new bus routes to the already congested roads. Long upgrading drainage system. Problem with surface water. Doctor surgery and school at full capacity. No justification for the amount of houses proposed that will change the identity of the village.	10232/21213	
	Object – amenities cannot handle extra housing. Roads cannot handle extra vehicles. Extra medical and dental services would be required. The area would be susceptible to flooding	10240/21228	
	Support - grew up in Haxby, very important to continue future development of the area. Have had to leave the area due to lack of available housing. New people will bring so much more money into the area as they will use local shops and amenities and this can only be good for the local businesses. Local businesses need the chance for them to survive and grow and as we see more and more local businesses disappear from our villages a development like this would be perfect for local trade. Younger and future generations have no option but to leave the area as the availability is not there. We should be trying to encourage the young local people to continue their lives in the area and allow them the same opportunities that their parents and older generations had. Haxby has so much to offer with numerous schools, a doctors, all the necessary shops and has a fabulous transport network into York and the surrounding areas. If this development does not go ahead then Haxby is not going to have a future past the people who currently live in the area.	10261/22075	
	Objection – foolish to build new houses on a floodplain. Infrastructure would be compromised. Potential traffic and parking issues. Reconsider the concerns of the residents	10262/21256	
	Objection – cannot handle extra houses or traffic. Amenities and facilities are already at full capacity. Rural route would be destroyed. Farmland should be protected.	10266/21258	
	Objection – already a busy village. Village would become congested. Green belt needs to be preserved.	10268/21261	
	Objection – brownfield sites should be developed first. Increased traffic would enlarge traffic jams. No provision for increase in water and sewerage drainage. Health centre at capacity. New school would be needed.	10275/21264	
	Objection – infrastructure could not handle influx of people. Area gridlocked at peak periods	10276/21266	
	Objection – green belt should be protected. Current infrastructure cannot handle proposed development, and would lead to congestion. Rail station would be necessary. Local amenities would need improving. Unconvinced of need for the large	10277/21268	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – no provision for improvements of infrastructure. Haxby rail station needs to be reinstated. Although York is a “cycle city”, the roads are not suitable for cycling, due to being too dangerous. Lack of accessible woodland in York	10285/21277	
	Objection – cannot cope with further housing developments.	10292/21300	
	Support – completely agree with the proposed sites for new housing in and around Haxby and the other areas. York needs more housing even if the greenbelt is used.	10297/21310	
	Objection – the Lowfield Drive area is recognised as a flood plain by the Environment Agency and surface water drainage is a problem. The proposed number of houses would have major impact on the infrastructure of the villages. The existing shopping facilities cannot be expanded and parking is very difficult. Traffic is already terrible and the Outer ring road will be further affected unless there is extra funding to make it dual carriageway. Primary and secondary schools in the area are full and it is expected that a further 600 places will be required.	10302/21316	
	Objection – where will the extra water come from? Parking is impossible at times. Roads are traffic heavy. Lack of sufficient amenities. Suitable Brownfield sites available.	10311/21843	
	Objection – lack of school places and infrastructure.	10315/21845	
	Object – infrastructure cannot handle the increase in population. Oppose green belt land development.	10316/21847	
	Objection – concerned about the proposed development in Haxby. The increase in homes will put considerable strain on the infrastructure. York Road is busy enough already. It will change the nature of the village- although Haxby is a town with a population of 12,000 it still retains a village feel and atmosphere and increasing the number of homes to this lovely will change that irreversibly. Believe the green belt should be protected – once its gone its gone.	10322/21855	
	Objection – infrastructure, including the roads, drainage, parking, amenities are at capacity in Haxby. Needs to be more detail regarding employment opportunities.	10331/20623	
Objection – the impact of the development would be totally unsustainable and have disastrous consequences for Haxby and Wigginton. The infrastructure is already under severe strain, this includes access to schools, GP and medical services, public transport, traffic access, suitable road systems, parking, drainage, shops, employment, entertainment, facilities and activities for young people, older people and vulnerable people. There is potential for increase in crime and anti-social	10333/26010		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	behaviour. Brownfield sites should be used first.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – houses will be directly in view from other properties. Haxby and Wigginton are already over subscribed; they do not have the infrastructure to cope with such development. The roads in the village are at capacity. Greenspace should not be used for urban sprawl. Access will be an issue.	10336/26028	
	Objection – greenbelt should be protected until all brownfield sites are exhausted. Drainage in this area is not sufficient.	10341/26034	
	Objection – concerns are for the drainage, transport access, health services, retail outlets and parking, lack of employment and education places.	10365/26060	
	Objection – there is regular overspill from parking from the village which is problematic for residents. The village has no space for additional parking facilities. Schools in the catchment are at capacity.	10380/26074	
	Objection – Haxby and Wigginton has grown from two separate villages to a small town. Over this period there has been no investment in the basic infrastructure of the villages. Parking and traffic congestion is an issue. There is very little green space. An increase in the population will have a detrimental effect on medical services, school places. There needs to be a full infrastructure impact assessment undertaken and improvements made to deal with any additional housing.	10384/26077	
	Objection – this would completely change the character of Haxby and Wigginton. The village would become a large housing sprawl. York is an attractive tourist city and it is essential that it remains so. The whole area must be protected. The village have problems with drainage. There are not enough shops, medical or education places for an increased population. Traffic is slow and often at a standstill.	10389/26085	
	Objection – York Road leading to the ring road is not able to cope with the traffic volume currently. Questions building more houses when the infrastructure cannot cope presently. There is not parking in the centre of Haxby. There are no school places.	10395/26009	
	Objection – the village cannot cope at the size it is now. It is impossible to park, get a doctors appointment. The drainage is inadequate, the roads are congested, more traffic would make this worse and affect the road quality.	10396/26092	
	Objection – how will the village of Haxby/Wigginton/Strensall cope with the volume of traffic that these developments will generate. It is a slow a painful process already in the morning trying to leave the village and get onto the ring road.	10401/22490	
	Objection – overcrowded and insufficient infrastructure. Oversubscribed schools. Limited green space for recreation and issues with drainage. Traffic congestion.	10419/22513	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – infrastructure in place unable to support extra houses. Road system, school and GP already insufficient.	10420/22515	
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – significant concerns with regard to the impact on infrastructure roads drainage, transport, traffic, parking and amenities of such a huge development. Greatest concern is with regard to the health care services which are already stretched to the limit in terms of accommodation. Given the lack of NHS funding to develop primary care premises it is difficult to know where the health needs of the massive resultant increase in population would be serviced. There are already very significant traffic congestion problems at peak times which would be greatly exacerbated by a large increase in population. There are also public health issues relating to provision of recreational facilities. Brownfield sites should be exhausted before any further development on Green Belt Land.	10429/19093	
	Objection – traffic flow through the village at peak commuter times it is very difficult to leave the village. This problem will get much worse if so many houses are built. The proposed site of the new homes is served by only 2 narrow roads which will funnel all the traffic onto York Road and Wiggington Road. Motorists will suffer large traffic jams and delays every day, the roads will become less safe for cyclists and the volume of traffic is likely to deter existing and potential cyclists. The buses will become even more intermittent and unreliable. Many new residents may wish to work in York and the nearby area. I do not see any great expansion in opportunities for good jobs to provide employment for new residents. The existing medical centre is very busy. It is very difficult to obtain an appointment. Additional residents will put even more pressure on this service. All of the three primary schools in Haxby are full. The Joseph Rowntree School is reasonably full. If the catchment area for the school is unchanged there will be more children resident in the catchment area than can be accommodated by the school. Understand that the area to the north of Haxby already suffers with drainage problems – again the additional strain placed on the sewer system by more houses will add to the problem.	10441/19414	
	Objection –infrastructure simply wouldn't cope and the villages will lose their current appeal. Roads and schools are already congested and there may be an impact on the value of our homes.	10442/19416	
	Objection - strongly opposed to the development on this site.	10449/22544	
	Objection – village can hardly cope with current population. Bad traffic every morning and evening. Amenities are constantly busy. The schools are full. Increase in flooding risk	10487/22635	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)	Objection- nothing should be done until A1237 is made dual-carriageway and Haxby station is re opened, together with a better bus service. Sewers and drains won't cope with additional waste as well as water pressure. Health service would need to be increased as well as other local services. Electricity and gas supplies wouldn't cope with increase in demand.	10493/22656	
	Objection – before any further development takes place in this area an examination of the infrastructure needs to take place showing that facilities can cope.	10563/22767	
	Comment –if this goes ahead, Haxby and Wigginton will need improved infrastructure e.g. more roads, schools, better bus service etc. Currently, the commute to work in the morning takes some considerable time. Most of this is school traffic as the commute is much improved in the school holidays. It would be good if the Council could consider a dedicated bus service for school children so that traffic is reduced.	10587/22107	
	Objection – Haxby/Wigginton currently doesn't have a flooding problem due to natural drainage. Destroying this will have an impact on the natural defence and likely lead to severe consequences, which come at financial and personal cost	10594/22808	
	Objection – brownfield sites first.	10616/20378	
	Objection – full schools. Inadequate roads, traffic hazards. Impact on natural drainage and existing drains and sewage systems.	10620/20386	
	Objection –short, medium and long term issues for the area and adverse effects for the community. Traffic and access issues: congestion and road safety issues, shocking state of repair of existing roads. Priority should be given to maintaining existing facilities. Inadequate infrastructure. High housing density would lead to a significant drop in the quality of life for the local community. Insufficient Health centre and facilities. Full schools. Drainage and sewage systems and flood risk. Surface water issues. Land at risk of extreme flooding. Brownfield sites within York could be utilised first. Natural habitat for animals. Impact of any potential wind farms has been overwhelmingly understated.	10622/20391	
	Objection - too ambitious plan. The support services are unlikely to be upgraded sufficiently. Drainage is the most important concern. Area prone to flooding.	10623/20396	
	Objection – insufficient infrastructure. Increased traffic will cause more problems. Not suitable road for the increase in traffic. Concerns about water table and surface flooding.	10624/20398	
Comment – not against revision of the number of dwellings provided there is a good mix of size and prices of properties to be built, land is specifically allocated for people who want to self build, Haxby station is reopened with a good size and moderately	10634/20418		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	priced car park and the allotments lost by the station replaced in areas ST9 and SF4.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	<p>Objection – a large development in this location will increase the number of people and cars, increasing the burden on an already busy area. For example the main road through Haxby and Wiggington will become even more congested. The resulting traffic jams will cause drivers to use more of the smaller residential roads. These residential roads will become rat runs and impact local families with the potential for an increase in accidents involving the venerable in our community such as the elderly and children. The junction of Mill Lane and B1363 struggles to cope with the volume of traffic at the moment, with long tail backs at the lights, despite having a dedicated turning lane. Additional traffic will have a knock on effect on the surrounding roads. The A1237 is already gridlocked at peak times. Increased traffic going into York via the Haxby and Wiggington roads will have a detrimental effect to residents and facilities in the north of York, south of the northern ring road. This has the potential to endanger lives if it blocks or slows access into York District Hospital. Peak time public transport is already under pressure and extremely full. Local families will be affected as there is already insufficient; parking; secure places for bicycles; recycling points; etc. Waiting times for appointments at the Haxby and Wiggington Health centre are already long. There is already a problem with localised flooding; with more extreme weather events predicted due to climate change this problem will become worse with additional housing. The chipping away of green spaces will have a detrimental effect on the health and well-being of those in the local community.</p>	10658/19753	
	Objection – area is likely to flood, lack of primary school provision and medical provisions, insufficient parking and congestion on the surrounding roads resulting in safety hazards.	10660/19595	
	Objection – does not believe that the infrastructure is in any way able to cope with this proposal and that a lot more time and money first needs to be spent improving the facilities we have before it is even imaginable to add such a large number of houses in our area.	10661/19597	
	Objection –does not believe that the infrastructure is in any way able to cope with this proposal and that a lot more time and money first needs to be spent improving the facilities we have before it is even imaginable to add such a large number of houses in our area.	10662/19599	
	Objection – not enough schooling provision. Roads won't be able to cope with traffic. York does not have the jobs available for the new residents. Brownfield land should be developed first.	10673/19770	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)	Objection – traffic is very heavy.	10678/19784	
	Objection – traffic would be horrendous. Many other areas better suited for development.	10682/19791	
	Objection – not enough employment in the area to support the increase in people. Local schools are at capacity. Green belt land would be lost.	10686/19801	
	Objection – village is struggling to receive adequate support for basic services. Parking in the village is scarce. Roads are poorly maintained. Sewerage and drainage issues in the area. Schools are near or at capacity. Medical and social care must be developed. Nature and character of the village will be changed.	10690/19811	
	Objection – would be overdevelopment.	10696/19829	
	Objection – poorly conceived, adversely impact significantly on the infrastructure of Haxby and Wigginton – strongly object.	10699/19829	
	Objection – poorly thought through, adversely impact significantly on the infrastructure of Haxby and Wigginton – strongly object.	10701/19833	
	Objection- when comparing all wards with Haxby/Wigginton has significant deficiencies of allotments, facilities for Outdoor Sports/Children/ Young People, Amenity Green Space. Safeguarded land north of Haxby is further than 800m from village centre by car as road access is easy and west only. More than 800m away from the village centre. Access to services key indicator for sustainability. All three schools in Haxby and Wigginton are full to capacity and were expanded when Oaken Grove Primary school was demolished for housing in 2002. Fail for provision for nursery care (2 year waiting list)	10713/19861	
	Objection-local schools are full. Local playgrounds are full. Traffic on York Road Haxby roundabout of A1237 is very bad during morning rush hour already before adding more houses/cars to Haxby. Very limited parking in The Village for the shops. Farming green belt should not be used for houses.	10716/19868	
	Objection- traffic volumes on York Road in Haxby is already too high. Haxby does not need and does not have the road capacity for further development.	10718/19870	
	Objection – doctors at capacity. Primary schools full. New roads needed. Drains cannot cope. Parking spaces are required. Bus service needs improving.	10743/19934	
	Objection – traffic will get worse.	10755/19977	
	Objection – hugely concerned about the impact on our infrastructure. Drainage (both surface water and sewage) telecoms, water supply and most importantly transport.	10765/20000	
Objection – Moor Lane (leading to Skelton) and Corban Lane are already busy and dangerous at rush hours and cannot take more traffic. There is no way the local roads	10770/20034		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	can cope with thousands more local homes. There are not enough facilities in Haxby or Skelton to accommodate the huge surge in local population that the proposed housing would create. Construction would create noise and pollution in a protected green belt area and close vicinity to Moorlands Nature Reserve. The increase in traffic would generate excessive pollution.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection – object to the building on green belts in the Haxby area; ST9 and SF4 because the current population density is high enough. There would be traffic issues and obstructions around the shopping areas, adding to those already happening. I do not feel that the current facilities could cope with so many people.	10776/21869	
	Objection – traffic makes access to the village difficult. Primary school recently closed so no spaces for new children.	10797/21889	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot support the expansion. Roads cannot cope at peak times. No train station. Not enough parking for cars on the high street. Ambulance response times will get worse.	10798/21891	
	Objection- proposed development would increase the size of Haxby by 40% which would overwhelm the existing infrastructure, in particular the drainage system. I believe strongly that all available brownfield land must be exhausted before encroachment on the green belt is contemplated.	10806/20660	
	Objection- scale unsuitable and inappropriate. Unrealistic as growth to this capacity could cause major problems with drainage and sewerage in the area. The school and medical centre would be unable to cope. Already heavily congested outer ring road. There is need for growth and development in the area but the proposed scale including the use of the greenbelt is inappropriate and brown field development areas should be exhausted before any development of green belt land.	10812/21349	
	Objection- inappropriate that a historic city could be ruined by plans for 16,000 houses on York's greenbelt. The character of York, Haxby and the villages will be lost forever. All brownfield sites must be used in the first instance. No available jobs in York for all the occupants of the newly built houses. The main problem is the strain which will be put on the local infrastructure. Risk of flooding to the potential building sites, Hazardous parking on yellow lines at the junction with station road. The situation will be far worse with the huge development proposed in the area. Damage will be caused to health services, schools, parking at the shops and the reliability of the bus services. York should be preserved so that visitors will want to come here to keep its economy healthy and not irreparably damage the green belt.	10815/21354	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)	Objection- schools are full. Huge issues will be created with the transport system. From an environmental point of view green belt land should not be built on. Not enough leisure facilities in Haxby and Wigginton.	10825/21370	
	Objection- green belt should remain as such with no development it is essential for green wildlife corridors, contributing to biodiversity and to prevent urban sprawl. In addition it enhances the area for the current population. The areas infrastructure is already overloaded. The infrastructure of Haxby and Wigginton would not be able to support such a development as the roads are already increasingly busy with severe congestion. Insufficient parking available in the shopping areas of Haxby.	10827/21373	
	Objection- there are many areas to build on without consuming greenbelt land. The areas to be built on do not have any access to main roads, all the traffic will have to travel through Haxby or Wigginton to get to the ring road. Surface drains already back up in Haxby, this development will cause the drainage issue to get worse. Health centre is already at capacity and schools will struggle. To increase this village by this amount is unsuitable.	10849/21416	
	Objection- proposed developments to the north of York (Clifton Haxby New Earswick Strensall) Will put an intolerable strain on our already overstretched services particularly transport. The ring road must be duelled in its entirety before any development takes place. Also a cycle route is needed between Wigginton and Clifton Moor.	10854/21452	
	Objection - residents of Usher Lane are already subjected to excessive speeds and volumes of passing traffic and this will significantly increase should the housing estate proposed be built. Access to the ring road during rush hour is already a significant issue and this would become even more of an issue with the increase population. The loss of greenbelt land will also detract from peoples quality of life. The villages infrastructure simply would not cope without investment in facilities such as schools, shops, libraries , doctors and dentists. The local primary schools are already heavily subscribed and over subscribed. The local secondary schools are very well established and are doing well, short sighted not to see the implications of the estate on the schools in the area.	10858/21471	
	Objection – the village cannot cope at the size it is now. It is impossible to park, get a doctors appointment. The drainage is inadequate, the roads are congested, more traffic would make this worse and affect the road quality.	10880/25883	
	Objection- road system is very congested at peak times; any further building will only add the congestion and pollution. The drainage system is inadequate in times of only	10883/21486	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	moderate rainfall, this problem has increased steadily over the years as the pollution has grown and will only be exacerbated by more houses. Unless there are major changes to the infrastructure, area cannot support a development of this size.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection- proposals will have a negative impact on the existing area in terms of pressure on already busy roads in peak hours, place in local schools, drainage/flood issues, increase in parking for local shops and amenities, pressure on existing healthcare services (doctors and dentists) , utilities, lack of adequate cycle lanes in that area. This proposed development would only have a negative impact on the village. This is green belt land and should be kept as such. There are other brownfield sites within the city that could be developed.	10890/21498	
	Objection – traffic at present queues past my house, over 1000 extra cars morning and evening will not benefit the situation. It is difficult to get an appointment at the doctors already because of the volume of patients. Car parking in Haxby is at breaking point. Where are all the jobs for potential residents of these houses. Will they be able to afford to buy them. Object to any more land which could have agricultural usage being used for building after all, where is all the food going to be grown to feed all these people.	10899/21519	
	Objection – the roads into and out of the villages are already unable to cope with the volume of traffic at peak times. The bypass is already congested. The drainage and sewage system in Haxby and Wigginton is not able to adequately support the additional loading of the proposed development. Local amenities are not satisfactory for the current population. Green belt should remain protected. There are brown field sites that should be developed. Schools, doctors etc will not cope with the additional developments.	10900/21522	
	Objection – is a new doctor’s surgery going to be built and funded by the developers. Are the property developers funding and maintaining all the utility infrastructure required.	10901/21525	
	Objection – the roads in and out of the villages are unable to cope with current volume. Bypass is congested. Drainage systems unable to cope with added pressure. Local amenities not satisfactory for current population. Brownfield should be developed. Services will not be able to cope	10903/21527	
	Objection – traffic is highly congested. Not enough resources for the people currently living in the village.	10908/21548	
	Objection – streets flood every time it rains. Traffic constantly getting worse. Schools are over capacity. Village access is difficult. Wildlife will be damaged.	10910/21553	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)	Objection – roads are congested. Amenities need upgrading. No mention of schools or other items for infrastructure. If ring road is not upgraded, the traffic problem will get worse.	10916/21558	
	Objection - building a large number of homes to the north will impact on already overcrowded road network in the area. Infrastructure is already struggling to cope. Schools have no vacancies- where will the children be educated? Doctors surgeries busy. More cars more pollution? If building goes ahead Haxby, Earswick, Strensall and Huntington will gradually merge into one conglomeration.	10930/21577	
	Objection – infrastructure unable to cope currently. Sewerage system is unable to cope at times. School closed recently, so new one would be needed to compensate for extra people. Parking is impossible. Brownfield sites should be developed first.	10941/21593	
	Objection – opposed to use of green belt land, need to stop urban sprawl. Understand need for more housing but not of the scale proposed. The very nature of Haxby and Wigginton will change forever. Congestion in the village and along York Road will worsen resulting in an increase in noise and air pollution.	11042/22239	
	Objection – insufficient sewer and drainage system. Overloaded roads. Full schools. Not enough health centres or dental practices. Brownfield areas first.	11173/21665	
	Objection – traffic congestion which happens every morning leaving Haxby would only be exacerbated by an additional residencies. This would also put great strain on the already well used local amenities. Concerned about the need for school places, with primary schools in the area already over subscribed and secondary schools unable to cope with the influx of additional student places that may be required.	11293/22216	
	Objection – increase in traffic. One school been knocked down. Overpopulating only school. Limited parking. Noise pollution problem. Damaging to all the facilities and people in the village.	11316/22873	
	Objection – lack of roads and infrastructural support	11354/22890	
	Objection – traffic problems. Full schools. Doctors full. Parking at shops difficult	11355/22893	
	Objection - will increase the Haxby and Wigginton residential conurbation by 40%. Don't see any input with regards to infrastructure. Proposal is to be built on a flood plain. Access to the site is proposed by the way of a new purpose built simple priority junction onto Moor Lane at the western edge of the site and on to Usher Lane at it eastern edge, these two sites are going to require junctions that are far more functional and safer, than a simple priority junction. Sanderson Associates in their Transport Assessment make no mention of the proposed railway station in Station Road and the large traffic this will generate in Usher Lane/ Station Road from any	11360/22221	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Station Car parking facilities. Nor is there any cognisance of the effect on the local Infant / junior school in Station Road. Amendments put forward b show very clearly that the Council have not listened to the strongly expressed views of the people of Haxby and its surrounding communities.		
<b>814 Land North of Haxby (SF4) (continued)</b>	Objection - strongly opposed to the proposed development in Haxby as we seem to be near breaking point as it is with the traffic and the drainage system. Gridlock in the main street and presumably children who will need school places in schools that are already full. There is a serious problem already with the sewerage on Usher Lane and that will only get worse with any future development. Surely Green Belt land is there for a purpose and should be left as such.	11362/22223	
	Objection – not enough facilities for the present population. Primary schools already at capacity. Not enough parking for the present population. Road system overcrowded and badly maintained. Local sewage system overloaded. Not enough activities for young people in the area.	11383/22918	
	Objection – massive impact on the infrastructure: drainage, parking and amenities. School and doctors at capacity. Protection of the green belt.	11384/22921	
	Objection – inadequate road infrastructure for a large increase in the population.	11393/22932	
	Objection – roads at capacity. Drainage, parking and amenities not enough. Brownfield areas first. Strongly opposed.	11396/22935	
	Objection – strongly object. Current infrastructure and social provision not enough. Devastating effect on the congestion along York Road.	11397/22938	
	Objection - strongly opposed to this development. Haxby and Wigginton are unable to cope with more development. Brownfield sites should be developed before greenbelt is eroded.	11644/26117	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate</b>	Comment – various development sites proposed are likely to have a direct or indirect impact on the A1079/A166/A64 Grimston Bar Interchange. The Council is currently working with the Highways Agency and the City of York Council to assess the cumulative impact of both Authorities' Local Plan development aspirations on the interchange. It is therefore important that the modified/additional sites, in particular, are likely to have an impact on the interchange: Site 97, ST7, ST15, SF3, 811, 802, 815, 22, 747, 794. These sites in particular, should therefore, be carefully factored into the transport assessment for the A64 interchange.	10/18966	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – proposed site extends into an area of green belt and is inappropriate development. There are no special circumstances attached to this site which would warrant the breaching of greenbelt status. The proposal, if adopted, would increase the size of the present Airfield Industrial site by 200%. This is a huge increase and totally without justification, as there is no proven need for extra industrial development here. Proposed site would have huge adverse effect on B1228. Extra traffic generated would cause chaos. The road bridge over the River Derwent is narrow and humped back. As with the other proposed sites in Elvington, any kind of development can only add to the strain on the existing infrastructure which is already at breaking point.	34/19143	Sutton upon Derwent Parish Council
	Objection – loss of agricultural land 3ha	45/18786	York Environment Forum
	Objection – Parish Council objects because of the scale of the proposed development. The increased number of HGV movements would bring unacceptable increases to HGV traffic passing through the village centre – already recognised as excessive for safe use by children walking and cycling to school. If through-HGV traffic was banned from the village centre (as in all neighbouring villages) then a major objection to this development would have been overcome. The Parish Council supports additional land being allocated for industrial use at the Airfield Industrial Estate to allow employment opportunities – but only if it is proportionate.	61/18832	Elvington Parish Council
	Objection – a landscaped separation of the footpath from any development is desirable, so we do not have the situation that exists off the A166 at Dunnington.	91/19633	
	Objection – the proposals are overly excessive for a rural location. This site takes up previous agricultural land within the greenbelt. The balancing pond is a haven for wildlife. Development will affect views, and cause noise and light pollution. The road network is inadequate.	657/23782	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20536	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – appears that no consideration has been given to the infrastructure of the village and its surroundings when this proposal was put forward. More factories may lead to more employment but this is at an unmentioned cost to Elvington. There is already a surfeit of HGV's and other traffic speeding through the village. Vulnerable groups will be particularly susceptible to dangerous roads. The B1228 is constantly subsiding under the existing weight of traffic and increased traffic will increase problems at the over-congested Grimston Interchange. It is high time that HGV's were banned from Elvington especially those from the Airfield Business Park. The term 'safeguarded' is extremely misleading, and has led people to believe that these sites are safeguarded from development.	1008/18205	
	Objection – see survey 2. If all the new sites are used, this will nearly double the size of the village. The infrastructure we have will not be able to cope. The road to Elvington from York is in a bad state already. It is used by a lot of traffic and many large lorries.	1152/26943	
	Objection – informed by Mr Julian Sturdy and Mr George Barton that there was no requirement for safeguarded Green Belt land for future development. Strongly object to any site that takes away greenbelt land especially around Elvington, where the roads are not suitable to take any more traffic and the infrastructure within the village is not capable of taking this amount of increase.	1175/18211	
	Comment – due to the size or location of this safeguarded land it may have an impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) and would be of interest to the Agency. The Agency has not made any assessment of the potential impact of this, together with other sites, at this stage. The Agency will be in a position to provide more detailed comments on the cumulative impact of new sites through the modelling exercise being undertaken in partnership with City of York Council. The Agency is therefore awaiting further input from CYC before proceeding with the mesoscopic modelling exercise to assess the cumulative impact of local plan development on the SRN.	1264/18595	Highways Agency (Yorkshire and North East)
	Objection – residents and community representatives in Elvington have expressed grave concerns over existing traffic and congestion issues through the village, particularly on the B1228. Fear that this development will increase HGV traffic in the village and worsen the existing safety risk to residents and children. When considered alongside other proposals in the village, the overall scale of development proposed for the village is disproportionate to its size. Also concerned that very few businesses on the existing industrial estate were aware of these proposals. Consultation on proposals 815 and 97 cannot be considered meaningful if those who are most likely to	1355/18629	Julian Sturdy MP

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be affected have not been properly consulted.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – neither Northminster or Elvington is an appropriate location to meet business needs. Fails to meet NPPF requirements.	1512/20580	
	Objection – several units on the existing development are currently vacant indicating that supply has already outstripped demand. To safeguard a further 7 hectares is unnecessary. It is totally disproportionate and potentially damaging to the rural green belt habitat.	1666/20448	
	Objection – destruction of the green belt, some of which is currently in agricultural use. Inappropriate development of the green belt. Transport network of roads are not designed to cope with the large volumes of traffic this development would bring. It would fail to cope. The infrastructure is so insufficient there is significant increase in the risk of road traffic accidents. Would significantly increase the drainage problems for the village. Sewerage facilities are at capacity already. Increase risk of flooding due to rush of surface water. Area is rich in flora and fauna. Will significantly impact on the privacy and amenity of the surrounding households, reducing quality of life. The addition of B2 uses is not suitable for the location which paves the way for more noisy and intrusive uses.	1667/23795	
	Objection – within the latest consultation exercise the council now proposes taking 15.4ha (sites 97 and 815) of agricultural land out of the green belt designation for the purposes of providing 8.4ha of employment land and 7ha of safeguarded land. These two sites lie almost immediately to the south of the existing airfield, a brownfield site. The Council accepts that the airfield [607] constitutes previously developed land. The degree of lawful activity at the airfield was identified by the Appeal Inspector 2009 and this has not been disputed by the council. Almost adjoining the north western corner of site 97 is a 20ha concrete hardstanding which forms part of the airfield. The airfield also wraps around the north of the air museum and north west of the established business park. The NPPF continues to promote the sequential release of land for development. Rather than taking Green Field land out of the green belt surely the redevelopment of previously developed land should be promoted? The redevelopment of the airfield to deliver the suggested employment and safeguarded allocations would see the natural habitats currently found on those sites maintained. Furthermore their established landscape character would be preserved without having to encroach into what is clearly open countryside.	1736/18519	MM Planning on behalf of Oakgate PLC
	Objection – this will increase the traffic through the village. The roads are not maintained, built or designed to carry this much traffic. The natural environment	2658/23821	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	needs to be protected for wildlife.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to proper town planning methodology or scrutiny.	2681/17940	
	Objection – would like to see the plans to develop the schools (currently full), medical practice (try getting appointment now), sewerage (currently at capacity according to Yorkshire Water), surface water drainage (beck overflows regularly now) and traffic flow (the queue at the end of Elvington Lane often stretches back to Clock Farm). How does building on green belt land protect the environment. Under great pressure to provide food and green energy – all of which needs green belt land. Building on brownfield has to be exhausted first. The essential character of the village will be destroyed forever as it will become another expanding small town with infrastructure issues. ‘Safeguarded’ is contradictory and misleading term – safeguarded for whom? This is not a mandatory requirement to provide so why is it needed.	2720/17786	
	Comment – landscaping is required to maintain the area.	2765/20617	
	Objection - B1228 already heavily congested. Additional HGV traffic will be dangerous for pedestrians and cause additional pollution. Lack of engagement with the local community. No attempt to try and build a consensus with the village community.	3031/20705	
	Objection - there is a pond to the north east of the site which is a haven for butterflies and dragonflies, newts and other amphibians, in addition to a large range of flora and fauna. This will be adversely affected by any future development. Infrastructure: The foul drainage system in Elvington is already at capacity. You can tell this because the system installed at the new affordable housing development needs sewage to be stored and then pumped away at night time. The scale of proposed allocations will cause problems in the future. Scale of allocation: The current business park extends to some 8ha (19.7acres) and although well developed there will still be land to be developed. The proposal of the 8ha extension (Site 97) will double the size of the park and there is just no need to then set aside a further 7ha site given the previous growth of the park. This is excessive for a rural location. Loss of amenity: This allocation will affect views from several properties such as Jubilee Court, Brinkworth Hall, Canon House Farm and Cottages, Elvington Grange, The Conifers. The allocation will be especially intrusive to Brinkworth Hall whose garden will border it and who could suffer from considerable noise pollution. Transport: The Road network into Elvington is inadequate for this development, with narrow B roads being the only way to get to the site. Traffic congestion is already quite bad at during peak times, without the possible near 200% increase in the size of the Park. As	3046/21963	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Elvington has a very poor bus service the majority of workers at the park will have a private vehicle. A weight limit would also be required on Sutton Bridge due to more HGV activity as it is not sufficient for all the heavy goods vehicles. Loss of Green Belt land. The proposed plan takes up previous agricultural land within the green belt and is an inappropriate development for any village location.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – loss of greenbelt with adverse wildlife and environmental impact. Too large development will put increased pressure on the road network. Heavy traffic through the village. Unacceptable in terms of scale and impact.	3063/22266	
	Objection – this road is very busy and this would make it more dangerous. This would adversely affect the approach to the village. There is no infrastructure to support this.	3108/23852	
	Objection - main worry is about the state of the B1228 and its ability to take more heavy traffic. There are already a couple of haulage firms based there. They also cause noise and disruption through the village if they turn right out of the industrial estate. The road through the village is narrow in parts and dangerous if two HGVs meet going in opposite directions. The suitability of the road would have to be looked at carefully and the road may have to be improved.	3113/22271	
	Objection – there would be an increase of HGVs which is dangerous.	3135/23863	
	Objection – inappropriate and contrary to general planning guidance. Development should be proportionate. An increase of the amount proposed here even if deferred for several years is not proportionate. Questioned whether there is a need for this development, there are currently empty units and the industrial estate and elsewhere in the York region. There is no evidence of need. More approach to concentrate on brownfield sites. Elvington is one of the few remaining small detached villages, its character contributes to the attractive character of the Greater York area as a whole. This was acknowledged by the Inspector in his report on the 1992/3 public inquiries. The village character should be substantially retained. The B1228 is already overloaded with traffic and the development would exacerbate this. Land is currently Green Belt, site was rejected firmly in the 1992/3 inquiry and deemed Green Belt. There is no justification to take it out of the Green Belt now.	3220/23874	
	Objection - Whilst the Airfield Business Park should naturally increase and develop, there will be a considerable impact on local residents, the biodiversity of the land, drainage and Green Corridor by the 'safeguarding' and development of the plot to the size proposed. It will be very intrusive to what is a stunning, open landscape/ Parts of it will be too close to the homes of residents. The wildlife that flourishes in this area will be greatly affected. Great Crested Newts, wild ducks, herons, and otters will	3363/21976	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be diminished by the removal of the 'balance pond'. The balance pond was created to help alleviate the problems of flooding and water logging that is a characteristic of this land.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – do not object in principle to the expansion but consider that the land to be taken out of the Green Belt should be at the most half of the suggested areas. Major concern is the increase in heavy goods vehicles on the already busy B1228.	3532/23906	
	Objection – opposed to the removal of land from the Green Belt. Allocation seems rather large. Takes up agricultural land and is inappropriate for the village location. Will affect views from many neighbouring properties including Brinkworth Hall. The road network is adequate. There is a poor bus service and no other form of public transport. A weight limit would be required on Sutton bridge due to increased HGV activity and to avoid disturbance to the local records. The balancing pond to the north east of the site is a haven for wildlife.	3598/23919	
	Objection – this will double the size of the employment park. It is excessive in a rural location, inappropriate in the existing landscape and there is a lack of infrastructure. There is a lack of regular public transport. This will add to traffic congestion. The site is a haven for newts. There would be a visual impact.	3909/23936	
	Objection – this land is designated green belt, to protect the countryside from urban growth and maintain areas of agriculture and outdoor leisure. There is wildlife which needs protecting.	5146/22368	
	Objection – this land was designated as green belt to protect from future development, and prevent the character, beauty of the countryside being taken over by urban sprawl. Safeguarded land is a misleading term. Brownfield should be used first. Impact on unique city surrounded by historical countryside – plans would change this. Land surrounding Elvington is an area of outstanding natural beauty and of historical and wildlife significance, it is important that this is preserved. There is no mention of plans to improve the transport network – many local roads cannot cope at peak times. New residents will commute to Leeds as employment opportunities low in York.	5147/22377	
	Objection – site is not appropriate for a factory. Green belt land. Flooding would be more likely. Biodiversity would be greatly affected. Land size is too large. All previous development has been on Brownfield land.	5153/22385	
	Objection – this land is currently Green Belt, that is for a purpose: to retain the rural nature of the community. And this is highly relevant to the identity and character of the York area as a whole. As with site 97, this represents a significant increase in	5235/23994	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>commercial land use around the Airfield, which is much greater than any proposals elsewhere in the City of York area. While some organic development is to be expected, this represents a major change to the character of the area. Elvington needs to retain its village character. It is one of very few small detached villages within the Greater York area. As such, its character contributes to the attractive character of the Greater York area as a whole. This point was acknowledged very prominently by the Inspector in his Report on the large 1992/3 public inquiries into planning proposals. The village character should be substantially retained: this means development which is modest and in keeping with that of a village. So far Elvington has co-existed with the airfield and associated developments reasonably well. But an increase of this magnitude in industrial/commercial activity will inevitably have an effect to the detriment of the village and surroundings. Development of this site 815 will further add a significant extra loading upon the B1228, which is already at capacity. This both in the direction towards York, and (perhaps more importantly) through the main part of the village itself where heavy goods traffic has been of much concern for many years. In the past few years, attempts were made to ban HGV vehicles from Sutton Bridge, and this did offer some respite to the villagers. However, it was overturned under pressure from the haulage industry. Further substantive development here will make matters much worse, and lead to further conflict and degradation of quality of life for the village as well as road safety. The site (or effectively this area) was rejected firmly in the 1992/3 inquiry and deemed Green belt. There is no justification to take it out of the Green belt now. Creeping destruction of the Green Belt. Excessive in a rural location.</p>		
<p><b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – The road network into Elvington is inadequate for the scale of development, with narrow B roads the only way to reach the site. Traffic congestion is already bad at peak periods without the possible near 200% increase in the size of the Park. The village has a poor bus service and no other public transport. Most workers would need a private vehicle. A weight limit would be needed on Sutton Bridge due to increased HGV activity and to avoid disturbance to local residents.</p>	<p>5237/21775</p>	
	<p>Objection - not totally opposed to any development in Elvington but strongly believe that it must be appropriate, proportionate and sustainable. Although the Business Park is already well-developed, there is still land on the current business part which has not yet been developed and utilised. The proposed 8ha extension (Site 97) in the Additional Sites phase of the Local Plan would already double the size of the existing business park. There is simply no requirement to then set aside a further 7ha site</p>	<p>5259/20069</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>given the previous growth of the park. When you combine this with the land at the existing Airfield business park which is not yet even developed and used, and taking account of the previous growth rate of the industrial estates this would appear sufficient for the life of the plan. The proposed allocation in Site 815 takes up previous agricultural land within the green belt and is therefore ‘inappropriate development’ for the village location. The road network into Elvington is inadequate and inappropriate for the scale of development. Traffic congestion through the village is already bad even before you consider the potential near 200% increase in the size of the Business Park. Elvington has a very poor bus service. The majority of workers at the park would use a private vehicle to get to and from work. Elvington is too far out of York, and the B1228 just not safe enough, for most workers to cycle safely to any new industrial employment sites. A weight limit would also be required on Sutton Bridge due to the increased HGV activity and to avoid disturbance to the local residents. Concerned at the loss of amenity for nearby residents. The addition of B2 uses (i.e. general industrial) could cause nuisance to local residents and local businesses including the Air museum. The proposed intensification and change of nature of the permitted business types is not suitable for such a rural location. Private residences should be buffered from industrial sites. The foul drainage system in Elvington is already at capacity. The balancing pond to the north east of the proposed site is a haven for a wide variety of flora and fauna. At the very least, buffer zones and ‘wildlife corridors’ should be provided to protect the wildlife from further development and enable the wildlife to move to other areas.</p>		
<p><b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - ‘safeguard’ is a misleading term. If fully developed the site will have 7ha of industrial use, if Site 97 was also approved, would mean a total of 15.4ha of industrial use on green land when the airfield itself is brown land and lies unused apart from odd events on weekends. Adequate resources should be included into the plan to upgrade the road infrastructure into the site. The existing Brownfield land at the airfield should be used as opposed to building on Green land. The development is disproportionate to the size of the village, will have an adverse effect on the local wildlife, will have an adverse effect on local services including particular roads etc.</p>	<p>5284/18393</p>	
	<p>Objection – this proposal is excessive in this location. This is previous agricultural land and greenbelt. The road network is inadequate. Traffic is already heavy. The bridge would need a weight limit. Infrastructure is already struggling with traffic levels.</p>	<p>5423/24016</p>	
	<p>Objection – no requirement to set aside even more land. This is a rural location the</p>	<p>5439/24024</p>	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	proposals are excessive. Would take up agricultural land within the Green Belt and the proposals are inappropriate development. Transport is another big concern. The road network is inadequate for the size of the development. Sutton Bridge will not be able to cope with more HGVs and will need a weigh restriction. A buffer is required to protect wildlife.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – the village deserves to retain its status. Infrastructure, schools, sewerage, roads or doctors are all at capacity. Green belt land. Disproportionate development would alter the character and nature of the village. Dangerous roads. No reason to site Gypsy and Travellers site in Elvington. The village is not equipped to handle an influx of potentially transient residents. Neither the local employment opportunities, nor the infrastructure. Totally unsuitable site	5450/21817	
	Objection – Elvington already has three substantial industrial/business parks together with a chemical plant and Yorkshire Water treatment works. The traffic to and from all these businesses is horrendous, all passing the front doors and gardens of the residents of the small village. Object to the proposal based on the potential increase in traffic and harm to health and the environment. Would seriously unbalance the village. Do not have the infrastructure or facilities this development would demand.	5535/18012	
	Objection – Elvington already has three substantial industrial/business parks together with a chemical plant and Yorkshire Water treatment works. The traffic to and from all these businesses is horrendous, all passing the front doors and gardens of the residents of the small village. Object to the proposal based on the potential increase in traffic and harm to health and the environment. Would seriously unbalance the village. Do not have the infrastructure or facilities this development would demand.	5536/18017	
	Objection- the B1228 that runs through the village is already very busy at peak periods and this will further increase the volume of traffic. This is already a concern at current volumes especially as speed restrictions are not always observed which poses a risk to residents. Development of these sites should be in proportion to the residential element of the village and not cause problems for the village/community. Some of the land is Green Belt and should remain so.	5571/20758	
	Objection – B1228 that runs through the village is already busy at peak periods. This will increase, particularly HGV's. Some of this is green belt land and should remain so.	5572/20764	
	Objection – this development will create an increase in traffic and an increase in noise. An increase in the number of HGVs passing through the village will be an increased safety risk to residents. There is no need for the extensions as there are empty properties on the three existing industrial estates at Elvington. Removing land	5738/20868	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	from the green belt may lead to potential loss of rural farming communities.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection - development will significantly increase the size of the business park which is not proportionate or reasonable. It has already been proposed that this land be extended and developed. This proposal would mean that there is sufficient land and development in line with the plan. Removing land from the Green Belt is not appropriate. The site would accommodate general industry which could lead to complaints by residents in the village. There is one main road in and out of Elvington and this road is not suitable for an increase in traffic volume. Traffic is already a problem at rush hour. Transport links are extremely poor with limited bus services to and from York. Drainage system is full. Development would also affect the wildlife in the area.	5842/22392	
	Objection – further development for residential properties in Elvington and surrounding area – does not bear thinking about. Area within the CYC is at present reducing employment by at least 1000 jobs per year, who will be purchasing these properties.	6281/21032	
	Objection- the airfield is well developed and still has land to be developed. It doesn't need an increase of 200%, this is excessive for this location. Green belt land should be kept as Green Belt. The road network into Elvington can't cope with the traffic. The drainage system in Elvington is at full capacity. Part of this proposed site is a haven for wild life. This is protected so the proposed development would go through this haven.	8313/24092	
	Objection – the site is in the greenbelt. The existing business park is not full. The site includes a pond with a wide variety of wildlife. There is no access by public transport.	9258/24098	
	Objection – B1228 already very busy and in a poor state of repair. Will increase HGV traffic in village – safety risk to residents, especially children.	9265/22415	
	Objection- the provision for the future building of many new properties will impact upon traffic. The village is busy and noisy enough and any development will place unreasonable demands on local services and roads.	9283/17854	
	Objection – the proposals will result in a doubling in size of the population and will impact upon the natural and historic heritage of Elvington. The village already suffers the effects of very heavy traffic and pollution and it is considered that additional traffic could pose a danger to school children. Development would also impact on the sewage and drainage, medical and education infrastructure – services which are largely all at capacity. There is a disregard of wildlife habitat and endangered species, such as barns. Loss of Green Belt land is unacceptable when there are alternative	9387/18149	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	sites.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – the roads are already narrow and congested. To propose a 17 acre extension to Elvington Industrial Estate, when access is along winding, unlit, country lanes is absolute madness - as is the increase in traffic which would be caused by the size of the proposed house building and travellers site. The infrastructure is simply not in place and would completely ruin the village.	9397/20073	
	Objection – if Elvington village were to expand you would not only lose the community spirit, but you would also lose the rural nature of the village. Increasing the industrial estates would increase the amount of traffic. If there were an increase in traffic, community events held on the village green could not go ahead as people's safety will be at risk. Increases in the number of vehicles passing through would not only increase pollution levels, but would also increase congestion in and around the village areas. This would have a negative effect on wildlife in the area. The local school would not be able to cope with the extra capacity as they are already full. Drainage and sewerage would also need to be taken into account. We are struggling to get new superfast broadband as there are not enough ports to supply the existing village, so what would happen to the technology side of things if the developments were to go ahead. If there was an increase in developments, or the possibility of a travellers site within Elvington the whole ethos of the village will change. People will no longer want to allow their children to play outside, as there will be too many 'strangers' they may encounter. The proposed developments will no doubt decrease house prices in the area.	9435/18452	
	Objection – B1228 already very busy and in poor state of repair. Will increase HGV traffic in the village. Safety risk to residents, especially children. HGVs should be banned from the village. Any development should be proportionate to the residential size of the village.	9436/18459	
	Objection - the plans for Elvington (taken together) are wholly disproportionate to the village. Proposals involve tripling the size of The Elvington Airfield Business Park, to the point where the number of businesses would substantially exceed the number of homes in the village; this makes no common sense. Supportive of a 'proportionate' increase to the size of the Business Park. Neither Grimston Bar, nor the B1227 could safely accommodate this amount of additional industrial traffic. Before there is any agreement to increasing the size of the Airfield Industrial Estate, the Council must introduce an HGV weight limit from Halifax Way to Sutton Bridge. HGVs already represent a safety hazard to cyclists and pedestrians due to our narrow roads and	9441/19110	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pavements, and all residents express their concerns about this. All the adjacent villages have HGV restrictions in the centre of their village. Assuming current usage density on existing industrial sites, there would be more business premises than residential properties, turning Elvington from a village with three industrial estates to a Business Park with some residential accommodation.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – further development for this area is totally unacceptable and excessive for this location. Will affect views from Brinkworth Hall, Canon House Farm and Cottage, Elvington Grange, Jubilee Court and The Conifers. Brinkworth Hall will in particular be affected by light pollution and noise as their garden will border the proposed development. There would be an increase in traffic on what is already a busy B road. There would be an increase in HGVs which would disturb residents by the noise. Sutton Bridge is already a busy detour for HGVs. The bridge is listed, and there would have to be a weight limit issued to prevent the bridge’s deterioration. The surrounding roads are already busy, particularly at peak times the B1226 leading up to the Grimston roundabout is already congested. The increase in traffic would be dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians. The drainage system in Elvington is already at capacity. The pond to the north east of the site contains protected newts. There are other flora and fauna which need protecting, as numbers have dwindled because of flooding and recent new developments in the York area.	9448/18473	
	Objection – scale of the proposals is large as the existing business park extends to 8ha and although well developed there is still land to be developed. Site 97 already doubles the size of the park, there is no need to set aside a further 7ha given the previous growth of the park. Proposals are excessive and inn appropriate for a rural location. Takes up previous agricultural land within the green belt. Will affect views from neighbouring properties. Road network is inadequate. Poor bus service, the majority of workers will need a private vehicle. Weight limit would be required on Sutton Bridge. Balancing pond to the north eas of the site is a haven for wildlife and flora and fauna. Buffer zones are required as a minimum to protect wildlife.	9462/24122	
	Objection – see survey 2. The proposed plan will double the size of the village and result in the over development of Elvington.	9470/22424	
	Objection – opposed to the proposals to ‘safeguard’ land at Elvington Industrial Estate. This would extend the Business Park by another 9 hectares, which together with the extension proposed at Site 97 (which already doubles the size of the Park) would be a completely unacceptable level of increase in this location. Object to the loss of Green Belt land which is an ‘inappropriate development in a village location,	9473/18492	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>according to Government Planning Guidelines. It would create a serious loss of amenity and local residents could be disturbed by noise and light pollution. The existing site is has B1 and B8 uses, but the new proposals include B2 which would generate nuisance to local residents and businesses including the Air Museum. There are serious traffic issues to the Business Park and Elvington's Roads are inadequate for such expansion being narrow B roads. Traffic congestion is already bad at peak time and HGV activity is already at an unacceptable level. An increase in HGV traffic poses a greater risk to narrow and historic Sutton Bridge. Public transport to the business park is very poor and therefore additional workers would mean additional vehicles travelling to the site. Foul drainage at Elvington is at capacity. The loss of a large area of Green Belt would have a huge impact on the environment – the balancing pond to the north east of the site provides a haven for newts and other amphibians, butterflies and dragonflies. An increase in the Business Park is just not necessary as there is land on the existing site which, given the previous growth rate of the Park, would be sufficient. Any large increase in the site would bring huge disadvantages to the environment around Elvington.</p>		
<p><b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the land to be taken out of the green belt and therefore development is not in the best interests of the environment. The flora and fauna for this site is diverse and is a haven for butterflies and dragonflies. Public transport to this site is limited so workers at this site would be reliant on private vehicles. The road network leading to this site (B1228) is already inadequate and further traffic would only add to this problem. The road is particularly hazardous for cyclists as there is no cycle path and more heavy goods vehicles would increase the danger. If Site 97 is accepted and developed as an extension to the business park there is no need to safeguard extra land for future development. Site 97 is excessive on its own, to then put aside another 8ha is inappropriate for this rural location. The proposal would bring the industrial park nearer to residential areas, in particular Brinkworth Hall, Cannon House Farm and Cottages, Elvington Grange, Jubilee Court and the Conifers. This could be problematic in terms of light and noise pollution</p>	<p>9476/19116</p>	
	<p>Objection – infrastructure in Elvington is not adequate to facilitate a large growth. An increase in homes will mean more traffic passing through the village. This is already an issue. This will increase HGV traffic and the roads are not suitable.</p>	<p>9484/18746</p>	
	<p>Objection - to the proposed future development of Elvington Village as the sewage system is already at capacity. Whilst the sewage problem has been partially rectified by Yorkshire Water fitting a non-return valve when the main sewer is working to</p>	<p>9501/18657</p>	<p>Flatford Limited</p>

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	capacity when there is a blockage is the existing main sewer, which runs west to east along York Road, sewage backs up and has resulted in regular flooding by raw sewage in our yard and adjacent to our offices. This still causes problems as workforce have to cease using facilities.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection - the proposal would significantly increase the number of large side and HGV vehicles through the village. The widths of roads already are of great danger. The road cannot take two such vehicles without one mounting the kerb. This would increase traffic congestion and reduce road safety.	9518/18693	
	Objection - this will turn this area into a commuter suburb and lose the character of surrounding villages. Increased traffic congestion at this huge development site, it is disproportionate to the capacity of the road infrastructure. It's unclear where roads would exit onto and access the A64 effectively. Destruction of green belt – very little green belt area left.	9528/22435	
	Objection – site is not suitable for industrial use. What plans are there to add the necessary infrastructure. The existing village's infrastructure is already at bursting point. Several people have given up cycling in the village because it has become dangerous to do so. Developing this area will only lead to the above situation being made untenable for those already here. Village centre is dangerous with parked and speeding traffic. Roads are overburdened. No requirement for this site to be set aside for future development. Should remain as productive farmland. Object to this unnecessary proposal.	9556/19082	
	Objection – overall this plan is a disaster for our village.	9597/22447	
	Objection – significant issues include loss of green belt, diminution in the overall character of the village, a serious increase in the size of the village. Biggest concern will be the increase in road use and the linkage to road congestion around the shop and primary school. The B1228 already has attracted more traffic, increasing the 'rat run' through Elvington for East Riding village residents. The B1228 runs straight through the village.	9602/22459	
	Objection – excessive increase in population. Main road cannot cope with extra traffic. Drainage is at capacity. Part of the site is a haven for wildlife.	9640/22467	
	Objection - there is still available land at the existing business park and the scale of this new allocation is excessive for such a small rural village. The poor road surface of the B1228 makes it completely inadequate for the scale of this and other planned developments which will lead to an increase in heavy traffic. The resulting increase in noise and air pollution will be a serious loss of amenity for those living near the	9647/19317	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	airfield. In addition the sewerage system in Elvington is not suitable for further development.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to putting land into a position of holding for future use. Object to loss of greenbelt and agricultural use so close to the village. Opposed to inclusion of B2 uses. Local residents would suffer noise and light pollution which is unacceptable when there is no proven need for this provision. The road network is not adequate. Village would suffer due to traffic intensity with narrow footpaths, safety issues for children. Traffic noise would disturb an otherwise peaceful village along with pollution. Increased vibration damage to properties alongside the roadside causing property values to plummet.	9667/19457	
	Objection – will increase traffic. This is meant to be a sleepy village not a motorway stop over for HGVs.	9670/20132	
	Objection – to disproportionate increase in industrial use. Object to removal of land from Green Belt as this would: increase traffic congestion; pose further road safety issues; ruin the special character of the village.	9710/20168	
	Objection– no reason to safeguard when there is unused land at the existing business park. Removing more land from this area will have an adverse effect on the wildlife. Too close to private homes, causing considerable noise.	9719/20183	
	Objection – the windows rattle in my house as lorries go by already. The existing business park is just enough for a village. Have you had so many businesses crying out for space, if so, use the Brownfield land available in York. The road is just fit for purpose, it is narrow and is already congested at peak times. Already, we have large vehicles through the village which are inappropriate for children playing or riding bikes.	9726/20196	
	Objection – existing airfield business extends to some 8 has and have been undeveloped for 20 years. It is still not full. An extension has been put forward (site 97) there is no need to safeguard further land for industrial development. Demand is limited and the scale of development implied is inappropriate. The land is good quality agricultural land within the greenbelt. Infrastructure in the area is totally inadequate.	9743/26347	
	Comment – support further development as it would provide more local jobs and be of benefit to the local economy however development should be restricted to use class B1 and heavy good traffic should be banned from using the route through the centre of the village.	9776/21677	
	Objection - object, in the strongest possible terms, to the proposed Industrial Estate development at Elvington. My concern revolves around road traffic issues, especially	9778/20233	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>around the doctor's surgery, school and village green. Further development can only aggravate safety concerns exponentially. The increased HGV traffic also raises issues concerning noise and fume pollution together with attendant damage to the road. Elvington is only a small village and an increased Industrial Estate Development will change the character of the village beyond recognition. Traffic leading into those sites may also increase congestion, as additional land will be required to support employment opportunities.</p>		
<p><b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – developments in Elvington will be disproportionate for a small village. There will be too much encroachment on to Green Belt land. No account seems to have been taken as to the affect these plans will have on the wildlife of this area. At Sites 97 and 815 development needs to be proportionate for the size of the village. The B1228 is already a busy road and its state of repair is lamentable and is not suitable for even more HGV traffic unless it is upgraded. HGV traffic should be restricted through the village for safety purposes if the plans proceed. The road through the village is too narrow for HGV vehicles; they come far too close to pedestrians on very restrictive pavements.</p>	9791/20253	
	<p>Objection – whilst broadly in support additional land to support employment opportunities however concerned that the scale of the proposals could create an industrial area of a size that is out of keeping with the rural area. It would generate significant amounts of traffic including large vehicles on roads that are already busy. Any future development should include measures to redirect heavy traffic from the estate via Grimston Bar and ban it from the village, or a 20mph limit from the school to the bridge. The site is within the designated corridor number 5 Evlington Tillmire under the York Biodiversity Action Plan which should be taken into account. A buffer as a minimum should be considered. The area to the north east of the site is a haven for wildlife and should be protected from development.</p>	9798/20268	
	<p>Comment - support in principle the proposed development for employment however, the B1228 cannot cope with HGVs through the village. The 1079 Hull Road is more suited to HGVs. The proposed site should be appropriate to the residential size of the village. Development must not encroach on the size of Elvington. Must enhance and support the village not over take it. Would be detrimental to the natural habitat of the village.</p>	9812/19329	
	<p>Comment– support in principle the proposed development for employment however no HGVs should be allowed through the village, the B1228 cannot take further traffic/ congestion. The proposed site should be appropriate to the residential size of the</p>	9813/20274	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – an unacceptable extension which is excessive for a business park in a rural location. Taking into account other proposals (site 815 and 97) object to the scale of the proposed developments. B1228 is very busy with traffic. This proposals will increase HGVs and increase the safety risk to residents especially children. There would need to be a ban on HGVs through the village. It is within a designated wildlife corridor rich with fauna. Minimum buffer zones should be considered. Scale would cause problems with drainage, foul drainage is at capacity. Would have visual effect on nearby residences and potential for excess light levels and noise.	9814/24179	
	Objection – this must constitute inappropriate development. Removal of Green Belt land will have a negative impact on Availability of agricultural and livestock farming land thus meaning less locally produced food, affecting the local economy and having wider environmental consequences. The existing drainage has absolutely no further capacity to support any development at all. The current infrastructure is insufficient to support proposed site ref 815. There will be an inevitable increase in traffic volume on the B1228 which will result would be congestion at the school, through the village and at the Derwent bridge. Recent weight restrictions on the bridge have been almost impossible to police/enforce. Vehicles driving through the village already pose a clear road safety risk, especially in the village centre and by the school. This risk can only increase if further commercial/industrial development takes place. Can CYC please provide evidence of the need for additional commercial/industrial development to the extent proposed. The scale of the proposed development is completely disproportionate to the amount of existing land for commercial land and which is not yet fully developed anyway. We are talking about a rural location here, on the edge of the small village of Elvington. Industrial development here is not appropriate at this location. There is already an additional site (ref E9) which has been allocated for expansion, at the Elvington Industrial Estate. So why the need for any more. The allocation within site ref 815 will affect views from Brinkworth Hall, canon House Farm & Cottages, Elvington Grange, Jubilee Court & The Conifers and other private residences. It will be especially intrusive on Brinkworth Hall whose garden will border the proposed allocation and who could suffer from both noise and light pollution. Elvington is a small village which enjoys a village atmosphere with a close-knit community. There is no need for it to become anything different. That is why so many of my fellow residents and also the Parish Council itself are against the proposals contained in the Local Plan. This is our village. Please do not allow it to be	9824/20285	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	changed out of recognition.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection - the road network, using the B1228 is inadequate and if there is further development the toll on the roads, pollution, noise will be greatly increased. The residents who live close to this proposed will suffer hugely from noise and pollution which will reduce their standard of living. At the moment the existing occupiers are B1 and B8 and the addition of B2 users could cause problems, to local businesses, including our famous Air Museum, and local residents. The drainage and sewerage systems are at full capacity now so goodness knows what will happen with this proposed development. On the north east side of the site is a balancing pond which is a haven for newts, other amphibians, butterflies, dragonflies plus a big variety of flora and fauna which need protecting.	9831/22067	
	Objection – no requirement to safeguard land. Together with Site 97 this would be a tripling of the business park which is excessive given its rural location. The park has not been fully developed after 15 years why are we planning for the next 15. Inappropriate development on agricultural green belt land in a village location. The addition of B2 use class opens the site up for more intensive, noxious and noisy uses which would mean a loss of amenity for the nearby residents. Road links are already busy. All HGV traffic should be barred from going through the village. The balancing pond to the north east of the site is a haven for wildlife and flora and fauna. Buffer zones are required as a minimum to protect wildlife.	9833/24235	
	Objection – the B1228 is very busy already. The road is not suitable for an increase in HGVs. They should be banned through the village.	9847/24190	
	Objection- the B1228 is already very busy at peak times. The road is not suitable for an increase in HGV and other traffic. HGV's should be banned through the village.	9848/24195	
	Objection - will have a huge negative impact on village life in terms of extra traffic congestion, safety, noise and its population. The school is operating at capacity. The impact on safety is of grave concern. Currently the industrial estates are far enough on the outskirts so as not to impose on village life in terms of noise, pollution, safety and appearance.	9861/24265	
	Objection- already traffic holdups occur every day and HGV's are still crossing the Sutton Bridge. If the industrial estate grows much more Elvington would lose its village feel.	9873/24203	
	Objection – large and out of context with natural steady growth. Will take land out of the green belt and cause a nuisance to local residents and businesses. Current bus provision is not adequate. The main road is already very busy with local traffic and	9884/24319	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	through traffic both cars and HGVs. The drainage/sewerage system is over stretched.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – proposals at site E9 provides more than sufficient land for development in the area when combined with the remaining areas of the business park that could be developed. This proposals is excessive and unnecessarily uses the green belt to develop a disproportionate amount of land in a rural location. Would severely impact on congestion, bringing more HGVs into to an area which would also risk damage to the bridge at Sutton on Derwent. Drainage systems are already at capacity.	9900/24342	
	Objection – the village cannot sustain anymore large scale industrial development. The main B1228 road is totally inadequate for present traffic. The HGV and large agricultural vehicles are unsuitable on this rural road. Development will only increase the risk to Sutton Bridge which was designed for horse and cart. East Riding of Yorkshire Council have recognised that Sutton upon Derwent is a special rural village and is to be safeguarded from certain development in their Local Plan. Elvington is a special rural village and should be maintained as such. Elvington should be treated with sympathetic vision not as an extension of the City of York.	9904/24348	
	Objection – opposed to this proposal	9916/24367	
	Objection – the village has already catered for employment. Any future extension will be disproportionate for the size of the village turning the area from residential to industrial. HGVs already cause congestion through the village which would be exacerbated causing safety risk to residents. The already busy B1228 would have to accommodate even more traffic particularly HGVs.	9917/24370	
	Objection – will have deeply adverse effect on the area and on the quality of life for existing residents. Little thought given to the infrastructure implications. The B1228 is already a busy road, will surely become significantly more dangerous and congested particularly in the centre of the village.	9930/24425	
	Objection – this site will encourage large HGVs passing along the B1228 and Sutton Bridge. There should be a cycle path to Grimston Bar. Any development should be proportionate to the size of the village.	9937/24474	
	Objection – an inappropriate site. Opposed to use of the green belt. A 1ha site has already been allocated for the expansion of the industrial estate, this land along with land lying empty and still to be developed on the existing business park is sufficient for the life of the local plan on previous growth rates. Traffic congestion on nearby roads is already bad. The pond on the site is a haven for newts and other wildlife, flora and fauna which would be affected by any further development.	9943/24485	
	Objection- the existing industrial park and land yet to be developed is already a very	9944/20312	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	sizeable industrial park for a rural location. The road through Elvington is already overloaded with large HGV lorries, proposal would increase HGV traffic considerably causing major disturbance to residents. Both Hagg Bridge and Sutton Bridge were not built to cope with the size and weight of these vehicles. Further demands on an already overstretched infrastructure would be unsustainable.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – this site will encourage large HGVs passing along the B1228 and Sutton Bridge. There should be a cycle path to Grimston Bar. Any development should be proportionate to the size of the village.	9950/24496	
	Objection – local people would not be buying the houses due to the employment reduction.	9961/21120	
	Objection – takes up agricultural land within the greenbelt and is inappropriate development for a village location. Balancing pond to the north east of the site is a haven for wildlife, flora and fauna. Buffer zones are required at a minimum to protect wildlife. The existing business park extends to some 8ha with land still to be development. Site 97 already doubles the size of the park. There is no requirement for this allocation given the previous growth of the park. The proposals are excessive for a rural location. A 1ha site has already been allocated which is sufficient for the life of the plan. Sewage drainage system in Elvington is at capacity. The road network is inadequate for the scale of development. A weigh limit would also be required on Sutton Bridge due to increased HGV activity to avoid disturbance to the local residents.	9981/25924	
	Objection – business park size would triple. More needed, but not to the extent proposed. Traffic would increase. Expansion is irresponsible and detrimental to the area. This proposal will bring increased traffic and danger to children at the primary school. The airfield industrial estate lies in the middle of the Elvington Tillmire Biodiversity corridor which is of national importance for the preservation of wildlife. It is also part of the former Langwith Stray which provides a habitat for many birds and animals. To propose this expansion is irresponsible and detrimental to the natural environment.	10001/20340	
	Objection – no need for this expansion, there are a number of units available. This is inappropriate use of greenbelt land. The road system is already over saturated. Heavy traffic through the village adds to the danger to our children and pollutes the environment	10044/24400	
	Objection – safeguarded a misleading term. Together with Site 97 is an unacceptable extension to the Elvington business park. Excessive for a rural location. There is land	10047/21126	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	left to develop at the business park. Access is from an already congested road, risk to residents safety, especially children. Would need to ban HGV traffic through the village. Site is within a designated nature corridor which should be protected by buffer zones. Foul drainage system is at capacity. Loss of amenity for nearby residences.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – the B1228 is already very busy and in poor condition which would be made worse by any additional traffic. There will be an increase in HGVs through the village which will not be able to cope. Any development should be in proportion to the size of the village and should be on brownfield land not green belt.	10072/24440	
	Objection – the B1228 is already very busy and in poor condition which would be made worse by any additional traffic. There will be an increase in HGVs through the village which will not be able to cope. Any development should be in proportion to the size of the village and should be on brownfield land not green belt.	10073/24445	
	Objection – this is within the Tilmire corridor green zone. The river derwent and lower derwent valley is nationally important for wildlife and requiring management to reduce diffuse pollution and improve water quality.	10074/24451	
	Objection – this site is in the greenbelt. Government state that 90% of residential and industrial development should be on brown field sites before greenbelt. The proposals are excessive for a rural location. The proposed site will be intrusive to current private dwellings and reduce amenities. There will be increased road use. The drainage system is at capacity in the village. The balancing ponds are a haven for wildlife.	10076/24456	
	Objection – the proposed allocation takes up agricultural land within the green belt and is 'inappropriate development' for the village location. Balancing pond to the north east of the site is haven for wildlife, flora and fauna which will be affected by any further development at the site. Buffer zones are required to protect the wildlife from further development and allow the wildlife to move to other areas. Proposals are excessive for such a rural location. A 1ha site (Site E9) has already been allocated for expansion of the Elvington Industrial Estate combined this with what's left to develop at the existing Airfield Business Park then given the previous growth rate of the industrial estates this would appear sufficient for the life of the plan. The sewage system in Elvington is at capacity. The scale of proposed allocations will cause problems going forward. The road network into Elvington is inadequate for the scale of development, with narrow B roads being the only method of reaching this site. Traffic congestion is already bad at peak times. A weight limit would be required on Sutton Bridge due to the increased HGV activity and to avoid disturbance to local residents.	10077/19348	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – the loss of green belt land is inappropriate for a rural village. There will be increased traffic, especially HGV's to an already busy infrastructure, the possible inclusion of B2 use could cause a nuisance to local villagers, loss of privacy and views for a number of residential properties adjacent to the site.	10079/20346	
	Objection – infrastructure is at capacity and cannot support further development. Increase traffic in the area.	10092/25812	
	Objection – the scale of development is too large. There will be a loss of greenbelt, amenity, there is poor public transport, infrastructure is at capacity and destroy biodiversity.	10095/25820	
	Objection – B1228 is already very busy with high HGV movement. Further development should result in a HGV ban through the village. The size of this development would be disproportionate to the village	10109/25834	
	Objection – roads are already hazardous with the HGVs using the village roads. There should be a new access off the A64.	10110/25839	
	Objection – the transport system through Elvington is inadequate for an increase in HGVs. This is detrimental to air quality. The main road passes close to the local primary school and doctors surgery. This is greenbelt land and will negatively impact on the environment and wildlife.	10119/25850	
	Objection - the infrastructure is not capable of supporting this development. The road is already excessively busy. More traffic will result in more risks to the villages and children.	10125/25858	
	Objection – scale of allocation, there is no requirement for more land. This is a loss of greenbelt. Traffic congestion is already high. The infrastructure is at capacity. This is negatively affect biodiversity.	10164/26000	
	Objection - does not agree that land should be taken out of the green belt. The infrastructure of the village is insufficient to cope with additional houses (in the region of 135). The drainage system could not cope with an increase in the size of the village of this kind.	10169/24200	
	Objection – site is inappropriate development. There is staunch opposition to this plan in the village. If implemented, it would create serious and unwarranted tensions in Elvington. There is little infrastructure to support it, with Elvington having very little access points. New homes would mean an extra 100 or so school-aged children. Elvington Primary School does not have the facilities to cope with such extra numbers.	10173/19373	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – strongly objects because of the size of land area being proposed. Increase in HGVs through the village will be a danger to children.	10175/19376	
	Objection –opposed to safeguarding the Green Belt should be the primary aim of the Council. There are plenty of unused areas in brown field sites and the city centre.	10176/19381	
	Support – it will bring employment opportunities to the village and surrounding area. The extension is proportionate to the size of the village and has no negative impact on the culture of the village. Concerns about the increase in traffic which should be address before any approval.	10197/21139	
	Object – green belt land will be lost, the loss of greenbelt is inappropriate for a rural village. Infrastructure could not cope with extra traffic. B2 use would cause nuisance to local villagers	10210/20355	
	Objection – concern about road capacity, local amenities, surgery and local school, public transport or post office. Unsustainable without major infrastructure.	10211/21168	
	Objection – the village is very aware of the pressure that developments of the last four decades has put upon the village and its environment. This village is becoming a dormitory settlement. These proposals will only destroy what remains of its natural character. The increase in population has not yet brought any improvement to the infrastructure. The growth in traffic has severely damaged the environment. To ignore the greenbelt offends villagers, upsets wildlife habitats, and destroys the village status.	10246/26005	
	Objection – area proposed too large. Traffic would increase, increasing risk to children.	10283/21273	
	Objection – HGV’s should be banned from passing through the village	10286/21280	
	Objection – current proposals are excessive. The amount of land proposed is out of proportion with the rest of the village. Infrastructure would need to be addressed.	10288/21286	
	Objection – green belt land. Roads are extremely busy. Drainage is at capacity. Village and local business could be affected by noise and pollution.	10289/21290	
	Objection – adverse effect on local primary school and road network.	10290/21295	
	Objection – current population and size is sufficient. Traffic at current level is adequate. Noise and air pollution currently an issue. Water and sewerage at capacity.	10293/21303	
Objection – general principle must resist the loss of Green Belt – productive agricultural land and priceless natural wildlife habitat. Future development would constitute expansion of neighbouring business park with further industrial and commercial premises. This would mean more goods vehicles on the one road through Elvington – employees at the new development would need their own transport too,	10382/21860		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	as Elvington has only a bare minimum of public transport . Result would be increased traffic on this road and therefore congestion at the school, through the centre of the village, and at the Derwent Bridge at the far end of the village.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – this would increase traffic congestion into the village – specifically HGV's and increase safety specifically at school corner at corner into green.	10445/22528	
	Objection – inappropriate because – B1228 is already busy at peak times. It will increase HGV traffic , a safety risk to residents, especially children. HGV's should be banned – as in all neighbouring villages if plans proceed. Development should be proportionate to the size of the village.	10446/22532	
	Objection – the proposal takes up agricultural land. Proposal is too large for the size of the village. Traffic problems would increase. The land contains several areas designated as wildlife havens.	10453/22558	
	Objection – concerned about the amount of HGV traffic that will be increased into the village, this poses a risk to children. HGV's should not be using the village as a route to the motorway when there is easy access via the A64. Any development should be proportionate to the size of the village.	10456/22091	
	Objection – the existing business park extends to nearly 20 acres and although well developed there is still land there to be developed. The proposed allocation of between 8.4ha and 15.4ha an increase of nearly 200% is far too excessive for such a location. The proposed allocation takes up previous agricultural land within the green belt and is inappropriate development. A site of this size would mean an increase in vehicle access and the main road could not cope with this volume especially larger vehicles. Turning traffic will interfere with the free flow of traffic on the B1228 thereby creating another traffic hazard. The foul drainage system in Elvington is at capacity, as is evidenced by the system installed at the new affordable housing development where sewage is stored and pumped away at night time. The scale of the proposed allocation will cause problems going forward. The balancing pond to the NE of the site is a haven for newts and other amphibians, butterflies and dragonflies together with a wide variety of flora and fauna which will be affected by any further development, and giving the ability for the wildlife to move to different areas. The proposed site will affect the views from Brinkworth Hall, Canon House Farm & Cottages, Elvington Grange, jubilee Court & The Conifers s and other private residencies. The site will e especially intrusive on Brinkworth Hall whose garden will border the proposed site and who could suffer form both noise and light pollution.	10459/22567	
	Objection - the existing business park extends to some 8ha (19.7acres) and although	10463/22096	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>well developed there is still land to be developed. The proposed 8ha extension (site 97) already doubles the size of the park, there is no requirement to then set aside a further 7ha site given the previous growth of the park. The proposals are excessive for such a rural location. The road network into Elvington is inadequate for the scale of development, with narrow B roads being the only method of reaching the site. Traffic congestion is already bad at peak periods without the possible near 200% increase in the size of the park, given that Elvington has a very poor bus service and no other form of public transport, a majority of the workers at the park will need a private vehicle. A weight limit should also be required at Sutton Bridge due to he increased HGV activity and to avoid disturbance to local residents.</p>		
<p><b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - it will increase heavy traffic on an already busy road that is in desperate need of resurfacing as it is. Appreciate the need for some development and the creation of jobs. Believe it correct to stop HGV access to Elvington Village and the old bridge. Most definitely, if there is any further industrial development. All neighbouring villages already have a ban in place. It is an accident waiting to happen in Elvington. Would it not be sensible to put in place the ban before a child is killed. The old bridge has recently been rebuilt after a HGV damaged it at a cost of well over £100,000 paid for by the local tax payer. Any further development should also take into account the size of the village and not to add another large industrial estate with putting in proper infrastructure. I appreciate that local authority cannot afford to resurface the existing road so how will it cope with the extra traffic without breaking up completely. If there is to be a reasonable sized industrial development then there should be a new and suitable road link put in to the A64 York By-pass. I am not sure I believe there is some restrictions in this area because of wildlife conservation.</p>	<p>10464/22103</p>	
	<p>Objection – character of village would be destroyed. Green belt area development would adversely affect the wildlife. Additional pressure on local amenities could be catastrophic. Would cause road safety issues. Village life should be protected.</p>	<p>10479/22613</p>	
	<p>Objection – no demonstrated need for expansion for land. Surrounding roads are congested. Would put intolerable burden on the infrastructure.</p>	<p>10483/22620</p>	
	<p>Objection – dangerous road would be further compromised by additional HGV traffic. Separate access road to link to the ring road would be required</p>	<p>10484/22624</p>	
	<p>Objection – tripling the area not based on any need to the area. Roads and infrastructure are inadequate for what is required. No evidence of extra employment needed</p>	<p>10486/22632</p>	
	<p>Objection - an increase of nearly 200% is too excessive. Takes up land on the green</p>	<p>10488/22637</p>	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	belt and is inappropriate. Increase in vehicle access and the main road couldn't cope with this volume. Foul drainage system in Elvington is at capacity. Balancing pond to the north east is full of animals, fish and bugs which would be affected by further development, buffer zones are required at a minimum to protect wildlife from further development. Proposed site will affect views from Brinkworth Hall, Canon House Farm & Cottages, Elvington Grange, Jubilee Court & conifers and other private residents. Town will suffer from noise and light pollution.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection - problems with increase of traffic. Insufficient foul drainage system. Flora and fauna at risk. Affected views.	10489/22646	
	Objection- no need for this amount of land to be set aside to satisfy a demand that doesn't exist, given that the existing estate is not fully developed or occupied, despite being available for 20 years. Land should only be set aside to meet a need that has been demonstrated by analysis. The roads, especially the road in the village, is totally inadequate to serve any expansion of the industrial land and other infrastructure is also at full capacity.	10492/22653	
	Objection - will affect the green belt. Village cannot cope with increased demands on amenities and infrastructure	10519/22702	
	Objection – see survey 2. Strongly oppose the extent of the development proposed for Elvington. Will utterly change the character and make up of a rural village. Local services, schools and infrastructure will not be able to cope with such a demand.	10521/26998	
	Objection – increased safety risk. Current road unsafe for cyclists due to HGV's. Narrow pavements make it hazardous for pedestrians. The proposal will increase the danger. Adequate infrastructure proposals have not been made. There has been inadequate consultation. The Parish Council does not support the plan.	10524/21320	
	Objection – represents nearly a 200% increase in area, clearly excessive for such a location. The expansion impacts on green belt land and is therefore inappropriate. B2 uses could generate a nuisance to local residents and is not suitable. There are inadequate transport links for proposed increase in size. Limits on Sutton bridge would be necessary. The village drainage system could not cope. The site is a haven for flora and fauna, which would be compromised.	10527/22715	
	Objection- Greenbelt should not be compromised and any additional development in Elvington area must consider the B1228, already over run with HGVs- farm vehicles and tankers.	10542/22755	
	Objection – this land is currently Green Belt, that is for a purpose: to retain the rural nature of the community. And this is highly relevant to the identity and character of	10543/19195	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>the York area as a whole. As with site 97, this represents a significant increase in commercial land use around the Airfield, which is much greater than any proposals elsewhere in the City of York area. While some organic development is to be expected, this represents a major change to the character of the area. Elvington needs to retain its village character. As commented elsewhere, it is one of very few small detached villages within the Greater York area. As such, its character contributes to the attractive character of the Greater York area as a whole. This point was acknowledged very prominently by the Inspector in his Report on the large 1992/3 public inquiries into planning proposals. The village character should be substantially retained: this means development which is modest and in keeping with that of a village. So far Elvington has coexisted with the airfield and associated developments reasonably well. But an increase of this magnitude in industrial/commercial activity will inevitably have an effect to the detriment of the village and surroundings. Development of this site 815 will further add a significant extra loading upon the B1228, which is already at capacity. This both in the direction towards York, and (perhaps more importantly) through the main part of the village itself where heavy goods traffic has been of much concern for many years. In the past few years, attempts were made to ban HGV vehicles from Sutton Bridge, and this did offer some respite to the villagers. However, it was overturned under pressure from the haulage industry. Further substantive development here will make matters much worse, and lead to further conflict and degradation of quality of life for the village as well as road safety. The site (or effectively this area) was rejected firmly in the 1992/3 inquiry and deemed Green belt. There is no justification to take it out of the Green belt now.</p>		
<p><b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - main concern is the volume of traffic this development could make the B1228 which can already get extremely busy and then increase the HGV traffic in the village which is such a safety worry already. HGV's should be banned. I have lived in the village for nearly 6 yrs and have seen close hand the near misses some children have had walking to and from school. In places the pathways are so narrow and when HGV vehicles are approaching in both directions and have to pass each other the vehicles are known to mount the curb. I feel this development would only work if they was a ban on HGV vehicles from the village and it should be proportionate to the residential size of the village</p>	<p>10581/22778</p>	
	<p>Objection – the airfield is well developed and there is still land to be developed. There is no need for this extension. The road network cannot cope with this and noise and</p>	<p>10597/26101</p>	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pollution will be increased. The drainage system is at capacity. This site is a haven for wildlife.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – the airfield is well developed. There is no need for an increase of nearly 200%. This is inappropriate in the greenbelt. The road network cannot cope with more traffic, noise and pollution. The drainage system is at capacity. Part of the site is a haven for wildlife. Elvington should remain a small village.	10608/26106	
	Objection – Green Belt land. Pollution, diesel fumes and oil spills. Adjacent pasture and agricultural land adversely affected. Impact of the traffic: noise, pollution and vibration. Hazardous cycling. Adequate undeveloped land on the industrial sites already.	10628/20404	
	Objection – inappropriately developed with loss of green belt land. Foul drainage system at capacity.	10632/20413	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed safeguarded industrial site. The existing business park is nearly 20 acres. The proposed allocation would be an increase of nearly 200% - excessive. It takes up agricultural green belt land and is inappropriate. Increase in vehicular access means the main road could not cope. The drainage system is at capacity. The balancing pond is a haven for flora and fauna which will be affected by development. The site will affect views from Brinkworth Hall Canon House Farm & cottages , Elvington Grange, Jubilee Court and The Conifers. Brinkworth in particular could suffer from noise and light pollution.	10635/20419	
	Objection – although an industrial estate, this is a village and near residential homes and the scale of the proposals are too large. Any plans should be sympathetic to their surroundings. Many homes will suffer the problems of noise pollution with Brinkworth Hall particularly suffering from noise and light pollution as a result of these plans. Noise problems and traffic problems are already happening and this plan would surely increase traffic - both of heavy goods vehicles and those commuting to work at the estate. The houses on Elvington Lane already suffer from noise and traffic problems from the heavy traffic on the B1228 from the early morning until late at night. It can already be difficult to get safely in and out of driveways on Elvington Lane. As important is the impact on wildlife. The balancing pond to the north east of the site is a haven for newts, butterflies and dragonflies. This will be adversely affected by development at the site ad I’m sure you are already aware.	10648/19581	
Objection – before further development of the industrial estate, Elvington village should be bypassed and the lane upgraded to a main road with cycling facilities. All HGV’s should be banned from passing through the village as the road is not wide	10649/19741		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	enough to accommodate the monstrous vehicles.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – inappropriate development in a village location on green belt land that was previously used for agriculture. Increased traffic will cause problems. Increase noise pollution will affect surrounding residential properties. Concerns about the impact on wildlife and the environment. Balancing pond to the north east of the site. Buffer zone needed to protect the habitats from further development and the enable wildlife to move to other areas.	10664/19602	
	Objection – HGV traffic will increase	10669/19607	
	Objection – HGV traffic will increase	10670/19765	
	Objection – infrastructure cannot cope. More frequent power cuts. Green belt land would be spoilt forever. People of the village were supposed to get an allotment on the site.	10683/19797	
	Objection - extension (Site 97) already doubles the size of the park, there is just no requirement to then set aside a further 7ha site given the previous growth of the park. The proposals are excessive for such a rural location. 1ha site (site E9) has already been allocated for expansion of the Elvington Industrial estate combined this with what's left to develop at the existing Airfield business park then given the previous growth rate of the industrial estates this would appear sufficient for the life of the plan. The proposed allocation takes up previous agricultural land within the green belt and is "inappropriate development" for the village location. This further allocation will affect views from Brinkworth Hall, Canon House Farm & Cottages, Elvington Grange, Jubilee Court & The Conifers and other private residencies, especially intrusive on Brinkworth Hall whose garden will border the proposed allocation and who could suffer from both noise and light pollution. The balancing pond to the north east of the site has a wide variety of flora & fauna which will be affected by any further development at the site, buffer zones are required at a minimum to protect the wildlife from further development and giving the ability for the wildlife to	10697/19824	
	Objection – too much land will be taken from green belt.	10702/19837	Elvington Action Group
	Objection - further development should take place in Elvington eg infilling on Elvington Lane but traffic has taken place on their need to be increased. Heavy lorries using the B1228 as a short cut would have to be re-directed to major roads. The success of the Airfield Business Park and Elvington Industrial Estate should be applauded. However, any extension of these enterprises should safeguard Elvington village so that access is readily available but heavy through traffic is re-directed to	10710/19852	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	major roads.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection- no sufficient infrastructure around and in the village of Elvington for any plans on the scale intended. Elvington is a village, to put a traveller show peoples site, especially opposite the medical centre and sports club is unsustainable and out of keeping with the nature of the village. Village doesn't have a regular bus service so to increase its inhabitants on the scale of the proposal is counter productive. Land that floods, insufficient drainage, no road infrastructure, no bus services ,a tiny village shop, no post office and on public house how do you proposed the village can sustain these plans. The planning authority have recently turned down an application for a tea room in the village yet it is considering the above noted plans.	10724/19881	
	Comment – support employment opportunities, but HGV traffic through the village needs to be assessed.	10745/19940	
	Objection – increase in traffic. Increase in noise. No road infrastructure. Industrial estates have empty premises. Green belt land will lead to loss of rural farming.	10756/19982	
	Objection – currently traffic flow through Elvington is very busy. There are already far too many HGV's thundering through the village. Roads are not capable of sustaining current traffic flow and it can be dangerous for pedestrians on the footpath. A new development at the Airfield Business Park would surely increase the amount of traffic, particularly HGV's, increasing the likelihood of accidents	10766/20010	
	Objection- Elvington is a rural village and already hosts industrial estates. Many of the units in the estates are empty. Increasing industrial development will bring additional traffic to an already busy road that is inappropriate for the heavy goods traffic. This type and volume of traffic should not be permitted where it is dangerous to do so. There have been numerous occasions where buildings and property have been damaged as a result of industrial traffic. If this increases then its only a matter of time before Elvington hits the headlines for something more serious.	10816/21357	
	Objection- Elvington does not have capacity for this level of potential development. The character of the village would be lost. Village school is at capacity. The roads would not accommodate increase in traffic. Will also pose further road safety issues around the school, playground and village green. The mains drainage and sewage are already at capacity. Developments on these sites would adversely impact on local wildlife.	10830/21376	
	Objection -Elvington does not have capacity for this level of potential development. The character of he village would be lost. Village school is already at capacity. The roads will not accommodate the increased traffic. Additional traffic will also pose	10832/21381	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	further road safety issues. The main drainage and sewage system are already at capacity. Additional development will increase the likelihood of flooding. Development on these sites would adversely impact on local wildlife.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection - further extension is possible but not on this scale. The volume of traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles, is already substantial. The increased number of HGV movements would bring unacceptable increases to HGV traffic passing through the village centre – already recognized as excessive for safe use by children walking and cycling to school. Elvington Lane, the B1228, currently appears unsuitable for existing. Safeguarding land is not a requirement and should not be undertaken.	10842/21401	
	Objection - further extension is possible but not on this scale. The volume of traffic, particularly heavy goods vehicles, is already substantial. The increased number of HGV movements would bring unacceptable increases to HGV traffic passing through the village centre – already recognized as excessive for safe use by children walking and cycling to school. Elvington Lane, the B1228, currently appears unsuitable for existing. Safeguarding land is not a requirement and should not be undertaken.	10845/21410	
	Objection- there would be increased traffic congestion.	10892/21501	
	Objection – to the B1228 through Elvington and between Elvington and York is already very busy especially at peak times. An increased number of HGV's passing through the village is a major concern. If access to the village by HGV's could be restricted this would overcome this major concern.	10896/21508	
	Objection – see survey 2. There is already a proposal to expand the business park by 200%, so this proposal for even further expansion is excessive in such a rural area, right at the edge of Elvington village and would impact on surrounding housing enormously, causing light pollution, general pollution and noise nuisance. This is green belt land and is therefore 'inappropriate development' for a rural location. It provides a haven for newts, butterflies and dragonflies and other wildlife. The proposed addition of B2 users, which is general industrial, would be extremely intrusive and unsustainable on the rural roads and through the village. HGV's would have to be prevented from going through the village, as they would be extremely dangerous for children. The pavements are non-existent. The old bridge would need a weight limit. Elvington has very poor public transport so all workers at the business park would need private vehicles, thus making already congested roads worse. HGV's and other industrial and commercial vehicles already make walking around the village dangerous, children getting to school cannot cycle safely.	10898/21517	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses  
Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Object – green belt land, rejected before. Doubling the size of the business park will result in a huge increase in traffic. Additional traffic will cause congestion at Grimston Bar roundabout. The sewerage system is at capacity.	10935/21581	
	Objection – safeguarded land (sites 802, 97 and 815) for proposed development will result in the village being swamped disproportionately to its present size, and will increase traffic especially HGV's with resulting noise and safety problems.	10936/21586	
	Objection – village is in danger of losing its distinctive character. Insufficient information about infrastructure implications. The “further sites” don't have local support.	10953/21610	
	Objection – development too large for the current transport system and infrastructure to cope with. Improvements at Grimston Bar would be undone.	11169/21663	
	Objection – current road network cannot support such a scheme. There is a limited bus service which will lead to employees using private vehicles. Already far too many HGVs thundering through the village. Either divert the traffic or ban HGVs. Should consider putting a weight limit on Sutton Bridge. Will cause safety issues, pollution and noise issues.	11216/21914	
	Objection –see the need for industrial development to assist the local economy would have thought it more appropriate to utilise brown field sites, and sites with appropriate supporting infrastructure such as a road network and local public transport services – neither of which apply to the Elvington site. Beyond the further loss of greenbelt land I am also particularly concerned about the suitability of the immediate road network and the likely impact of any growth in heavy goods vehicle traffic. Traffic through the village is already considerable, and contains a significant amount of HGV traffic, a particular danger due to the village primary school and the number of children who walk to school, traffic control is already insufficient for the nature of traffic passing through the village, the likely expansion in such traffic through the village will undoubtedly cause issues, both within the village and for the recently restored Sutton Bridge.	11217/22110	
	Objection – already heavily congested roads. Increased risk of accidents. Development should be proportional to the size of the village.	11218/22833	
	Objection – roads are heavily congested. Existing road is dangerous. Development should be proportional to the size of the village.	11313/22865	
	Objection - development is inappropriate for the village location with the loss of green belt land. Transport is already a problem with heavy goods vehicles passing through the village, noise, pollution and houses shake as these vehicles traverse the B1228 –	11367/22227	

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses**  
**Section 5: New and Revised Safeguarded Land (continued)**

**November 2015**

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	it is a "B" road. The effect this development will have on several houses close by will be very intrusive. One has only to see how many industrial units and office sites around York are empty and for sale or to let to again wonder why the proposed increase. The balancing pond on the site is a haven for newts and other amphibians – what is going to happen to them? As for drainage and sewerage, full capacity has long been reached – what are the proposals for a solution for this.		
<b>815 Elvington Industrial Estate (continued)</b>	Objection – already two large industrial estates on edge of the village, both seem to have empty premises. Increase the amount of traffic on the B1228, a responsible council would ban HGV's in the village not encourage more. Rural village not appropriate to turn into a business park.	11382/22914	
	Objection – concerned about the scale of the proposals. It will detrimentally affect the village. Already many lorries through the village, extra traffic would cause an even greater hazard. The road is not well maintained which will be exacerbated. Variety of wildlife on some of the site. Protection should be a priority. Wonders where the business are going to come from when there are many empty industrial units around the city.	11385/21917	
	Objection – opposed by the Parish Council because of the scale of the development. HGV traffic would increase to an unacceptable level. Had HGV traffic been banned from the village a major objection could have been overcome.	11399/22942	
	Comment – support further development as it would provide more local jobs and be of benefit to the local economy however development should be restricted to use class B1 and heavy good traffic should be banned from using the route through the centre of the village.	11419/21673	
	Objection – this proposal is unjustified. The roads in and around Elvington are already congested. This will be lead to further heavy traffic going through the village.	11646/26123	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development.	Petition 5	