

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
772 Knapton Moor, Wetherby Road	Objection – loss of 2.4ha of agricultural land	45/18803	York Environment Forum
	Objection – it will interfere with the activities of the airfield and particularly the flying of microlight aircraft. The airfield is still used by the military under emergency procedures. It is suggested that renewable energy be created by utilising the roofs of houses i.e. properties be fitted with solar panels. These would be able to immediately connect to the National Grid. This would also reduce the need for and the cost of further infrastructure development such as 'wind farms', 'solar fields' and electricity pylons.	71/18803	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – do not support this proposals as believe there to be more appropriate sites elsewhere. CYC are currently insisting at Yorwaste resubmit their planning application for recycling and waste transfer buildings in order to maintain a rural aspect to this approach to York. It would fly in the face of these efforts to locate a solar farm, or indeed any other development on this site. Consideration must also be given to the adjacent flying activities (gliding, micro lights and gyrocopters) which could well be distracted by reflected glare from solar panels.	74/18837	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Objection – it will interfere with the activities of the airfield and particularly the flying of microlight aircraft. The airfield is still used by the military under emergency procedures. It is suggested that renewable energy be created by utilising the roofs of houses i.e. properties be fitted with solar panels. These would be able to immediately connect to the National Grid. This would also reduce the need for and the cost of further infrastructure development such as 'wind farms', 'solar fields' and electricity pylons.	78/19018	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – solar panel farm is a better option for this site.	91/19638	
	Objection – not a suitable nor appropriate site. Wetherby Road is a busy road, glint and glare listed in Council's own evaluation criteria as 2 and for land use is classed as 3 when it is advised that solar should use level 1 land. There is also a footpath/cycle route adjacent to the site.	192/23770	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20540	
	Comment – see survey 12. Solar power is needed, but perhaps in smaller numbers not 'farms'.	1049/26827	
	Objection - concerned about proposals to allocate 6 acres of greenbelt land at Knapton Moor for a solar farm. Surely space could be found on a brownfield or former industrial site for such a construction.	1159/20563	
	Objection – the site will adversely impact upon views of the countryside between the quiet rural villages of Knapton and Rufforth. Correspondence received from pilots	1355/18633	Julian Sturdy MP

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	from Rufforth Airfield reveals they are greatly concerned about the danger posed by reflective light flicker from a solar farm, which they consider to be much too close to the airfield which they regularly use.		
772 Knapton Moor, Wetherby Road (continued)	Objection – solar panels should only be on roofs, that way they do not take up land that is needed to produce food.	1935/17889	
	Objection – see survey 11.	2356/26774	
	Objection – site is green belt land. Brownfield sites are more appropriate areas for business use.	2554/17808	
	Objection - does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17944	
	Support – supportive of the use of renewable energy. Landscaping needs to be considered as part of the development.	2765/20612	
	Objection – see survey 11. Solar power is unnecessary and a further intrusion into the Green Belt.	2814/26777	
	Objection – solar farms are more appropriate on a brownfield site. This area should be planted with trees to help combat air pollution,	3004/23845	
	Support – there is no objection to this proposal.	3618/23926	
	Objection – see survey 11. The City of York Council is causing loss of amenity to what were very pleasant rural villages by imposing solarfarms on them.	3784/26779	
	Objection – setting within the landscape and green belt makes this site inappropriate. High security fencing would spoil the open aspect of the area. Vast quantities of pylons would be required to connect this site to the nearest national grid network access point. Too much glare would be produced too close to the road network and projected into the flight paths for Rufforth airfield.	3836/18280	
	Objection – this site is not appropriate for a solar farm being too close to both the B1224 and the end of the active Rufforth runway. It also consumes green belt unnecessarily.	3880/21690	
Objection - why use open countryside when even the government has made some announcements about it and discourage the allocation of farmland for wind/solar farms.	4008/21703		
Comment – applaud the council’s commitment to promoting sites for renewable energy generation, but urge them to refuse planning permission for wind farms that intrude on all the wonderful ‘long views’ of the historic city. In most places close to and in York solar energy generation provides an obvious solution that if properly sited can be invisible in the landscape and properly managed (e.g. by setting the panels in	4039/18539		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	managed, flower-rich meadows) can actually benefit wildlife.		
772 Knapton Moor, Wetherby Road (continued)	Objection - do not support this proposal, concerns that it is on the flight path from Rufforth Airfield.	4647/22054	
	Objection – the council are currently insisting that Yorwaste resubmit their planning application for recycling and waste transfer buildings in order to maintain a rural aspect to this approach to York. It would fly in the face of these efforts to locate a solar farm, or indeed any other development on this site. Consideration must also be given to the adjacent flying activities (gliding, micro lights and gyrocopters) which could well be distracted by reflected glare from solar panels. I also note that the plan does not seem to indicate how the electricity from the Solar Farm will actually get to the Grid. Another article in Guardian seemed to suggest that solar panels be fitted to factory roofs rather than in farms – if the ‘Tear Drop’ a Brownfield site of approximately 37 acres is not going to be developed for several years perhaps this would be a better place to site them?	4648/19685	
	Comment – question how the power will be transmitted. There are hectares of suitable roofing on industrial estates. The positioning of solar panels would be out of character with the surrounding area and clear encroachment into open countryside.	4689/23981	
	Comment – solar energy farm should be underground with no visible pylons, poles, stays or cables o ensure a low profile due to the nature of the flat landscape.	4726/22336	
	Objection - the area is in danger of looking (more) unsightly as there is the Yorwaste site in that direction, with litter flying into the nearby fields as soon as there is any wind. Many people like to walk along those fields and eh litter is distressing for locals and dangerous for wildlife. Any more disruption to the remaining lovely field areas that are enjoyed by locals here would need to be kept to a minimum. There is already an industrial estate and a tip in this general area, why do York council want to put something else here when here is so much other available space further afield or in areas t hat are already built up.	5211/21754	
	Object – better suited to Brownfield sites.	5228/21764	
	Objection – see survey 11.	5526/26783	
	Objection – there is no need to use Greenfield sites for solar energy. CYC has yet to make full use of its own social housing for the installation of solar panels and there are many commercial and industrial buildings suitable for photovoltaic energy generation. Both proposed sites are agricultural land and should be discounted for that reason.	5775/20882	
	Objection – the overall size of wind turbines creates an unacceptable hazard to low	5800/17971	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	flying aircraft. Should not be near Harewood Whin which attracts hundreds of sea birds.		
772 Knapton Moor, Wetherby Road (continued)	Objection – see survey 11. Why is Green Belt land being used for a solar farm?	5952/26785	
	Objection – understand that the Council is currently insisting that Yorwaste resubmit their planning application for recycling and waste transfer buildings in order to maintain a rural aspect to this approach to York. Would therefore contradict any effort to locate a solar farm or any other development on this site. The rural aspect around York must be retained otherwise York would lose its character. Should also consider pilots being distracted by glare which would be a health and safety issues.	6222/21024	
	Support – generally supportive of the recommendations.	6516/20329	Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – see survey 11.	8033/26788	
	Objection – disagree on proposed solar farm on green belt land. Do believe in solar power but think it is better suited to the roofs of buildings etc.	9266/17830	
	Support – as a pilot there are no concerns regarding reflections from panels to aircraft operating in the vicinity.	9294/18044	
	Objection – opposed to use of green belt for solar energy, these should form part of a brownfield site instead.	9302/18086	
	Objection – this is an infringement on the greenbelt. Solar installations can be incorporated into most of our new and some older buildings.	9445/19451	
	Comment – will result in a relatively modest level of electricity generation, but could be substantially increased if further sites are also allocated. Queries whether there is an opportunity to put forward further sites before the plan is submitted for examination. Other sites under consideration have only recently become potentially available. If further sites were brought forward this could assist the Council in implementation of other local plan policies in respect of sustainable development and renewable energy.	9594/19292	Arcus Consultancy Services Ltd.
	Objection – are these solar sites being proposed because the council are getting a large grant to support it at the outset. What happens when the grant ceases. Will they be viewable from the roads. More information is required.	9857/20296	
	Objection –the use of agricultural land for solar installations renders it incapable of food production. There is an increasing need for the UK to be able to feed itself and not rely on imports of food. There is an abundance of roofs which can still be covered with solar panels before resorting to ground based systems.	10008/19649	
	Objection – see survey 11.	10553/26791	
Objection – see survey 11. Although such sites appear to have a more benign impact	10555/22764		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	than both on-shore and off-shore wind farms, there is no indication of the height of the proposed installation despite the footprint appearing modest enough. Equally, the relatively small size raises the question of efficiency. Is it really worthwhile to sacrifice greenbelt land for a comparatively small harvest of solar energy. Far more benefit would be achieved by reducing existing power consumption at the personal, community and city level. Appreciate that steps are being taken in this direction, such as the trial dimming and conversion of sodium to LED street lighting.		
772 Knapton Moor, Wetherby Road (continued)	Objection – Wrongly positioned. Valuable farming land and open space. Save farm land, but encourage renewable on appropriate sites.	10621/20389	
	Objection – in principle to using farm land for solar farms, when there are vast areas in close proximity of existing industrial roof buildings, which could be used for the same purpose.	10637/20431	
	Comment - is the proposed Solar Energy site a sop to Green energy. Will it really contribute to York’s economy. Or is it a piece of invasive tokenism.	10638/19572	
	Objection – insisting that Yorwaste resubmit their planning application for recycling and waste transfer buildings in order to maintain a rural aspect to this approach to York would fly in the face of these efforts to locate a solar farm or indeed any development on this site. Consideration should also be given to adjacent flying activities distracted by reflected flare. Placed next to a major arterial route, subsequent flare or distraction this will provide and impact on visitors coming to visit an historic city. No cost benefit analysis or indication of how the electricity will get to the grid, if more unsightly pylons would be another reason for objecting. Perhaps the tear drop site would be a better place to site them.	10732/19901	
	Objection – this site will interfere with the activities of the airfield. Roof of houses utilised for renewable energy.	10734/19914	
	Objection – see survey 11. There is ample industrial / grey land available for solar. Rufforth is an easy target.	10933/26793	
	Objection – see survey 11.	10937/26798	
	Objection – see survey 11.	10940/26801	
	Objection – see survey 11.	10944/26805	
	Objection – see survey 11. Disagrees with a solar farm in the green belt.	10946/26808	
	Objection – see survey 11.	10948/26812	
	Objection – see survey 11.	10949/26815	
Objection – see survey 11.	10955/26818		
Objection – see survey 11.	10956/26821		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
772 Knapton Moor, Wetherby Road (continued)	Objection – see survey 11.	10958/26822	
	Objection – see survey 13. Should have solar on every south facing roof before we use wind farms.	11005/26327	
750: Land Northwest of Hermitage farmland	Objection – loss of agricultural land 5ha	45/18790	York Environment Forum
	Comment – Parish Council do not object to this site to be considered for renewable energy but research into the condition of the site must take place as there is a forest of Himalayan Balsam at this location. The proximity of the SSSI (Strensall Common) should be noted and any effect that such an installation would have on wildlife.	77/18578	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Comment – presumably means solar panels in the field, where there is presently some woodland. The bridle path on the western boundary screened from the farm and adjacent woodland retained.	91/19635	
	Objection – see survey 16.	735/26341	
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20541	
	Comment – see survey 12. Solar power is needed, but perhaps in smaller numbers not ‘farms’.	1049/26828	
	Objection – Site considered much too close to Stockton Hermitage and Strensall Common Nature Reserve (Special Area of Conservation) and could have an adverse effect on the local wildlife populations in these two areas.	1355/18634	Julian Sturdy MP
	Comment – support the recognition in the Technical Officer Assessment that the proposed allocation lies immediately adjacent to Strensall Common SAC and SSSI. The acknowledgement of this and the need to appropriately assess the potential impacts of the proposed allocation are welcomed. The RSPB also recommends that, given the proximity of the site to the internationally and nationally important habitats and species populations, than any and all opportunities for biodiversity enhancement should be sought.	1399/18575	RSPB
	Objection – see survey 16.	1710/26353	
	Objection – solar panels should only be on roofs, that way the do not take up land that is needed to produce food.	1935/17890	
	Objection – see survey 16.	2486/26356	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17945	
	Support – supportive of site 750	2765/20609	
Comment – applaud the Council’s commitment to promoting sites for renewable	4039/18540		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	energy generation, but urge them to refuse planning permission for wind farms that intrude on all the wonderful 'long views' of the historic city. In most places close to and in York solar energy generation provides an obvious solution that if properly sited can be invisible in the landscape and properly managed (e.g. by setting the panels in managed, flower-rich meadows) can actually benefit wildlife.		
750: Land Northwest of Hermitage farmland (continued)	Objection – see survey 16.	4242/24482	
	Objection – see survey 16.	4394/26484	
	Comment – solar energy farm should be underground with no visible pylons, poles, stays or cables o ensure a low profile due to the nature of the flat landscape.	4726/22337	
	Objection – better suited to Brownfield sites.	5228/21765	
	Objection – already facing a possible wind farm to the east of the Stockton on Forest and now have this latest eyesore on the other side. Don't want this solar farm any more than the wind farm.	5532/18009	
	Objection – there is no need to use Greenfield sites for solar energy. CYC has yet to make full use of it's own social housing for the installation of solar panels and there are many commercial and industrial buildings suitable for photovoltaic energy generation. Both proposed sites are agricultural land and should be discounted for that reason.	5775/20883	
	Objection – see survey 16.	5834/26486	
	Objection – see survey 16.	6501/26489	
	Comment – careful consideration needs to be given as to whether a solar farm on 25 acres is suitable for the environ of this historic city and whether this would have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The site sits roughly equidistant between Earswick, Strensall and Stockton-on-the-Forest and the proximity of the SSSI at Strensall Common should be noted with consideration as to what affect this might have on wildlife. It has also been noted that there is Himalayan Balsam present at the site, and therefore thorough site condition research will be required.	6514/19240	Cllr Paul Doughty, Conservative Councillor on behalf of Strensall ward
	Support – supportive of site 750	6516/20330	Liberal Democrat Group
	Objection – see survey 16.	9114/26490	
	Objection - the proposal if successful will reduce the availability of good farm land. The area proposed for solar panels is currently part of an agreement with English Nature for the conservation of plants and species under the Entry Level Scheme that runs until 30 November 2015. Reference to 'Greenfield the majority of which is arable' is incorrect, the old tip site is not arable and cannot be ploughed as the rubbish is covered by a very thin layer of soil. It has been grazing grassland since the tipping	9208/19499	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>was ended. It has been grazed for 30 yrs until 2012. The technical officers assessment says there are no concerns for this site. Towthorpe Road is now a very busy road in constant use and when the Farmers Cart has evens many hundreds of cars are parked from the shop back up to Towthorpe Road, all of which are entering and exiting the entrance to the Farmers Cart throughout the day. The old tip half of the site was a domestic rubbish site which is still leaking leachate and methane gas which North Yorkshire County Council are required to monitor. Not a suitable site given electricity and methane are an unsafe combination. There are at least 3 species of bats in the area. Pipistrelle, Common Longeared and Noctule. There are large badger sets, adders and rare birds (such as Woodlark). The area is very heavily infested by Himalayan Balsam (HB) which is spreading onto the main drainage ditch and my adjoining woodlands. To destroy HB requires continuing spraying throughout the spring and early summer for many years. The HB would be almost impossible eradicate if the area was covered in solar panels. The HB needs to be eradicated before and solar farm can be considered. The NYCC area is high above the surrounding flat land and can be seen for miles around so any solar panels will reflect the sunlight and will be highly visible from a very long way as far as York Minster, as one can see the Minster from the top of the tip and the Sherriff Hutton Castle the other direction. This is a totally unsuited place for solar panels. Much of the proposed site is surrounded by large trees and many panels would be shaded much of the time, especially in winter when the sun is low and sets in the West behind the woods alongside.</p>		
<p>750: Land Northwest of Hermitage farmland (continued)</p>	<p>Objection – disagree on proposed solar farm on green belt land. Do believe in solar power but think it is better suited to the roofs of buildings etc.</p>	9266/17831	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16.</p>	9317/26491	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16.</p>	9328/26492	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16.</p>	9423/26493	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16.</p>	9426/26494	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16.</p>	9433/26495	
	<p>Objection – see survey 16.</p>	9442/26496	
	<p>Comment – will result in a relatively modest level of electricity generation, but could be substantially increased if further sites are also allocated. Queries whether there is an opportunity to put forward further sites before the plan is submitted for examination. Other sites under consideration have only recently become potentially available. If further sites were brought forward this could assist the Council in</p>	9594/19293	Arcus Consultancy Services Ltd.

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	implementation of other local plan policies in respect of sustainable development and renewable energy.		
750: Land Northwest of Hermitage farmland (continued)	Objection – see survey 16.	9612/26498	
	Objection – see survey 16.	9655/26500	
	Objection – see survey 16.	9681/26676	
	Objection – see survey 16.	9709/26502	
	Objection – are these solar sites being proposed because the council are getting a large grant to support it at the outset. What happens when the grant ceases. Will they be viewable from the roads. More information is required.	9857/20297	
	Objection - see survey 16	10043/26944	
	Objection - see survey 16	10135/26945	
	Objection - see survey 16	10140/26946	
	Objection - see survey 16	10201/26948	
	Objection - see survey 16	10385/26949	
	Objection - see survey 16	10418/26950	
	Objection – in principle to using farm land for solar farms, when there are vast areas in close proximity of existing industrial roof buildings, which could be used for the same purpose.	10637/20432	
	Objection – the government has recently made a series of announcements discouraging the allocation of solar farms in open countryside. Surely this type of development would be more suitable to be located on Brownfield sites or in industrial or business parks rather than Greenbelt or farmland. I would have thought that solar panels would be a potential glare hazard to the aircraft, gliders auto-gyrocopters etc, which use the airfield at Rufforth.	10652/19750	
	Objection - see survey 16	10700/26952	
	Objection – see survey 13. Should have solar on every south facing roof before we use wind farms.	11005/26328	
	Support - see survey 16	11027/26953	
	Objection - see survey 16	11030/26954	
	Support - see survey 16	11034/26956	
Objection - see survey 16	11041/26964		
Objection - see survey 16	11043/26966		
Objection - see survey 16	11045/26968		
Objection - see survey 16	11048/26972		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
750: Land Northwest of Hermitage farmland (continued)	Objection - see survey 16	11052/26975	
	Objection - see survey 16	11054/26978	
	Objection - see survey 16	11056/26980	
	Objection - see survey 16	11058/26983	
	Objection - see survey 16	11060/26987	
	Objection - see survey 16	11061/26991	
	Objection - see survey 16	11064/26994	
	Support - see survey 16	11066/27013	
	Objection - see survey 16	11067/27023	
	Objection - see survey 16	11068/27034	
	Support - see survey 16	11071/27037	
	Objection - see survey 16	11072/27039	
	Objection - see survey 16	11080/27041	
	Objection - see survey 16	11085/27049	
	Objection - see survey 16	11087/27051	
	Objection - see survey 16	11091/27053	
	Objection - see survey 16	11093/27056	
	Objection - see survey 16	11095/27058	
	Objection - see survey 16	11101/27061	
	Objection - see survey 16	11102/27066	
	Objection - see survey 16	11103/27163	
	Objection - see survey 16	11104/27170	
	Objection - see survey 16	11106/27172	
	Objection - see survey 16	11107/27174	
	Objection - see survey 16	11108/27176	
	Objection - see survey 16	11109/27182	
	Objection - see survey 16	11110/27188	
	Support - see survey 16	11111/27195	
	Objection - see survey 16	11112/27198	
	Objection - see survey 16	11113/27212	
Support - see survey 16. The solar farm is a good idea	11116/27217		
Objection - see survey 16	11117/27219		
Objection - see survey 16	11118/27221		
Support - see survey 16	11120/27224		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Section 7: New Renewable Energy Sites

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
750: Land Northwest of Hermitage farmland (continued)	Objection - see survey 16	11121/27226	
	Objection - see survey 16	11122/27228	
	Support - see survey 16	11126/27231	