

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>3 (YORK001) Chowdene, Malton Road</b></p>	<p>Support - the site forms a part of the green wedge centred on Monk Stray which penetrates from the open countryside into the heart of the built-up area of the City. With the southern expansion of Monks Cross, the development of this area would significantly reduce the width of the wedge at this point and, consequently harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York. Since the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York, support it not being included in the next stage of the Local Plan.</p>	238/18174	English Heritage
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	973/26359	
	<p>Support – welcome the proposed withdrawal of this site from the Local Plan on the obvious grounds of the negative impact on the openness of the greenbelt and the open countryside, as well as site specific concerns over access, affordability, flooding and landowner consent.</p>	1355/18635	Julian Sturdy MP
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	1934/26363	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	1946/26366	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	2052/26370	
	<p>Support – see survey 1. Agree with the decision to withdraw the proposed traveller site.</p>	2416/17899	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	2470/26376	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	2599/26379	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	2994/26381	
	<p>Support - the site is very close to established homes. Previous application for a smaller number of touring caravans was refused on the grounds that the access was not good enough.</p>	3799/22046	
	<p>Support – withdrawal of plans to build a gypsy and traveller site on Malton Road.</p>	4159/21737	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	4287/26385	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	4738/26388	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	5901/26394	
	<p>Support – welcomes the removal of the site from the Plan.</p>	6508/26142	CYC Conservative Group
	<p>Support – house prices would go down and don't want a gypsy site near their house.</p>	6772/21056	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	7236/26397	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	7253/26401	
	<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	7255/26407	
<p>Support – see survey 1</p>	7260/26411		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>3 (YORK001) Chowdene, Malton Road (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 1	7297/26412	
	Support – agree with the withdrawal of plans to build a gypsy and traveller site on Malton Road	7313/18711	Cllr Nigel Ayre, on behalf of Heworth Without ward
	Support – see survey 1	7346/26415	
	Support – see survey 1	7389/26417	
	Support – see survey 1	7417/26420	
	Support – see survey 1	7424/26423	
	Support – see survey 1	7436/26427	
	Support – see survey 1	7437/26430	
	Support – see survey 1	9256/26432	
	Support – the decision to withdraw the proposal for a Travellers site. The price, site access, associated noise, litter and proximity to local homes, nature areas and businesses made it inappropriate. Site was the result of wildly overinflating the travellers need for accommodation in York.	9382/17779	
	Objection – site is suitable for this use.	9437/24103	
	Support – see survey 1 and survey 6	9697/26435	
	Support – see survey 1	9704/23691	
	Support – see survey 1	10132/26438	
	Support – see survey 1	10203/26439	
	Support – this site is unnecessary near a large residential community. Welcome withdrawal of the site.	10212/19465	
	Support – strongly agree with the removal of this site from the plan.	10539/22746	
	Support- welcome the recommendation to withdraw the Malton Road Travellers site.	10546/22759	
	Support – the use of greenbelt and agricultural land is a short sighted idea. There will be a time when there is a need to produce more food for a growing population.	10554/26096	
	Support – completely against the proposed travellers site in Huntington York	10781/21875	
Support – see survey 1 and survey 6	11238/26444		
Support – see survey 1	11239/26447		
Support – see survey 1	11240/26450		
Support – see survey 1	11240/26455		
Support – see survey 6	11243/26846		
Support – see survey 6	11244/26852		
Support – see survey 1	11256/26459		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>3 (YORK001) Chowdene, Malton Road (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 1	11258/26462	
	Support – see survey 1	11260/26465	
	Support – see survey 1	11261/26468	
	Support – see survey 1	11262/26471	
	Support – see survey 1	11263/26473	
	Support – see survey 1	11264/26505	
	Support – see survey 1	11265/26508	
	Support – see survey 1	11266/26511	
	Support – see survey 1	11267/26514	
	Support – see survey 1	11268/26517	
	Support – see survey 1	11269/26521	
	Support – see survey 1	11271/26525	
	Support – see survey 1	11273/26529	
	Support – see survey 1	11274/26532	
	Support – see survey 1	11275/26535	
	Support – see survey 1	11276/26538	
	Support – see survey 1	11277/26541	
	Support – see survey 1	11278/26544	
	Support – see survey 1	11279/26547	
	Support – see survey 1	11280/26550	
	Support – see survey 1	11282/26557	
	Support – see survey 1. Malton Road travellers site – already have 2 sites very close, not an appropriate location.	11284/26561	
	Support – see survey 1	11285/26564	
	Support – see survey 1	11287/26588	
	Support – see survey 6	11289/26855	
	Support – see survey 6	11291/26858	
	Support – see survey 6	11292/26861	
	Support – see survey 1 and survey 6	11294/26590	
	Support – see survey 1	11298/26594	
	Support – see survey 1	11299/26597	
Support – see survey 1	11300/26660		
Support – see survey 1	11301/26603		
Support – see survey 1	11302/26607		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>3 (YORK001) Chowdene, Malton Road (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 1	11303/26730	
	Support – see survey 1	11305/26735	
	Support – see survey 1	11307/26739	
	Support – see survey 1	11309/26743	
	Support – see survey 1	11310/26746	
	Support – see survey 1	11311/26751	
	Support – see survey 1	11312/26754	
<b>9 (YORK002): Land at Common Road and Hassacarr Road, Dunnington</b>	Support –strongly support the Council’s recommendation not to include this site as an allocation for a Gypsy, Roma and Traveller use. The majority of the site is located within flood zone 3, and is therefore not compatible with a highly vulnerable use in flood risk terms, which caravans for permanent residential use are categorised as according to Planning Practice Guidance.	3/18864	Environment Agency
	Support – the Parish Council and the residents of Dunnington overwhelmingly support this recommendation.	59/19147	Dunnington Parish Council/
	Support - this site was one of those specifically considered by the Inspector at the Green Belt Local Plan Inquiry in 1994. Since the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York, its withdrawal of it not being included in the next stage of the Local Plan is supported.	238/18175	English Heritage
	Support – pleased to note the removal of the proposed gypsy site (for 15 pitches) at Common Lane, Dunnington. It is however emphasised again that the ecological importance of this nature reserve would be impacted by any form of development of the land originally proposed as a gypsy site. Little importance appeared to be attached to the ecological value of Hassacarr Nature Reserve and that no full environmental survey was undertaken to inform this decision; rejection appears to be based solely on flooding criteria. Criteria 1 fails to recognise the designation of Hassacarr Nature Reserve as a SINC.	401/18104	York Ornithological Club
	Support – see survey 5. Withdrawal of proposed land for Gypsy and Travellers at Common Road.	945/18199	
	Support – see survey 5. Fully support of the withdrawal of Dunnington Traveller Sites.	995/20547	
	Support – Welcomes the proposed withdrawal of this site from the Local Plan on the obvious grounds of the negative impact on the openness of the greenbelt and the open countryside, as well as site specific concerns over access, affordability, flooding and landowner consent.	1355/18636	Julian Sturdy MP

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>9 (YORK002): Land at Common Road and Hassacarr Road, Dunnington (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 5	1939/27249	
	Support – see survey 5	2406/72251	
	Support – the withdrawal of this site is very much welcomed.	2429/26143	
	Support – see survey 5	2467/27253	
	Support – see survey 5	2506/27255	
	Support – see survey 5	2551/27257	
	Support – see survey 5	2561/27259	
	Support – see survey 5	2563/27261	
	Support – see survey 5	2624/27263	
	Support – see survey 5	2635/27265	
	Support – see survey 5	2647/27268	
	Support – see survey 5	2677/27270	
	Support – see survey 5	2679/27272	
	Support – see survey 5	2682/27274	
	Support – see survey 5	2794/27276	
	Support – see survey 5	2816/27294	
	Support – see survey 5	2835/27296	
	Support – see survey 5	2847/27298	
	Support – see survey 5	2947/27300	
	Support – see survey 5	2957/27303	
	Support – see survey 5	2958/27306	
	Support – see survey 5	2974/27346	
	Support – see survey 5	2975/27348	
	Support – see survey 5	2980/27350	
	Support – see survey 5	3090/27353	
	Support – see survey 5	3147/27356	
	Support – the withdrawal of this site is welcomed.	3179/23864	
	Support – see survey 5	3225/27358	
	Support – see survey 5	3290/27360	
	Support – see survey 5	3335/27362	
	Support – see survey 5	3453/27364	
	Support – see survey 5	3515/27366	
Support – see survey 5	3530/27368		
Support – see survey 5	3534/27370		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>9 (YORK002): Land at Common Road and Hassacarr Road, Dunnington (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 5	3610/27372	
	Support – see survey 5	3636/27373	
	Support – see survey 5	3688/27375	
	Support – see survey 5	3756/27377	
	Support – see survey 5	3765/27379	
	Support – see survey 5	3789/27381	
	Support – see survey 5	3843/27386	
	Support – see survey 5	3798/27384	
	Support – see survey 5	3932/27388	
	Support – see survey 5	3940/27390	
	Support – thanks for the decision that the proposed Gypsy and Travellers site in Dunnington should not be pursued.	3952/20726	
	Support – see survey 5	3955/27394	
	Support – we are pleased to see and fully support the removal of this site for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller use because most of it is within flood-zone 3. We would further add that if the development had gone ahead it would have risked severely damaging Hassacarr local nature Reserve (another wildlife gem close to the city) on the site's south-western and south-eastern boundaries.	4039/18541	
	Support – see survey 5	4045/27395	
	Support – see survey 5	4265/27399	
	Support – see survey 5	4507/27401	
	Support – see survey 5	4520/23130	
Support – see survey 5	4533/27404		
Support – see survey 5	4557/27406		
Support – supportive of the proposed removal of this site. Objected to inclusion of site for the following reasons: The site is in the Green Belt and as such should not be used to build a traveller site. The site acts as a buffer zone between the business/commercial area of Dunnington and the residential area. The local amenities would be seriously impacted. The development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the environment and the water courses surrounding the site. These water courses have exceptionally good water quality and this must be maintained. The development would also impact the Hassacar Nature Reserve recognised by York Council as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The development of this site would impact the openness and character of the village.	4626/21984		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Development of this site would have a significant visual impact as it is on one of the major routes into the village. Drainage is poor in Dunnington. Part of the area is in the flood plain. The water courses at this site provide the main drainage from the village to the river Derwent which is prone to flooding. It is essential that nothing impacts this drainage route. There is a dangerous junction at the end of Common Lane where it meets the Hull Road. The site is productive agricultural land. Developed youth teams at the Sports Club the village is short of playing fields. If this site has to be developed at all it should be used for sport pitches.</p>		
<p><b>9 (YORK002): Land at Common Road and Hassacarr Road, Dunnington (continued)</b></p>	Support – see survey 5	4804/27410	
	Support – see survey 5	4827/27412	
	Support – see survey 5	4863/27414	
	Support – see survey 5	4987/27416	
	Support – danger to children. Visual aspect of village would be spoilt. Local amenities would be strained. Wildlife would be disrupted.	5127/22363	
	Support – see survey 5	5187/27419	
	Support - applaud the recent decision to respond to villagers wishes and withdraw the proposed travellers site York 002	5208/22388	
	Support – see survey 5	5241/27420	
	Support – see survey 5	5377/27422	
	Support – see survey 5	5984/27425	
	Support – see survey 5	5989/27429	
	Support – see survey 5	5990/27431	
	Support – see survey 5	6098/23690	
	Support – see survey 5	6113/27434	
	Objection – to the proposed deletion of the Gypsy and Traveller site for the provision. Detailed justification as to the suitability of the site provided, see response.	6160/19132	DPP One
	Support – see survey 5	6257/27436	
	Support – see survey 5	6259/27438	
	Support – see survey 5	6454/20136	
	Support – see survey 5	6460/27441	
	Support – welcomes the removal of the Dunnington and Huntington Travellers Sites and the Knapton Show People site from the Plan.	6508/19136	CYC Conservative Group
Support – this site should not be included in the next steps of the local plan.	6519/24070		
Support – see survey 5	8596/27444		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>9 (YORK002): Land at Common Road and Hassacarr Road, Dunnington (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 5	9281/27446	
	Support – removal of the site is welcomed.	9397/20074	
	Support – this site was not suitable for gypsies or travellers. Too much traffic leading to the site. Gypsies overlooked from sports club. They wouldn't have any privacy. Too near residential property. Drainage problems.	9451/18477	
	Support – see survey 5	10913/27447	
	Support – see survey 5	11327/27449	
	Support – see survey 5	11329/27451	
	Support – see survey 5	11334/27453	
	Support – see survey 5	11337/27455	
	Support – see survey 5	11343/27457	
	Support – see survey 5	11348/27459	
	Support – see survey 5	11350/27460	
	Support – see survey 5	11358/27463	
	Support – see survey 5	11359/27465	
	Support – see survey 5	11361/27467	
Support – see survey 5	11364/27469		
Support – see survey 5	11368/27471		
Support – see survey 5	11372/27473		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington</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 be carefully factored into the transport assessment for the A64 interchange.	10/18967	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
	Objection – Parish Council are opposed to this proposed development and recommend its removal from the Local Plan. Planning permission for this site as designated has already been rejected twice by City of York Council and the rejection was confirmed on an appeal by the Planning Inspectorate in 2011. Site is known to be at risk from flooding and has already been turned down as being unsuitable for residential or employment development. Site is within an area of green belt. Travelling Showpersons use large and heavy vehicles which are unsuitable for operation on this type of site and should be based in an industrial area where they could operate in relative safety. The infrastructure of the village would be seriously	34/191145	Sutton upon Derwent Parish Council

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	affected by any increase in population. The school, medical practice and sewage system would be inadequate for the significant extra burden placed on them by this site and other extra sites, and would be unable to cope. The B1228 is already at saturation point and would be further pressured if this development is allowed.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the Parish Council believes the Planning Inspector’s decision of 2011 should be fully implemented and that the land should revert to Green Belt.	61/18828	Elvington Parish Council
	Objection – oppose this application as being unsuitable for this location. The proposal represents a mixed use which is contrary to National Planning Policy requirements and to the expressed government view of utilising brown field sites for multi use occupancy in the first instance and specifically not in rural locations, which this clearly is. Change of use in this location would have a serious effect on the nature and balance of the community and environment which is already under pressure. The Planning Inspector in his 2011 judgement said that the site was unsuitable for residential or employment purposes and must be returned to green field status by 2016.	246/19163	Yorkshire Air Museum
	Objection – this site should not be removed from the green belt, this is a failure to observe the inspectors decision and to comply with government guidelines.	657/23778	
	Objection – against the extension of Elvington Showpeople Site.	995/20548	
	Objection – see survey 2. Entirely the wrong place for an allocated site and object to expansion in site numbers. Brownfield sites should be utilised first, than take agricultural land out of production. The Planning Inspector has already decided that this site must return to Green Belt by 2016.	1008/18202	
	Objection - Opposed to the increase of the site which was only granted temporary status in the first place. Nothing has changed since the inspectors decision when it was agreed land should return to Green Belt.	1150/20439	
	Support – see survey 2.	1150/27236	
	Objection – see survey 2. Whilst there is no objection to the development provided the site is well screened from the road and the only access is via the existing entrance or off the airfield road there are concerns over road safety with the increased usage of this site which is on an extremely road where numerous accidents have happened in the past.	1175/18208	
Objection - a planning application for one permanent pitch on this site was refused by the Council on two occasions in 2010, on the grounds that the proposed development constitutes inappropriate development in the greenbelt and planning policy is clear that such mixed use sites should not be permitted in rural locations.	1355/18639	Julian Sturdy MP	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>On appeal, the Planning Inspector agreed with the Council's decision making but considered the immediate needs of the family, and the Council's under provision of Showpeople sites to give sufficient reasoning to allow temporary permission for one pitch until March 2016. This was supposed to give the Council sufficient time to identify alternative and more suitable brownfield sites. Therefore to now suggest this location as a permanent site for additional plots is contrary to the same planning policy which the Council correctly interpreted only four years ago, as well as in direct contradiction to the advice of the Planning Inspector. The need for Showpeople pitches does not constitute the exceptional circumstances required to permit development in the greenbelt. There are also insufficient amenities in the village to cope with additional Showpeople families. The Council should withdraw this proposal, looking again at more suitable brownfield locations.</p>		
<p><b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this site has been refused planning permission as a Travelling Showpersons site twice by CYC and by the planning inspectorate as inappropriate in the greenbelt. The planning inspectors report specifies that this site must be vacated by the current family not later than June 2016.</p>	<p>1666/20446</p>	
	<p>Objection –the site was granted temporary permission for 5 years by the Inspectorate. This is legally binding under high court jurisdiction and making a permanent site risks breaking the terms of the original agreement – risking legal challenge of the Local Plan. Local Authority is responsible for upholding this ruling. Current occupation is frequently an eyesore. NPPF designates such sites as 'inappropriate development' in the green belt and restricts them to brownfield localities. Such mixed use plots/yards are not to be permitted in rural locations. Site was historically part of the Brinkworth Hall estate and part of the approach to the Hall, mirrored by the field at the other side of the driveway. To allow any kind of development would severely distract from the rather special and historic appeal of the Hall. The special and open nature of this green belt land would be ruined. The green belt land at the Stables is part of a shrinking green belt in Elvington and particularly around Brinkworth since the development of the airfield. Suitable landscape mitigation measures will only further reduce the openness of the site. Adjacent woodland stood in water over last winter and wonder whether there is sufficient drainage for this site to accommodate any further settlement. Failure to take proper account of views of local residents. Elvington airfield could house a large number of Travelling Show People, on instant hard standing with no additional cost.</p>	<p>1667/17772</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Support – site is a suitable location for the proposed use with safe access to the main road network. B1228 has had the speed limit reduced which can only benefit towards its safety. Existing access is privately owned and linked to the site. Also good safe pedestrian access. Village amenities within walking distance. Bus stop directly outside the site provided bus service to the city centre and surrounding villages. The site is screened, little visible impact on the village residents and visitors. Settled family, integrating a small showmans site/family into a village is helping to tackle racism and misunderstanding. Children already part of the local school so no added pressures on the school. Own environmentally friendly sewerage system installed to no added pressure on local sewerage system. Already registered with local doctors so no added pressure. Site is small in size and is proportionate and appropriate to the size of Elvington village.	1722/23799	
	Objection – see survey 2	1894/26962	
	Objection – does not appear to have been subject to best practice town planning methodology and scrutiny.	2681/17946	
	Objection – how will this be policed. Crime is proven to rise in areas where these sites are located.	2720/17783	
	Objection – the village is full of character and should stay that way. Village’s charm is partly due to the fact we all have a stake in it, homes, children at the school, use the shops, people who come and go and feel no particular loyalty to an area do not enhance it. The area will deteriorate; quality of life will be reduced.	3011/22255	
	Objection – see survey 2. Loss of greenbelt and inappropriate use even if land was deemed brown belt. Conflicts with previous assessments that found the site to be unsuitable.	3063/22268	
	Objection – there is no need for extra pitches as the site is under-utilised already. The planning inspector has ruled that the site should be returned to the green belt in 2016. The Parish Council object to this proposed and there has been inadequate consultation.	3108/23856	
	Objection – the inspector has ruled that this site should return to the greenbelt.	3135/23859	
	Objection – this is completely inappropriate for the Green Belt. It will put undue pressure on an already fragile drainage system. It was rejected for these reasons by the City of York Council twice when a family wanted to settle here and only allowed as a result of public appeal.	3363/21977	
	Objection – contravenes the existing permission. This site should not be removed from the Green Belt.	3532/23903	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>22 (YORK008)</b>  <b>The Stables, Elvington</b>  <b>(continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this constitutes inappropriate development in the greenbelt. This type of development is not permitted in rural locations. Planning permission for Showpeople use has been refused twice. Brownfield sites should be used first.</p>	3598/23921	
	<p>Support – the family own this land, work hard and contribute to society. The children are settled and attend the local school. The site is tidy and the location well suited to the nature of their business. The green belt restriction should be lifted.</p>	4320/23961	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2</p>	5146/23146	
	<p>Object – this is green belt land. Planning inspector has already rejected the proposal. A traveller's site represents inappropriate development.</p>	5153/22382	
	<p>Objection – the proposal is considered to constitute inappropriate development of green belt and would conflict with national advice in Planning Policy guidance note 2 and Policy GB1 of the CYC Draft local plan. The proposal will erode the open rural character of the site and have a visual impact on the character and appearance of the area. The application conflicts with the Council's adopted Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The inspector granted planning permission for five years for change of use of buildings and part land to provide a site for travelling showpeople's use for one family at Elvington Stables. This land should be removed from the local plan process and dealt with on its own merits and returned to green belt at the end of this period. The local school is full. There is demand for a doctor's surgery. Public transport is limited. There is no post office. The sewage system is at capacity. There are traffic and road issues to consider. The site is on a busy corner, making access to the site difficult. Turning vehicles will interfere with the flow of traffic.</p>	5237/21773	
	<p>Objection – concerns do not relate to the family who are well integrated and well regarded in the village. Only objections are based on national planning policy as the proposals go against national policy. Mixes use sites are specifically not to be permitted in rural locations. Inappropriate development within the green belt. Site has already been refused twice. Site rejected during the technical site assessment process as being unsuitable for residential or employment purposes. Temporary permits give no right for permanent permission. Brownfield sites should be used first. National guidance requires fair and equal treatment for travellers not preferential treatment.</p>	5259/20067	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Alongside other development in the village will be disproportionate to the village, will have an adverse effect on the local village school and on the local surgery.</p>	5284/18380	
	<p>Objection – access is on a particularly dangerous point on the B1228 where a</p>	5535/18014	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	number of accidents have occurred. Site is an eyesore on the approach to the village. Overdevelopment when consider the new low cost housing development near the site.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 2. Access is on a particularly dangerous point on the B1228 where a number of accidents have occurred. Site is an eyesore on the approach to the village. Overdevelopment when consider the new low cost housing development near the site.	5536/18019	
	Objection – This land was granted as a travelling show people site until 2016 when it will return to green belt. There is already erosion of the green belt without overturning previous decisions. This is asking for permanent dwelling, which should be treated the same as other permanent dwelling.	5571/20759	
	Objection – this land was granted as a travelling show people site until 2016, then it should be returned to green belt. There is an erosion of green belt land without overturning previous decisions. Permanent dwelling permission should be treated as any other application.	5572/20766	
	Objection – the site is greenbelt land and the provision of plots for children that are only in primary school unnecessary.	5595/24036	
	Objection –the planning Inspector has already ruled that this plot of land must be returned to the Green Belt in 2016 and so the present occupiers of the site will have to move off the land then.	5741/20872	
	Support – see survey 2. The travelling showpeople families are already using the land and have been for some time. It is no longer Green Belt. Their children are part of the community. The site is outside the village.	5741/26976	
	Objection – there should be no traveller site here, let alone additional pitches, because the Planning Inspector has already decided that the land must be returned to green belt in 2016; the site is already unsightly and adding further pitches would only increase this.	5774/20880	
	Objection – it is inappropriate development for green belt land. This kind of development is not appropriate for a rural village. The site has already been deemed unsuitable for residential or employment purposes during the technical site assessment process.	5781/20888	
	Object – mixed use sites are not permitted in rural areas. Inappropriate development in the green belt. Planning permission for the site has been refused twice. Land must return to green belt by June 2016.	5816/20896	
	Support – the family have lived on this site for a few years. They are part of the	5832/20924	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village and community. The site only uses a small amount of land. The Stables are on the outskirts of the village. As they've lived in the village for a few years, there would be no extra strain on the amenities on the village. They use an eco-friendly sewerage system, so there is no extra strain on the amenities.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – under National Planning Policy regulations development on this site is inappropriate as it is in the green belt and constitutes inappropriate development. City of York Council refused planning permission for this site to be used for travellers twice in 2010. Supported by the Planning Inspectorate following appeal in 2011. Should honour Inspectorates decision and find alternative suitable sites i.e. brownfield. Development on greenbelt land should only be granted in exceptional circumstances, travellers are not. Approval would contravene Governments policy of developing on greenbelt sites. Increase in the number on pitches on the site will put pressure on local amenities and infrastructure. Primary school and doctors are at capacity, facilities in the village are minimal, poor public transport. Sewage system for the village is at full capacity due to recent developments.	5842/22393	
	Objection – see survey 2. Wildlife considerations should be taken into account. Opposed to use of greenbelt. Along with other developments in the village, not in context with the village. Fabric of the village will be threatened.	6036/19227	
	Objection – see survey 2. An unpleasant site especially in winter when the trees are bare. Green belt site and should not be used for the storage of machinery and vans. Permission has been refused twice. There are unoccupied pitches at the site in Fulford so no need to provide more.	6196/18023	
	Objection – see survey 2. Rural farming community already congested with heavy goods vehicles, cars and local bus service, roads in poor condition and cannot sustain further traffic. There is a primary school nearby think about health and safety of our children. Similar proposal for a traveller site withdrawn because of greenbelt location. No facilities or amenities.	6281/19474	
	Support – agree with the allocation, it is being used as such and is available for an additional two plots.	6504/18026	
	Objection – see survey 2. We don't see why gypsy/travelling people should be allowed to come to a small close knit village. They are classed as travellers for a reason – they travel and choose that lifestyle so should not have permanent sites built for them at our expense.	8313/26982	
	Objection – site is in the greenbelt and applications have been refused twice. It should return to the greenbelt when temporary planning permission expires.	9258/24094	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – Planning Inspector has already decided that land must return to green belt in 2016.	9265/22416	
	Objection – see survey 2. We don't see why gypsy/travelling people should be allowed to come to a small close knit village. They are classed as travellers for a reason – they travel and choose that lifestyle so should not have permanent sites built for them at our expense.	9278/23239	
	Objection – see survey 2.	9283/26985	
	Support – if the family were forced out of the area it would be detrimental to the children's education. The family are very much part other school community.	9297/18047	Evington Church of England Primary School
	Objection – this would lead to the ruination of a peaceful and historic village within a significant green belt area. Services such as sewage and drainage, schooling and medical facilities are already at capacity. There will be an unacceptable impact of traffic congestion. 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. There has been a disregard for wildlife habitat. This village community has a strong natural and historic heritage, which should be preserved not destroyed. Use 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.	9387/22419	
	Objection - the village is already at its maximum traffic capacity. The traffic in the morning and the evening is terrible and the road conditions are awful. Drainage and flooding problems are something the Council should concentrate on.	9406/18311	
	Objection – if Elvington village were to expand you would not only lose the community spirit, but you would also lose the rurality 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. The village is struggling to get new superfast broadband as there are not enough ports to supply the existing village. 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	9435/18453	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	doubt decrease house prices in the area.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – Planning Inspector has already decided that land must return to Green Belt in 2016. Site is considered unsightly	9436/18455	
	Objection – the site must be returned to the Green Belt in 2016 in accordance with the Planning Inspector’s decision arising from the Public Inquiry in 2011. The Officer representing CYC categorically assured the Inspector that alternative sites for travelling show people would be identified by 2013 at the latest. It is up to CYC to deliver these sites or to explain why they made such apparently undeliverable commitments at the public inquiry. CYC must now deliver its commitments, and by doing this, an important part of the Green Belt in Elvington to be retained.	9441/19112	
	Objection – see survey 2.	9447/26986	
	Objection – see survey 2. The proposed development of this site is inappropriate as this land is in the green belt as defined in the National Planning Policy regulations. The NPP states that the mixed use sites i.e. for travelling showpeople residences, plus maintenance of storage equipment, are not meant to be permitted in a rural location like Elvington. This site was a 5 year temporary residence so that the CYC could find appropriate brown field sites. The Planning Inspectorate stated that this site had to be vacated and returned to Green Field status by June 2016. Brown field sites must be considered before this site. The lack of amenities and the infrastructure in Elvington cannot cope with an increase in people. The road through Elvington is already a very busy road and is dangerous to cross. The water and sewerage tanks are full to capacity. The school is already full. The doctors is also full. There is no post office, only a small village shop. The bus service is very sparse. The site is considered unsightly for residents of Brinkworth Hall. Travelling showpeople use trailers and caravans which would be dangerous turning into the site. The road to Grimston Bar is already very congested, even more so at peak times.	9448/18472	
	Objection – this is inappropriate development on the greenbelt, a mixed use development is not permitted in rural locations such as Elvington.	9462/24124	
	Objection – this is inappropriate development within the greenbelt. Brownfield sites should be considered first.	9466/24131	
	Objection – this is inappropriate development within the greenbelt. Brownfield sites should be considered first.	9467/24134	
	Objection – see survey 2	9470/23256	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection –Elvington is classified as a rural village community and National Planning Policy states that mixed use sites (those proposed for travellers) are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. Planning permission was refused in 2010 on the ground as being unsuitable for residential or employment purposes. Lack of amenities: the proposed site could actually accommodate many more TSP plots, therefore if approved as a permanent site, future applications could be made to expand the plots. The village cannot cater for this; the school is already full, the surgery is running out of capacity and the sewage system is at capacity	9474/18718	
	Objection – the site is currently Green Belt and therefore should not have been allocated as a temporary Travelling Showperson site and as such should not be made permanent or extended. Planning applications to use this site as a Travelling Showperson site were refused twice in 2010 and again in an appeal in 2011. The reasons for these rejections still stand. Additional plots are required for the children of the family currently occupying the plot but as these children are only 8 years old there does not appear to be an immediate need for extra permanent plots.	9476/24134	
	Objection – permission has been refused twice. Should be returned to the greenbelt.	9484/24138	
	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 capacity. When there is a blockage in 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.	9501/18654	
	Objection – it will devalue the properties in the area and crime will also increase.	9524/19259	
	Objection – see survey 2. The proposed travellers sites are inappropriate, no other village has them.	9551/19060	
	Support – the children on this site are well integrated in the school. Every child, regardless of their culture, values and upbringing deserve access to education and healthcare, which these children are getting. The site is well screened and appears tidy. The site is well served by the road and footpath into the village. They have their own water, electricity and sewerage connection.	9554/24141	
	Object – totally against the provision of a site for show folk to overwinter on.	9556/19079	
	Objection – see survey 2	9574/26990	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>22 (YORK008)</b>  <b>The Stables, Elvington</b>  <b>(continued)</b></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>9602/22461</p>	
	<p>Object – mixed use sites not permitted in rural areas. Site was refused twice. Green belt requires protection. The site would be an eyesore and harmful to the appearance and character of the village.</p>	<p>9640/22468</p>	
	<p>Objection – planning permission has already been refused. The site was assessed as unsuitable for residential or employment purposes and should be returned to green belt. To expand the site would be inappropriate for a rural village with poor amenities.</p>	<p>9647/19319</p>	
	<p>Objection – already been refused, there has been no change in circumstances. Brownfield site would be more appropriate to house this family.</p>	<p>9667/19454</p>	
	<p>Objection – NPPF regulations state that green belt boundaries are not to be altered except in ‘very special circumstances’, which do not apply in this case.</p>	<p>9670/20130</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Will significantly impact the character of the village.</p>	<p>9710/20167</p>	
	<p>Objection – green belt land. Only granted temporary use until June 2016. Granting permission would go against NPPF regulations</p>	<p>9720/20188</p>	
	<p>Objection – this site has already been refused by CYC. A 5 year licence was granted and that should be that. CYC should be in agreement to protect the Green Belt against any development. Inappropriate for the village as the village should be kept rural.</p>	<p>9726/20198</p>	
	<p>Objection – existing temporary approval granted on the understanding that the site be returned to green belt. This requirement should be observed. Occupation of this land in this way is not appropriate in the greenbelt. Alternative brownfield sites should be found. Inappropriate in a small rural village. No worthwhile public transport or local amenities available.</p>	<p>9743/26346</p>	
	<p>Support – see survey 2. Agree with this proposal as long as the site is only used by the current occupants and adequate screening is provided.</p>	<p>9776/21674</p>	
<p>Objection –to this proposed development will significantly impact upon the character of the village as it represents a discernible proportion of the village’s total size. Planning Inspector has already decided the land must be returned to Green Belt in 2016. Site will place pressure on school which is already at capacity. Location of site</p>	<p>9778/20234</p>		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	opposite school will have adverse effect on road safety and congestion at key times. Road around the school is already congested with attendant risk to children. Concerned that demographics on village, given its small size, shall be demonstrably changed by the creation of Travellers' site. There must be better suited sites which will not impact upon the culture of an established rural community. The site is considered unsightly especially for residents at Brinkworth Hall.		
<b>22 (YORK008)</b>	Objection – the Planning Inspector has already said that this site should revert to Green Belt land in 2016.	9791/20254	
<b>The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the planning inspector has ruled that this site must return to the greenbelt in 2016, when temporary permission expires.	9803/24170	
	Objection – permission was only granted on this site if it reverts back to green belt in 2016. This proposal is contrary to the planning inspectors ruling.	9804/24173	
	Support – site has been self funded by the family at no cost to the council. Has caused no problems. Proven need that provision is needed. Standards will be maintained in accordance with the showman's guild rule book.	9808/18156	Showman's Guild of Great Britain
	Objection – proposed traveller site should be on brownfield land. Sites with capacity are already available in Osbaldwick and Chowdene. Current site is unsightly, particularly for owners of Brinkworth Hall, and expansion will only make the problem worse. Proposed sites need adequate screening but this site does not, either from the main road side or from Brinkley Hall side. Site already has high visual impact on the main road leading to the village, meaning expansion will spoil the area visually even more. Elvington is 8 miles from York town centre, the needs of the show people need to be met by creating a site nearer to the centre to give them easier access. Already been decided that this land must return to green belt in 2016,	9812/19325	
	Objection – This land reverts to Greenbelt in 2016, proposed site should be on Brownfield sites. There are currently sites with capacity already in Osbaldwick and Chowdene, making expansion here unnecessary. The current site is unsightly, particularly for the owners of Brinkworth Hall, and expansion will only make the problem worse. Proposed sites need adequate screening but this site does not. The current site has a high visual impact on the main road leading to the village and the expansion will spoil the area visually even more. Elvington is 8 miles from York city centre, the needs of the show people need to be met by creating a site nearer to the centre to give them easier access.	9813/20275	
	Objection – the NPPF does not permit mixed use sites in rural locations .	9814/24181	
	Objection – mixed use not allowed in rural areas. Planning permission rejected twice.	9823/20278	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Returns to green belt in June 2016. Brownfield should be considered first.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection - the proposed development constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Elvington is classified as a rural village community. NPPF specifically states that "mixed used" sites are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. Planning permission was refused twice in 2010 by CYC on these grounds and this decision was further supported via a Planning Inspectorate refusal following an appeal by the family in 2011. The Planning Inspector ruled that The Stables must be vacated and returned to Green Field status by June 2016 at the latest. If this does happen then yet another area of land will be lost to the detriment of wildlife, flora and fauna of the area. There are not enough amenities or sufficient infrastructure in Elvington to support additional numbers of residents. The distance of Elvington from emergency services, coupled with the vulnerability of caravans to fire, means that locating the caravans here is unsafe for the occupants. The presence of caravans, trailers and other equipment would constitute an eyesore.	9824/20282	
	Support – this additional plot is not for additional families, they are for the existing family who already reside there. The family is a real asset to the village. The children are well settled in the school. It is on the edge of the village and kept neat and tidy. It is well screened by the trees. It benefits from its own eco-friendly sewerage system. This is not a new site and this family deserves to have a permanent home.	9829/24227	
	Objection – not to the family but the policy itself, but the proposal. The site has to be returned to greenbelt in accordance with the ruling. Mixed use sites are not permitted in rural sites. B1228 is a busy road and the movement of equipment and heavy items is not suitable.	9831/22068	
	Objection – the planning inspector rejected this site for permanent consent. The council should find a more suitable site. The site should revert back to greenbelt.	9833/24232	
	Objection – this is inappropriate in the greenbelt and unsightly.	9847/24188	
	Objection – this is inappropriate in the greenbelt and unsightly.	9848/24193	
	Objection – planning permission here has been refused twice. It is inappropriate development under the NPPF. The site must be returned to greenbelt once the temporary planning permission has expired. This would create a precedent for other similar sites in rural areas in York.	9852/24257	
	Objection- site has already been rejected because it is greenbelt.	9873/20301	
	Objection – Planning Inspector previously ruled that The Stables must be vacated and returned to green field status by June 2016. NPPF guidelines emphasise the responsibilities of local authorities to protect green belt against such inappropriate	9877/19330	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	developments. If this site is approved it would create a precedent for other similar sites in the rural areas of the City of York.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – it has been ruled that this site should be returned to the greenbelt in 2016. Seems premature to allocate plots for children who are only in primary school. The site at time is untidy. Giving permission for this will set a precedent.	9884/24321	
	Objection – the condition set by the planning inspector to return this site to the greenbelt in 2016 should be implemented. The existing site is poorly landscaped and incongruous in the rural location. The owner occupier does contribute to the local community. They should be supported to uptake permanent residence in housing and use commercial residence already available in the village.	9886/24324	
	Objection – opposed to the site.	9904/24349	
	Object – mixed use sites not allowed in rural areas. Planning permission rejected in 2010. Site must return to green belt in June 2016.	9912/21653	
	Objection – opposed to this proposal	9916/24364	
	Objection – this site is on greenbelt, rather than brownfield. Mixed sites, under government policy are not permitted in rural locations. To allow 2 extra plots for children is to allow for preferential treatment.	9931/24466	
	Objection – this land is due to return to the greenbelt in 2016. Two further pitches would be a major increase in demand of utilities. Elvington lane is already under pressure. This will further aggravate the dangerous and narrow part of the road.	9936/24473	
	Objection – the current village infrastructure cannot support more development and additional traffic. The traffic volume is already dangerously high. Too much land is being taken from the greenbelt. There is a lack of a dedicated cycle/footpath to Grimston Bar. This destroys much of York’s Historic and distinctive culture. This site should be returned to the greenbelt in 2016. The site is unsightly. It provides no value to the village.	9937/24476	
	Objection – Elvington is a rural village, mixed use sites are not permitted in rural locations. Contradicts government policy for brownfield first.	9943/24484	
	Objection – this is greenbelt land which has been previously been refused permission. It should revert back to greenbelt in 2016.	9948/24210	
	Objection – the current village infrastructure cannot support more development and additional traffic. The traffic volume is already dangerously high. Too much land is being taken from the greenbelt. There is a lack of a dedicated cycle/footpath to Grimston Bar. This destroys much of York’s Historic and distinctive culture. This site should be returned to the greenbelt in 2016. The site is unsightly. It provides no	9950/24497	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	value to the village.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 2. Rural farming community already congested and roads in poor conditions. Greenbelt location. No amenities and facilities.	9961/19473	
	Support – this should remain a permanent home for the existing and any future children. The site is clean, tidy and well respected. They site poses no disruption on the outskirts of the village, with safe access and footpaths.	9975/24523	
	Objection – national guidance states that mixed use sites are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. The Council has historically failed to provide any appropriate Travelling Showpeople plots. Planning Inspector awarded temporary residence permit to allow the council time to bring forward alternative more appropriate sites. Inspector ruled that the site must be vacated and returned to its green belt status at 2016 at the latest. The site is unsightly affecting the visual amenity and outlook especially for residents at Brinkworth Hall and for residents using the footpath and road that passes the site. Planning permission for the site has been refused twice.	9981/25926	
	Objection – site was previously rejected. Land returns to green belt in June 2016. 200 of 220 people polled objected to the proposal. Disregarding democratic views of local residents	10001/20341	
	Objection – this site is designated greenbelt, it have been refused planning permission in the past.	10044/24398	
	Objection - this site has been granted a temporary 5 year residency permit for 1 plot to Travelling show people to provide the show people family somewhere to live whilst an alternative site is being found by which complies with National Planning Policy regulations for use of land for mixed use. The use of a green field site for mixed use is not permitted in rural locations. The proposal to increase the plot from 1 to 3 plots and at the same time make it permanent is contrary to national planning regulations.It seems to be a way into affordable housing which is not open to other residents renting in the village or nearby.	10047/21128	
	Objection – this site must revert to greenbelt in 2016. Brownfield sites are more appropriate.	10052/24415	
	Objection – this site is only temporary and should be greenbelt again in 2016.	10058/24422	
	Objection – this should return to the greenbelt in 2016. Mixed use sites are not appropriate in rural areas.	10065/24437	
	Objection – this land should be returned to the greenbelt in 2016. It is unsightly.	10072/24443	
Objection – this land must be returned to the greenbelt in 2016. It is unsightly.	10073/24448		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – within the greenbelt, mixed use sites are not appropriate in rural locations; previous planning permission has been refused on the site. Brownfield sites should be considered first.	10074/24450	
	Objection – within the greenbelt, mixed use sites are not appropriate in rural locations; previous planning permission has been refused on the site. Brownfield sites should be considered first.	10076/24454	
	Objection – Planning Inspector ruled that The Stables must be vacated and returned to its green field status by June 2016 at the latest. As Elvington is classified as a rural village community, the NPP states that ‘mixed use’ sites (as required by Travelling Showpeople) are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. Planning permission for use of this site as a travelling showpeople’s site was refused twice in 2010 by CYC on these grounds and this decision was further supported via a Planning Inspectorate refusal following an appeal by the Traveller / Showpeople family in 2011. The sewage system within the village is already at capacity. The recent development at Roxby Farm and The Conifers have to have large storage tanks and an overnight pumping system to pump sewage away. The site is considered to affect the visual amenity and outlook especially for the residents using the footpath and road that passes by this site and those at Brinkworth Hall.	10077/19346	
	Objection – the planning inspector has ruled that the site should be returned to the greenbelt by June 2016. Permanent planning permission has been refused previously. Brownfield sites should be exhausted first. The NPPF rules that traveller sites should not be permitted in rural locations and in the greenbelt.	10078/25789	
	Objection – oppose this development in Elvington.	10092/25810	
	Objection – this site is in the greenbelt and has been refused permission in the past. There is a lack of services and amenities in the village.	10095/25817	
	Objection – this site is due to be returned to the greenbelt. There is no justification to increase this site by two further plots. The access is limited. There is no adequate drainage for the site.	10125/25859	
	Objection – taking land out of green belt is inappropriate and contravenes National Planning Policy which states that mixed use sites i.e. residence and storage and maintenance of equipment are not to be permitted in rural locations. This site has already had planning permission for Travelling Showpeople turned down twice and was only allowed temporarily on appeal, which affords no rights towards permanent residency. There should be no preferential treatment given to anyone wanting to use greenbelt land for residency either settled or travelling. The Local Planning Authority	10143/19357	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	need to be consistent when assessing development in villages and need to respect the visual amenity of small character villages. Many fairground items are not in keeping with the village which is one of the first things that is visible when entering the village and is totally inappropriate development. Brownfield site should be used first.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – NPPF states that mixed use sites are not appropriate in rural areas. This site has been refused permission twice. There is no immediate need for plots.	10164/25999	
	Objection – this is inappropriate in the greenbelt and unsightly.	10169/24198	
	Support – see survey 2. No objection to this site.	10175/19379	
	Objection – entrance to the site leaves cars butting on the Elvington Lane, with a car towing a caravan turning in will cause a hazard for the 40mph traffic.	10176/19384	
	Objection – planning permission has been refused twice. Consists of inappropriate development in the greenbelt under national regulations. Legal ruling that the site must be caved and returned to greenbelt. Would create a precedent for other sites in the rural areas.	10193/19403	
	Objection – see survey 2	10196/19409	
	Support – agree with the proposals to increase this site. The site is discreet and not intrusive into the village and can support a further two pitches with very little disruption to the surrounding landscape. There is good access. The site is self sufficient for sewerage disposal and the proposed expansion would not add any additional burden to the village sewerage works. Will allow further diversity of people in the village which can only be a benefit.	10197/21141	
	Objection – unsightly. Land return to Belt Green in 2016. Concern about more plots in the future.	10210/21166	
	Objection - land due to return to Green Belt in 2016. Increase of traffic flow, both people and vehicles.	10211/21172	
	Objection - residential development in recent years, impact negatively on the rural character of the village, local infrastructure and services. Mixed use sites are not permitted in such rural, green belt locations. Return of the area to green field.	10221/21191	
	Support – fully support this allocation	10283/21274	
	Objection – site is used more than allowed currently. Sewage and water issues.	10286/21281	
Objection – National Planning Policy Framework states mixed use sites are not to be permitted in rural areas. Green belt land. Land must return to green belt at end of residence permit. Previously rejected.	10289/21292		
Objection – adverse effect on local primary school and road network.	10290/21296		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>22 (YORK008)</b>  <b>The Stables, Elvington</b>  <b>(continued)</b></p>	<p>Object – Must return to green belt in June 2016. Green belt must be protected.</p>	<p>10306/21836</p>	
	<p>Objection – this site is beginning to look unsightly. Allowing this allocation is a contradiction of government policy. Brownfield sites should be considered before greenbelt. This site should return to the greenbelt.</p>	<p>10345/26131</p>	
	<p>Objection – this site has green belts status. Its use as Travelling Showpeople site was conceded to meet the need of the residents when no other site was to be found. However the aim surely must be that this site will be able to return to Green Belt status in due course. If the city council permit the site to be developed further then it will be that much harder for the site to revert to Green Belt.</p>	<p>10382/21861</p>	
	<p>Objection – the proposal for 3 permanent travelling show person plots at the stables is inappropriate use of Green Belt land. 3 permanent plots on the approach to the village would have a detrimental effect on its charm and character. The 1 temporary plot is already unsightly. The temporary travelling show persons plot has to be returned to Green Belt status by June 2016 at the latest as instructed by the Planning Inspector. The National Planning Policy states that Traveller Sites both temporary and permanent are inappropriate developments for Green Belt land and should not be approved except in special circumstances. 3 permanent plots on the approach to the village would have a detrimental effect on Elvington’s unique charm and character as well as an effect on the environment and wildlife in the area</p>	<p>10414/22081</p>	
	<p>Objection – the Planning Inspector has already decided this will return to green belt in 2016. This would increase travel congestion.</p>	<p>10445/22531</p>	
	<p>Objection – the site is inappropriate and should not be passed. Land should be returned to green belt in 2016. Current owners to provide two additional pitches for young children. Current residents have contributed to village life. The site is unsightly, especially for nearby residents at Brinkworth Hall.</p>	<p>10446/22536</p>	
	<p>Objection – this site has already been proposed and rejected. It constitutes inappropriate development of green belt under NPP regulations. Planning policy requires ‘fair and equal treatment for travellers’. This proposal offers preferential treatment as no member of the settled community would be given planning permission/residency rights to occupy a green field site and say they need more land for family members. Elvington is a rural community. NPP states that ‘mixed use’ sites are not permitted in such rural locations. Planning permission was refused twice in 2010. A 5 year temporary residence permit was issued until June 2016.</p>	<p>10451/22552</p>	
	<p>Objection – the site was rejected twice before. Temporary residence was permitted. Must return to green belt status by June 2016.</p>	<p>10453/22556</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the current occupiers were granted access to the green belt site on a 5 year temporary basis whilst CYC put in place more permanent arrangements. It therefore seems ridiculous that the occupiers are already campaigning to have a permanent and increased site for family members. If CYC agree to this they will effectively be granting favours to show people that are simply not afforded to members of the settled community.	10454/22563	
	Objection – Elvington is classed as a rural village community and National Planning Policy specifically states that mixed use site are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. Planning permission for use of this site as a Travelling showpeople site was refused twice in 2010 by CYC on these grounds and this decision was further supported via a planning Inspectorate refusal following an appeal by the TSP family in 2011. Revised NPP guidelines (March 2012) re-emphasises the responsibilities of local authorities to protect Green Belt against such inappropriate development when making their plans. The site being so close to the main road, would be an eyesore and harmful to the appearance and character of the village	10459/22570	
	Objection – this site was given temporary permission for 5 years for a single occupancy, terminating in 2016. After this the Planning Inspectorate ruled would need to be returned to the greenbelt. The Local Plan proposal is in clear conflict with this decision already made by the Planning Inspectorate. Planning Inspectorate rulings are legally binding under the jurisdiction of the high court, and temporary residence permits afford no right towards permanent permission. The site is located at a key visual gateway into the village. The incongruous nature of a caravan site and increased traffic movements involving large vehicles at this sensitive location detract from the visual amenity enjoyed by the village and would detrimentally affect the identity of the village. Finally as this site was rejected during the 'Technical Site Assessment Process' as being unsuitable for residential or employment purposes (Criteria 4).	10463/22099	
	Support - the family on this site are a good support to the village and the site is far enough away from the main village as to be of little problem. The increase in pitches from 1 to 3 should only be allowed for use of the existing family. Should be better screening put in place to protect Brinkworth House.	10464/22101	
	Support – agree conditionally that the site is kept neat and tidy, the owner only uses the site for immediate family, site is unobtrusive.	10466/22580	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>22 (YORK008)</b>  <b>The Stables, Elvington</b>  <b>(continued)</b></p>	<p>Support – small amount of land. Unobtrusive to village life. Proportionate to the village. Good road access. No impact to amenities. Eco-friendly sewage system used, so no extra impact.</p>	10475/22600	
	<p>Objection – Inspector ruled the land should revert back to green belt</p>	10476/22602	
	<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>	10479/22611	
	<p>Objection – already refused permanent residence. Inspector ruled land to return to green belt</p>	10483/22622	
	<p>Support – existing families are settled. More screening to the rear of the site would make them more contained, and no problem to the village</p>	10484/22626	
	<p>Objection- Elvington is classified as a rural village community.</p>	10488/22640	
	<p>Objection – mixed use sites are not allowed in such rural locations. Harmful to the appearance and rural character of the village.</p>	10489/22642	
	<p>Objection - the land is within the green belt and should not be removed. This is an indictment of the planning authority in that they are now trying to legitimise their own failure to take enforcement action. The occupants have not observed the conditions imposed by the temporary permission and there is no reason to believe that they will comply with longer term restrictions. The argument that additional plots are required for use by family members carries no weight especially where such use would be very distant.</p>	10492/22651	
	<p>Objection – a green belt site and so contradicts the government's policy of allocation of brown field sites. Use of green belt land as Traveller's Sites is only approved in special circumstances. There are none here. The temporary permit was for 5 years until June 2016. Extending would go against legally binding planning inspectorate rulings.</p>	10498/22665	
	<p>Objection – there has been inadequate consultation prior to the preparation of the plan. Has yet to be established that any parish councils support the plan. Concerned there is insufficient information given about infrastructure implications. The planning inspector has already decided the land must return to green belt in 2016. The current residents wish to provide two additional pitches for future use by children, and have contributed to village life.</p>	10500/22668	
<p>Support – the existing site is well maintained, and has been demonstrated there has been no negative impact on the village in terms of traffic, or disruption of village life. The site is well screened by trees, and is hardly visibly. It is sited between two</p>	10504/22679		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	industrial estates, which are more obtrusive, so no detrimental effect on the visual aspects of the village. Although a mile from the centre of the village, it still has easy access to medical and educational facilities. Increasing the number of pitches on the site is reasonable and would not adversely affect the local area.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – lack of school spaces, increase in traffic on small roads and character of village would be ruined.	10507/22683	
	Objection – insufficient resources to support an increased population. Roads are too small to cope	10510/22688	
	Objection – inspector decided land should return to greenbelt. Elvington is a rural community. Mixed use sites are not allowed in such areas. Planning inspectors rulings are legally binding and Permission has been refused numerous times.	10515/22695	
	Objection – see survey 2	10521/26997	
	Objection – current site is under utilised. Due to nature of travellers sites in various locations may be more appealing than larger sites in one place. Parish Council does not support this proposal. Land will return to green belt in 2016, as decided by planning inspector. Increase in traffic will lead to child safety issues. Traffic is already above capacity for roads and village.	10524/21318	
	Objection – inappropriate as it sits within green belt. NPP states that mixed use sites are not permitted in such rural locations. Planning permission has been refused twice in 2010 by CYC based on this. Site has permitted five year temporary use. The alternative must be a brown field site and current site returned to green field status by 2016 as ruled by planning inspector. Site was rejected as unsuitable for residential or employment purposes. It should be rejected again on this basis. Temporary residence permit does not allow for permanent residency. Current permission is legally binding. NPP regulations only allow for alteration to green belt boundaries under special circumstances. None exist here. A member of the settled community would not be allowed planning permission or right of residency and in 'fair and equal treatment for travellers' they should also be denied. CYC should consider other brown field sites before this green belt land. Lack of village infrastructure should also be considered.	10527/22716	
	Objection – the site should return to Green Belt in 2016. Incongruous visual appearance.	10529/22720	
	Objection - increase the visual contrast between it and the houses nearby, spoiling the general appearance. Site return to Green Belt as agreed.	10532/22735	
Objection – concerns about school, health facilities and shops. Increase in traffic.	10536/22742		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	High speed of vehicles and roads ruined. The increase in village population will impact the school. Travellers will impact the village's character. Village status will be lost. Increase of congestion. Plan is detrimental to the village in every way.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continue)</b>	Objection – see survey 2	10540/22750	
	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.	10542/22757	
	Support – consider that there are sufficient safeguards and caveats in place to ensure appropriate measure can be taken to mitigate against undue pressure on infrastructure and amenities. Showpeople are a valued part of our community and should be given a stable home address and schooling which can be easily provided at the current site with no disruption to the village. Travellers have a long history of living and working in this area without difficulties, a fact which is conveniently ignored by those involved in the campaign against the feature of this plan. There is a need for provision for these marginalised minority groups and Elvington can certainly provide this with mediation and support by and for the local communities provided by the Council.	10596/22812	
	Objection – very unfair that the gypsies will have preferential treatment and not go through the local planning regulations as we all do.	10632/20414	
	Objection – NPPF states that 'mixed use' sites are not to be permitted in rural locations. Planning permission for use of this site as a travelling show people's site was refused twice in 2010 by CYC. This decision was further supported via a Planning Inspectorate refusal following an appeal by the TSP family in 2011. The site being so close to the main road, would be an eyesore and harmful to the appearance and rural character of the village.	10635/20422	
	Objection – NPPF states that 'mixed use' sites are not to be permitted in rural locations. Planning permission for use of this site as a travelling show people's site was refused twice in 2010 by CYC. This decision was further supported via a Planning Inspectorate refusal following an appeal by the TSP family in 2011. The site being so close to the main road, would be an eyesore and harmful to the appearance and rural character of the village.	10641/19726	
Objection – under the National Planning Policy regulations the proposal would be classed as an inappropriate development. Elvington is a rural village community and the National Planning Policy specifically states that a mixed use site for residence and storage and maintenance of equipment should not be permitted in a location such as	10648/19735		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Elvington. NPPF regulations state that Greenbelt boundaries are not to be altered except in “very special circumstances” which doesn’t apply to this proposal.		
<b>22 (YORK008)</b> <b>The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this site is already used by more than is allowed. It is unsightly at times already. Concerns regarding sewage and water.	10649/19737	
	Objection – not in line with national policy. Mixed use sites are not permitted in rural locations. Greenbelt boundaries are not to be altered except in very special circumstances., no such justification here. Government policy is to allocate brownfield sites first.	10664/19601	
	Support – the plan is about meeting housing needs. If not approved, it will force a family out of their home. Only intend to use what they need.	10676/19775	
	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.	10683/19793	
	Objection – there should not be people on the site. It is green belt land. Site is on a main access route	10689/19807	
	Objection – this is not a newly proposed site. The new proposal is to expand this development from a temporary single plot (with permission until March 2016) to a permanent 3 plot site. Inappropriate development within the green belt as defined under National Planning Policy (NPP) regulations. NPPF specifically states that “mixed use” sites (as required by Travelling Showpeople for residence plus storage and maintenance of equipment) are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. Planning permission for use of this site as a travelling showpeople’s site was refused twice in 2010 by CYC on these grounds and this decision was further supported via a Planning Inspectorate refusal following an appeal by the TSP family in 2011. The Inspectorate ruled that The Stables must be vacated and returned to its Green Field status by June 2016 at the latest.	10697/19825	
	Objection – along with other developments in the village, too much land will be taken from green belt.	10702/19838	Elvington Action Group
	Comment – two additional pitches would not seem unreasonable	10710/19853	
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	10724/19882		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	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 has recently turned down an application for a tea room in the village yet it is considering the above noted plans.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Comment – the family living here do contribute to family life and do present a current need. Further screening could be explored to mitigate the impact on neighbours. If exceptional circumstances are deemed appropriate, would the site be subject to a local letting clause, as per allenby’s nursery site to restrict onward sale.	10745/19937	
	Objection – planning inspector has decided that the land should be returned to green belt in 2016 and with the increased pitches it will be less likely to be returned by that date. There will be more litter and since the present site is unsightly more pitches will make it only worse which will be detrimental to the visual approach to the village. There will be increased traffic and access to the site is on a bend making it dangerous.	10756/20638	
	Objection- location for proposed site is directly adjacent to the doctor’s surgery and children’s play area. This is a massive concern given the danger posed to the young children as well as the security of the sports club and doctors, It is proven crime increases with the introduction of said sites, and this is therefore a major concern. Proposed access is shortly after a blind corner creating a danger to road users would also spoil what is aesthetically a very pleasant approach to the village.	10810/21331	
	Objection- will adversely impact the character of the village and have an unacceptable impact on the landscape. Would be visually completely unacceptable. Additional screening could mitigate some of the above; however this in itself would have an unacceptable impact on the character and landscape of the village. The village school is already at capacity and would be unable to accommodate the additional children moving in. The Mains and sewage are also already at capacity. Additional traffic will also pose further road safety issues. Large vehicles turning into and out of the sites pose a significant road safety issue.	10830/21377	
	Objection- see survey 2. Placing the pitches in a small rural village will adversely impact the character and landscape of the village. Additional screening could mitigate some of the above; however this would have unacceptable impact on the character and landscape of the village. The village school is already at capacity and would be unable to accommodate the additional children moving into the pitches. The mains drainage and sewage are also already at capacity. Additional traffic will also pose further road safety issues, particularly large vehicles turning into and out of the sites	10832/21382	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pose a significant road safety issue.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – land should revert back to greenbelt.	10840/21397	
	Objection- temporary approval by the Planning Inspector due to conclude in 2016. The site will return to Greenbelt.	10842/21403	
	Objection- temporary approval by planning inspector. The site will return to greenbelt in due course.	10845/21411	
	Objection – Elvington is a rural village, a mixed use site is not appropriate in this location.	10866/25868	
	Objection – the school is at capacity, the access to this site is directly in a bend and create a major accident area.	10870/25871	
	Objection – would like to see the Planning Inspector’s decision of 2011 fully implemented and the land revert to Green Belt in 2016.	10896/21510	
	Objection – see survey 2. Under NPPF this is an inappropriate development within the green belt. Planning permission has previously been refused. This is not permitted in such rural locations, as stated under NPPF in a rural village community. The site was rejected during the ‘technical site assessment process’ as being unsuitable for residential or employment purposes (criteria 4) It was a beautiful Green Field paddock overlooked by residences. Revised NPPF guidelines re-emphasise the responsibilities of local authorities to protect Green Belt against such inappropriate development when making plans. Green Belt boundaries are not altered except in ‘very special circumstances’ which do not apply in this case. Brown field sites must be allocated first before even considering Green Belt land. NPPF requires ‘fair and equal treatment for travellers’ not preferential treatment. No resident of the settled community would be given planning permission/residency rights to occupy Green Field sites.	10898/21515	
	Objection – goes against NPPF. Inappropriate development within the green belt. Already refused permission twice. Green belt only to be adjusted in special circumstances, which doesn’t apply to this case. Contradicts government policy of using Brownfield first.	10906/21545	
	Objection – site is within the greenbelt. Has previously been refused permission. There are no very special circumstances to allow a different planning decision. The Council have not considered allocating brownfield sites before looking to use the greenbelt.	10922/21565	
Object – NPPF states development on this land is inappropriate. Planning permission has been refused in the past.	10935/21580		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – these types of site are never picturesque, should be placed on an industrial site. Should return the land back to greenbelt.	10936/21588	
	Object – village is in danger of losing it's distinctive character. Insufficient information about infrastructure implications.	10953/21609	
	Objection – see survey 2.	11150/27002	
	Objection – see survey 2	11153/27004	
	Objection – see survey 2	11154/27235	
	Support – see survey 2.	11156/27007	
	Object – mixed use sites not allowed in rural area. Planning permission was refused twice. Must return to green field status in June 2016	11157/21650	
	Objection – see survey 2	11158/27009	
	Objection – see survey 2	11160/27012	
	Support – see survey 2.	11189/27017	
	Objection – see survey 2	11191/27019	
	Support – see survey 2. The present family at the Stables are an asset to the village.	11192/27021	
	Objection – see survey 2	11198/27024	
	Objection – see survey 2. Travellers neither add to or contribute to the community into which they impose themselves.	11207/27028	
	Objection – see survey 2	11210/27031	
Objection - despite the apparent integration of the current residents into the local community it is clear that the current site fails to meet the criteria laid down in the National Planning Policy for a mixed use site as the site is clearly rural in nature. Furthermore the extension of the site to allow a further two plots for family use is unnecessary given the age of the current residents children both of whom currently attend the local primary school and hence will not be old enough for their own residential use by June 2016 when the current temporary approval runs out. The current temporary permission included the requirement for additional screen planting by the current residents which does not appear to have been undertaken. It appears clear that development of this site is in direct contradiction of the government policy that such sites should target brown field development sites and that national planning policy guidelines should only alter greenbelt boundaries except in exceptional circumstances.	11217/22111		
Objection – Planning inspector has already decided that land must return to green belt in 2016. Current owners wish to provide 2 additional pitches for future use by	11218/22835		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses

November 2015

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	their young children only. Site totally unfair to the residents.		
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection - Elvington is classified as a rural village community. NPPF specifically states that "mixed use" sites are specifically not to be permitted in such rural locations. Planning permission for use of this site as a travelling showpeople's (TSP) site was refused twice in 2010 by CYC on these grounds and this decision was further supported via a Planning Inspectorate refusal following an appeal by the TSP family in 2011. He ruled that The Stables must be vacated and returned to its Green Field status by June 2016 at the latest.	11220/22836	
	Objection – anyone who wants to be live in a permanent residence who is self employed should buy or rent a house and buy or rent a ware house	11286/22210	
	Object – planning inspector has decided the land must return to green belt in 2016. Current owners wish to provide additional pitches for future use by their young children. The sight is considered unsightly. Would destroy York's historic and distinctive culture. Lack of information provided	11313/22866	
	Object – inappropriate site for development. Local services are very busy, causing safety issues. Difficult manoeuvrability.	11314/22870	
	Objection - Planning Inspector granted the site and the Travelling Showpeople a 5 year temporary residential permit to live there and that the Stables site must be vacated and returned to its Green Field position at the latest by June 2016. This was because the City of York Council had several times failed to provide any appropriate Travelling Showpeople's plots. The City of York Council has had another almost 6 years to provide an appropriate Travelling Showpeople's site which it has not done. National Planning Policy specifically writes that "mixed use" sites, as required by Travelling Showpeople for residence as well as storage and maintenance of equipment, are specifically not to be permitted in such rural sites. The objection criteria does not in any way pertain to the Travelling Showpeople Family themselves but solely to the National Planning Policy. If approved to a permanent site it would leave the way open to expand the plot numbers, another point is the hazardous movement of equipment/trailers/caravans onto the busy B road.	11367/22228	
	Objection- this site is already unsightly especially for those who live close by or within view. Increasing the pitches would mean more large vehicles which are dangerous to manoeuvre in and out of where it is situated.	11371/22897	
	Object – land should not be taken from the green belt land for two extra pitches.	11385/21918	
	Objection – plot return to green belt in 2016. Industrial and residential mash. Detrimental to the visual approach to the village.	11391/22929	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>22 (YORK008) The Stables, Elvington (continued)</b>	Support– site only used by the current occupants and their two children. Adequate screening must be provided to offer protection to the site’s neighbours.	11419/21669	
	Objection – this proposal contravenes the NPPF for use in such a rural location.	11646/26122	
	Objection – this is in direct contradiction to the government’s policy of allocating brownfield first. This site has been rejected for permission before. There is no immediate need for these plots. This should be returned to the greenbelt in 2016.	11754/26128	
	Objection – opposed to the proposed development.	Petition 5	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>36 (YORK005)</b> <b>Land at Out gang Lane, Osbaldwick</b>	Support– concerns remain about any extension until the City Council is able to run the existing site properly. Any further expansion would be totally inappropriate given the setting of the site and the Parish Council are glad to see that this is also in the statements given in the appraisal.	69/18851	Murton Parish Council
	Support – this information is unclear. Information should clearly state that no further pitches would be allowed on this site.	91/19636	Ramblers Association (York Group)
	Support – welcome the fact that the site has not been considered suitable for further expansion or intensification.	1355/18638	Julian Sturdy MP
	Comment – concerned that comments submitted on the original planning application to expand the site were disregarded by the council. The site was badly managed and to have extended it will only aggravate the mismanagement.	11253/22207	
<b>220 (YORK007)</b> <b>Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton</b>	Support – supportive of the decision by the landowner to remove this site	71/189981	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – supportive of the decision by CYC not to use this site following it's withdrawal by the landowner.	74/18838	Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council
	Support – agree with the decision by the landowner to remove this site.	78/19019	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – this should never have been considered, it is totally inappropriate for this use.	192/23772	
	Support – welcomes the proposed withdrawal of this site from the Local Plan on the obvious grounds of the negative impact on the openness of the greenbelt and the open countryside, as well as site specific concerns over access, affordability, flooding and landowner consent.	1355/18637	Julian Sturdy MP
	Support – it is important to maintain the greenbelt around York's villages and thereby avoid settlements merging.	1790/20451	
	Support – see survey 8	1885/26608	
	Support – see survey 8	1886/26610	
	Support – see survey 8	1888/26612	
	Support – see survey 8	1981/26614	
	Support – see survey 8	1999/26616	
	Support – see survey 8	2012/26617	
	Support – see survey 8	2036/26619	
	Support – see survey 8	2038/26621	
Support – see survey 8	2041/26623		
Support – see survey 8	2042/26625		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
220 (YORK007) Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton (continued)	Support – see survey 8	2074/26628	
	Support – see survey 8	2095/26630	
	Support – see survey 8	2108/26632	
	Support – see survey 8	2134/26634	
	Support – see survey 8	2159/26636	
	Support – see survey 8	2186/26639	
	Support – see survey 8	2199/26641	
	Support – see survey 8	2267/26642	
	Support – see survey 8	2293/26644	
	Support – see survey 8	2319/26647	
	Support – see survey 8	2330/26649	
	Support – see survey 11.	2356/26773	
	Support – see survey 8	2371/26651	
	Support – any development on the proposed site, whether for show people or other purposes would materially affect the agricultural and landscape setting of the village and should not be considered or permitted.	2442/20468	
	Support – fully support the withdrawal of the land near Knapton proposed for use as a travelling show people site. To introduce travellers and show people on the scale proposed would have a devastating effect on the village community and the environment. The Government’s Planning Policy for Travellers Sites state that such sites in the green belt are inappropriate development and that the scale of such sites does not dominate the nearest settled community. There is also a lack of infrastructure, roads, schools and statutory undertaker’s services. Problems have been encountered in the village with mains drainage.	2453/17782	
	Support – see survey 8	2489/26656	
	Support – see survey 8	2589/26661	
	Support – see survey 8.	2612/26691	
	Support – see survey 8.	2616/26695	
	Support - welcome the removal of this site from the local plan.	2765/20605	
Support – see survey 11.	2814/26776		
Support – the position for a traveller site is not appropriate, support the withdrawal of this site.	3004/23844		
Support – welcome the Council deleting the site as a Site for Showpeople’s Accommodation.	3235/26144		
Support – welcome the removal of this site from the local plan.	3618/23930		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
220 (YORK007) Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton (continued)	Support – see survey 11.	3784/26778	
	Support - the removal of a proposed showpersons site is welcomed as it is totally inappropriate for that purpose.	3880/21691	
	Support – see survey 8.	4414/26700	
	Support – see survey 8.	4423/26702	
	Support – welcome decision by the land owners to withdraw this site.	4647/220505	
	Support – agree with the withdrawal of this land for the use of travellers/show people.	4649/19130	
	Support - welcome the decision to withdraw the use of the land at Wetherby Road, Knapton, for the use of Show people or any other Travellers and would ask you to remove it from the Local Plan and to put it back into the greenbelt to give it full greenbelt protection.	4648/19686	
	Support – this site should remain as greenbelt.	4689/23982	
	Support – support the decision of withdrawal of the land from use as a Showman’s site, as it is not suitable for any purpose other than arable agricultural purposes.	4726/22333	
	Support – see survey 7	4780/26565	
	Support –relieved that the council are now moving away from the idea of this wholly inappropriate development. This would have ruined the small quiet community here.	5211/27155	
	Support – pleased that he site had been removed as it was totally out of character with the surround area.	5228/21767	
	Support – see survey 8.	5261/26705	
	Support – see survey 11.	5526/26782	
	Support – see survey 8.	5765/26707	
	Support – see survey 11.	5952/26784	
	Support – see survey 7	6167/26568	
	Support – agree with decision not to use land at Whetherby Road, Knapton for show people or travellers. It should be reverted back to greenbelt.	6222/21022	
	Support – see survey 8.	7454/26709	
	Support – agree with the proposal to withdraw the land for the use of Showpeople	7946/24089	
Support – see survey 11.	8033/26787		
Objection – see survey 8.	8209/26711		
Support – support decision to withdraw the proposed Knapton Show people site.	9274/17840		
Support – this site should be withdrawn and the site should not be constructed.	9445/19450		
Support – see survey 7	9775/26570		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>220 (YORK007) Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 8.	9782/26714	
	Support – see survey 7	9839/26571	
	Support – pleased to note the site has been removed.	9857/20290	
	Support – see survey 7	9954/26572	
	Support – see survey 7	9963/26574	
	Support – agree with the withdrawal of this site. This should not be included in the next stage of the local plan. This should be greenbelt.	10342/26035	
	Support – see survey 8	10400/26662	
	Support – see survey 7	10544/26575	
	Support – see survey 11.	10553/26790	
	Support- see survey 11. Greatly relieved this has been withdrawn.	10555/22763	
	Support- the only positive in this entire document is the removal from the plan of the traveller site off the A1237 near Knapton	10638/19574	
	Support – the proposal has been withdrawn as it was totally out of character with the surrounding area.	10652/19747	
	Support – should remove the site from the local plan and put it back into the greenbelt.	10732/19894	
	Support – welcome the decision by the landowner to withdraw this site.	10734/19915	
	Support- encouraging to note the withdrawal of the proposal for the construction of a show peoples site.	10835/21388	
	Support – see survey 7	10864/26577	
	Support – see survey 11.	10933/26792	
	Support – see survey 11.	10934/26795	
	Support – see survey 11.	10937/26797	
	Support – see survey 11.	10940/26800	
	Support – see survey 11.	10944/26804	
	Support – see survey 11.	10946/26807	
	Support – see survey 11.	10948/26811	
	Support – see survey 11.	10949/26814	
Support – see survey 11.	10955/26817		
Support – see survey 11.	10956/26820		
Support – see survey 8	10965/26664		
Support – see survey 8	10966/26666		
Support – see survey 8	10967/26668		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>220 (YORK007)</b> <b>Land at Wetherby Road, Knapton (continued)</b>	Support – see survey 8	10968/26670	
	Support – see survey 8	10969/26672	
	Support – see survey 8	10970/26674	
	Support – see survey 8	10971/26654	
	Support – see survey 8	10972/26659	
	Support – see survey 8	10973/26677	
	Support – see survey 8	10974/26679	
	Support – see survey 8	10976/26686	
	Support – see survey 8	10977/26688	
	Support – see survey 7	10979/26579	
	Support – see survey 8	10980/26693	
	Support – see survey 8	10983/26698	
	Support – see survey 8	10984/26703	
	Support – see survey 7	10985/26582	
	Support – see survey 8	10986/26716	
Support – see survey 7	10987/26586		
Support – see survey 8	10988/26718		
<b>253 (YORK017)</b> <b>Site adjacent A1237/A64, Askham Bryan</b>	Support – agree with the Technical Officers decision not to progress this site for the reasons stated.	71/18983	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support –agree the Technical Officers decision not to progress this site for the reasons stated.	78/19021	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support - the relationship of York to its surrounding settlements, therefore, 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. A development in this location would lead to a consolidation of development around Askham Bryan village from Copmanthorpe. Since the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York, we support it not being included in the next stage of the Local Plan.	238/18177	English Heritage
	Support- welcome the recommendation not to pursue this site for development. Do not consider this site to be suitable for Traveller site development, in light of its greenbelt location.	1355/18645	Julian Sturdy MP
Support – Support the decision not to progress this site.	4726/22335		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>253 (YORK017)</b>  <b>Site adjacent</b>  <b>A1237/A64,</b>  <b>Askham Bryan</b>  <b>(continued)</b></p>	<p>Support - agree with the technical officers decision no to progress this site for the reasons stated.</p>	<p>10734/19917</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington</b></p>	<p>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 are likely to have an impact on the interchange. These sites in particular, should therefore, be carefully factored into the transport assessment for the A64 interchange.</p>	<p>10/18968</p>	<p>East Riding of Yorkshire Council</p>
	<p>Objection – Parish Council are opposed to this proposed development and recommend its removal from the Local Plan. Location of this site is totally inappropriate being opposite the children's play area, medical centre and sports field and clubhouse. The loss of privacy and risk of accidents would be unacceptable. Site is known to be at risk from flooding and has already been turned down as being unsuitable for residential or employment development. Site is within an area of greenbelt. The site would detract from the visual appearance and character of the approach to the village. The increase of traffic generated by the site would be significant on what is already a congested route. The infrastructure of the village would be seriously affected by any increase in population. The school, medical practice and sewage system would be inadequate for the significant extra burden placed on them by this site and other extra sites, and would be unable to cope.</p>	<p>34/19146</p>	<p>Sutton upon Derwent Parish Council</p>
	<p>Objection – there is no proven need for further Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the York area. There are unoccupied pitches at nearby privately managed sites. This site is in Green Belt and a brown field site should be allocated first. The size of the site is unsustainable for a rural village. The land floods. Development in this location would have an adverse effect on the village's approach and setting, as well as on the character and appearance of the area. It is an obvious encroachment into the countryside and would reduce the openness that exists in this small area of open Green Belt. There are infrastructure issues such as the sewage treatment works already being at full capacity, an infrequent bus service and a school with no room for expansion. The development is disproportionate to the village as we already have a site for touring caravans and a site for Travelling Show People. Access to the site would be dangerous.</p>	<p>61/18829</p>	<p>Elvington Parish Council</p>
	<p>Objection – unsuitable site due to proximity to playing fields, bearing in mind ongoing problems around Osbaldwick site.</p>	<p>91/19637</p>	<p>Ramblers Association York Group</p>

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the proposed scale and location is inappropriate development which will clearly and permanently damage the rural nature of this location. The proposals take no account of the activities associated with this kind of development and the already highly overloaded amenities and utilities would seriously impact and reduce the overall standard of living and traditional environments for this small community and the existing working populations in businesses in the immediate area. Proximity of the proposal to the locations of historic sites and especially to the French Air Force Memorial on York Road near to the proposed site – the only one of its kind in Great Britain, would seriously denigrate the City’s international standing and the location of the memorial. The size of the proposal would grossly over balance the current population in excess of the national average, which in itself is inappropriate development. The impairment of the visual amenity of this traditional rural village location would lead to a serious deterioration of the area. There are naturally occurring high water tables in the area which leads to regular ‘flash flooding’ thereafter.	246/19164	Yorkshire Air Museum
	Objection – this is removal of land from the greenbelt, visual amenity in the heart of the village, lack of infrastructure, site is liable to flooding, road is busy and a hazard, question the need for more pitches.	657/23780	
	Objection – see survey 2. Opposite the surgery, the sports field and the children’s play area coupled with the road/parking congestion suggest that this site is a non-starter. Aware that a planning application for development has been refused on Green Belt and highways consideration.	1008/18203	
	Objection –opposed to the recommendation that the site is suitable for Gypsy, Traveller and Roma. The site is considered to be particularly inappropriate given its location near to the Village Primary School, Medical Centre and Sports Ground. Concerns that incidences of anti-social behaviour and crime could increase.	1027/18108	
	Objection – see survey 2. This site has been rejected in the past for development. Numerous vehicles coming and going will cause more danger on the roads. The road is very noisy. A quieter site should be found.	1150/19180	
	Objection – see survey 2. The access to the site is not suitable. The village infrastructure cannot sustain a travellers site. The drainage of the field is not good. This is a greenbelt site.	1152/23791	
	Objection – see survey 2. Strongly opposed to the integration of travellers into residential areas – it can only cause friction between the two parties. Could be as many as 21 caravans with 40 plus occupants with the ensuing problems this would	1175/18209	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	bring. On a busy main road. Would spoil the integrity of this ancient village. Village does not have good amenities. The position of the site would make pulling caravans extremely dangerous.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 4	1210/27302	
	Objection – the proposal is strongly opposed by the local community. The site has already been rejected by the Planning inspector and it is in green belt.	1259/20568	
	Objection – not clear why the same logic applied to withdrawn sites at Dunnington and Huntington has not been applied to this site, namely the negative impact on the openness of the greenbelt. Suggestive of inconsistencies in the methodology. Has been refused permission for residential development. Direct contravention to national guidance of prioritising brownfield sites over Greenfield. Residents concerned about increase in population and the unrepresentative proportion of travellers compared to national averages. Site is in a prominent location which would be harmful to the character of the village. Concern about flooding, road safety, lack of sufficient amenities and infrastructure. Nearby sites at Fulford are under occupied.	1355/18640	
	Objection – Gypsy, Traveller and Show people sites are inappropriate in the greenbelt. The proposed site lies squarely within the long term accepted greenbelt and especially within the Elvington Tillmire Biodiversity Corridor Sector No5 of green belt surrounding York.	1666/20445	
	Objection – proximity to roadside which will mean the unsightly development will be on clear view. Will detract from the visual amenity of the village and destroy the rural and special character of Elvington which conflicts with the 2005 local plan. The occupants of the site would be overlooked themselves; similar planned sites have been rejected on these grounds (Kent and Derbyshire). Concerns about safety of residents and road users. Access and egress for pedestrians if not sufficiently provided for. Not well served by amenities. Queries validity of evidence for the site. Encroachment into the ever shrinking greenbelt. Inappropriate use of the green belt. Fair and equal treatment not preferential.	1667/19191	
	Objection – see survey 2. Travellers sites are not appropriate in rural Green Belt locations. Not appropriate for small village with limited amenities and already stuffed infrastructure. Site would be opposite playground and playing fields – totally wrong.	1894/26961	
Objection - Increased traffic congestion. Inappropriate location. This land could be used for a small residential development or allotments for village people to rent.	2658/22254		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Green belt should be conserved.		
<b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – has not been subject to proper planning and scrutiny.	2681/17947	
	Objection – how will the site be policed. Crime is proven to rise in areas where these sites are located.	2720/17784	
	Objection – area would become run-down. No pride in surroundings. Crime will increase.	3011/22256	
	Objection - site already rejected for development by the Planning Inspector, being green belt and poor highway, opposite a busy car park and blind bend. Prone to flooding. It should be rejected as per the same proposal for Dunnington.	3031/20702	
	Objection – this would change the character and appearance of the local area quite significantly. The site is directly on the roadside, near a designated conservation area. The businesses and residential properties nearby would overlook the site, leaving inhabitants with no privacy, even if more landscaping were to be completed nearby. Choosing this site for development, directly contradicts government policy of primarily allocating brown-field sites. The site does not provide for grazing animals. The proposed gypsy & travellers' site represents an inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The site is to be on the corner of a busy road which is the main access route for several villages and industrial estates very close by, creating dangerous and difficult access. There is no pedestrian footway on the verge along the proposed site. Children from the village will have to cross a very busy road to get to the playground and sports centre. This proposal will be dangerous to children in the area. On two sides the land is bordered by open culverts. There would need to be significant engineering to make sure the caravans were safe from rising waters. Moreover, there are currently pitches which remain unoccupied at the privately managed gypsy and traveller site nearby in Fulford. The local facilities consist of one small shop. The public transport facilities to access in York are extremely limited. Elvington Primary school is already oversubscribed and the high demand for the doctors' surgery creates considerable delays already. Previous development applications in this area have been recently refused.	3046/20212	
	Objection – see survey 2. Loss of greenbelt with adverse wildlife and environmental impact. Unsuitable location would compromise the nature of the village and create a traffic hazard. Disproportionate by size would stress village amenities and infrastructure. Unproven needs.	3063/22267	
Objection – the location of this site would make it dangerous for the community. The village approach would adversely affected by the site, affecting businesses in	3108/23853		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the village. There is no infrastructure to support the site. This site is not supported by the parish council.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this site is in the greenbelt. If this development went ahead the traveller population would be 7% of Elvington. The road carries heavy traffic making it dangerous. There is no footpath on the side of road. The village services are at capacity.	3113/23857	
	Objection – this site has already been rejected. The location is inappropriate due to proximity of the children's play area. Access from the road is dangerous.	3135/23860	
	Objection – this proposal is contrary to general planning guidance, policy and philosophy. This is a greenbelt location, development here would be an eyesore, visible from the highway. Elvington should remain a rural village. There is no proportionality of this development to the village and this would adversely affect the character of the village. Increased traffic would be hazardous for villagers.	3220/23873	
	Objection – present sites are not full. The site has already been turned down for housing development. The rules for Green Belt land should apply. Access for the site is on a bad bend on an already busy B1228 would cause a traffic hazard. Local facilities are overstretched. It would have an adverse visual impact on the rural character of the area and is inappropriate development.	3532/23904	
	Objection – this site is in the greenbelt and the area is environmentally sensitive. Brownfield land should be considered first. There is no proven need for pitches in this area. Development would harm the openness of the greenbelt and the appearance and character of the area. The site would be located on a blind corner and close to a designed conservation area. The site would add to the traffic congestion and road hazards. The infrastructure in the village cannot cope with further development.	3598/23923	
	Objection – see survey 4	3864/27308	
	Objection – see survey 4	3882/27312	
Objection - this land is protected as Green Belt and a previous application for residential development on the very same plot of land was rejected for this very reason. Government policy is to allocate Brown Field sites for development before every considering use of Green Belt Land. The government document 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' considers use of Green belt land for the purpose of establishing a gypsy/traveller site as 'inappropriate development' unless in exceptional circumstances. Concerned about the traffic flow through Elvington and the safety of children crossing the roads. This site is immediately opposite the	3909/21699		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>sports club and children’s play park. Cars parked along the roadside making the road hazardous to cross due to reduced vision. Adding large vehicles such as caravans and transit vans will further increase this risk. Amenities in Elvington are stretched to the limit. The primary school is full and there is generally a minimum wait of a week for an appointment at the GP surgery. The sewage system is working at capacity. The visual impact on the village would also be significant. Caravans and any associated machinery such as generators and large vehicles would be incongruous with the local environment</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – see survey 4</p>	<p>3920/27314</p>	
	<p>Objection - the village has no long term connection with traveller communities so should not be singled out for such a new site, when expansion of existing sites would be more appropriate. Site would clearly require significant investment to make it viable and unobtrusive. Question the general need for such a large increase in Traveller Sites in York and note that other Yorkshire towns are not making such large provisions.</p>	<p>4197/21719</p>	
	<p>Objection – there is a lack of infrastructure. The site entrance is on a blind bend near a children’s playground. This site has been rejected for development previously, is in the greenbelt and is prone to flooding. There is no proven need for pitches in this area. There is no provision for grazing for horses. The development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the village.</p>	<p>4309/23958</p>	
	<p>Objection – no proven need. Unoccupied pitches at a nearby privately managed site. The site is in the greenbelt and brownfield sites should be allocated first. Size is unsustainable for the village. Would have an adverse effect on the village’s approach and setting as well as character and appearance. Obvious encroachment onto the countryside which would reduce the openness of the green belt. Infrastructure issues. Disproportionate to the village as there is already a travelling showpeople site. Site is opposed by the vast majority of residents.</p>	<p>4358/19664</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Question that the need figure could therefore be overstated due to data protection resulting in doubling counting. It can not be expected that the council provide funding as they have already provided housing. 12 households in bricks and mortar should be removed from the net figure. Including the impact of compound growth this figure provides for 13% growth over 5 years, 28% growth over 10 years, 45% growth over 15 years and 52% growth over 17 years. This growth overestimates demand significantly. The UK census 2011 and ORS survey data both indicate the population of gypsies and travellers doubles</p>	<p>5146/22371</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>around every 50 years – an annual growth of 1.5% per annum. CYC acknowledges this in their 2013 assessment. When 1.5% growth is compounded over 17 years this translates to 22 properties not 44 as estimated by the council. The site could be used for allotments, recreation or nature area. There is a limited bus service, no library, post office and access to services e.g. hospital would be difficult. There are limited employment opportunities. Elvington lacks the facilities sited in the CLG document ‘Planning Policy for Traveller Sites’. Both local primary schools are already oversubscribed. Creation of this development would impact on the character and setting of the area. Access onto the single track road could lead to congestion and accidents with children crossing at busy periods. The proposed site could impact on arable farm land, if horses escape from the site and roam on nearby land. Curbs will need to be dropped to provide access to the site. Sewage, draining and electricity costs could be significant. Bearing in mind financial cuts and grant reduction from central government. Elvington will lose its unique character and infrastructure, putting strain on the local school and roads which are in poor repair. New roads and schools will change the character of the village.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – Elvington does not have the infrastructure to cope with this development. Need is over inflated and should be scaled back. The development would dominate the entrance to the village. There is no room on the site for future community expansion should that be required. The cost would be make development unviable. There is a lack of local facilities and services; lack of employment in the area, the road is already very busy.</p>	<p>5147/23991</p>	
	<p>Objection – green belt land. Roads would be a danger. Infrastructure couldn’t handle the increase. Growth is too large for the size of the village. Green belt should be protected except in special circumstances.</p>	<p>5153/22383</p>	
	<p>Objection – this is excessive in terms of size and number of pitches. It will overwhelm the village. This is in the greenbelt. What is needed here is small scale housing, an extension to the sports club or allotments. Development of this type will have an effect on the visual amenity and environment of the area as a whole.</p>	<p>5235/23995</p>	
	<p>Objection – the proposal is considered to constitute inappropriate development of green belt and would conflict with national advice in Planning Policy guidance note 2 and Policy GB1 of the CYC Draft local plan. The proposal will erode the open rural character of the site and have a visual impact on the character and appearance of the area. The inspector granted planning permission for five years for change of use of buildings and part land to provide a site for travelling show people’s use for one</p>	<p>5237/21774</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>family at Elvington Stables. This land should be removed from the local plan process and dealt with on its own merits and returned to green belt at the end of this period. The site could accommodate more TSP plots. The local school is full. There is demand for a doctor's surgery. Public transport is limited. There is no post office. The sewage system is at capacity. There are traffic and road issues to consider. The site is on a busy corner, making access to the site difficult. Turning vehicles will interfere with the flow of traffic.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – for the Local Planning Authority to be consistent in assessing development applications, the proposed gypsy and travellers' site development should also apply the same policies in respect of the impact the development would have on the green belt, visual amenity and attractive rural character of the area. The intensification of vehicle use and the presence of machinery and generators which a gypsy and traveller site would entail are incompatible with the environmental interests. There is no proven need for traveller accommodation in this location. Allocating this site for development is in direct contradiction to the government policy of allocating brown-field sites first. The proposed gypsy and travellers' site development here would be inappropriate and unsustainable for a village the size of Elvington. The site does not include provision for grazing animals, which are a major factor of gypsy life. This site has already been rejected for residential development. The site by the character and nature of the materials used and the incongruity of caravans in comparison to the character and nature of the residential dwellings in close proximity to the site would create a feature that would fail to respect the character and nature of both the properties in proximity of the site and the rest of the village. Given the vulnerability of caravans and caravan sites to flooding, the proposed gypsy and travellers' site development in land which is known to flood is inappropriate. The land is bordered on two sides by open culverts. Turning traffic will interfere with the free flow of traffic on the class II road B1228 thereby creating a traffic hazard. Parking is already very difficult for the sports centre. The local school is already full and high demand for the doctors' surgery already creates significant delays. The sewage system within the village is already at capacity.</p>	<p>5259/20068</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Not a suitable site. Number of pitches is misleading. Disproportionate to the site of the village. Adverse affect on the local school and surgery.</p>	<p>5284/18381</p>	
	<p>Objection – this site is in the greenbelt, it is inappropriate and unsustainable for</p>	<p>5422/24012</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Elvington. It would be harmful to the character and appearance of the village. There is no proven need in this location. The site is on a busy bend making access dangerous. Local facilities are limited and in high demand.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this site is in the greenbelt, it is inappropriate and unsustainable for Elvington. It would be harmful to the character and appearance of the village. There is no proven need in this location. The site is on a busy bend making access dangerous. Local facilities are limited and in high demand.	5423/24013	
	Objection – this site is in the green belt and should be deemed unsuitable for development. There is no proven need for gypsy accommodation here. The volume of travellers would have a massive effect on the village, including the appearance. There is no provision for visiting families or grazing of horses. The site is liable to flood and will require significant engineering to ensure the caravans are not in danger. Increased traffic will endanger those walking and cycling in the village. The infrastructure in the village cannot support this development. Previous applications have been rejected on the site.	5439/24023	
	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	5450/21814	
	Objection – this site has been previously rejected for residential development. Brownfield sites should be considered first. This site would increase the amount of traffic on Elvington lane. This site would result in a disproportionate number of travellers in Elvington. It would be harmful to the character and appearance of the rural village. This site is liable to flooding, and over looks the sports club and Doctors. The village infrastructure cannot support this development.	5472/24028	
	Objection – site is in a prominent location. Directly opposite a thriving sports club, children's play park and much used doctor's surgery. Fronts onto a busy road. The site is totally unsuitable. Would be better used as an extension to the village's social site. Safety issues.	5535/18013	
	Objection – see survey 2. Unsuitable for such use. Set in the park and sports club vicinity it would cause extra traffic onto an already busy stretch of road, with no footpaths or bus stops. Site is in a prominent location. Directly opposite a thriving sports club, children's play park and much used doctor's surgery. Fronts onto a busy	5536/18018	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	road. The site is totally unsuitable. Would be better used as an extension to the village's social site. Safety issues.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the land is green belt and should remain so. The land floods. The access point is potentially dangerous due to the blind bend, in addition on days with sporting events this could lead to congestion.	5571/20760	
	Objection – the land is green belt and should remain so. The land floods. The access point is potentially dangerous due to the blind bend, in addition on days with sporting events this could lead to congestion.	5572/20765	
	Objection – this site is located on a bend and is a further hazard to children crossing the road. The village school is at capacity. This site is in the greenbelt and is home to many species of wildlife.	5595/24035	
	Objection – site already rejected due to green belt and highways access. Inappropriate location as opposite a medical centre, children's play area and the sports club. Diagonally opposite a new estate of 100 houses proposed by the Council. The land floods. Detrimental to the visual approach to the village. Access is dangerous. Increase in litter and noise. Disproportionate to the village as there is already a site for caravans. Should be rejected for the same reasons as the Dunnington site. Vast majority of residents are opposed.	5738/20869	
	Objection – see survey 2. The site has previously been rejected for residential development because it is in the green belt and environmentally sensitive. There is no proven need for additional traveller accommodation in this location and there are many brown field sites within the York boundary that could be used. The size of proposed site is inappropriate for the size of the village and would mean that travellers would count for approx 7% of the village population. The plans make no provision for livestock. The site entrance is right on a main road and opposite a children's play area which would cause a serious road safety risk. The driveway shown on the CYC map as access to the site is under separate ownership and not part of the plan. The site could become a blot on the landscape if it is not kept tidy and would present a visually dominant development for the neighbouring properties. The local public services are already full, facilities very limited and the sewage system in the village is at capacity. There are unoccupied pitches at the Fulford traveller and gypsy site.	5741/20873	
	Objection – the site has already been rejected for development by the Planning Inspectorate. The site will be detrimental to the look of the village. This proposal should be rejected for the same reasons as Dunnington. It would be	5774/20881	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	disproportionate development of traveller sites in the village as there are already temporary pitches for touring and travelling show people. It is important to ensure green belt rural fields surrounding the village, to keep farming fields and village look and feel.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the land is green belt and should be protected from development. The size of the proposed development is not visually in keeping with the rest of the small village. There is no space for their animals to graze and no space for family to visit. The doctors surgery and near by housing will over look the site and give residents no privacy. The views of open country side will be badly affected. The character of the village will be affected. The road is already very busy and there are concerns of a further increase of traffic, especially so close to a school, play area and GP surgery. The land floods. There are existing spaces at a site in Fulford. The school is already at capacity. The GP surgery is very busy. The site has already been turned down for development by a planning inspector. There is already provision for travellers in the village.	5781/20889	
	Objection – greenbelt land. Machines and generators used by them are incompatible with the environment. There is no proven need for the site. Travellers would represent 7% of the village population. No provision for grazing animals. Government considers travellers sites inappropriate development in the green belt. Special circumstances required to be able to change the green belt status. Would ruin the visual amenity of the village. Land is prone to flooding. Site is located on the bend of a busy road, making access dangerous. Children would be in danger of accidents. The distance from emergency services is too large. Local facilities are limited. Sewerage is at capacity. There are unoccupied pitches in Fulford.	5816/20897	
	Objection – the site would change the settled character of the village.	5820/20899	
	Objection – Land has been previously rejected. Green belt land. Land is liable to flooding. Increase would put a great strain on village amenities. If used as anything other than green belt land, it should be housing or extra room for the sports club.	5832/20923	
	Objection – previously rejected four times for residential housing, due to being greenbelt land and environmental factors. Impact on environment will increase due to vehicles, machinery and generators. Noise created will impact on residents who neighbour the site. No proven need for traveller site in location. Cannot be classified as rural exception as it is not a small site. More suitable places in York which are brownfield sites, rather than a village greenbelt. Proposal has not set aside any land for grazing animals. Site is in the heart of the village with residential	5842/22394	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>housing on either side, this would the residents and intrude on the character of the village. Site has 2 sides of open culverts would require engineering work at high cost to ensure no risk of flooding on site. School is full, Doctors is busy, amenities are limited, sewage system is full. Peter Brett Associates Assessment for the City of York Council requires there to be good amenities and transport links – Elvington cannot provide these. No evidence of need in Elvington, private run site in Fulford has empty pitches. Located directly on busy road – dangerous, additional cost incurred to create entrance and exit to the site. In an event of a caravan fire increased risk to local residents due to time take to access site.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – site is on the corner of a narrow road, close to children’s play area. Unsafe access.</p>	5878/20971	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Adverse impact on the greenbelt and wildlife. Why must Elvington take the brunt when sites such as Dunnington and Huntington aren't subject to any of these plans. Very fabric of the village will be threatened.</p>	6036/19226	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Opposed on highways and safety concerns..</p>	6196/18025	
	<p>Objection – see survey 4</p>	6209/27316	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. rural farming community already congested with heavy goods vehicles, cars and local bus service, roads in poor condition and cannot sustain further traffic. There is a primary school nearby think about health and safety of our children. Similar proposal for a traveller site withdrawn because of greenbelt location- surely same cause of action. No facilities or amenities.</p>	6281/21030	
	<p>Objection – site inappropriate for this use given the greenbelt location and its proximity to existing dwellings, health centre and children’s playground. The site has previously been rejected for housing and there can be no justification, given the same planning principles apply for both uses, for it to be considered to house travellers if it is not suitable for residential house building.</p>	6508/19138	City of York Council Conservative Group
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Don’t see why gypsy / travelling people should be allowed to come to a small close knit village. They are classed as travellers for a reason, they travel &amp; choose that lifestyle, so should not have permanent sites built for them at our expense. There is no proven need and this cannot constitute a rural exception site. Brownfield sites must be used first. This is inappropriate and unsustainable in the village. All proposals must be judged by the same criteria.</p>	8313/24093	
<p>Objection – site is inappropriate, there is already a large site for showpeople and a sizeable development of affordable housing which will undoubtedly change the character of Elvington and the local environment and put pressure on local</p>	9257/17817		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	amenities. Opposed to use of greenbelt land.		
<b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the scale of the development is disproportionate to the size of the village. The site is in the greenbelt and is environmentally sensitive. The site floods regularly. The site will create a serious traffic hazard. There are no local amenities in the village.	9258/24096	
	Objection – site has already been rejected for development by the planning inspector. Inappropriate location for travellers site -opposite children play area, sports club and surgery. Land floods. Detrimental to visual approach to the village. Consultants report is one sided as the community were not consulted. Access dangerous - close to blind bend and opposite to a busy entrance to car park.	9265/17827	
	Objection – inappropriate position being at the heart of the village and in close proximity to: the health centre which has heavy traffic flow, the sports field and children’s play area which are extensively used, the village school and residential housing. Would also add to traffic congestion. Would have a detrimental impact on Elvington and neighbouring communities.	9270/17834	
	Objection – see survey 2. Don’t see why gypsy / travelling people should be allowed to come to a small close knit village. They are classed as travellers for a reason, they travel & choose that lifestyle, so should not have permanent sites built for them at our expense. queries the need for some many traveller pitches. Site in Fulford is not full. How will a traveller site on the main road into Elvington opposite the doctor’s surgery enhance a beautiful picturesque village. No amenities to support the site, the bus service is poor, the school is at full capacity, limited local shops. Why has Dunnington’s site been removed because of the greenbelt, should use the same rules for every site.	9278/18039	
	Objection - see survey 2. It is clear that everywhere travellers go crime and mess increases. This is a peaceful safe village and this is why we live here. It will ruin the place for the future, please stop this from happening – political correctness prevents many people from saying what si the undeniable truth that crime will increase, the area will become filthy, positioning opposite the doctor’s surgery will lead to a number of issues including increased car crime, local residents will be regularly bothered by travellers, property prices will fall and as a principle does not want anyone in their community that does not contribute to it. Former industrial estates a more suitable location.	9283/17856	
	Objection – the beautiful village would be spoiled.	9347/18064	
Objection – land is in the green belt. Brownfield sites should be considered before	9353/18065		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	development green belt. The proposed site would be far too large for a small village like Elvington. Positioning the site in the centre of the village would be harmful for the character of the village, effectively cutting the village into 2 halves. Amenities in the village are not suitable to sustain another 60 people. Given the distance to the closest police and fire services and the fire risks involved with caravans this site is totally unsuitable.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – site not considered suitable for open market housing by the Council. Traveller provision is essentially the same as open market housing, if it is unsuitable for one it is unsuitable for the other. Necessary technical information has not been submitted so the council cannot know that the land is suitable as a traveller site. Should provide the needed pitches as an extension to an existing site which would already have the existing facilities to cater for traveller needs.	9381/17766	Linden Homes
	Objection – this development would have a detrimental effect on the character of the village, as well as on the wildlife and conservation status of the village.	9386/24101	
	Objection – this proposal will lead to the ruination of a peaceful and historic village within a significant green belt area. Services such as sewage and drainage, schooling and medical facilities are already at capacity. 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. The disregard for wildlife habitat. Elvington is home to many endangered species such as barn owls, other birds of prey, buzzards etc. These plans will lead to a disproportionate increase in the size and character of Elvington. The Council must examine them and find another solution.	9387/22420	
	Objection – the removal of the travellers site proposed in Dunnington from the plan is welcomed but it is similarly inappropriate to propose this in Elvington instead, or any other of the surrounding villages.	9397/17993	
	Objection – nobody in the village wants travellers which will ruin the village. Village is already at its maximum, roads conditions are bad as is drainage.	9406/18310	
	Objection – would no longer be a safe village.	9435/18454	
	Objection – site has already been rejected on green belt and highways access issues. Inappropriate location opposite children’s play area, sports club and doctor’s surgery. Flooding issues. Detrimental to visual approach to the village. Access dangerous. Consultant’s report one sided as the community were not consulted.	9436/18456	
	Objection – the site is unsuitable, prone to flooding. Adverse effect on the village’s	9441/18464	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>approach and setting. Would conflict with the purposes of the green belt. Opposite key village facilities which are busily used. No safe access. Already a showpeople site in the village. Owners of the site are not committed to the proposed use of the site. Proximity to proposed housing site. Clear that there is local opposition to the site. Must be consistent with decision on site in Dunnington.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – it is in the greenbelt. Sewage works are at full capacity now, the school is also full. The site is too near the sports club, playing fields and doctor's surgery.</p>	9447/18467	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. The proposed site is in the green belt and is also prone to flood. Caravans are a fire hazard. The doctor's surgery overlooks the proposed site. Also the increase in traffic on what is already a busy road. The towing of trailers and caravans would cause a disruption when turning into the proposed site. It would be a danger to their children crossing a busy road, if they wanted use of the play area. The school and doctors are already full. The facilities in the village are minimal i.e. bus service, no post office, dentist, small village shop. There is flooding in the area. The sewage system is at capacity after the developments at Roxby Farm and The Conifers. With nearby businesses and residential properties overlooking the site there would be no privacy. The site would result in increased traffic problems, and increased parking of cars on the road. There is no pedestrian footway which would be dangerous. The site is also near to a conservation area, which needs to stay that way.</p>	9448/18469	
	<p>Objection – not appropriate for the size of the village, 7% of the village population. Inappropriate development in the green belt, previously rejected for this reason. Brownfield sites should be used forest. No proven need for traveller accommodation in this location. Prominent location, harmful to character and appearance of the village. Close to designated conservation area. Would not fit with the character and nature of the properties close to the site. Land is prone to flooding. Road safety issues. Lack of amenities and infrastructure. Unoccupied pitches in Fulford.</p>	9458/18482	
	<p>Objection – there is no proven need. This site has been rejected for residential development. Brownfield sites should be allocated first. There is no provision for grazing. The size, scale and openness of the site would harm the openness of the greenbelt. It would make the road more dangerous for residents and users of the playground and sports club. The village infrastructure cannot sustain this site.</p>	9462/24121	
	<p>Objection – this site is in the greenbelt and been rejected for development in the past. Brownfield sites should be considered first. There is nowhere for the grazing of horses. There is no proven need for these pitches. The site is close to a conservation</p>	9466/24132	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	area, drastically altering the character and appearance of the area. Access on and off the site would be dangerous. There are parking issues which would be made worse by this site. The infrastructure is not capable of sustaining this site. The gypsy and traveller community should be consulted.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this site is in the greenbelt and been rejected for development in the past. Brownfield sites should be considered first. There is nowhere for the grazing of horses. There is no proven need for these pitches. The site is close to a conservation area, drastically altering the character and appearance of the area. Access on and off the site would be dangerous. There are parking issues which would be made worse by this site. The infrastructure is not capable of sustaining this site. The gypsy and traveller community should be consulted.	9467/24135	
	Objection – see survey 2. The traveller site will change the whole character of the site and bring along new challenges. Concerned about what impact the site will have.	9470/22426	
	Objection – National Planning Policy states that Brownfield sites must be allocated first before even considering Green Belt sites. Green Belt policy requires that any development is small scale or limited and does not cause undue visual intrusion. The proposed site is in the heart of the village and therefore the incongruity of the caravans in comparison to the character and the nature of the residential home nearby would create a visually dominant feature. It would totally fail to respect the character and nature of the rest of the village. The B1228 is already busy and heavy vehicles for travellers and their business would create a hazard. The site is directly opposite the village playground and sports centre used by young children, therefore this will increase the danger of accidents. Elvington is a small rural village with limited infrastructure and facilities. The primary school is full, there is a high demand for medical services at the surgery, the road is heavily congested and the sewage system is at capacity.	9473/18730	
	Objection – this is greenbelt land. Not appropriate for same reasons as it was previously rejected for residential development. Inappropriate in size, location and scale and would harm the openness of the greenbelt which is contrary to national guidance and the 2005 local plan. Inappropriate location.	9474/18719	
	Objection - the fact that this is greenbelt land is a direct contradiction of government policy of considering brownfield sites first. Proposal is inappropriate for the size of the village. Would represent around 7% of the current village population. Nationally and regionally the percentage of gypsy and travellers make up 0.1% of	9476/20077	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>the population. The location for the proposed site is in the centre of the village, close to the main road and therefore very visible to all through traffic. The site would not be in keeping with the character of the village and its residential dwellings. Parking for this facility at times can be inadequate resulting in cars having to park along Elvington Lane. The congestion caused by this would only be further exacerbated if access to a gypsy/traveller site were in this vicinity. Village school is already full. Local facilities are very limited. Public transport to allow access to other facilities further afield is very limited. This could potentially present problems for travellers without their own transport.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this site will add to the traffic problem on the road. Opposite a playground, sports club and GP. Land is known to flood. Greenbelt location.</p>	9484/18748	
	<p>Objection – road safety concerns, nearby businesses, the sports club and playground, medical centre and residences already create a great deal of traffic.</p>	9501/18655	Flatford Ltd.
	<p>Objection – will cause greater traffic congestion, road safety concerns. Sewerage and drainage is at capacity. Increase pressure for schools and local amenities. Will change the character of the village. Similar to Dunnington will impact on the openness of the greenbelt. Impact on the character and setting of the area.</p>	9518/18691	
	<p>Objection – would change the character of the village and have an adverse effect on the approach and setting of the village. Landscaping is unlikely to mask this development effectively. Issue of flooding needs to be addressed more robustly. Vehicle access and increased traffic congestion concerns.</p>	9528/22433	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Wholly inappropriate, will affect the character of the village. All aspects taken into account during the inquiry in 1992/1993 are still valid now. Will put additional pressure on existing infrastructure. Will increase traffic and destroy wildlife. Quality of life will decrease. School is at full capacity. Access to see a GP is difficult.</p>	9551/18496	
	<p>Objection – already been refused because of greenbelt and highways considerations. Site is on a very busy and often very congested road. If considered unsuitable for houses then it must be unsuitable for travellers. Brownfield site would be more suitable.</p>	9556/19080	
	<p>Objection – located on a busy road.</p>	9558/19068	
	<p>Objection – inappropriate on greenbelt land, contrary to national guidance and the 2005 local plan. Size is disproportionate to the size of the village which does not have the amenities to cope. Inappropriate next to an electricity sub station.</p>	9572/19076	
<p>Objection – the site should not be developed as the biodiversity of the area would</p>	9573/19280		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be greatly decreased and the area is currently an ideal habitat for a wide variety of flora and fauna. The proposed site is subject to flooding, any kind of development there is a bad idea.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 2. Roads are already busy, hazards caused by parked cars. Privacy an issue as the doctor’s surgery would overlook the site. School and doctor’s surgery are already at capacity. Limited local shops and public transport. Few employment opportunities. Site designated as green belt. Site is known to flood.	9574/19282	
	Objection – by building more houses and allowing gypsies to move in 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.	9597/22450	
	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.	9602/22462	
	Objection – there should not be more introductions of gypsies.	9624/24151	
	Objection – would impact negatively on the nature of the village and its community. Unsustainable as the main road would not cope with an increase in vehicles, it is already hazardous. Detrimental to the aesthetics of the village. More pressure on the doctor’s surgery and village school which is already at full capacity. Greenbelt must be retained, direct contradiction of national policy of brownfield first. Would harm the openness of the greenbelt. Sewage system is already at capacity. Not in the best interests and welfare of the travellers due to lack of proper bus service and limited shops. Will be overlooked by neighbouring houses and businesses. Access safety concerns. Noise from school and sports club will have an impact on inhabitants of the site.	9640/22469	
Objection – the proposed development would have a damaging effect on the visual attractiveness of this rural village. Facilities in Elvington are very limited; there is only a small local shop, the bus service to York is very poor, the school is already full and there are already delays at the doctors’ surgery. The B1228 is already a very busy road and there is often severe congestion at Grimston Bar, and difficulties parking at the sports centre and medical practice. To have an increase in traffic at the site, including heavy vehicles, will only exacerbate these problems. There	9647/20108		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	appears to be little or no evidence that there is demand for such a site among the travelling community, and reportedly there is capacity at the Traveller's site at Fulford.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the road is busy and dangerous despite the fact that it has a 30 mile an hour limit. We have a very limited bus service in Elvington so the travellers using the site would have to have their own mode of transport which would in turn spill out on to the already congested road. There is already a travellers site in Fulford which is much closer to local amenities and has better communications which has vacant pitches. The entrance to Rolawn has large tractors and grass cutting machinery, next to that is Flatford with more huge lorries, and the entrance to Yara Chemical Works. The proposed Travellers Site entrance would be about 25 metres away from all of this. If the proposed site goes ahead the true character of the village will be lost completely. I strongly disagree with this proposal.	9662/20124	
	Objection – village community and amenities could not sustain the proposed site. Limited shops and services. Busy road, safety issue. Opposed to use of greenbelt. Land previously rejected for residential use. Noise and air pollution would cause a disturbance. Prominent location that would spoil the character and appearance of the local area which is contrary to 2005 local plan policy. Brownfield sites should be considered first. Major flooding issues in the past. Would alter the nature of the village.	9667/19453	
	Objection – not suitable at all. Site would be opposite children's play area, sports club and doctor's surgery.	9670/20133	
	Objection – the road is very busy and will cause a hazard to those using the playground and the sports club, the school is full.	9671/24206	
	Objection – see survey 2. Will significantly impact the character of the village.	9710/20166	
	Objection – concerned about removal of land from the greenbelt and proximity to the conservation area. Would be detrimental to the environment and wildlife. Inappropriate location on the main approach to the village, totally out of character, will cause disruption to traffic and road safety issues. Sewage and drainage systems already at capacity. Contrary to national guidance. Has already been rejected for residential development.	9719/20185	
	Objection – unsuitable, road safety/access issues, land already rejected due to being in the greenbelt and an environmentally sensitive area. Surface water and foul water drainage infrastructure would be required. Land is prone to flooding. Prominent location would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the	9720/20186	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village. Local community not consulted prior to the consultants report. Local amenities already fully stretched.		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the land is on Green Belt land and York has previously turned down this for housing development because of this. A proposed site is dangerous for traffic, will increase traffic and further more increase the population size inappropriately for the size of the village. It would also visually intrude upon the conservation nature of the village. Road safety is already an issue in the village.</p>	9726/20201	
	<p>Objection – the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of Elvington and would not be in keeping with other developments nearby, 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 of existing residents. Public transport would not be adequate and Elvington lane would be more congested and dangerous. Increased traffic noise, pollution and additional danger fro pedestrians especially school children.</p>	9731/19534	
	<p>Objection – development of this green belt land will harm the character and appearance of the local area. The site is overlooked therefore the occupiers of the caravans would have not privacy. The site regularly floods. Local facilities are inadequate. There are unoccupied pitches available at an existing site in Fulford which is better served by public transport and local amenities.</p>	9743/26345	
	<p>Objection – land is known to flood. Sewage system is at maximum capacity. Local school is full. Central location would be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area. Conflicts with 2005 local plan. Adjacent to conservation area. Character and nature of the site would be incompatible. Nearby businesses and properties would overlook the site, leaving the occupants no privacy regardless of landscaping. Detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	9766/19560	
	<p>Objection – inappropriate in a residential village without substantial amenities. Biggest problem is adding a multivehicle access in this location. Road is already very busy. Residential development previously refused. Opposed to use of the greenbelt. Would be an eyesore out of keeping with the current development. Screening offers very little of visual cover at the present. Should target brownfield sites.</p>	9768/19564	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Potentially dangerous access, near a bend and opposite the surgery, sports club and playground. Site is in the greenbelt and brownfield sites should be used first. Site would occupy a prominent position on the main approach to the village and would be visually intrusive. Size of the site would be disproportionate to the size of the village. The reasons given for the withdrawal of</p>	9776/21675	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the site in Dunnington are equally pertinent to this site and should be withdrawn for the same reason.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the site will significant impact upon character of village as they represent a discernible proportion of the village’s total size. There are already sites for touring caravans and travelling show people. Land should be considered for residential development. Site will place pressure upon school which is at capacity, and will adversely affect road safety and congestion. Road around the school is already congested at peak times. Concerned that the demographics of the village, given its small size, shall be demonstrably changed by the creation of traveller’s sites.	9778/20235	
	Objection – proposals would seriously damage the environment of Elvington. The plans would inevitably make the village much busier and nosier, 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.	9788/20248	
	Objection – proposed site is on a blind bend, opposite the sports field, used very frequently by local young people and adults, and also the health centre. If the scheme goes ahead road accidents are inevitable. The whole nature of the village will be changed for the worse. There is no objection to smaller developments infilling vacant areas or brownfield sites, particularly in York City itself.	9790/20250	
	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. The open nature of the access to the village will be destroyed by such a development. It would not reflect the village vernacular and would be rather close to the conservation area within the village. There are also important issues of access to such a site from the highway.	9791/20255	
	Objection - opposite a children’s play area, sports club and doctors surgery which already generates significant amounts of turning traffic on a busy road. On a weekend when there are sporting events cars are parked all along the road particularly on the pavement which would make it hazardous for traffic turning out of any traveller site. It would also make it hazardous for any children crossing from a traveller site to sports ground. The land is known to flood. The land is greenbelt, caravan would be visually inappropriate, particularly close to a conservation area.	9798/20265	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	There is already land set aside for travelling show people within the village boundary.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – site is greenbelt and its development has previously been refused. Location and construction would be out of character to the rest of the village being in such a prominent position. Access would greatly increase the likelihood of accidents. Gypsy/travellers would account for 7% of the village population, that national average is 0.1%. Nature of the village will be thrown out of balance.	9803/24168	
	Objection – this is a greenbelt site which has already been rejected for development. Such a development would be detrimental to the village.	9804/24172	
	Objection – Elvington Lane is incapable of coping with an increase in traffic. Would have a massive impact on the village, contrary to national guidelines. Consultation with traveller community stated they did not want to come to the York area. Proposed site has nothing in common with the type of site preferred by the traveller community. Water and electricity supply is at capacity. There is capacity at two current traveller sites making this proposal unreasonable. Will spoil the village and village life. Public transport is basic. Local services would be put under strain. Travellers way of life differs greatly from that of rural village life.	9812/19326	
	Objection- this site has already been rejected for any development by the planning inspector. The site is unsuitable as it is in close proximity to the sports club, medical practice and children’s play area. It is subject to flooding. Only one traveller family based in Scunthorpe showed interest in the proposed site following recent consultation with travellers. The consultation also confirmed that the travellers prefer locations nearer busier and more industrial towns/cities. There are no illegal sites in the area and the facility for more travellers is not appropriate to their needs. The site will have massive effect on the character of the village. The primary school, medical practice, roads, water and electricity supply are already running at full capacity and further development will make matters dramatically worse. The traveller community has a completely different way of life to that of the village and such a development will be detrimental to both their and the villagers’ needs. The consultants report is one sided on this proposal, the community was not consulted and the proposal should therefore be discounted. The landowner would prefer the land be used for residential development/extension to the sports field but this has not been considered. The council has not fully justified a need for the proposed site.	9813/20276	
	Objection – this site has been refused planning permission in the past. This is greenbelt land with no special circumstances for development. There is no proven	9814/24180	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	need or request from the travelling community to live here. This will cause a visual intrusion to the approach to the village. There will be no privacy on the site due to its proximity to businesses, houses and the sports club. The infrastructure cannot sustain this site. Access to the site is dangerous. CYC should demonstrate working with other local authorities to assess need and that other traveller sites in York are full.		
<b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this site will spoil the village.	9820/24220	
	Objection – located on the corner of a busy road. Opposite a sports centre, out of school club and a playground. Location is already dangerous due to speeding motorists. Land has previously been rejected. Location is prominent in the centre of the village. Local amenities are at capacity.	9823/20279	
	Objection – development of the land for residential use has already been rejected by the Planning Inspector. This land is currently in Green Belt. Wildlife habitat of fields and hedgerows will be destroyed and the loss will be irreversible. There is no demonstrable reason why use of this land for gypsies/travellers can constitute a 'rural exception' for Green Belt use. Brown field sites should be considered in the first instance. There are not enough amenities or sufficient infrastructure to support additional numbers of residents. The existing drainage has absolutely no further capacity to support any further development at all. There is also a parking/road safety issue at the site of the doctor's surgery/sports club at the weekend when there is inadequate parking available and cars spill out onto the verge and road. The road is dangerous here as it is just off a bend which you cannot see around when exiting to turn right out of the site. The distance of Elvington from emergency services, coupled with the vulnerability of caravans to fire, means that locating the caravans here is unsafe for the occupants. The presence of caravans and trailers in comparison to the character and nature of the residential dwellings in close proximity to the site would create a feature that would fail to respect the character and nature of both the properties in proximity of the site and the rest of the village.	9824/200286	
	Objection – the local school is already at capacity. Question whether travellers would want to live in a rural location.	9828/24225	
	Objection – this is inappropriate in the middle of a sprawling village. It is too close to the village services and amenities. It would cause the road to be busier. This is not an appropriate location for travellers, travellers would not choose it themselves. The infrastructure cannot sustain additional development. The site is marshy.	9829/24228	
Objection – conflicts with 2005 local plan. Elvington's size does not lend itself to a	9831/22069		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>gypsy and traveller site of this size. The site has no safe available access (as it is landlocked) onto a busy road, and it would be hazardous with all the required movement of caravans, trailers, vehicles and horses. There is no provision for grazing animals. The school and doctors are already full. Village does not have the amenities. The Fulford site has empty available pitches plus all the extra amenities that Elvington does not have.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this site is within defined greenbelt and is inappropriate development. There is no safe access to the site. Increased traffic will create more of a hazard also. The number of travellers would overwhelm the settled community. The infrastructure of the village cannot sustain this.</p>	9833/24231	
	<p>Objection – this development would be a little village in its self. It would change the character of the village. The size, position and associated activities would spoil the expanse of the countryside that surrounds the village. It would be inappropriate location near the sports club, children’s playground and doctors. It would increase traffic on the roads meaning that children could not have the freedom to go out alone. The nomadic lifestyles would interrupt other children’s education in the primary school.</p>	9841/24247	
	<p>Objection – this site has been previously rejected due to its greenbelt location. It is inappropriate in its location close to a children’s play area, sports club and doctors surgery. The access from the highway would be dangerous and it would have a detrimental affect on the visual approach to the village.</p>	9847/24187	
	<p>Objection - this site has been previously rejected due to its greenbelt location. It is inappropriate in its location close to a children’s play area, sports club and doctors surgery. The access from the highway would be dangerous and it would have a detrimental affect on the visual approach to the village.</p>	9848/24192	
	<p>Objection – brownfield sites should be allocated first, to develop this site would contradict government policy, this would not form an integral part of the village character. The access has poor visibility. There is no proven need for accommodation in this location.</p>	9849/24253	
	<p>Objection – brownfield sites should be allocated first, to develop this site would contradict government policy, this would not form an integral part of the village character. The access has poor visibility. There is no proven need for accommodation in this location.</p>	9850/24254	
	<p>Objection - the appearance of this site would ruin the entrance to the village. The infrastructure cannot support this proposal. The site is known to flood and so is</p>	9852/24258	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	unsuitable. The land is greenbelt and is environmentally sensitive. Brownfield should be used first. Access is poor and hazardous.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection - 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. Will create an eyesore. Will impact on safety being opposite the children's playground which is heavily used.	9861/24263	
	Objection – this has been rejected in the past due to highway access and greenbelt. The road is very busy.	9873/24204	
	Objection – this will overstretch the infrastructure in the village. It has been refused permission in the past due to being greenbelt. The road is very busy. An area more suitable to transient lifestyle would be more appropriate. A feasibility study needs to be carried out as this site has a history of flooding.	9884/24317	
	Objection – this site is inappropriate, there are inadequate public transport links. It would increase traffic flow. Traffic poses a significant health and safety risk. The existing infrastructure is at capacity. This site is a prominent location in the village and is out of character for a sensitive location. The site has been previously rejected for development. There will be a loss of habitat wildlife, flora and fauna. The boundary of the site is wrongly drawn in the consultants report. It would be better suited to be used as an expansion of the sports club.	9886/24322	
	Objection – this site should be used an expansion to the sports club. The habitat will be spoilt by the proposal. It will destroy greenbelt land.	9887/24325	
	Objection – this is inappropriate use of the greenbelt. The size is inappropriate and makes no provision for visiting family members. There is no evidence of need in Elvington. Development will cause visual intrusion for neighbours, and harm the character and appearance of the local area. The infrastructure in the village is already at capacity. This site has been refused planning permission previously.	9900/24340	
	Objection – opposed to the site.	9904/24350	
	Objection – green belt land and environmentally sensitive. Direct contradiction to the government policy of allocating brown-field sites first. Travellers would represent 7% of population. No very special circumstances or exceptional circumstances. Would be harmful to villages' character. Not far from conservation area. Harm the visual amenity of neighbouring villages. Land prone to flooding. Sewage system is at capacity. Unoccupied pitches in Fulford. Increased traffic and hazardous area to drivers and pedestrians.	9912/21654	
	Objection – opposed to this proposal	9916/24363	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Objection – this area of the village already suffers from road congestion. This proposal will exacerbate this problem and cause a safety risk. More travellers, as well as the showpeople would amount to a disproportionate number of travellers in the village. The land should have been considered for housing first. There is no proven need in the village.	9917/24368	
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this site would have a huge impact on the historical character of the village, devaluing the quintessential character. There are concerns over health and safety of increased traffic and the site sits on a busy bend. The infrastructure cannot cater for more people. There are limitations within the village and the area is subject to flooding. Previous plans were rejected with regards to the greenbelt and highway access.	9920/24374	
	Objection – it is opposite the children’s play area and medical practice. A totally inappropriate area.	9930/24428	
	Objection – this is on greenbelt land. There is no published evidence that need is in Elvington. This site has an abundance of wildlife that will be lost. The size is disproportionate to the village. The village infrastructure cannot support this. There would be a safety issue with the location opposite a doctors and the sports club. There is poor drainage on the site. It will visually harm the appearance and character of the village. This site has already been refused permission.	9931/24467	
	Objection – this site has been previously rejected for residential use as it is in the greenbelt. A traveller site will create problems with more vehicles and generators. The sounding land is heavy clay and unsuitable to graze horses on. The site is a haven for wildlife. A traveller site would be better on the perimeter of a village or a brownfield site. There is no provision for visiting family members.	9933/24468	
	Objection – this site has been previously rejected for residential use as it is in the greenbelt. A traveller site will create problems with more vehicles and generators. The sounding land is heavy clay and unsuitable to graze horses on. The site is a haven for wildlife. A traveller site would be better on the perimeter of a village or a brownfield site. There is no provision for visiting family members.	9934/24469	
	Objection – this site has already been rejected for highway access reasons. The entrance would be close to the very busy entrance to the doctors and sports club. The access in and out of the site would be dangerous. The site has flooding issues. The village has insufficient infrastructure to support this.	9936/24471	
	Objection – the current village infrastructure cannot support more development and additional traffic. The traffic volumes is already dangerously high. Too much land is	9937/24477	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>being taken from the greenbelt. There is a lack of a dedicated cycle/footpath to Grimston Bar. This destroys much of York's Historic and distinctive culture. This site has already been rejected for development. It is in an inappropriate location, opposite a playground, sports club and doctors surgery. It will be detrimental to the visual approach of the village. Access will be dangerous. It would create a disproportionate number of travellers in the area. The land flood.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the land is at risk of flooding and infestation from rats, not uncommon in culverts. Travellers are traditionally Catholic, there is no Catholic school near by and no bus service. The village lacks the infrastructure to support this site. It would be harmful to the character and appearance of the village. Should be rejected for the same reasons a residential development was. Brownfield sites should be considered first. Former P&amp;R at Askham bar would be more appropriate location.</p>	<p>9943/24488</p>	
	<p>Objection – this site has been previously rejected for residential use as it is in the greenbelt. A traveller site will create problems with more vehicles and generators. The sounding land is heavy clay and unsuitable to graze horses on. The site is a haven for wildlife. A traveller site would be better on the perimeter of a village or a brownfield site. There is no provision for visiting family members.</p>	<p>9946/24490</p>	
	<p>Objection – this is greenbelt land which has been refused for permission in the past. The proposed site floods, the school is at capacity, access would be dangerous, it will spoil the rural character of the village and is totally unsustainable.</p>	<p>9948/24208</p>	
	<p>Objection – the current village infrastructure cannot support more development and additional traffic. The traffic volume is already dangerously high. Too much land is being taken from the greenbelt. There is a lack of a dedicated cycle/footpath to Grimston Bar. This destroys much of York's Historic and distinctive culture. This site has already been rejected for development. It is in an inappropriate location, opposite a playground, sports club and doctors surgery. It will be detrimental to the visual approach of the village. Access will be dangerous. It would create a disproportionate number of travellers in the area. The land flood.</p>	<p>9950/24498</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Rural farming community already congested and roads in poor conditions. Greenbelt location. No amenities and facilities.</p>	<p>9961/21119</p>	
	<p>Objection - inappropriate due to its proximity to the children's play area and medical practice. Detrimental visually when approaching the village and the access from the busy road which has a lot of heavy goods vehicles would be dangerous and also being opposite a busy car park. Would prefer for this site be developed for residential use which does not seem to have been properly considered as there are</p>	<p>9975/24524</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	already sites for touring caravans and travelling show people in the village.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the local school and doctors surgery is already at capacity. The location does not respect the character of the village and would encroach on the open countryside. This is greenbelt land. This site is on a busy road, making access difficult and dangerous.	9978/25919	
	Objection – no special circumstances which justify changing the greenbelt. The site is located on a busy road with village amenities across the road. The site does not have a footpath to it. Infrastructure and public transport in the area is poor.	9980/25923	
	Objection – previous applications have been refused in recent years because it is in the green belt. The intensification of vehicle use and presence of machinery and generators are incompatible with the environmental interests. Allocating this site contradicts the government policy of using brownfield sites first. There are no very special circumstances to warrant the change in green belt status. The site is located not far from the conservation area. There are already unoccupied pitches at the nearby privately managed site in Fulford. The site is located on a corner of a busy road making access onto and off the site difficult and dangerous. Parking is already very difficult for the sports centre. The increased traffic will bring hazards to both pedestrians and drivers. The sewage system is already at capacity. The travellers would amount to about 7% of the village population whereas nationally and regionally they account for 0.1% of the population. Would be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area. Would harm the visual amenity and outlook from properties neighbouring and opposite the site. The inhabitants of the site would be afforded no privacy regardless of landscaping measure. The site is known to flood.	9981/25925	
	Objection – residential applications in the same area have been refused as the land is in the greenbelt and is environmentally sensitive. Brownfield sites should be used first. The proposed population of the site is not proportionate to the village population. Private sites in York have unoccupied pitches.	9991/25940	
	Objection – opposite the surgery, land floods, will create horrible approach to the village, dangerous access and opposed by vast majority of village residents.	9996/19478	
	Objection – see survey 4	10004(i)/27317	
	Objection – the overall character and appearance of the local area would be impacted. The development would harm neighbours view. The land is greenbelt. The size, scale and location are inappropriate.	10015/25055	
Objection – the character of the village will be affected. The amenities in the village	10039/24386		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	are not sufficient to support this. There are road safety issues with the increase of traffic, the site floods. By increasing the village population this will negatively affect the wildlife. Land should only be taken out of the greenbelt when all other options are exhausted.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – developing the greenbelt should be a final option. This size of development would be an entire new community. There is not the infrastructure to support this. The roads are already very busy and dangerous. This would be unsightly eyesore in the heart of the village.	10044/24397	
	Objection – refused as housing site, should be consistency in assessing development proposals. Inappropriate development in the green belt. There are no special circumstances. Brownfield sites first. Significant visual intrusion on the approach to the village and rural aspect of the area. Access to the site will be dangerous for vehicles and pedestrians. Site is overlooked giving no privacy to the travellers. Site is prone to flooding. Sewage system is already at capacity. Other infrastructure would not be able to cope.	10047/21129	
	Objection – the land is greenbelt, environmentally sensitive, the number of travellers would overwhelm the settled community, there is no provision for grazing horses, the site is on a dangerous road with poor visibility, it is prone to flooding, the local school/GP surgery is full. There are traveller sites in York that are under subscribed.	10052/24413	
	Objection – this site has been refused in the past due to greenbelt and poor access. The access is dangerous.	10053/24416	
	Objection – this land should not be removed from the greenbelt. Access is on a blind bend. Previously been rejected for housing. Sites in York have empty pitches.	10056/24418	
	Objection – this is greenbelt land which has previously been refused permission due to greenbelt and environmental reasons. Brownfield sites should be used first. There is limited public transport or facilities in Elvington. Site will be overlooked by business giving the residents no privacy.	10058/24421	
	Objection – the site is in the middle of a small village. There is no direct access onto the road. The site sits on a bend. The site would cause big traffic issues. Question demand in this area. There are more suitable brownfield sites in York. The infrastructure in the village is at capacity. There are unoccupied pitches on a private site in York.	10065/24438	
	Objection – this site has previously been rejected for development. It is an unsuitable location. It will be visually detrimental to the village entrance. Adding	10072/24444	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	more sites for travellers in the village will be disproportionate.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this site has previously been rejected for development. It is an unsuitable location. It will be visually detrimental to the village entrance. Adding more sites for travellers in the village will be disproportionate.	10073/24449	
	Objection – increase of traffic and road hazards. Site is located on the corner of a busy road. Access will be hazardous. Boundary shown is incorrect and access is under different ownership. Distance for emergency services make living in caravans more dangerous. Greenbelt location. Overwhelm the settled community. No grazing for horses.	10074/21131	
	Objection – inappropriate use in the greenbelt, have not established that there are no suitable brownfield sites for this use. Previous proposal for residential use have been resisted, not material changes in planning considerations since that time. No proven need in this location. Unoccupied pitches at Fulford. Harmful to the character and appearance of the village including conservation area. Threat to amenities. Build form of the village would not be preserved or enhanced. 7% of the population is above the national average of 0.1%. Highway safety a concern. The site floods. Would add to local drainage problems. Wildlife value would be lost. No support locally. Similar proposal at Dunnington has been rejected.	10075/19345	Hickling Gray Associates
	Objection – increase of traffic and road hazards. Site is located on the corner of a busy road. Access will be hazardous. Boundary shown is incorrect and access is under different ownership. Distance for emergency services make living in caravans more dangerous. Greenbelt location. Overwhelm the settled community. No grazing for horses. Infrastructure is at capacity and cannot support further development.	10076/24455	
	Objection – inappropriate development in the greenbelt and there are no special circumstances. Previously rejected for residential use, must be consistent. Brownfield sites first. Proximity to conservation area. Harmful to the character and appearance of the local area and conflicts with the 2005 local plan. Would harm the visual amenity of nearby residents. Land is known to flood. Highway safety concerns. Unsustainable for the village, 7% of population when national average is 0.1%. National guidance requires fair and equal treatment for travellers not preferential. Site would be overlooked. Sewage system is already at capacity. Unoccupied pitches in Fulford.	10077/19347	
	Objection – opposite a children’s playground, sports club and doctors surgery.	10092/25809	
Objection – this site is in the greenbelt and has been previously rejected for development. This does not constitute a rural exception site. Brownfield sites should	10095/25816		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	be allocated first. The traveller population will overwhelm the village. There needs to be provision for visiting family members also. Need for grazing land. Impact on visual amenity, land is known to flood, village has a lack of services and amenities, question need for pitches.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this is in an inappropriate location opposite a primary school, doctors. Sportsfield and playground, which is a high traffic area. The access is in a blind sight area. This site has already been rejected.	10109/25833	
	Objection – children would be endangered by traffic and social inclinations of travellers and their children. Negative impact on village life and visual amenity. No local policing provision.	10110/25837	
	Objection – dangerous location, concern about highways. Unless it is screened it would be an eyesore. The land floods. Preferential treatment of travellers. Where will horses be accommodated other than roadside verges.	10114/19477	
	Objection – fair and equal treatment of travellers not preferential. Harmful to the appearance and character of the village.	10116/19355	
	Objection – this is at odds with the greenbelt nature of the land. Increased housing and traffic will have a detrimental effect on the environment, increased pollution and wildlife. The road is already a hazard to young children. Proposals are unsustainable due to infrastructure being oversubscribed.	10119/25847	
	Objection – this site has been previously rejected by the planning inspector as green belt. The access is in an inappropriate location. The local facilities and amenities are already stretched to capacity. The village already has a traveller site, this extra site would be disproportionate to the village.	10125/25860	
	Objection – site has previously been rejected as it is in the greenbelt and is environmentally sensitive. Traveller community would overwhelm settled community. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the village. The character and nature of caravans would be incongruous and would fail to respect the character and nature of the village. Inhabitants would have no privacy. The road is very busy and would be made busier by this proposal, making it more dangerous. The sewerage system is at capacity.	10164/25998	
	Objection – this site has already been rejected for development. The location is inappropriate. The access to the site is dangerous and site would have detrimental effect on the visual approach to the village. The community has not been consulted.	10169/24197	
	Objection – see survey 2. Inappropriate location in a prominent position, assessment by the council is wrong. No safe road access. Owners of the site would prefer the	10175/19378	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	site is used for residential development. Disproportionate for the village as there is already a showpeople site.		
<b>747 (YORK016): Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – highway safety concerns. Safeguarding the greenbelt should be the primary aim of the Council. Brownfield sites should be used.	10176/19383	
	Objection – bad access. Already available sites for touring caravans and show people. Need for more school places, amenities and public transport.	10190/21137	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – this land has already been rejected for residential development as it is greenbelt and the land is environmentally sensitive. The government policy is to use brownfield sites first. This land is known to flood. There is a lot of on road parking in this area which is close to the sports club. This would cause road hazards. The access is poor for large vehicles. The sewerage system in the village has trouble coping with this already. The school and doctor's is at capacity.	10193/26003	
	Objection – see survey 2.	10196/26996	
	Objection – flood risk. Already a traveller site in the village. Green belt land already rejected by planning inspectors for development. Congestion in the village. No provision for grazing. Overlooked by the medical practice, removing the privacy of the occupiers of the site. Additional burdens on the amenities for the village, already at capacity. Unoccupied pitches at the existing privately site.	10197/21142	
	Objection - adverse effect on the residential amenity by disturbance and loss of privacy. Site not appropriate for any form of residential development, neither gypsies nor travellers. Vulnerable to flooding. Inappropriate location. No special circumstances demonstrated.	10210/21167	
	Objection - highway access very dangerous. Flooding issues. Not appropriate amenities. Limited public bus service. Small school.	10211/21171	
	Objection – opposite to children's play area and sports club. Visually intrusive on the approach to the village. Brownfield sites first. Not enough infrastructure.	10214/21174	
	Objection- negative impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Harmful to the rural character and appearance of the area. Unsustainable size of the site. Limited school, doctor services, employment and public transport. Safety issues due to busy and dangerous road. Risk of traffic accidents.	10221/21192	
	Objection – no amenities and lack of Infrastructure. No study to prove the site is required. Green belt land should only be used in special circumstances. Minimal public transport, no post office, no space in school and no space in the doctor's	10235/21221	
	Comment – provided the travellers maintain the site properly and it is under the supervision of the council there is no objection to this site. Question whether there is a brownfield site and how appropriate it is near to the doctors and sports club.	10246/26008	
	Objection – no reason for a site that size. No vehicle access, making entering dangerous. Village already has a travellers site.	10283/21275	
	Objection – site has already been rejected. Detrimental to visual aspect of the village. Access is dangerous. Risk of flooding. Use for residential development, which is preferred by the owners.	10286/21282	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the land floods, and access is difficult due to being on a bend. It has also been turned down for development. Amenities are at capacity.</p>	<p>10287/21284</p>	
	<p>Objection – greenbelt land. No evidence to show site is needed. Site would change character of the village. Traffic issues would increase. School is at capacity. Sewage system is at capacity.</p>	<p>10289/21291</p>	
	<p>Objection – adverse effect on local primary school and road network.</p>	<p>10290/21297</p>	
	<p>Objection – will detract from the aesthetics of the village. Site is inappropriate as it is on a busy stretch of road. Risk to children around the play area. Current drainage and sewerage amenities at capacity.</p>	<p>10293/21304</p>	
	<p>Objection –currently green belt and its location, opposite the existing sports club field, makes it ideal for the extra football field required by the club. A traveller site opposite the sports field would create a traffic hazard for pedestrians, especially young children. The area is prone to flooding. Access to the proposed site is poor</p>	<p>10298/21311</p>	
	<p>Objection –is in the green belt and this directly contradicts the government’s policy of allocating brown-field sites first, before considering land in the green belt. The character and appearance of the village will be damaged if this proposal goes ahead. The site would encroach into the open countryside spoiling the attractive rural character of the area. Concerned that properties opposite the proposed gypsy and travellers’ site, such as the doctor’s surgery, sports club, play park, residential and business properties would overlook the site, affording the inhabitants no privacy, regardless of any landscaping that may occur. Concerned about traffic impact within village. Elvington has limited amenities with a school at full capacity, a doctor’s surgery with already significant delays, a small shop, no post office and limited public transport.</p>	<p>10305/22079</p>	
	<p>Objection –inappropriate development on green belt land. Schools and medical services at capacity. Road safety would be impacted. Detrimental to character. Concerns for safety and sanitation in the area.</p>	<p>10306/21835</p>	
	<p>Objection – the incidents at Murton and Osbaldwick traveller sites over the years set alarm bells ringing when traveller sites are proposed.</p>	<p>10329/26019</p>	
	<p>Objection – there is a safety aspect of the site being opposite a play area, sports field and medical centre. The proposal will add further traffic hazards. Plans should consider the visual amenity and rural character of the area. Infrastructure in the village is at capacity.</p>	<p>10345/26040</p>	
	<p>Objection – not in any way proportionate or appropriate. Traveller sites in York are not currently at capacity, there is no need for more pitches. This site has been turned</p>	<p>10374/25120</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	down for housing in the past due to greenbelt location and the site being environmentally sensitive. This site would clearly harm the character and setting of the local area. The road can be very busy at times and this would increase the number of vehicles and road hazards. The village amenities are at capacity and cannot sustain more development.		
<b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – area is included in Green Belt. Not aware of pressing need for development of any kind including Gypsy and travellers' site that would justify cutting into the green belt land, with the consequent loss of agricultural land and natural habitat.	10382/21862	
	Objection – green belt land, previous developments have been refused because of this. Increased vehicles/machinery from a traveller's site would be incompatible with green belt. There is no proven need for a traveller site and the proposed size of the site is unsustainable in Elvington. There are no 'very special circumstances' to justify development of the site. The infrastructure may not be able to cope.	10406/22498	
	Objection - green belt land, housing has already been refused on the site. Planned in the middle of the village harm the character and appearance of the village. When events are held at the sports club the area becomes congested an access point along with potential trailers entering and exiting will increase the risk of accidents. School – any increase in numbers would result in taking more field space away from the children.	10413/22509	
	Objection – the proposed land has previously been rejected for residential development as it is Green Belt land. The site would be visually intrusive on Green Belt land. Elvington is a rural community which has already lost some of its Green Belt land to other developments. The location is on a busy main road near the school, doctors surgery, sports club and children's play area which already has traffic congestion with large numbers of parked cars at school opening/closing times and during sporting events. Increased traffic and heavy use of vehicles as favoured by travellers would be hazardous for both drivers and pedestrians. Provisions need to be made for travelling family and grazing animals. There is a lack of infrastructure in the village. The nearby doctor's surgery, businesses and residential properties would offer no privacy for the occupants.	10414/22510	
	Objection – inappropriate to have travellers site in centre of village. Development was previously deemed inappropriate.	10423/22520	
	Objection - such a development would be detrimental to the traditional and rural character of the village and to its appearance. This land has previously been rejected	10426/22088	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	for development, on of the reasons being that the land floods.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – green belt land. In the middle of the rural village. Would damage the visual amenity of the village. The site is vulnerable to flooding. Site is located on the corner of a busy road. There is no post office. There is limited public transport. Sewerage system is at capacity. Unoccupied pitches in Fulford.	10443/22524	
	Objection – this would increase traffic congestion within the village, this is an inappropriate location for such a site, and this would spoil the image of the village and dramatically change the environment. This is the same position as Dunnington that has since been rejected.	10445/22530	
	Objection – the site has been rejected by the Planning Inspector. It is an inappropriate site as it is opposite a children’s play area, a sports club and local surgery. The land floods. It would be detrimental to the visual approach to the village. The consultation report did not include the local community so it should be discounted. Access is dangerous, close to a blind bend. Elvington already has sites for caravans and travelling show people. The area could be used for residential development, which has not been discussed. The proposal is opposed by village residents.	10446/22535	
	Objection – the site is inappropriate as it is the centre of a rural village, near a primary school and medical centre and has been rejected for development.	10447/22539	
	Objection – the site is inappropriate as it is the centre of a rural village, near a primary school and medical centre and has been rejected for development.	10448/22541	
	Objection – greenbelt land. Detract from visual amenity. The site is on a busy road, leading to safety risks. The site doesn’t have sufficient sewerage disposal potential. No space for essential travelling peoples amenities. Unoccupied site at Fulford.	10453/22555	
	Objection - totally inappropriate for a traveller's site. It will look very untidy and ruin the look of the village. It will make playing at the playground more dangerous for the children with the increased amount of traffic.	10456/22093	
	Objection - this is green belt land. One of the many purposes for designating land as green belt land is to protect and preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and villages. Elvington falls very firmly into this category. Developing a traveller site in the middle of the village will very definitely impact on the character and setting of this long established village. The size of the proposed development is also disproportionate to the size of the village and unsustainable. This is particularly concerning as there is no proven need for traveller accommodation in this area. Access to and from the site is also of great concern. It is planned to be located on a	10457/22566	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>busy road and vehicles towing caravans in and out of the site will impact on congestion and road safety. Road safety in this area is of high concern especially for young children as it is located opposite the sports centre and playground. Green Belt land is also very important for allowing wildlife to flourish in the area, turning this section of land into a traveller site will have an impact on the local wildlife in the area.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - impact on the character and nature of the village and its community, as well as infringing in the Green Belt which already has had residential development refused. The village is too small to support such an increase in population. An increase in vehicle access and the main road would not cope, especially being so close to the village school; sports club and doctors surgery with on road parking already being such a hazard during evening and weekend sports fixtures and school drop off and pick up times. This make the area hazardous to both drivers and pedestrians as there is not a clear view for crossing the road or driving. Turning traffic will interfere with the free flow of traffic on the B1228 thereby creating another traffic hazard. The use and presence of machinery and generators are incompatible with the environmental interest of the area. Nearby businesses and residential properties including the doctor's surgery would overlook the proposed site, affording the inhabitants no privacy, regardless of any additional landscaping measures. It would not be in the best interest and welfare of the gypsies having a site with a lack of a proper bus service, no post office, no shops and other amenities except the village store, the site overlooked by neighbouring houses and business properties so they have no privacy, safety of access to and from the proposed site both for vehicles and people on foot , the noise of the school at playtimes, noise from the out of school club, football matches, social events, congestion around the site when events are on.</p>	<p>10459/22571</p>	
	<p>Objection - the removal of this area 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 from 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</p>	<p>10461/22574</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>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 from 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 from 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><b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this is not a place to put traveller when it is so near to the sports club and children play area. It will ruin the village visually, make the road dangerous.</p>	10462/22095	
	<p>Objection – previous planning application for residential development was previously refused at this site for the following reasons, the proposed development would be contrary to the provisions included in the development plan, the proposed development would be situated within the green Belt proposed for the area, turning traffic for ay estate road junction will interfere with the free flow of traffic on the class II road B1228 thereby creating a traffic hazard In addition, the intensification of vehicle use and the presence of machinery and generators which are associated with Gypsy/Traveller Site are incompatible with the environmental interest. Detailed comments regarding national policy – see rep.</p>	10463/22576	
	<p>Objection - greenbelt and site access. With as many as 20 or so caravans the access point will be much busier. This is a totally inappropriate site opposite a sports club; children's play area and the main surgery building. The site would be detrimental to the appearance of the approach to the village and should not be considered. This sort of infill site would be better used for a small number of residential properties which is what the owners really want, even though it would be on a green field site.</p>	10464/22100	
	<p>Objection – road safety issues. Access is difficult and dangerous. Increased traffic, increasing road safety risks. No pedestrian footpath. Danger to small children. Parking will get worse</p>	10465/22578	
	<p>Objection – opposite children's play area, sports club and doctors surgery, and has no safe access. The land floods. The land should be green belt. Detrimental to small community</p>	10466/22581	
	<p>Objection – greenbelt land that should only used in exceptional circumstances which have not been demonstrated. Brownfield sites should be prioritised. Area already suffers from inadequate parking and transport infrastructure. Likely to increase higher safety incidences. Land floods. The school and doctor's surgery are full. Other</p>	10468/22582	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	facilities in the village are limited.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection- previously rejected for residential development. Council can only consider using green belt land in “exceptional circumstances”, not aware that there are. Vehicle usage and other machinery would be against the environmental interests of the site. Recommended site is opposite existing playing field on a stretch of road which already suffers from inadequate parking and transport infrastructure. Culverts bordering two sides of the site, caravans would be susceptible to flood damage. Elvington school and Doctors surgery are already full, additional demand on their services would lengthen already long wait times.	10469/22586	
	Objection- area of development is in green belt therefore is environmentally sensitive. Gypsy sites must have space for visiting family members; the site would need extra land for grazing animals. Site would be an eyesore, not far from a designated conservation area. The land is known to flood so would be highly inappropriate for a caravan site. Village play area is opposite the site which means there would be a high number of children crossing the road. Sewerage system in the village is already at capacity and there is already a site in Fulford which is privately managed with unoccupied pitches.	10470/22586	
	Objection- inappropriate location, opposite children’s play area. Flood plain. School already to capacity. Not visually acceptable.	10471/22587	
	Objection- inappropriate position. Poor drainage of land. Access dangerous. Vast opposition by many residents.	10473/22590	
	Objection – previously rejected. Liable to flooding. Detrimental to visual approach of the village. Disproportionate to the size of the village. Great strain on amenities. Access is dangerous.	10475/22599	
	Objection – greenbelt site. The size of the site is unsustainable by the village. Adverse effect on the village approach and setting. Encroachment into the countryside. There are infrastructure issues. Access to the site would be dangerous. No special circumstances to warrant use of green belt.	10476/22601	
	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.	10476/22612	
	Objection – already rejected for residential use. Unsuitable for travellers due to increased traffic and imposition on overstrained services and infrastructure.	10483/22623	
	Objection – has been previously rejected. Access to the health centre, sports club and playground would be dangerous. Gypsies prefer to be further away from local	10484/22627	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	residents.		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – land has been determined unsuitable for residential use. Land has poor access, traffic problems, environmental value and dangerous positioning. Unsuitable for a village of less than 100 people</p>	10486/22633	
	<p>Objection- would impact on the character and nature of the village and its community as well as infringing on the green belt, which has already had residential development refused. Contradiction to the government policy of allocating brown field sites first before even considering green belt land. A site of this size would increase vehicle access and the main road will not cope. Road parking is already a hazard. Site being so close to the main road would be an eyesore and harmful to the appearance and character of the village. Nearby business and residential properties would overlook proposed site, affording the inhabitants no privacy. School and doctors surgery are already at capacity, sewage system within the village is also at capacity.</p>	10488/22641	
	<p>Objection – impact in the character and nature of the village. Unsustainable for the village. Problems with the increase of vehicles. Inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Harmful to the appearance and character of the village. Limited amenities and services. Sewage system at capacity. Bad impact in gypsies lives due to limited amenities and disturbances around the area.</p>	10489/22647	
	<p>Objection – land is in the ‘Green Belt’. Machinery and generators incompatible with the environmental interest. Not supported by the ‘Planning Policy for traveller sites’.</p>	10490/22648	
	<p>Objection- site is unsuitable for residential use beyond low density housing as it is subject to flooding, positioned on a blind corner of a bus road and has environmental value. The visual approach to the historic core of the village would be damaged. A traveller site to accommodate up to 60 people is disproportionate for a village of less than 1000 residents and unsustainable given the lack of infrastructure.</p>	10492/22652	
	<p>Objection – increased traffic along York Road and access to site needs addressing. The village playground and sports field are opposite the proposed site, increasing the number of children crossing the road. This is hazardous for drivers and pedestrians. a green belt site and so contradicts the government’s policy of allocation of brown field sites. Use of green belt land as Traveller’s Sites is only approved in special circumstances. The proposed size of the site would be inappropriate for a village the size of Elvington. Previous development applications have been refused.</p>	10498/22666	
	<p>Objection – already been rejected by the planning inspector. Inappropriate site, as it is opposite a children’s play area, sports club and a surgery. The area suffers from</p>	10500/22669	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	flooding. Access to the site is close to a blind bend, and opposite a busy car park. Would support residential development on the site.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the site is in the green belt, and previously rejected. Government policy states Brownfield used before Greenfield. Government policy states green belt only used in exceptional circumstances. The site is proposed on a main road, making access to the site dangerous. Local amenities are limited, and no public transport. Local schools can't cope with extra students.	10501/22670	
	Objection - the site is in the green belt, and previously rejected. Government policy states Brownfield used before Greenfield. Government policy states green belt only used in exceptional circumstances. The site is proposed on a main road, making access to the site dangerous. Local amenities are limited, and no public transport. Local schools can't cope with extra students.	10502/22671	
	Support – situated half a mile from the historic heart of the city, therefore can have no effect on the visual character of the village. The site is directly opposite the industrial estate, which has 20 foot high chemical containers, visible from the roadside. On the same side of the road as the proposed site, there are sewage works and other utility buildings. This cannot be considered rural or greenbelt. The site borders the main road, therefore would provide direct access to the road network without causing any inconvenience. There are frequent visits from chemical tankers and other heavy goods vehicles, which has a higher effect on traffic that the site would. The proposed site has no history of flooding. The site contains a row of trees, which if preserved, will provide complete privacy for residents.	10504/22678	
	Objection – the proposal threatens the community spirit and contribution to the village. Site has already been rejected. Inappropriate site for the traveller site, opposite play area and surgery. Community was not consulted. Access is dangerous due to being near a blind bend.	10506/22681	
	Objection – lack of school spaces. Increase in traffic on small roads. Character of village would be ruined	10507/22682	
	Objection – insufficient resources to support an increased population. Roads are too small to cope	10510/22687	
	Objection – land not appropriate for use as it is green belt land. Confirmation of special circumstances leading to change in land classification required. Confirm if Brownfield land has been considered. The distinctive character of the village would be detrimentally affected. Development would increase the likelihood of accidents, and endanger those trying to cross to get to the playground.	10512/22692	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – greenbelt land unsuitable for residential living. Unsuitable infrastructure in place. The size of the village is disproportionate to the size of the travellers site. There is no provision for grazing animals. There are no special circumstances to warrant removing the green belt land. Access would be dangerous, as the entrance is on a blind bend.</p>	<p>10515/22696</p>	
	<p>Objection – greenbelt land unsuitable for residential development. The size of the site is incompatible with the village. There is no proof that the site is needed. Government policy of using Brownfield before Greenfield has not been adhered to. The site would impair the look of the village and neighbouring properties. Access is located on the corner of a busy road, which could be dangerous. The infrastructure of the village would fail to cope with the increase in people. The school is full and there is limited public transport. The sewage system is already at capacity. Nearby traveller sites are currently unoccupied</p>	<p>10519/22703</p>	
	<p>Objection –position of the site, opposite the sports club and children’s park, has been badly thought out. Traffic congestion would be too much for Elvington Lane if a large site were to be built opposite. Potential hazard for children crossing the road with the increased traffic.</p>	<p>10520/22705</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. The site is a concern as it would mean a completely disproportionate and unsustainable increase in village population, in such a short time. Local amenities and infrastructure are already overtaxed and /or barely adequate. The local primary school is at capacity. The proposal ignores better suited brown field development of unused sites around York, in favour of green-belt and rural development. Such development goes against any rural character or desire to maintain such character. The private traveller site in Fulford is yet to reach capacity, the development, it seems, is not needed at all. Current need should be addressed – the site it appears is not informed by current or future need. There is no provision for grazing of animals in the plan, as tethered horses are a problem, posing a risk of collision to motorists. Also the site is prone to flooding and busy with traffic, which is a danger to all children.</p>	<p>10521/22706</p>	
	<p>Objection – the current site has substantial wildlife. The site is on a busy B road, already saturated with traffic. There are industrial sites close by, with high HGV activity and excessive noise. Development of the proposed site would further congest the area. Elvington is a small village with limited facilities. There would be further traffic congestion opposite the sports club, which already proves noisy, for those living nearby, during evening events.</p>	<p>10522/22707</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - increase in traffic is dangerous near children's play area. Rejected by the planning inspector. The community were not consulted. There is already a site in the village. This proposal is disproportionate to village size. This was rejected in larger village of Dunnington so should be rejected in Elvington. Demand does not exist as current site is under utilised. Rejected by residents.</p>	<p>10524/21322</p>	
	<p>Objection – greenbelt land that has been rejected for housing for this reason. No proof of a need for this site in this location. Government guidance is for brownfield sites first. Would mean 7% of population are travellers, national average is 0.1%. There is not sufficient provision for grazing animals. Prominent position which would be harmful to the character of the village therefore contradicts 2005 Local Plan. Occupants will not be afforded any privacy as the site is overlooked. Flood risk. Access concerns.</p>	<p>10527/22717</p>	
	<p>Objection- the road is extremely busy. Further traffic would add further pressure. When sporting activities take place parking spills over onto the road so access to the development would be dangerous. A development opposite the sports club would be affected by noise during events. Infrastructure could not cope with an increase in numbers. Residential use of the site would impact on existing wildlife population. The site would impact on the children's play area, harming the outlook and increasing the traffic. Village amenities are already at capacity. Unoccupied pitches in Fulford.</p>	<p>10528/22718</p>	
	<p>Objection – caravans incongruous with conventional buildings; detract from visual appeal of the village. Not safe entering and leaving the site by vehicle due to bend in the road and density of traffic.</p>	<p>10529/22719</p>	
	<p>Objection –would be out of character with the surrounding buildings. Also lead to vehicles emerging onto a dangerous bend.</p>	<p>10532 /22737</p>	
	<p>Objection – road safety as mayor concern. Higher volume increases the risk of traffic injuries: vehicular incidents or vehicle versus pedestrian. Increase in traffic. High speed of vehicles and roads ruined. The increase in village population will impact the school. Travellers will impact the village's character. Village status will be lost. Increase of congestion. Plan is detrimental to the village in every way.</p>	<p>10536/22741</p>	
	<p>Objection – road already saturated with vehicles and heavy traffic. Increase of danger for children. Possible disturbance due to late social events at the club. Increase risk of accidents. Limited amenities within the village: doctors and school would struggle to accommodate any increase. Wildlife in the site.</p>	<p>10538/22744</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Not the right environment for such a site. Concerns about appearance or issues such as crime, house devaluation, etc.</p>	<p>10540/22749</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection - this is disproportionate to the size of Elvington where there is already an under utilised site. To facilitate the travelling show people in a number of site locations is more desirable. This is a smaller village than Dunnington which was rejected for this and so Elvington should be unsuitable on the same grounds. The 'consultants report' did not consult with the residents all findings in it should be rejected. A dangerous increase in traffic near a children's play area makes this inappropriate for the safety of our villagers. The land floods and is not appropriate for development into a traveller site. The local Parish Council and local residents do not support the proposal.</p>	<p>10542/22756</p>	
	<p>Objection – 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. The village character should be substantially retained. This site will inevitably look an eyesore, with several pitches, ancillary vehicles and will detract from the nuclear village concept and character of Elvington. The proposal represents a potentially large and significant change to the village population. Allow one or two pitches, and let the village accept gypsies in a proportionate way: that would be commensurate with normal organic growth. But such a significant number would adversely affect the character of the village. This land is currently Green Belt. That is for a purpose: to retain the rural nature of the community. The B1228 through Elvington is already over-loaded and increasingly hazardous for villagers.</p>	<p>10543/19199</p>	
	<p>Objection – would totally spoil the visual approach to the village. This would also be ludicrous opposite the proposed 100 houses in the original draft not to mention the dangerous access/exit onto the main road being close to a blind bend and opposite a bus entrance to a car park. There are already sites for touring caravans and travelling showpeople therefore the new site would be disproportionate. The consultant's report is one sided as the community were not consulted and therefore it should be discounted. It is opposed by the vast majority of village residents. Location would cause problems for services opposite it. Visual approach of the village would be spoilt. Plans previously thrown out in Dunnington. Consultants report is one sided, and community weren't consulted.</p>	<p>10581/22776</p>	
	<p>Support –there are sufficient safeguards and caveats in place to ensure that appropriate measures can be taken to mitigate against undue pressure on infrastructure and amenities. Current site can easily provide without any difficulties.</p>	<p>10596/22811</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this site is contrary to national greenbelt policies. Brownfield land should be used first. This has been refused for development in the past. The roads need improving and the infrastructure in the village cannot support further development.</p>	<p>10597/26099</p>	
	<p>Objection – this site has been previously rejected as it is in the greenbelt and is environmentally sensitive. It is unsustainable for a village the size of Elvington. The plan does not mention how this will be managed or where grazing will be to support a site. This site is prone to flooding. It would encroach on the open countryside and would be detrimental to the visual amenity and attractiveness of the village. Caravans are vulnerable to flooding. Access is on a bend. The road has no pedestrian footpath. The infrastructure is already at capacity in the village.</p>	<p>10604/26103</p>	
	<p>Objection – no proven need for the site. Brownfield land available. No special circumstances, which are required to develop on green belt land. There is no infrastructure in place to support the increase in people.</p>	<p>10608/20368</p>	
	<p>Objection – detrimental to the visual approach to the village and inappropriate for a travellers site. Risk of flooding and opposite to a children's play area and sports club.</p>	<p>10627/20402</p>	
	<p>Objection - minimal and overstretched amenities within the village. Schools and GP practice at capacity. Very busy road.</p>	<p>10628/20406</p>	
	<p>Objection – no current need for Gypsy &amp; Traveller accommodation in the York area. Harmful to the character of the local area and encroach on the open countryside and the attractive rural character of the village. Very high local water table, so extremely prone to flooding site. Very dangerous due to the busy main road. Suitable brownfield site should be allocated first. Full school.</p>	<p>10631/20410</p>	
	<p>Objection – greenbelt. School and doctors surgery at capacity. Need of improved transport. Vacant pitches at the privately managed gypsy and traveller site in Fulford.</p>	<p>10632/20415</p>	
	<p>Objection – would impact too much on the character and nature of the village and its community. Infringe on the green belt. Site has had residential development refused. It is inappropriate and unsustainable for the size of the village. The green belt must be retained, otherwise it is in direct contravention of government policy of allocating brown field sites first, before considering green belt. Increase in vehicle access means the main road could not cope, parking causing a hazard. Turning traffic will cause a further hazard. Use and presence of machinery and generators are incompatible with the environmental interests of the area. It would harm the openness of the green belt, be an eyesore and harmful to the appearance and character of the village. Nearby businesses and residential properties would overlook</p>	<p>10635/20423</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>the proposed site affording inhabitants no privacy. The village school is full. There are long waiting lists at the doctors' surgery. The sewage system is at capacity. As well as the above, this is not in the interests of the gypsies – a site with a lack of amenities. Safe access to the site is a concern as is noise from school, football matches, social events etc which would impact on inhabitants of the site.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – would impact too much on the character and nature of the village and its community and infringe on the green belt, which has had residential development refused. It is inappropriate and unsustainable for the size of the village. The green belt must be retained, otherwise it is in direct contravention of government policy of allocating brown field sites first, before considering green belt. Increase in vehicle access means the main road could not cope, parking causing a hazard. Turning traffic will cause a further hazard. Use and presence of machinery and generators are incompatible with the environmental interests of the area. It would harm the openness of the green belt, be an eyesore and harmful to the appearance and character of the village. Nearby businesses and residential properties would overlook the proposed site affording inhabitants no privacy. The village school is full. There are long waiting lists at the doctors' surgery. The sewage system is at capacity. As well as the above, this is not in the interests of the gypsies – a site with a lack of amenities. Safe access to the site is a concern as is noise from school, football matches, social events etc which would impact on inhabitants of the site.</p>	<p>10641/19724</p>	
	<p>Objection- this site has already been rejected due to it being Green Belt land and the highway access. The highway access is very important as opposite this proposed site we have a children's play area, sports club and doctors surgery. The land in question is disproportionate to the size of the village and opposed by a vast majority of residents. If the site is not rejected it will have a detrimental effect on the current residents of the village and for the people who have to come to the village to use the current medical and educational amenities.</p>	<p>10646/19576</p>	
	<p>Objection – the land for this proposal is in the greenbelt and any development for any purpose, is not in the best interests of the environment. To use green belt land for this purpose is a direct contradiction of government policy of considering brown field sites first. The proposal is inappropriate for the size for the village. Seven permanent pitches of 3 caravans each could accommodate in excess of 60 individuals. A site of this size is inappropriate for the size of the village representing approx. 7% of the village population. Elvington has only one small shop, one pub and no post office. Public Transport to allow access to other facilities further afield is very</p>	<p>10647/19578</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	limited. This could potentially present problems for travellers without their own transport.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – land is Greenbelt land. The lands proposed for development into a gypsy and travellers’ site is in greenbelt and has been rejected before as a residential development because it is Greenbelt and environmentally sensitive. Therefore surely it cannot be suitable for use as described in the proposal. The government considers gypsy and travellers’ sites to amount to ‘inappropriate development’ in the Greenbelt and that development of this nature ‘should not be approved except in very special circumstances’ or ‘exceptional circumstances’. There are no ‘very special’ or ‘exceptional’ circumstances in this proposal.	10648/19736	
	Objection – the site has already been rejected for development by the Planning Inspector. Inappropriate location for a traveller site. Detrimental to the visual approach to the village. Consultants report is one sided as the community were not consulted. Access is dangerous as it is close to a blind bend and opposite busy car park. The land floods. Use for residential development, which owners would prefer.	10649/19738	
	Objection – this site has already been rejected by the planning inspector and it greenbelt land. This is against the overwhelming majority of the village’s wishes.	10654/19587	
	Objection – there are plenty of sites across York, Elvington is too remote.	10656/19590	
	Objection – intention to utilise Greenbelt land here goes against National Planning Policy. The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites document clearly states the governments view the gypsy and traveller sites are “inappropriate development” in the Greenbelt and that such development “should not be approved except in very special circumstances.” The location of the proposed site will dramatically alter the character of the village and detract from its current appeal. Elvington is a very natural looking village and the proposed site will harm that. This seems to conflict with policies GB4 and H7 of the CYC Draft Local Plan (fourth set of changes).	10664/19755	
	Objection – congestion is already a problem outside the site. Danger to children and adults would be increased. Village has few amenities.	10668/19761	
	Objection – inappropriate location of travellers site as it is opposite a children play area, sport club and surgery. Detrimental to visual approach to the village.	10669/19604	
	Objection – inappropriate location. Detrimental to visual approach to the village.	10670/19762	
	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.	10683/19794	
	Objection – location would have an adverse effect on the visual approach of the	10684/19799	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – inappropriate for a small village. School is at capacity. Roads are already dangerous. Site is green belt land and refused permission before.	10689/19808	
	Objection – no proven demand for the site. Access to land is inadequate for development. Site would cause problems for road users. Site is prone to flooding. The character of the village would be damaged.	10693/19816	
	Objection – as this is an area of greenbelt that has previously been rejected for residential development because it is greenbelt and it is environmentally sensitive. Site is on a bend on the only road through Elvington, concerns re: from a road safety perspective especially as the children’s playground and sports field is immediately opposite. The prominent location would be harmful to the character and appearance of the village. The site is bordered on two sides by open culverts and given the vulnerability of caravans to flooding significant engineering would be required to ensure caravans are not impacted by rising waters. Planning policy for gypsy traveller sites states ‘fair and equal treatment for travellers’- not preferential treatment. Planning permission for residential use has already been refused on this greenfield land so a gypsy camp site should be refused for the same reasons.	10697/19826	
	Objection – there are far too many new houses planned. Too much land will be taken from green belt. The site for the travellers is inappropriate opposite playground.	10702/19839	Elvington Village Action Group
	Objection – the owners would prefer residential development and this would not seem unreasonable.	10710/19854	
	Objection- Elvington does not have enough space at the current sports field to accommodate the growing club. Restricts the club from entering and competing in the York league. The land, opposite sports club, that is proposed as a gypsy site would be better used as an extension to the sports club. Necessary funds could be raised to purchase the land by the club and this would then be seen as an additional and needed amenity for the residents and other people living close by. Using this land for gypsy site has the following issues in Elvington, lack of proper bus service, lack of post office, lack of amenities, congestion around the site when events are on every weekend.	10715/19866	
	Objection – unsuitable and out of keeping with the nature of the village.	10724/19883	
	Objection – the land is within green belt and has previously been turned down for residential planning. The number of proposed pitches is not sustainable for such a small village. The proposed site would be harmful to the appearance and character of the village. The proposed site would be overlooked on two sides meaning a lack of	10730/19892	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>privacy for both the current residents and the gypsies. This is contrary to guidelines laid down in the draft plan. The site is located on a busy road at a blind corner. Extra burden would be put on local surgery and school which are both at capacity. Empty sites, privately managed are already nearby and not at capacity.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – greenbelt land. No proven need for traveller accommodation here. Direct contradiction of the national policy of allocation brown-field sites first. Unsuitable on environmental grounds for a village the size of Elvington. No grazing for animals. Full school. Not special circumstances or exceptional circumstances. Preferential treatment and no member of the settled community would be given planning permission/residency rights to occupy the green field site. The character and appearance of the local area would undoubtedly be harmed. Near a designated conservation area. Regular land floods. Sewage system at capacity. Traffic hazard. Difficult and dangerous access to the site.</p>	<p>10733/19904</p>	
	<p>Objection – greenbelt land with previous rejected housing development. No proven need for traveller accommodation here. Not qualify as ‘rural exception site’. Direct contradiction of the national policy of allocating brown-field sites first. Unsuitable on environmental grounds for a village this size. No grazing for their horses. Full school. No very special or exceptional circumstances warrant the change in green belt status. Character and appearance of the local area would undoubtedly be harmed. Totally inappropriate with regard to the character and nature of properties and village. Direct contradiction of the existing policies of the city of York Draft Local Plan. Regular floods. Very busy roads. Road safety issues. Medical Practice at capacity, as well as the sewage system.</p>	<p>10738/19928</p>	
	<p>Objection – no proven need for the site. Inappropriate development of the green belt. Site would be disproportionate with the rest of the village. Opposite busy amenities, so dangerous to visitors. The land is susceptible to flood.</p>	<p>10745/19938</p>	
	<p>Objection – this site has already been rejected by the Planning inspector due to green belt and highway access. It is an inappropriate location for the proposed site as the land floods, it is opposite local amenities (medical centre, sports facilities and children’s play area) and it will have negative visual impact on approaching the village. There will be increased traffic and access to the site is dangerous as it is close to a blind bend and opposite the entrance to car parks. School and Sport centre traffic park along the road reducing the road to single lane and limited vision which would create an accident black spot at the entrance to the site. The proposal is disproportionate for the village which presently has a site for touring caravans and a</p>	<p>10756/20639</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	site for travelling show people.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – increase in traffic. Inappropriate location. Land could be used for residential development. In the green belt.	10757/19984	
	Objection – classified as green belt land. Development would increase traffic on busy roads. Village has few amenities.	10761/19995	
	Objection – green belt. The village school is at max capacity and the general facilities don't warrant a development of this size. The site proposed opposite the sports club/kid's playground is inappropriate for travellers with significant traffic issues.	10764/19999	
	Objection – this proposal is totally unfit for a rural village with a small community, limited public transport and few local facilities. The site proposed is green belt land. The land has already been refused planning permission - it is susceptible to flooding and regularly floods during winter. The council have not dealt with the current high levels of traffic and the speed of the traffic through the village.	10766/20007	
	Objection - this land has been previously rejected for residential development due to it being Green Belt and environmentally sensitive. Existing sewage/drainage infrastructure is already at full capacity. Brownfield sites should be considered first. The site is inappropriate for a traveller site of this sizes it will vastly increase the amount of traffic at Elvington Lane. When the sports club is in use vehicles are parked along this stretch of road. There is an existing under occupied Gypsy/Traveller site in Fulford. The extra traveller pitches in Elvington will make it a disproportionate number for the village, equating to 7% of the village population. The land floods. The village infrastructure cannot support this development.	10794/21323	
	Objection – road safety concerns. Crime increases a concern. Would spoil what is aesthetically a very pleasant approach to the village.	10810/21332	
	Objection- the site has already been rejected by the planning Dept as being unfit for development. It is prone to flooding and is on a blind bend on a busy road. It is directly opposite amenities that already attract a good deal of moving and stationary traffic- medical/ play area/ social club. This would create additional dangers for road users.	10816/21622	
	Objection- proposed site is in green belt, previous applications to build on this site have been refused because of this. Elvington Main Street suffers from high volumes of traffic; this proposal will add to an already struggling network. No evidence of proven need for traveller accommodation in this location. Allocating this site for development is in direct contradiction to the government policy of allocating brown-field sites first. This development is inappropriate and unsustainable for a village the	10818/21360	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>size of Elvington, there would be additional temporary pitches in addition to the stated numbers. Concerns that the site does not include provision for grazing animals. No “exceptional circumstances” that would warrant the change in Greenbelt status as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework. Will be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area. The proposal conflicts with policy GB4 and policy H7 of the City of York Draft Local Plan 2006. They will be places in the middle of the village on a busy road where the school is already full and high demand for the doctor’s surgery already creates significant delays.</p>		
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b> <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection- see survey 4. The village has seen a considerable number of both small and large housing 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. Any or all of these proposals will have a significant impact on the residents of Wheldrake due to increased traffic numbers and congestion on Fulford road and Hull road, Increased vehicle numbers will create gridlock. Increase in dwelling numbers is not proven to be required.</p>	<p>10822/21366</p>	
	<p>Objection- Will adversely impact the character of the village and have an unacceptable impact on the landscape. Would be visually completely unacceptable. Additional screening could mitigate some of the above, however this in itself would have an unacceptable impact on the character and landscape of the village. The village school is already at capacity and would be unable to accommodate the additional children moving in. The Mains and sewage are also already at capacity. Additional traffic will also pose further road safety issues. Large vehicles turning into and out of the sites pose a significant road safety issue.</p>	<p>10830/21378</p>	
	<p>Objection- see survey 2. Placing the pitches in a small rural village will adversely impact the character and landscape of the village. Additional screening could mitigate some of the above, however this would have unacceptable impact on the character and landscape of the village. The village school is already at capacity and would be unable to accommodate the additional children moving into the pitches. The mains drainage and sewage are also already at capacity. Additional traffic will also pose further road safety issues, particularly large vehicles going into and out of the sites pose a significant road safety issue.</p>	<p>10832/21383</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection- size of the site is unsuitable for a rural village. Development in this location would have an adverse effect on the he approach into the village, as well as on the character and appearance of this beautiful village. Access to the site would be dangerous, due to its location. The development is also disproportionate to the village. Additional concerns about the school being at capacity.</p>	<p>10840/21398</p>	
	<p>Objection- no need for further gypsy and traveller accommodation in the York area. Unoccupied pitches at nearby privately managed site. Brown field sites should be allocated first. The size and sitting of the site is unsustainable for a rural village. The land floods. Development on this location would have an adverse effect on the villages approach and setting, as well as on the character and appearance of the area. Infrastructure issues such as the sewage treatment work is already at capacity, an infrequent bus service and a school with no room for expansion. Development is disproportionate to the village as already have a site for touring caravans and a site for travelling show people. Access to this site would be dangerous. No special circumstances that would warrant loss of greenbelt.</p>	<p>10842/21404</p>	
	<p>Objection- no proven need for further Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Unoccupied pitches at a nearby privately managed site. Brown field should be allocated first. The land floods. Development in this location would have an adverse effect on the villages approach and setting. Infrastructure issues such as the sewage, infrequent bus service and a school with no room for expansion. Already have a site for touring caravans and a site for Travelling show people. Access to the site would be dangerous. No special circumstances to warrant loss of greenbelt. Developments should be proportionate to the needs of the location.</p>	<p>10845/21412</p>	
	<p>Objection- Should remain as greenbelt. Proposed land is on a dangerous corner on a very busy road. Eyesore. When playing fields are in use there cane be 40 cars parked on the road, any more activity will cause chaos. In nearby wood bat activity has been recorded.</p>	<p>10859/21474</p>	
	<p>Objection – the site is on the corner of a busy road, access to the site would be hazardous. There is no pedestrian path. The proposal will pose a further danger for children in the area from traffic accidents. Previous planning applications have been refused on the ground of greenbelt. This site should be refused on the impact on the greenbelt, visual amenity and attractive rural character of the area. This development is close to the heart of the village, the proposal would conflict with the Local Plan, 4<sup>th</sup> set of changes. There are unoccupied pitches in York.</p>	<p>10866/25867</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – this proposal will harm the wildlife in the area. This site is located on a bend which would create a traffic accident risk. The school is at capacity. This is greenbelt.</p>	<p>10870/25870</p>	
	<p>Objection- the proposed site would be harmful to the overall nature of the village. Nearby businesses and residential properties including the GP surgery would overlook the proposed site, affording the inhabitants no privacy, regardless of any additional landscaping measures. Elvington primary school, GP surgery and the sewage system in the village are all already at capacity. The site has previously been rejected for residential development because it is greenbelt and environmentally important to the nature of our village. The site does not include provision for grazing animals, which are an aspect of gypsy life. Nearby land would have to be made available and this can't be guaranteed to be managed properly.</p>	<p>10888/21495</p>	
	<p>Objection- traffic through the village; at the moment there are too many HGVs travelling at speed through the village and the roads are not maintained or built or designed to carry so much traffic. Children walking to school are in danger of the HGVs mounting kerbs as the road is not wide enough for them to go side by side. Need to protect the environment for local wildlife. If there was a proposal to bypass the village and have a direct road access to the A64 then this proposal could be supported.</p>	<p>10892/21500</p>	
	<p>Objection - the site is in Green Belt and has already been rejected for development. The size of the proposed site is disproportionate for a small rural village. The site is opposed by the vast majority of village residents as evidenced at a series of recent public meetings. The village infrastructure is already either operating at capacity or very limited. Would have a negative effect on the village's character and approach. There is already a Travelling Show Peoples site and a touring caravan site a short distance away from this land. There has been confusion over the site due to the boundary on the map being inaccurate and therefore it may not have been properly assessed. Highway access would be dangerous due to the proximity of existing accesses to a range of facilities, homes and businesses.</p>	<p>10896/21511</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. The land is Green Belt and has previously been rejected for residential development for this reason and it is environmentally sensitive. The travellers would make up 7% of the population whereas regionally and nationally gypsies and travellers account for just 0.1% of the population. There is no privacy for the site, access is only onto the busy main road where children cross for the playground and the sports club. The local school is already full and high demand for</p>	<p>10898/21514</p>	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	doctors already causes delays in treatment. Public transport is very poor and there is only one small shop and no post office. Amenities are very limited and the sewage system is already under stress.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – land is greenbelt and as such traveller site would harm the openness of the greenbelt and inappropriate. Not followed government policy seeking to allocate brownfield sites. Scale not compatible with small rural village, infrastructure and facilities. No post office, small shop, no useful transport like, sewage and school are full. No provision for grazing horses, land known to flood, negative on wildlife. Site would have a lack of privacy for inhabitants as businesses and residential properties overlook the site. Location would harm visual amenity and character of the village.	10922/21566	
	Objection – currently greenbelt and historically rejected for housing. Will bring pollution to the village, visually unappealing at the heart of the village and near the conservation area. Site offers little privacy to travellers. Susceptible to flooding. Increase in population c.7% inappropriate considering size of the village. Location in centre of village on a bend, increased traffic volumes on very busy road- congestion will be worse and potential traffic hazards turning in and out of the site. Lack of amenities and infrastructure in the area. School, doctors, small village shop, limited bus service. Sewage at capacity.	10926/21570	
	Objection – planning permission has been previously rejected. Land is extremely prone to flooding. Site is inappropriate development in green belt land. The site is very central to the village, and would damage the village's character. There are spare pitches in Fulford.	10935/21583	
	Objection – should not be on a prime site at the entrance to the village. It has already been rejected on greenbelt and highways access. Should be on an industrial estate.	10936/21587	
	Objection – traffic is very heavy. Large lorries on small roads. Road surface is poor. Pipe damage recently on the site, added pressure increases the risk. Sewerage system redeveloped recently, but not sufficient for more people. Doctor's surgery and school at capacity. No post office and only one shop. Almost no buses. Unoccupied pitches in Fulford	10938/21589	
	Objection – badly thought out when only recently a new small development has been built nearby.	10945/21599	
	Objection – village is in danger of losing its distinctive character. Insufficient information about infrastructure implications.	10953/21608	
	Objection – rejected for residential use due to being in the green belt. Site would	10960/21632	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	lead to increase in traffic issues. Access to site is limited. Site is haven for owls. Would be better for the site to be on outskirts of village or on a Brownfield site.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – see survey 2.	11150/27003	
	Objection – see survey 2.	11153/27005	
	Objection – see survey 2.	11156/27008	
	Objection – site is in the green belt, and previously rejected. Contradicts government policy to use Brownfield first. Site would be inappropriate and unsustainable for the village. Development would harm the openness of the green belt. Considered inappropriate development of the green belt. Would be considered harmful to the character and appearance of the village. Site would be located not far from a designated conservation area. Site would be considered a visually dominant development when viewed from neighbouring properties. Putting a travellers site on a location known for flooding is inappropriate. Access on and off the site would be dangerous due to being on a busy road. Site does not have a public footway. Development would cause a safety hazard for children in the area. The sewerage system is at capacity. Previous applications have been refused.	11157/21651	
	Objection – see survey 2.	11158/27010	
	Objection – see survey 2.	11159/27011	
	Objection – see survey 2.	11160/27014	
	Objection – see survey 4	11161/27318	
	Objection – see survey 4	11162/27320	
	Objection – the site would be in an inappropriate location, opposite the children’s play area, sports club and doctors surgery. The site would spoil the village’s appearance. The school is oversubscribed. The residents were not consulted. The site has already been rejected for development.	11163/21656	
	Objection – see survey 4	11164/27322	
	Objection – see survey 4	11166/27324	
	Objection – see survey 4	11167/27326	
	Objection – see survey 4	11168/27328	
	Objection – the size of the proposed development is out of proportion with the village. A successful application is unlikely.	11169/21622	
	Objection – see survey 4	11170/27330	
Objection – see survey 4	11171/27332		
Objection – see survey 4	11172/27334		
Support – see survey 4	11174/27336		

## Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma &amp; Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)	Objection – see survey 4	11175/27338	
	Objection – see survey 4	11177/27340	
	Support – see survey 4	11178/27342	
	Objection – see survey 4	11179/27344	
	Objection – see survey 4	11180/27351	
	Objection – see survey 4	11181/27383	
	Objection – see survey 4	11182/27392	
	Objection – see survey 4	11183/27397	
	Objection – see survey 4	11184/27408	
	Objection – see survey 4	11185/27427	
	Objection – see survey 4	11186/27440	
	Objection – see survey 4	11187/27475	
	Objection – see survey 4	11188/27477	
	Objection – see survey 2. Cannot see any benefit of the proposed traveller site in Elvington. The proposed site is not an appropriate location on a very busy road.	11189/27018	
	Objection – see survey 2.	11191/27020	
	Objection – see survey 2.	11192/27022	
	Objection – see survey 4	11193/27479	
	Objection – see survey 4	11196/27482	
	Objection – see survey 4. The traveller site should be used as housing development rather than as a traveller site. Building a traveller site would cause disruption and discomfort for the local communities. Should the site be used for housing, it would increase local communities.	11197/27484	
	Objection – see survey 2. Don't need travellers in the middle of our village.	11198/27025	
	Objection – see survey 4	11199/27486	
	Objection – see survey 4	11200/27488	
	Objection – see survey 4. No body wants traveller sites, they don't need them and residents shouldn't pay for them and have them on the doorstep.	11201/27490	
Objection – see survey 4	11202/27492		
Objection – see survey 3.	11203/27237		
Objection – see survey 4	11204/27495		
Objection – see survey 4. Comment: The plans are strategically sited in areas where Labour support is minimal. The siting of travellers sites in Elvington being a prime example.	11206/27498		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>747 (YORK016)</b>  <b>Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – see survey 2.</p>	<p>11207/27029</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2.</p>	<p>11210/27032</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 2. Don't accept that extra traveller sites are necessary and certainly shouldn't be located in Green Belt. Position opposite medical centre is completely inappropriate.</p>	<p>11211/27033</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 3.</p>	<p>11212/27240</p>	
	<p>Objection – see survey 4</p>	<p>11214/27500</p>	
	<p>Objection – unfit proposal for a rural village with a small community. Green belt land. Land has been previously rejected. Site is susceptible to flooding. Question whether there is there a proven need for the site.</p>	<p>11216/21915</p>	
	<p>Objection - the development of the 7 pitch site (in effect a site of up to 21 caravans) appears to be an inappropriate use of green belt land and the site in question has many disadvantages. Firstly the site is on a busy road, a road which does not just serve Elvington but also many more outlying villages. In addition to the village traffic there is a considerable amount of heavy goods vehicle traffic, also inappropriate for the village roads. The site lies near to a sports club, which has extremely busy traffic and parking every Saturday. The local school, despite recent development, is already over-stretched, the local sewerage handling facilities are at capacity and local transport facilities are very limited offering little access to the broader amenities of York.</p>	<p>11217/22112</p>	
	<p>Objection – site already rejected for development by the planning inspector. Inappropriate location for a travellers' site as children play in the area. Regular flooding. Detrimental to the visual approach of the village. One-sided consultants report as the community was not consulted. Dangerous access to and from the location. Same reasons to be rejected as that of the Dunnington proposal. Already disproportional development of traveller sites in and around the village. Little or no support to the proposal from the village.</p>	<p>11218/22834</p>	
<p>Objection – it has previously been rejected for residential development because it is green belt and environmentally sensitive. The proposed gypsy &amp; travellers site is considered to represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt as the size, scale and location of the proposed gypsy and travellers' site, together with the activities associated with it, would harm the openness of the Green Belt. Given the prominent location of the proposed gypsy and travellers' site development in the heart of the village it is considered this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area. Given the vulnerability of caravans to flooding, the</p>	<p>11220/22837</p>		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>proposed gypsy and travellers' site development in land which is known to flood is inappropriate. The land is bordered on two sides by open culverts. Significant engineering would be required to ensure the caravans are not impacted by rising waters. The site is located on a corner of a busy road providing the principal access route for several villages and a number of industrial estates in the immediate vicinity, making access onto &amp; off the site difficult &amp; dangerous – especially for vehicles towing caravans &amp; trailers. The sewage system within the village is already at capacity. The recent developments at Roxby Farm &amp; The Conifers have to have large storage tanks and an overnight pumping system to pump sewage away. There are already unoccupied pitches at the nearby privately managed gypsy and traveller site in Fulford, which would enable the occupants to have much better access to public transport and local amenities.</p>		
<b>747 (YORK016)</b>	Objection – see survey 4	11221/27502	
<b>Land at</b>	Objection – see survey 3.	11224/27245	
<b>Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	<p>Objection - the site has already been rejected for development by planning inspector. The site is prone to land floods and is positioned opposite a children's play area, sports facility and surgery and in effect bang in the middle of the village. With ref to site 802 there could be up to 135 extra houses therefore the residential size of the village could increase by 65% with no infrastructure to support this and also no drainage capacity confirmed by Yorkshire water</p>	11250/22205	
	<p>Objection- the local school is already fully capacitated. The Elvington bus route is not very good and certainly not sufficient to send children to further reach schools. The proposal for the site is between two parts of the village and not on the outskirts. The old part of the village is on the main street with reasonable small housing estate set to the rear each side. The proposal for this site is directly in the centre of a large contingency of residence and a directly where hundreds of the villagers converge each Saturday. If indeed York does have a shortage of Gypsy site then a site better suited would be one on outskirts of a village.</p>	11286/22209	
	<p>Objection – the location of the proposed site is currently on Greenbelt land. Development of any kind on Greenbelt land has a detrimental effect on the wildlife and the environment. The site is not in keeping with protecting the environment and the increase of traffic that the site will bring will mean more pollution in the village. The introduction of the site would also mean a greater lack of amenities and infrastructure in the area. The land is susceptible to flooding. It would be inappropriate and unfair to provide land to travelling families which is known to flood.</p>	11295/22219	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The site has been rejected previously for residential development		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection – the site has already been rejected. Inappropriate as children play in the area. Regular floods on the land. Detrimental to visual approach of the village. Accessing the land is dangerous. Disproportionate development of sites in and around the village. Traffic problems. Would put safety of children at risk.	11313/22862	
	Objection – inappropriate site for development. Local services are very busy, causing safety issues. Difficult manoeuvrability.	11314/22869	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11319/27280	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11321/27285	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11322/27288	
	Objection – see survey 3.	11324/27291	
	Objection - the site is on a busy road and would make access onto and off the site difficult and dangerous especially for vehicles towing caravans and trailers. The site is landlocked with no safe available access. Understand that there are empty available sites at the nearby privately managed gypsy and traveller site in Fulford and Fulford has a far greater number of local amenities than Elvington. Also additional temporary pitches for visiting family members have to be available in addition to the numbers proposed. The land suggested is bordered on two sides by open culverts so significant expensive engineering would be required to ensure the caravans are not vulnerable to flooding. There is no provision for animal grazing.	11367/22229	
	Objection – inappropriate location for this site, the car park overflows onto roadside parking, this will cause problems and danger when accessing the proposed traveller site. People who are travellers do not intend to make anywhere their home therefore not really showing or giving any concern for the community.	11371/22898	
	Objection – safety issue due to the volume of traffic. Concerns about flood water diversion.	11375/22904	
	Objection – inappropriate and prominent location close to centre of village, harm visual character. Land is green belt and previously rejected for residential development. Scale disproportionately large to the village, accommodating 60 individuals in village would be difficult (at capacity) primary school and surgery. Road already busy, would cause further problems. Government policy states brown fields sites to be used before green belt – government considers gypsy and travellers sites to amount to ‘inappropriate development’ in green belt (Planning Policy For Travellers sites) and that ‘should not be approved except in very special circumstances’. There are no very special circumstances. The site is not a “rural	11380/22909	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	exception site" as not small or accommodate households with either current residents or have an existing connection to the village.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection- green belt land previously rejected for residential development- contradiction to the Governments policy on brown field sites. Inappropriate in green belt, size, scale and location. Government considers these sites 'inappropriate development' . Inappropriate and unsustainable for village size, school already full, local facilities limited, bus service limited. Sewage works at capacity. Population increase will lead to traffic increase, could endanger children in the area from traffic accidents. Harmful to local character and appearance in heart of village near a conservation area. Nearby business and residential properties including the doctors surgery and park would overlook the proposed site, affording the inhabitants little or no privacy. Land is bordered on both sides by open culverts and prone to flooding.	11381/22911	
	Objection – proposed site already rejected as unfit for development. Site prone to flooding. Adjacent to blind bend on busy road with fast moving traffic. Directly opposite medical centre/children’s playground/social club – potential traffic problems. Village already has a touring caravan site and a site for travelling show people. It is a small village – proposals disproportionate number of traveller sites. Will detract from rural feel. No one in the village has contributed to the feasibility report for the site. 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.	11382/22916	
	Objection – green belt land. Number of pitches is disproportionate with the size of the village. Access to the site would be dangerous. Speed limit is rarely adhered to. There are unoccupied sites in Fulford.	11385/21919	
	Objection – no proven need for further gypsy/traveller accommodation. There are unoccupied pitches at a nearby private site. The site is green belt – brown field should be allocated first. The site size is unsustainable for a rural village. The land floods. Development would encroach on the countryside and have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the village. The infrastructure is already at capacity. Development is disproportionate as we have a site for touring caravans and travelling show people. Access to the site would be dangerous. Owners want to use the land for residential development. There are no ‘very special circumstances’ for loss of green belt. Site is opposed by local residents.	11399/22943	
	Objection – dangerous access. Brownfields used first. Visually intrusive. Disproportionate size of the site. Reason given for the withdrawal of the proposed	11419/21671	

## Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma &amp; Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	gypsy and travellers' site in Dunnington are equally pertinent to this site.		
<b>747 (YORK016) Land at Elvington Lane, Elvington (continued)</b>	Objection –dangerous access. Brownfield first. Visually intrusive. Disproportionate size of the site. Reasons given for the withdrawal of the proposed gypsy and travellers' site in Dunnington are equally pertinent to this site.	11646/26121	
	Objection – this is totally unsuitable, there is very poor access off Elvington Lane. This is in the centre of this rural village.	11754/26127	
	Objection – the development of this site is unsustainable and inappropriate for a small village. The traveller population would overwhelm the settled population. There needs to be temporary pitches for visiting family members. This is greenbelt land with no special circumstance for change. This is in contradiction to the council's own policies.	Petition 5	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p><b>772 (YORK013)</b>  <b>Land at Wetherby Road/Knapton Moor, Knapton</b></p>	<p>Support – supportive of the Technical Officers decision not to progress the site for the reasons stated.</p>	<p>71/18982</p>	<p>Nether Poppleton Parish Council</p>
	<p>Support – support the decision not to use this site for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller use and that this site should not be included in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>74/18839</p>	<p>Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council</p>
	<p>Support – supportive of the Technical Officers decision not to progress the site for the reasons stated.</p>	<p>78/19020</p>	<p>Upper Poppleton Parish Council</p>
	<p>Support – the proposal would represent a clear incursion into the open countryside to the east of the City which forms part of the rural setting of York. Since the development of this area seems likely to harm elements which contribute to the special character and setting of York, we support it not being included in the next stage of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>238/18176</p>	<p>English Heritage</p>
	<p>Support – pleased that recommendation is to withdraw the proposed show peoples site at Knapton and remove it.</p>	<p>1159/20562</p>	
	<p>Support- welcome the recommendation not to pursue this site for development. Do not consider this site to be suitable for Traveller site development, in light of its greenbelt location.</p>	<p>1355/18641</p>	<p>Julian Sturdy MP</p>
	<p>Support – agree with removal from the plan.</p>	<p>2765/20613</p>	
	<p>Support - the removal of a proposed show person's site from is welcomed as both were totally inappropriate for that purpose.</p>	<p>3880/21692</p>	
	<p>Support – pleased about the withdrawal of it, but insist that the site will be part of the green belt, and not an industrial estate or building site in the future</p>	<p>4008/21702</p>	
	<p>Support – supportive of the decision not to use this site for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller use and that this site should not be included in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>4647/22056</p>	
	<p>Support - support the decision to withdraw the use of the land at Wetherby Road, Knapton Moor (page 64, site ref 772) for the use of Gypsy, Roma and Travellers and that this site should not be included in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>4648/19687</p>	
	<p>Support – agree with the technical officers' decision not to progress this site for the reasons stated.</p>	<p>4726/22334</p>	
	<p>Support- supportive of the decision not to use the land at Whetherby Road, Knapton Moor for use of Gypsy, Roma and Travellers.</p>	<p>6222/21023</p>	
	<p>Comment – should not contemplate providing anymore of these sites until the Council can better manage the ones it already has and can collect the rents and revenues from the uses of these sites.</p>	<p>10652/19748</p>	
<p>Support – supportive of the withdrawal of the use of the site for Gypsy, Roma and Travellers site. This site should not be included in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>10732/19895</p>		

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>772 (YORK013)</b> <b>Land at Wetherby Road/Knapton Moor, Knapton (continued)</b>	Support – agree with the Technical Officers decision not to progress this site for the reasons stated.	10734/19916	
	Support – continuing to be opposed to this plan, which would, if pursued ruin the village of Knapton.	10768/20434	
<b>Section 8.3.2</b>	Support – from experience of Water Lane site the lesson is not to over burden the resident community. Agree with conclusions, would not wish to see any expansion of the Water Lane site.	56/23759	Clifton Without Parish Council
<b>Recommendation 8a</b>	<p>Comment – suggest that the Policy should make it clear that the study may have underestimated need from unauthorised development and housed Travellers and that the 66 additional pitch target for 2015 – 2030 should be treated as a minimum, with the study kept under review. The ORS figures and the NYGTA assessment provide very similar results. The Trust is aware of the seriousness of overcrowding and accommodation needs which the Gypsy and Traveller community have dealt with over the many years. The study may underestimate need. Question the consultant's approach to discounting part of unauthorised provision. The consultants would exclude unauthorised caravans occupied by Travellers who are staying in the area temporarily. But this is how the Travellers survive when staying on the roadside is not tolerated. Estimates should be kept under review: York is characterised by high Traveller numbers in bricks and mortar housing, who tend to be a little known and understood community with many not revealing their identity. If York were to develop the private provision it needs, then part of that provision is likely to be taken up by such Travellers with the consequence that not all identified needs would be met.</p>	262/18887	York Traveller Trust
<b>Recommendation 8b</b>	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/20506	
	Support – have employed a planner to review the viability and suitability of the sites suggested during the Plan's preparation of the next few months and use the contacts we have with the Traveller community to try and identify sites. We will liaise with the Council's site consultants, PBA over and above this. The number of land for new sites found has been disappointing.	262/18888	York Traveller Trust
<b>Recommendation 8c</b>	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/26150	
	Support – this recommendation seems sensible. It is clearly aimed at facilitating two easier routes for development of new sites.	262/18889	York Traveller Trust
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/26151	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Recommendation 8c (continued)</b>	Support – hopes that the Council proceed with recommendation	4449/17800	
<b>Recommendation 8d</b>	Objection – there is existing provision at Outgang Lane, Osbaldwick and proposed additional pitches on adjacent land. Members would oppose on-site provision at ST7 as it seems to be unworkable and would add to existing tensions within the wider community. Favour Option C funded by commuted sums as being the only realistic way forward.	65/18569	Heworth Without Parish Council
	Support - strongly support this recommendation. However, given that the needs are immediate and sites delivered through this option may not come until later, it can only be one of a number of approaches. This approach may not be welcomed by developers, so the policy must be specific indicating how many pitches each of the major sites will be required to provide and making it easy for them to deliver. The policy should require the provision to be on-site or on a nearby suitable site in the developer's ownership. We are extremely cautious (to the point of opposition) of the idea of offering landowners the possibility of paying a commuted sum. The threshold for allowing a developer this option must be set very high.	262/18890	York Traveller Trust
	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/26152	
	Objection - Strongly opposed to recommendation of holding owners of strategic sites to ransom by insisting that they either provide a section of their sites for use as a Travellers site, land elsewhere under their ownership or a commuted sum.	1355/26149	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – the Consortium consider that it would be unviable to make provision for Gypsies, Roma and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople on this particular site. They would be prepared to discuss the potential provision on another suitable site in their ownership or the provision of a commuted sum on the understanding that any funds collected could then be used to pay for provision of facilities on any other identified sites and the purchase of sites by the Council.	1523/18564	Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners, on behalf of the Clifton Moor Consortium (TW Fields, Barratt Homes, Hallam land Management Ltd and Commercial Estates Group)
	Objection- large sites having traveller provision is not what residents of quiet suburbs want.	1897/17884	
	Objection – in relation to ST8, object to a gypsy and travellers site here.	3201/19194	
	Objection- travellers sites and development of large sites are two different matters. Developers should not provide land for travellers sites as their contribution.	4096/17960	
	Objection - do not agree with the proposal to force developers to use 1% of available land to provide gypsy and traveller sites. Who wants to pay good money for a nice	4300/26161	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	newly built home only to find there is a gypsy site just up the road.		
<b>Recommendation 8d (continued)</b>	Support – hope that the Council proceed with recommendation 8d	4449/26154	
	Objection – gypsy sites lead to an increase in crime and litter.	6547/24072	
	Objection- in relation to ST8 unhappy to see that the Council's are now agreeing that developers of large sites should provide for a travellers site as part of their developer contribution, there has been no information about this.	9284/17858	
	Comment – proposals to require developers to provide accommodation is untested and there is no evidence that any consultation has taken place to determine whether the proposals are realistic.	6516/27511	
	Objection- in relation to ST8, there has been no consultation on developers providing land for travellers as part of their development.	9285/17860	
	Objection – object to option 8d being taken forward. Appears ill-conceived for several reasons. Detailed comments provided, see response.	9895/19332	Savills on behalf of Halifax Estates
	Objection – this is not appropriate, new housing developments would be less attractive when in close proximity to such sites and overall the development of large areas and traveller sties would reduce the attractiveness of the area and the prices of existing properties.	9911/24357	
	Objection –do not consider that recommendation 8d would result in a fair, realistic or inclusive policy. There is no explanation or justification of the strategic site size threshold of 50ha, or where the use of less than 1% of the site area is derived, nor is there any explanation of the priority of on-site provision first, followed by off-site provision on land in the same ownership and finally, a commuted sum. Further explanation is required. Based on experience and understanding of Gypsy and Traveller provision, there is no desire on the part of existing or new occupants of modern site facilities to live within the confines of a major new housing development. There are a number of other considerations which weigh against this prioritised approach including those relating to the delivery of market and affordable housing. An individual call for sites for Gypsy and Travellers would be appropriate to fund suitable sites rather than force larger strategic sites to provide land.	10354/19410	Johnson Brook
Objection- policy is illogical and 'market' will respond by builders refusing to start developments under such constraints, and if they do, having difficulty selling properties.	10539/22747		
<b>Recommendation 8e</b>	Support – agree with the recommendation for inclusion in the local plan.	943/26153	
	Support – hope that the Council proceed with recommendation 8e.	4449/26155	

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>General Comments</b>	<p>Comment – welcome the overall vision of the City of York Council of ‘building confident and healthy communities’. Fully support the intention of the Council to meet its responsibilities to all sections of the community. Welcome the way in which the specific needs of the Gypsy and Traveller and Showpeople communities are highlighted within the Local Plan. The Council should be praised for the way in which it has commissioned additional research to update the accommodation needs data. YTT has been consulted and kept informed of developments and encouraged to participate in the planning process. Part of our vision for the York Plan is that it should support a transition from exclusively local authority to a more pluralistic mix of site provision. This would require that much of the additional provision should be on private sites developed by Travellers themselves, and that opportunities should also be created for housing association/ third sector involvement. Our preference is for as much as possible the additional provision to come through small privately provided family sites. There is likelihood that Travellers own land within the rural and urban fringe areas, but that these potential sites haven’t been identified yet. In this context, a blanket Green Belting of the undeveloped parts of the City without identifying sites for Traveller Needs risk being found unsound. Concerned that in the future when Travellers try to bring forward sites these will come against Green Belt policy. To overcome what we believe to be a fundamental flaw in the plan, we recommend a three strand approach: A much stronger focus on identifying a supply of deliverable sites; Policy of requiring developers of the largest housing sites to identify appropriate parcels to be excluded from the Green Belt and allocated for Traveller residential use; Including within the plan more extensive areas of safeguarded land excluded from the Green Belt. We suggest that there is a case for considering a reserve of up to twenty year’s needs, including for Traveller Sites. An issue for the YTT relates to the link between the management of sites and the development process for new sites. Some of the problems faced in relation to the attitudes expressed by the settled community to the Local Plan recommendations may well be influenced by the way current sites are managed. We would encourage the Council to aspire to the provision of sites of the highest quality. They should meet the needs of Gypsies and Travellers and their families and enable them to live with dignity.</p>	262/18891	York Traveller Trust
	<p>Objection - the commissioned traveller needs assessment remains fundamentally flawed. Accommodation provision needs are in stark contrast to neighbouring councils with similar levels of existing provision, all of which have found no evidence</p>	1355/18648	Julian Sturdy MP

Section 8: New and Revised sites for Gypsies, Roma & Travellers and Travelling Showpeople (continued)

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>that extra accommodation provision for Travelling Showpeople are necessary. Assessment lacked independence from the Council required to deliver objective and impartial findings. Poor level of stakeholder engagement in the assessment. Assessment downplays poor inter-community relations. Assessment was unable to verify the level of traveller accommodation need with some travellers being double counted. Method of assessing accommodation needs for travelling show-people community was particularly concerning. The approach taken is entirely unsuitable and should be reviewed as matter of urgency. Disappointed that no mention has been made in the recommendations for looking again at Council owned land in York to make provision for Traveller and Travelling Showpeople. Disappointed that further intensification or expansion was not considered possible on the New Walk Orchard caravan site on St. Oswald's Road in Fulford. It is widely known that this site is currently under occupied and this should be looked at again as a priority.</p>		
<p><b>General Comments (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – see survey 1. Strongly oppose any traveller sites around York.</p>	<p>11294/26591</p>	