

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
9 Land at corner of Hassacarr Road and Common Lane	Objection – opposed to technical officer comments which fails the site, to the lack of housing allocation at the site and to the proposed deletion of the gypsy and traveller allocation as a site for provision. The site passed the ‘criteria 1 to 4’ assessment which also considered matters of flood risk, therefore it is strange that it fails the technical officer’s comments. Notwithstanding the above, flood risk was the only show-stopper identified. There are therefore no other obstacles to the potential allocation of the site for residential development. Indeed, it is noted that the site is considered to be accessible to services and facilities, including employment opportunities and open space. Subject to the consideration of flood risk, this is a good residential site. The masterplan submitted with the initial representation in relation to this site showed how development could be accommodated on the site. The masterplan showed built development on the land outside the zone 3a flood zone with gardens, open space and areas of ecological enhancement in the flood zone 3a areas. It has therefore been demonstrated that the site would provide a small, but meaningful contribution to the housing requirement. Therefore request that the site is allocated for residential development in the Submission draft version of the Local Plan.	6160/19133	DPP One
13 Station Yard at Wheldrake	Objection –disagrees with technical officers comments and the council’s conclusion on the site’s suitability. Housing development of the site will deliver significant local community benefits and will make a meaningful contribution towards meeting local housing needs and support the services and community infrastructure of the village. The site serves no Green Belt purpose. The existing allocation of land to the north of North Lane (H28) is demonstration of the Council’s appreciation that Wheldrake is an appropriate and sustainable settlement, suitable of accommodating new residential development. Detailed comments provided to demonstrate why the site is a suitable location, see response. It is requested that the site be included as a residential allocation within the publication draft Local Plan.	10121/18866	Quod
67 Land at Millfield Lane	Support – agree with technical officers recommendation for failing criteria 1	71/18985	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with technical officers recommendation for failing criteria 1	78/19023	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support - the plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans in the area. Roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will	2893/20689	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	make the situation untenable.		
67 Land at Millfield Lane (continued)	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	3577/22000	
	Support – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	3596/22015	
	Support – Poppleton cannot cater for more housing, the schools are not capable of taking the extra people and the vehicles used to transport them. The road infrastructure is at capacity.	4857/23989	
	Support – this land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses.	5704/20822	
	Support – this land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses.	5705/20837	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5735/20856	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5817/20908	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5852/20947	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
67 Land at Millfield Lane (continued)	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9692/21945	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9874/24288	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9882/24311	
	Support – this site should not be used for housing.	9989/27510	
	Support – site should remain as open space for further sporting and recreational activities.	10421/22517	
	Comment –proposals for ‘infill’ in the village – sites 733, 67,215. As all of these developments are within the village boundary, need to look at these proposals as a whole and to think extremely carefully about what expansion the already overstretched village can withstand.	10430/19426	
	Support – strongly opposed to developments proposed in the West York / Poppleton area, including this site.	10440/22732	
	Support – land should not be used for residential development, but for amenity use (cricket ground).	10578/22769	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10580/23731	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10582/22787	
	Support – agree with the technical officers’ recommendations for failing criteria 1.	10734/19919	
	Support – too many houses. Green belt would be eroded. Infrastructure would be strained. Development should be on Brownfield first.	10752/19955	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10754/19969	
	Support – development would negatively impact the village. More frequent flooding.	10758/19990	
Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already	10767/20020		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 2: Residential Site Assessment Proformas

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.		
67 Land at Millfield Lane (continued)	Support – greenfield site of historical importance. Would impact on Poppleton.	10771/20047	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10791/20651	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10805/22824	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10811/21341	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10848/21930	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10850/21425	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10852/21440	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10855/21463	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10881/25893	Georgina Grace Trust
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10904/21537	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10957/21622	
Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11155/21644		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 2: Residential Site Assessment Proformas

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
67 Land at Millfield Lane (continued)	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11215/21905	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11246/22847	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11248/22122	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11251/22137	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11252/22152	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11254/22167	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11257/22182	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11259/22197	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11417/23750	
76 Duncombe Farm, Strensall	Support – site is shown as failing criteria 4, agree that this site is in an unsustainable location. The site is currently within the York Green Belt.	77/18580	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
83 Main Street, Knapton	Support – it is important to maintain the greenbelt around York’s villages and thereby avoid settlements merging.	1790/20449	
88 Land at Villa Pond, East of B1363, Wigginton	Objection –at the preferred options stage the site was submitted for tourism, leisure, sport and recreation uses, comprising a small holiday lodge development of circa 22 eco cabins grouped around the existing fishing lake and featuring the formation of a new second lake. It is also considered that these proposals would meet the	550/18547	Peacock and Smith Ltd

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>requirements set out in the NPPF at para 81 and requirements of the draft Local Plan to plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt. Whilst it is important that residential sites have access to facilities, services and transport, the criteria are not relevant in assessing the site which proposes eco cabins as part of a holiday lodge development. Reference to failing criteria 4 should be omitted. Request that the site is identified for tourism, leisure, sport and recreation uses in the Local Plan.</p>		
112 Brook Nook, Osbaldwick Way	<p>Objection – considers that the site is suitable for housing. Previous permission for a caravan park, development has started.</p>	1303/20570	
137 Land at Heworth Croft	<p>Objection- disagree with the technical officers' assessment of issues relating to open space and recreation and flood risk. Confirm that the loss of the pitches at Heworth will be more than adequately compensated by the development of the new sport centre at Haxby Road, and that the remaining issues highlighted as amber in the assessment can be resolved. Therefore support allocation of land at Heworth Croft as student housing. Detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	38/18509	O'Neill Associates, on behalf of York St John University.
	<p>Objection – understood that the Council require Sport England's acceptance of the principle of this sites being developed before they can be considered in the round as part of the Local Plan process. It is Sport England's policy to oppose development which is either prejudice or result in the loss of playing fields unless one of the specific exceptional circumstances pertains to the development. As York Saint John University are proposing to replace the two sites with new and enhanced provision on land both west and east of Haxby Road, their proposals stand to be judged against Sport England's exceptional circumstances (E4). Sport England visited the site and the consultants for the University agreed to put together a planning statement which satisfied exceptional circumstances. Sport England has already accepted (via email correspondence) that York Saint John University proposals at its Haxby Road sports complex would satisfy the quantitative element to E4. The submitted statement provides further detail to satisfy (as far as possible at this stage) the further qualitative, timing and management issues raised by E4. Satisfied that the document shows that the combination planning approvals and the specification of works give a clear indication of the University's intention to satisfy the qualitative elements of E4. No objection to the site coming forward for development.</p>	349/23703	Sport England

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p>138 York St John University Playing Field, Hull Road</p>	<p>Objection – disagree with the technical officers' assessment of issues relating to the loss of playing fields. Representations are aimed at adequately confirming the loss of the pitches at Hull Road. Confirm that the loss of the pitches at Hull Road will be more than adequately compensated by the development of the new sport centre at Haxby Road. Therefore support allocation of land at Hull Road as housing or for Science Park uses as an extension to the existing science park.. Detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	<p>38/18508</p>	<p>O'Neill Associates, on behalf of York St John University</p>
	<p>Objection – understood that the Council require Sport England's acceptance of the principle of this sites being developed before they can be considered in the round as part of the Local Plan process. It is Sport England's policy to oppose development which is either prejudice or result in the loss of playing fields unless one of the specific exceptional circumstances pertains to the development. As York Saint John University are proposing to replace the two sites with new and enhanced provision on land both west and east of Haxby Road, their proposals stand to be judged against Sport England's exceptional circumstances (E4). Sport England visited the site and the consultants for the University agreed to put together a planning statement which satisfied exceptional circumstances. Sport England has already accepted (via email correspondence) that York Saint John University proposals at its Haxby Road sports complex would satisfy the quantitative element to E4. The submitted statement provides further detail to satisfy (as far as possible at this stage) the further qualitative, timing and management issues raised by E4. Satisfied that the document shows that the combination planning approvals and the specification of works give a clear indication of the University's intention to satisfy the qualitative elements of E4. No objection to the site coming forward for development.</p>	<p>349/23702</p>	<p>Sport England</p>
<p>139 Biorad, Haxby Road</p>	<p>Objection – the site should be included in the local plan for housing as it is brownfield land, the site is largely covered in tarmac, so development would be good for the immediate environment, and would enhance the green corridor. Similar development was authorised last year. Developing the site would reduce water run-off into the Foss, and reduce flooding in the area.</p>	<p>5826/20917</p>	
<p>170 Pond Field, Heslington</p>	<p>Objection –objects to the technical officer assessment and decision not to allocate this site for housing. Persimmon's December 2013 submission makes detailed points that address some of the technical officers' issues but these do not appear to have been taken into account. Detailed comments provided, see response. Without clear and strong justification, it is considered unreasonable for the Council to insist that Pond Field be retained in isolated agricultural use. The land should be allocated for</p>	<p>659/18884</p>	<p>Persimmon Homes</p>

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	considerably different to the data supplied by the Environment Agency.		
184 Land to South of A1237	<p>Objections - should reconsider the findings with a view to allocating the land for residential development. The Trust would look to develop up to 50% affordable housing on site as part of any scheme subject to a viability assessment. Green Belt Appraisal found that not all the area of land between Haxby and New Earswick needs to remain open and undeveloped in order to prevent coalescence. The assessment also found that land to the north of New Earswick and south of A1237 (site 184) could also be excluded from the Green belt because it also would not lead to coalescence of New Earswick and Haxby, because a sufficient gap would be maintained between the two settlements to ensure that Haxby would still be perceived to be physically separate from New Earswick. Furthermore development of site 184 would not inhibit the openness of the wider area and would uphold the 5 purposes of the Green belt. Assessment provided, see response.</p>	146/19486	Directions Planning Consultants on behalf of Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<p>185 Land South of Tadcaster Road</p>	<p>Objection – objection to rejection of this site as suitable for residential development. Gladman Developments consider land to be suitable and sustainable for release for housing from York Green Belt. Site is accessible to existing facilities and services in the village and its development would minimise car journeys through accessibility to the new park and ride facility at Askham Bar. Its location is on one of city’s cycle routes and has access to several local bus routes. Site does not fulfil any purpose as part of Green Belt. No evidence available to support Council’s assessment that the site fulfils a role in preventing coalescence. Existing gap between Copmanthorpe, York and Bishopthorpe will remain open in the event of the site’s development and is protected from development by the presence of Askham Bog to the north and flood zones to the east. Development site will not lead to pressure to develop the area any further. Site is well contained by surrounding uses. Site’s boundaries are well defined on all sides. East Coast Mainline provides recognisable boundary to Green Belt that is likely to remain in place for the foreseeable future. Site is more appropriate for release than those currently preferred by the Council to the west of the village (Site ST12 and ST13). Site 185 has some local support and will be included as a proposed allocation in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Assessment of Site 185 outlines that the site was omitted for consideration as a release from the Green Belt due to the failure to meet criteria established for historical character and access to services. The assessment itself is brief, with no explanation provided. Assessment appears to have been made within the confines of existing outdated documentation and has had no regard to the evidence submitted previously by Gladman to the Council, or section 85 of the NPPF. Council’s assessment of the site lacks wider strategic consideration of sustainability objectives such as the need to minimise car journeys, and is supported by out-date, insufficiently detailed evidence that does not reflect the framework.</p>	<p>1705/18514</p>	<p>Gladman Developments</p>
<p>191 Land off Avon Drive, Huntington</p>	<p>Objection – objects to failure of site to progress to allocation following failure of technical officer assessment. Only red score related to transport. Further transport evidence provided in form of proposed road layout options prepared by NTP, together with illustrative masterplan layout. Demonstrates that dualling can be achieved largely within the alignment of the existing ring road, and where additional land is required to widen the carriageway this can be provided to the north of the existing alignment. The incorporation of a dualled and/or grade separated junction on the ring road does not have significant implications for the</p>	<p>1289/18581</p>	<p>Signet Planning on behalf of Pilcher Homes Ltd.</p>

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>viability of a deliverable residential layout on the land north of Avon Drive. Detailed comments provided to address technical officer assessment amber scores, see response. The masterplan proposals for the site have been discussed with council planning and highways officers, who have indicated that, subject to addressing the detailed issues raised in the technical officer assessment, the site is otherwise appropriate in principle for residential development. Residential development will not prejudice proposals for dualling the ring road and residential development can be achieved without adverse effects on residential amenity, arising from dualling the ring road. Propose that the site is allocated to ensure the short term delivery of much needed housing and there is no need to delay an allocation because of the potential dualling of the York ring road, as one does not prejudice the other.</p>		
<p>191 Land off Avon Drive, Huntington (continued)</p>	<p>Support – welcomes that the site has been found to fail the technical assessment. Objection to the building off Avon Drive.</p>	1897/17886	
	<p>Support – this field is a valuable green space used by many for recreation and is home to varied wildlife. Certain areas of this land hold water in wet weather. Many of the gardens bordering this land struggle with excess water over wet periods, developing this land would exacerbate this problem and hard the wildlife in the area.</p>	9911/24356	
<p>215, Land at Manor Close, Upper Poppleton</p>	<p>Support – agree with technical officers recommendation to fail criteria 1.</p>	71/18986	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	<p>Support – agree with technical officers recommendation to fail criteria 1.</p>	78/19024	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	<p>Support - proposal contravenes the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans for the area. Roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable.</p>	2893/20690	
	<p>Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.</p>	3577/22001	
	<p>Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.</p>	3596/22016	
<p>Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this</p>	5704/20823		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.		
215, Land at Manor Close, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5705/20823	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5735/20857	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5817/20909	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5852/20948	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9692/21946	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9874/24289	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9882/24312	
	Comment –within the village boundary. Urge the planning department to look at these applications and proposals as a whole and to think extremely carefully about what expansion our already overstretched village can withstand.	10430/19427	
	Support – strongly opposed to developments proposed in the West York / Poppleton area, including this site.	10440/22733	
	Support – residential use of the land will destroy the compactness of Upper Poppleton and encroach upon farming land. Road network, schools and amenities cannot support this volume of housing.	10578/22773	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10580/23732	
Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this	10582/22788		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.		
215, Land at Manor Close, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support - agree with the technical officers recommendations for failing criteria 1.	10734/19921	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10754/19970	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10767/20021	
	Support - green field site of historic character. Will impact on the village of Poppleton and Knapton changing the natural environmental assets.	10771/20050	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10791/20652	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10805/22825	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10811/21342	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10848/21913	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10850/21426	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10852/21441	
Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10855/21464		
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10881/25894	Georgina Grace Trust

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
215, Land at Manor Close, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10957/21623	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11215/21906	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11246/22848	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11248/22123	
	Support – opposed to development at this site. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11251/22138	
	Support – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11252/22153	
	Support – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11254/22168	
	Support – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11257/22183	
	Support – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11259/22198	
	Support – objection to the proposed development. The number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11417/23751	
220 Land at Wetherby Road	Comment – the site impacts on the views from the A1237 regarding the setting and character of York and merits rejection on more substantial grounds than quoted.	45/18773	York Environment Forum
	Objection – the site quite clearly satisfies Criteria 1, 2 and 3, but fails on Criteria 4. However an assessment of services and facilities indicates that the site is	3235/18121	Yew Trees Associates

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	eminently accessible to local services and indeed will be providing additional facilities in the form of a substantial area of public open space as part of the development and as meet all of the necessary criteria. Yew Tree Associates now confirm that the site is suitable for residential development (including open market, affordable and student properties) and for the provision of public open space in the Local Plan. Detailed comments provided, see response.		
220 Land at Wetherby Road (continued)	Support – this site is not suitable for housing. It is a Greenfield site of historic character. Would impact on Knapton village changing the natural environmental asset.	10771/20048	
221 Land at Sim Balk Lane	Objection – to restrict the use of this land by greenbelt designation will have adverse economic effects and restrict the potential for logical further development. The land is available as a new education site as the same basis as sites 794 and 230. There are no showstoppers in respect of site delivery.	6327/22410	Stephenson and Son
250 South of A59	Support – agree with the technical officers recommendation to fail criteria 1	71/18987	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with the technical officers recommendation to fail criteria 1	78/19025	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – objects to building of residential property in close proximity to the already over-stretched resource of Upper and Nether Poppleton together with the inevitable traffic which increased numbers of motorists will create. The village cannot be self-contained if it becomes a speed conduit for an impatient York. Lack of school places at Poppleton Ousebank and Manor CE School, and the surgery is oversubscribed.	1581/18214	
	Objection – object to designation of ‘Area Retaining the Rural Setting’ within part of their client’s land, object to the continued designation of the whole area of the land at North Field as green belt, and object to the omission of their client’s land as a proposed allocation for housing. Representation supported by additional evidence including site location plan, site layout/land use plan, Transport Strategy Report, and Objectively Assessed Need for Housing Report. Land at North Field is considered a suitable site for the location of housing to meet the future housing needs of the city. Detailed comments identify how constraints identified by the Council as reasons to dismiss the site in respect of transport, highways and the character and setting of York can be addressed, see response.	1741/18936	DLP Planning Consultants
	Support – agree with the technical officer’s recommendations for failing criteria 1.	10734/19922	
Support - a green field site of historic character. Will impact on the village of	10771/20049		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Poppleton and Knapton changing the natural environmental assets.		
297 Land to Rear of Main Street, Elvington	Support – concern at introducing a lot of new housing to the village. Why does Elvington have to grow so quickly and exponentially disproportionately with the local plan proposed growth rate. Elvington will not serve York employment but provide housing for Leeds employees.	10076/24529	
676 Rufforth Airfield South of Southfield Close	Objection – the site was rejected with reference made to limited services and transport options despite passing criteria 4 for services which assesses both of these issues Surely increasing the population in the local area will support existing services and potentially lead to new services being delivered e.g. a more frequent bus timetable.	5826/20911	
719 Terry's Car Park and Land to South	Support – agree with officer rejection of the site, would affect setting and/or flood risk.	386/18924	York Green Party
	<p>Objection – technical officers conclusions are incorrect and not supported by a clear evidence base nor the Council's own assessments. The land offers a sustainable location for new development being located on the edge of the urban area with access to public transport, schools, shops and community facilities. Redevelopment suitable for a number of uses such as residential, doctors surgery/health centre, nursery etc. The car park is previously developed land. It is now considered unlikely that the car park site will be required to provide for as much car parking, to serve the new uses on the main Terry's factory site as previously anticipated. Does not perform any of the roles necessary for inclusion in the Green Belt; it does not need to be kept permanently open and if developed they would result in a sustainable pattern of development. It is clear that the Council considers that the Car Park site does offer scope for development, so long as that development incorporates additional peripheral landscaping and does not impinge adversely on views or the setting of the Terry's factory site.</p> <p>Development of a similar scale and overall height to the decked car park (likely to be approximately 5.5m once one has taken into account vehicles parked on the upper deck) is likely to be most acceptable. This would be equivalent to a single storey building. Whilst other higher development is considered unlikely to be acceptable it is not ruled out and it may also be acceptable depending on its scale, mass, design and residual impact on key views following landscaping etc. The suitability of such development would need to be demonstrated. Supporting documents and detailed comments provided, see response.</p>	4355/10973	England & Lyle

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
720 Land to the East of Terry's	Support – agree with officer rejection. Would affect setting and/or flood risk.	386/18925	York Green Party
	Objection – technical officers conclusions are incorrect and not supported by a clear evidence base nor the Council's own assessments. The land offers a sustainable location for new development being located on the edge of the urban area with access to public transport, schools, shops and community facilities. Not necessary to keep the site permanently open to achieve any of the purposes required for including land within the green belt. Should not be included in the green belt boundary and the beneficial use of this land for sustainable development to meet the future needs of the city should be positively encouraged. Suitable for residential or educational uses. Supporting documents and detailed comments provided, see response.	4355/10974	England and Lyle (on behalf of Henry Boot Developments Ltd)
736 Land to the rear of Hilbra Avenue, Haxby	Objection – believe that this site has all of the necessary attributes for inclusion within the final Sites, especially as it is a brownfield site that would not conflict with the openness of the countryside in practical and visual terms and which is deliverable now. Greystones site (H37) has been included following revisions which include a stretch of landscape/ open space to the south. Site 736 could also have this enhancement and become an extension to the Greystones site. Submitted a design and access statement for residential development at the site. The indicative layout suggested 55 dwellings of 2 – 3bedrooms with associated adoptable highways and parking, of which 14 would be low cost/ affordable in nature. Use of the site as residential reflects the opportunity for economic use (previous use as land fill site and pig farm). The approach to the site would be via Hilbra Avenue. The development will connect to an existing 225 diameter four drain running from York Road down Hilbra Avenue and connect to an existing surface water sewer which runs through the plot. It is proposed to retain the existing boundaries of hedging and fencing to the site with possibly increasing the planting to the north boundary.	1950/18182	David Chapman Associates
737 Stock Hill Field, West of Church Bulk, Dunnington	Objection – land should be included for development. Would not place too great a strain on the current infrastructure of the village. Will allow easy access to roads away from the village centre.	1953/20456	
	Objection- surprised that the offer of land along the west side of Church Bulk has been rejected. It is more suitable for housing as it is near to facilities in the village on a bus route and gives easy access to the A166. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village.	2517/20588	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
737 Stock Hill Field, West of Church Bulk, Dunnington (continued)	<p>Objection- surprised that the offer of land along the west side of Church Balk has been rejected. It is more suitable for housing as it is near to facilities in the village on a bus route and gives easy access to the A166. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village.</p>	3027/23709	
	<p>Objection – the grounds for rejecting this site are unsound. This housing development meets criteria for development. The site’s privacy could be ensured if the hedge was retained. There is good access to services and public transport.</p>	3464/23901	
	<p>Objection – this site is centrally located within Dunnington and could be regarded as limited infill within the Green Belt, as allowed by the NPPF. The Technical Officer rejects the site on the grounds that ‘Dunnington village needs to retain a distance from the main arterial road. This site compromises the setting of the village’. This may have been the case had there been no existing development along the A166. However, Site 737 fills in a relatively short gap between existing houses on Church Balk, and buildings on the A166. The arterial road defines Dunnington at this point. Site 737 is also hidden from view on Church Balk by a high hedge that could be retained, thus hiding any development. These arguments would not apply to the field bordering the A166 to the east. Church Balk is a bus route and the site would also give easy access to the A166, unlike suggested sites in Dunnington. The site is near to existing facilities in Dunnington. Development of this site would have minimal impact on the open character of the village because of the existing neighbouring buildings. As the Consultation Draft Dunnington Neighbourhood Plan for 2014-2029 states, future development of the village should be aimed at ‘nucleating’ the settlement, rather than extending it further into agricultural land. The Technical Officer’s comments are not sufficient ground for rejecting this site, and the site should be reconsidered for future development. This would bring it in line with the aspirations of the Parish Council’s Draft Neighbourhood Plan and would avoid ‘development sprawl’. In addition, in conjunction with Site 744, Bull Balks, Dunnington, the two sites would provide a single centrally located housing area with good access to public transport and an arterial road.</p>	3582/22024	
	<p>Objection- surprised that the offer of land along the west side of Church Balk has been rejected. It is more suitable for housing as it is near to facilities in the village on a bus route and gives easy access to the A166. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance</p>	4747/22342	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	to the village.		
737 Stockhill Field, West of Church Bulk, Dunnington (continued)	Objection- surprised that the offer of land along the west side of Church Balk has been rejected. It is more suitable for housing as it is near to facilities in the village on a bus route and gives easy access to the A166. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village.	4930/22357	
739 The Old Rectory, Moor Lane, Haxby	Comment – queries how site can be rejected when land opposite the site (ST9) has been allocated. This site is just as suitable/not suitable as the land across the road.	5826/20922	
740 South of Yorkfield Lane at the end of Learmans Way, Copmanthorpe	Support – field is a historic area, and failed criteria 1 for development. York field is the oldest mentioned on medieval maps. Askham bog would become unmanageable and destroyed.	10893/21896	
742 Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane	Support - would object strongly to any residential development on this site	71/19005	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support - would object strongly to any residential development on this site	78/19043	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support- residents of the area have already suffered with the new Park and Ride's endless road works. The village will no longer be that but an extension of Boroughbridge Road. There is not the capacity for residential proposals for over 4,000 houses in the area with overstretched facilities. Traffic will increase further and the identity of the place will be lost.	2888/23830	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	3577/21995	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	3596/22010	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5704/20816	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5705/20832	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5735/20851	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5817/20903	
Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5852/20942		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	for.		
742 Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane (continued)	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5882/22408	
	Support – opposed to additional housing in the rural west ward.	9411/18441	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9692/21940	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9874/24286	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9882/24309	
	Support- opposed to residential development on this site. Though on the outskirts of the village, this expansion would still rely on village services, which cannot cope. There are existing congestion issues on the A59 and A1237 as these are single lane roads. They are not built to cope with the volume of traffic this proposal would entail.	10430/19431	
	Support- cannot support development on this site.	10434/19424	
	Support – strongly opposed to additional residential development in the West York/Poppleton area, including this site for 66 dwellings.	10440/22724	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10580/23726	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10582/22782	
	Support – agree with the technical officers recommendation for failing this site.	10734/26475	
	Support – opposed to the urban sprawl that is proposed through proposals for 66 dwellings. Erosion of green spaces. The local infrastructure would be strained and traffic would increase.	10752/19954	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10754/19967	
	Support – development of 66 dwellings would negatively impact the village and engulf them in urban sprawl. The density of development is too great for the infrastructure to cope, in particular traffic.	10758/19989	
Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10767/20018		
Support – would impact on the village of Poppleton and Knapton changing the natural environmental assets.	10771/26451		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
742 Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane (continued)	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10791/20645	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10805/22819	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10811/21336	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10848/21925	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10850/21420	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10852/21435	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10855/21458	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10881/25891	Georgina Grace Trust
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10904/21532	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10957/21617	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11155/21639	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11215/21900	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11246/22842	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11248/22117	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11251/22132	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11252/22147	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11254/21162	
Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11257/22177		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	for.		
742 Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane (continued)	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11259/22192	
	Support- amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11417/23745	
744 Bull Balks, Dunnington	Objection- surprised that the offer of this land has been rejected. It is more suitable for housing as it is near to facilities in the village on a bus route and gives easy access to the A166. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village. Future development in Dunnington should be aimed at making the village more concentrated (nucleated) rather than spreading out into the rural end of Eastfield Lane.	2517/20589	
	Objection- surprised that the offer of this land has been rejected. It is more suitable for housing as it is near to facilities in the village on a bus route and gives easy access to the A166. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village. Future development in Dunnington should be aimed at making the village more concentrated (nucleated) rather than spreading out into the rural end of Eastfield Lane.	3027/23710	
	Objection - site 744 is centrally located within Dunnington, and could be regarded as limited infill within the Green Belt, as allowed by the NPPF. The Technical Officer rejects the site on the grounds that 'Dunnington village needs to retain a distance from the main arterial road. This site compromises the setting of the village'. This may have been the case had there been no existing development along the A166. However, Site 744 fills in a relatively short gap between existing houses on the A166 and the various buildings on the A166 near the junction with Church Balk. The de facto situation is that the arterial road defines Dunnington at this point. In addition, Site 744 is hidden from view on the A166 by a hedge and trees that could be retained, thus hiding any development. These arguments would not apply to the field bordering the A166 to the east. If this site was combined with Site 737, Stock Hill Field, West of Church Balk, it would have access to a bus route and give easy access to the A166. This is in contrast other suggested sites in Dunnington e.g. along Eastfield Lane. Given access via Site 737 any development here would be near to existing facilities in Dunnington. As the Consultation Draft Dunnington Neighbourhood Plan for 2014-2029 states, Dunnington is a compact village. Future development of the village should be aimed at 'nucleating' the settlement, rather than simply extending it further into	3582/22022	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	agricultural land on its furthest boundaries. The Technical Officer's comments are not sufficient ground for rejecting this site and the site should be reconsidered for future development. This would bring it in line with the aspirations of the Parish Council's Draft Neighbourhood Plan and would avoid 'development sprawl'.		
744 Bull Balks, Dunnington (continued)	Objection- surprised that the offer of this land has been rejected. It is more suitable for housing as it is near to facilities in the village on a bus route and gives easy access to the A166. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village. Future development in Dunnington should be aimed at making the village more concentrated (nucleated) rather than spreading out into the rural end of Eastfield Lane.	4747/22343	
	Objection- surprised that the offer of this land has been rejected. It is more suitable for housing as it is near to facilities in the village on a bus route and gives easy access to the A166. Housing here would relieve pressure to build on Eastfield Lane and would cause minimum disturbance to the village. Future development in Dunnington should be aimed at making the village more concentrated (nucleated) rather than spreading out into the rural end of Eastfield Lane.	4930/22358	
749 North of Riverside Gardens, Elvington	Support – concern at introducing a lot of new housing to the village. Why does Elvington have to grow so quickly and exponentially disproportionately with the local plan proposed growth rate. Elvington will not serve York employment but provide housing for Leeds employees.	10776/24530	
751 Off Fordland's Road, Fulford	Support – agree with the rejection of this site because of its contribution to the historic setting of Fulford and the city, as set out in the 2003 Green Belt Appraisal Map South.	62/19156	Fulford Parish Council
754 Land to the West of Strensall Road, Earswick	Support – any development of this site, despite failing criteria, will have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.	77/18867	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
755 Land to East of Strensall Road, Earswick	Support – any development of this site, despite failing criteria, will have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.	77/18868	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
763 Land West of Upper Poppleton	Support – would strongly object to any development on this site.	71/19006	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – would strongly object to any development on this site.	78/19044	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support - the plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans.	2893/20685	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	Roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable.		
763 Land West of Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	3577/22002	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	3596/22017	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5704/20824	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5705/20839	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5735/20858	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5817/20910	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5852/20949	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5882/22404	
	Support – infrastructure is at capacity and open land for pleasure/recreation should be retained.	9452/24112	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9692/21947	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9874/24284	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9882/24307	
	Support – this site should have failed criteria 1, 2, 3 and 4. It is important to retain the historic and village setting of Poppleton. Any development on this site would ruin the village setting.	10102/25825	
	Support – although on the outskirts of the village, this major expansion would still rely on village services - doctors, dentists, primary school etc which simply cannot cope with the projected number of new inhabitants. Furthermore, although the A59 roundabout has been expanded, the A1237 and the A59 are still single lane roads which are always extremely busy and backlogged.	10430/19429	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
763 Land West of Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – strongly opposed to developments proposed in the West York / Poppleton area, including this site.	10440/22730	
	Support – there is no transparency on how this site has been evaluated and selected.	10434/19418	
	Support – strongly opposed to developments proposed in the West York / Poppleton area, including this site.	10440/22730	
	Support - residential use of this land will destroy the compactness of Upper Poppleton and encroach upon farming land. Road network, schools and amenities cannot support this volume of housing.	10578/22771	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10580/23733	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10582/22789	
	Support – would strongly object to any development on this site.	10734/26476	
	Support – would be too many homes being crammed into this area. The infrastructure, doctors, amenities and schools do not have capacity. Also the character of the Poppleton villages will be compromised by the massive overdevelopment and urban sprawl that York Council is proposing in the Poppleton area.	10752/19952	
	Support – negative impact on the village. Development is too great.	10758/19988	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10767/20016	
	Support - green field site of historic character. Each will impact on the village of Poppleton and Knapton changing the natural environmental assets. The dangerous access to the site will lead to accidents. It is disconnected from the village and no suitable access. Majority of site fails criteria 1 historic character and setting.	10771/20051	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10791/20653	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10805/22826	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10811/21343	
Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10848/21932		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
763 Land West of Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10850/21427	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10852/21442	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10855/21465	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10881/25889	Georgina Grace Trust
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10904/21539	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10957/21624	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11155/21645	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11215/21907	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11246/22849	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11248/21224	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11251/22139	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11252/22154	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11254/22169	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11257/22184	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11259/22199	
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton	Support – would strongly object to any development on this site.	71/19007	Nether Poppleton Parish Council

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – would strongly object to any development on this site.	78/19045	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support- would represent a loss of green belt land with subsequent detrimental impact on the setting of the historic city and setting of the Poppletons. The highway network would quickly become inadequate.	192/23776	
	Support – green Belt would be lost forever – a precious commodity which cannot be regained when lost and urban creep will take its place. Where are all the jobs for people. Schools/drainage sewage systems/NHS and Doctors would be overloaded. Potentially 4000 more cars on the A59 and Ring Road in an area where there is already far too much traffic. More air pollution. Inadequate infrastructure makes this development unsuitable. Do we need 4000+ people on the outskirts of the village. Has this need been estimated on factual evidence. This development will spoil the character of the quaint, unique, historic York that visitors come to see. If they want a modern sprawling city they go to Leeds. It is easier for developers to build on green belt than tackle brownfield sites but we should ensure that the brownfield sites are used first to enhance the existing environment instead of wasting our green fields. Food production on the green belt is important. Preserve the individual and unique character of York which is attractive to visitors and investors.	1217/20565	
	Support – would put huge extra pressure on the A59, a road which, even with the latest improvements will struggle to cope with present-day pressures let alone the proposed extra buildings which could generate at least 1500 more vehicles. Has any consideration been given to the possibility of flood damage caused by the increasing destruction of the natural water soak-aways in this area, from the new Park & Ride to current proposals. The Poppleton' general infrastructure could not cope with the massive new influx – schools, parking, drainage etc.	2855/20621	
	Support - the plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans. Roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable.	2893/20684	
	Support- concern over the number of proposed houses to be built on ST1, ST2, 779 and 764. The local infrastructure is not suitable to cope with such developments. The roads, particularly the ring road is already severely congested. Question raised regarding the extra school places. Concern regarding the need for	3040/23849	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	further GP surgeries and other services. The proposals will lead to a complete loss of separation between the Poppletons and greater York. The safeguarded sites are ridiculous. Safeguarded should only mean it is guarded against any future development.		
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – the allocation of this site for 2808 houses is wholly unsupported by the infrastructure required for such amount of persons.	3045/20709	
	Support – the proposed development would totally destroy the character of the existing villages and desecrate the Green Belt concept in and around this area. Need of more facilities (school, shops, medical facilities). More traffic on already busy roads.	3284/20711	
	Support – the proposed development would totally destroy the character of the existing villages and desecrate the Green Belt concept in and around this area. Need of more facilities (school, shops, medical facilities). More traffic on already busy roads	3285/20717	
	Support – green belt and agricultural land. Urban development of such large plot would destroy the attractive westerly approach to the City.	3447/22318	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas. A primary school, doctors surgery and chemist needs to be provided for this site.	3577/22003	
	Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas. A primary school, doctors surgery and chemist needs to be provided for this site.	3596/22018	
	Support – the site of the proposed development is disproportionate to the existing Poppleton villages as combined they have approximately 4500 residents. Local amenities will not accommodate the additional number of people. The site itself is remote from local amenities and will increase pedestrian flow across the A59 thus increasing accident risk. Even allowing for the new Park & Ride a significant amount of extra traffic will be generated which will use the A59. This road is already heavily congested and there is going to be additional traffic from developments in the pipeline. There will be a significant increase in congestion and delay to Park & Ride vehicles as well as general traffic; and there will be increased vehicle emissions.	4078/21710	
	Support – the site of the proposed development is disproportionate to the existing	4080/21711	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>Poppleton villages. Local amenities will not accommodate the additional number of people. The site itself is remote from local amenities and will increase pedestrian flow across the A59 thus increasing accident risk. Even allowing for the new Park & Ride a significant amount of extra traffic will be generated which will use the A59. This road is already heavily congested and there is going to be additional traffic from developments in the pipeline. Consequently there will be a significant increase in congestion and delay to Park & Ride vehicles as well as general traffic; and there will be increased vehicle emissions.</p>		
<p>764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)</p>	<p>Support – the huge scale of this possible development would have considerable social and environmental impact in a community that is already enduring considerable stress from developments that deliver many costs with few identifiable benefits. The ongoing traffic congestion in the centre of Upper Poppleton, the dangers of presented by local/national road traffic speeding along the Long Ridge Lane “rat-run” at peak times to avoid waiting at the new A59 traffic lights, the loss of readily accessible play/recreational areas, are examples of the what is being “dumped” on this community.</p>	<p>4325/19659</p>	
	<p>Support – the huge scale of this possible development would have considerable social and environmental impact in a community that is already enduring considerable stress from developments that deliver many costs with few identifiable benefits. The ongoing traffic congestion in the centre of Upper Poppleton, the dangers of presented by local/national road traffic speeding along the Long Ridge Lane “rat-run” at peak times to avoid waiting at the new A59 traffic lights, the loss of readily accessible play/recreational areas, are examples of the what is being “dumped” on this community.</p>	<p>4326/19660</p>	
	<p>Support – would swamp the area almost doubling the size of the Poppletons. Significant demand on the already overstretched local services and infrastructure (especially road network). This would need to be a completely self contained village complete with amenities, instead of swamping local services on this side of York.</p>	<p>4422/20730</p>	
	<p>Support- there should be no housing development taking place on green field sites.</p>	<p>4437/23970</p>	
	<p>Support – this is greenbelt and agricultural land. Such a large plot would destroy the westerly approach to the city. Further urban sprawl should not occur.</p>	<p>4443/23977</p>	
	<p>Support – this proposal is too large and will detract from the approach to the city along the A59.</p>	<p>5408/24010</p>	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5704/20825	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5705/20842	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5735/20859	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5817/20911	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5852/20950	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	5882/22405	
	Support – unsuitable without expansion of the ring road.	5956/20988	
	Support – infrastructure is a capacity and open land for pleasure/recreation should be retained.	9452/24111	
	Support – the total population of this development would overwhelm the facilities currently available in Poppleton. The character of this area will be ruined. No indication is given as to how the infrastructure (roads, drainage etc.) will be handled. If this development must go ahead then at least call it by its own name and provide all the necessary facilities to make it a self-contained community not reliant on existing facilities in Upper and Nether Poppleton.	9493/18808	
	Support – this site would have significant impact on the village and surrounding rural area. This is building on farmland, in the greenbelt. It is totally unnecessary.	9634/25156	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9692/21948	
	Support - with every house comes more concrete and tarmac, all causing more run-off from all the rain and York knows what happens with all the water that goes into the rivers. How can our road infrastructure deal with all this development. Where is the employment in this City and surrounding area. Schools, surgeries, emergency services, gas and water pipes etc how will they all cope.	9857/20292	
Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9874/24283		
Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	9882/24306		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – the roads are congested and gridlocked. Where would all the people go to school. All this building creates a rabbit hutch effect, no parking, insufficient places for children to play, just as many houses in an estate as possible.	9984/25932	
	Support – totally inappropriate for the area. The outer ring road creates a natural boundary to the York conurbation and if Greenfield development is required to meet housing requirements there are plenty of Greenfield sites located within the outer ring road. These should be fully exploited before sites like this are considered. Brownfield sites need to be fully exploited before any Greenfield sites.	10041/24391	
	Support – this proposal is far too large for the surrounding infrastructure, the land regularly floods.	10046/24403	
	Support – it is the correct decision not to include this site in the local plan. The site would have an irreversible negative impact on Poppleton and the rural feel around it. The road infrastructure could not cope with it.	10102/25824	
	Support – the size of this proposal is totally inappropriate. It would change the historic feel of the village and cause undue stress on the local infrastructure. There would be high of accidents with extra traffic and pedestrians. This is greenbelt, there are other, more suitable sites within the bypass. There are insufficient jobs.	10108/25832	
	Support – this site will have a fundamental and catastrophic effect on the current life and work of Poppleton residents. The style of dwellings proposed are completely inappropriate for a semi-rural village. The plan makes no consideration for the need for additional infrastructure. The development makes no consideration of the history of York’s most significant village areas and the effect that such a large and significant increase in people will have on established services and way of life. This will lead to a fundamental change in the quality of life for existing residents.	10123/25854	
	Support – the local infrastructure cannot support this. This would put a massive burden on the ring road. Local services are over subscribed. To loose valuable farming land would be a considerable detraction to the conservation area.	10153/25991	
	Support - there is no information as to how such large developments will be serviced. Furthermore this development will be on undeveloped land.	10154/25993	
	Support – disproportionate number of houses to the remainder of the local community. Oversubscribed schools. Bad road access. Highly undesirable ribbon development. Protected grey partridges.	10202/21150	
	Support – the size and scale of this development is appalling. This will forma	10347/26043	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	village alone. The ring road is already over crowded. The development needs to be scaled back severely to protect Poppleton becoming part of York's urban sprawl.		
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – object to the following proposals: Sites 764, 763, 769, 742	10430/19428	
	Support –strongly oppose the allocation of West Poppleton. Would have severe consequences on the surrounding area as the infrastructure is already struggling to cope, particularly as this will already be increased due to the 1416 additional houses planned at sites 733, ST2, West View Close, 779 and ST1. Will add to traffic congestion on the A1237 and A59 and will increase traffic through the Poppleton villages. There are already concerns over parking around the village green area, and this will put residents on foot and bicycle at risk as they try and navigate moving and parked cars. It is not clear what the impact will be on local facilities/amenities. What additional infrastructure will be introduced. How will this be funded. Should be safeguarding the green-belt for future generations not for development. Building at West Poppleton will substantially erode the green belt, This goes against Policy SS5 to preserve the setting and special character of York. Once this land is developed for housing, retail industrial use, it is gone forever. The trees, ditches and fields around the area provide habitats for many of our native species. Deer, newts, frogs, owls and many other animals are regularly seen in this area. It is not clear that the impact on these animals has been properly assessed. A comprehensive review should be made. Given the loss of habitats from developments 733, ST2, 779, ST1, it is imperative that rural land is retained in the vicinity at site 764.	10434/19419	
	Support – strongly opposed to developments proposed in the West York / Poppleton area, including this site.	10440/22729	
	Support – Poppleton is a close community which has many attractions which would be permanently eroded if the village were to become part of an urban sprawl.	10474/22593	
	Support - land incorrectly labelled (next to Northfield Lane). Residential use of this land will destroy the compactness of Upper Poppleton and encroach upon farming land. Road network, schools and amenities cannot support this volume of housing.	10578/22770	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10580/23734	
Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided	10582/22790		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	for.		
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – out of scale with the rest of the environment. All traffic would have to exit on to the already overcrowded A59. Would require all the amenities of a small town. Resources in Poppleton already stretched.	10642/19730	
	Support – not suitable due to the size of the development relative to infrastructure and loss of green belt,	10725/19884	
	Support – agree with the technical officers recommendation for failing this site.	10734/26477	
	Support – too many houses. Amenities would be under great strain. Roundabout is likely to be congested again. Character of the village needs to be protected.	10752/19951	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10754/19964	
	Support – density is too high. Local infrastructure cannot cope. More frequent flooding.	10758/19987	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10767/20015	
	Support – excessive in size, not in accordance with the village design statement. Opposed to use of the green belt. Would overwhelm present infrastructure. The development is at the opposite side of the A59 and this will mean that car journeys over short distances to take children to school will increase leading to increased pollution and reduced air quality. Any children walking to school will be negatively impacted by the pollution and will face a dangerous fast road to cross.	10771/20038	
	Support – green belt land. Black Dike Lane not suitable for access.	10790/21881	
	Support – the amenities in the area are already under strain and new primary school, GP surgery and chemist must be provided.	10791/20654	
	Support – the scale of this increase in population will place massive stress on the schooling, health and utility services as well as the existing infrastructure. Much of this plan is for land which is existing greenbelt, when there are sufficient brownfield sites which could be used first.	10802/21329	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10805/22827	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10811/21344	
Support – unwelcome intrusion that will change the whole character of “rural West York” into “Suburbs of York”. This will create a largely unbroken coalescence of settlements from the A1237 ring road across the A59 into Poppleton. It will add	10836/21389		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	further burden on amenities. The fields are flat and become waterlogged or flooded at times of heavy rain, this affects existing homes, roads and amenities. The A59 cannot cope now with peak flows to and from A1237, this will make a bad situation worse.		
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10848/21933	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10850/21428	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	10852/21443	
	Support – overdevelopment of an area adjacent to the conservation area. Insufficient infrastructure. Amenities under great strain and need new facilities. Primary school and doctor’s surgery and chemist needed.	10855/21466	
	Support – the exclusion of this site from the Local Plan.	10881/25888	Georgina Grace Trust
	Support – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	10904/21540	
	Support – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	10957/21625	
	Support – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	11155/21646	
	Support – a primary school, doctor’s surgery, chemist and open space leisure opportunities need to be provided.	11215/21908	
	Support – primary school, doctor’s surgery and chemist needed.	11246/22850	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11248/22125	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11251/22140	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11252/22155	
Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11254/22170		
Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11257/22185		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	for.		
764 Land West of Millfield Lane, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11259/22200	
	Support - encouraging over population. Job opportunities declined since 70's. Green belt areas need to be preserved. 36 houses too many. Extra housing would swamp the locality. Amenities overcrowded. More transport required.	11345/22879	
	Support – no evidence of demand. Population forecasts don't justify development. Numerous properties that could be refurbished. Negative impact on rural community. Uses valuable agricultural land. Support services couldn't cope with the demand.	11357/22900	
	Support – amenities are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for.	11417/23753	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 2: Residential Site Assessment Proformas (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
766 112 Strensall Road, Earswick	Support – any development of this site, despite failing criteria, will have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.	77/18869	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
767 Land East of A19 (Selby Road) Fulford	Support – agree with the rejection of this site because of the contribution to the historic setting of Fulford and the city as set out in the 2011 Historic Character Technical Appraisal Paper.	62/19157	Fulford Parish Council
769 Land at Oak Tree Nursery, Upper Poppleton	Support – agree with technical officer recommendation to failing criteria 1	71/18988	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with technical officer recommendation to failing criteria 1	78/19026	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – the plans contravene the Poppleton Village Design Statement. The present infrastructure is wholly inadequate to accommodate such massive plans. Blairgowrie is in a conservation area and English Heritage object to the proposals. Roads in York are already wholly inadequate to cope with the existing traffic and the introduction of thousands more homes with no evident plan to improve the roads will make the situation untenable.	2893/20686	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	3577/22004	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	3596/22019	
	Support – this land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians. Another junction on this stretch of road to provide access to houses on Blair Gowrie is going to make the school run dangerous. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses.	5704/20826	
	Support – this land is in a conservation area and the proposal to build here directly contravenes the intent of the conservation area. There are already traffic problems in this area and a further increase to the number of cars will make it worse for drivers and pedestrians. Another junction on this stretch of road to provide access to houses	5705/20841	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	on Blair Gowrie is going to make the school run dangerous. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses.		
769 Land at Oak Tree Nursery, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – the existing site, together with the A59 Park and Ride, already impacts on the Green Belt policies for York as defined by the government. Any further expansion would further erode the Green Belt which is essential to preserving the identity of Poppleton and the character of the approach to York, directly contravening the government directives. The houses on Northfield Lane vibrate with the HGV traffic and this will increase with further use. Original building restrictions on use and opening times are not being adhered to and an extension to the business park will be unbearable to live with. Negotiating areas around the green where there are no footpaths is already difficult and will be worse with the additional traffic caused by more families. Another junction on this stretch of road to provide access to houses on Blair Gowrie is going to make the school run dangerous. The school nursery and the primary school are over subscribed and over full. The GP is full to capacity too. There are not the services available to sustain this many more people. If development is made on this site it should be in keeping with the natural; state of the site, keeping the barn, hedgerow and mature trees by having a few, well spaced houses. The extent of this development is excessive. Bbelieve that this number should be reduced. This land forms part of the green belt corridor which is essential to preserve Poppleton as a village and not a suburb of York.	5735/20860	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5817/20912	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5852/20951	
	Support - believe the number of houses should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	5882/22406	
	Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9692/21949	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be	9874/24285	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 2: Residential Site Assessment Proformas (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.		
769 Land at Oak Tree Nursery, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	9882/24308	
	Support – agree with the officers' assessment.	10430/19430	
	Support – strongly opposed to developments proposed in the West York / Poppleton area, including this site.	10440/22731	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10580/23735	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10582/22791	
	Support - agree with the technical officers' recommendations for failing criteria 1.	10734/19923	
	Support – too many houses. Green belt would be eroded. Infrastructure would be strained. Development should be on Brownfield first.	10752/19953	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10754/19966	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10767/20017	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10791/20655	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10805/22828	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10811/21345	
Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10848/21934		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 2: Residential Site Assessment Proformas (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
769 Land at Oak Tree Nursery, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10850/21429	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	10852/21444	
	Support – overdevelopment of an area adjacent to the conservation area. Insufficient infrastructure.	10855/21467	
	Support – agree with the exclusion of this site from the Local Plan.	10881/25890	
	Support – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	10904/21541	
	Support – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	10957/21626	
	Support – would have significant detrimental effect on all existing communities in north west York. Traffic congestion would get worse. Number of houses should be reduced. The areas amenities and facilities cannot cope.	11155/21647	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11215/21909	
	Support –the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11246/22851	
	Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11248/22126	
	Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11251/22141	
	Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11252/22156	
Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities	11254/22171		

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 2: Residential Site Assessment Proformas (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	must be provided for these areas.		
769 Land at Oak Tree Nursery, Upper Poppleton (continued)	Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11257/22186	
	Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11259/22201	
	Support – the number of houses on this and other sites in Poppleton should be reduced. The amenities in these areas are already under great strain and facilities must be provided for these areas.	11417/23754	
773 Land North of Skelton Village	Objection – disagree with the Council's assessment of site against Criteria 1, 3 and 4. Object to the identification of the land to the north and north east of Skelton as being important in preserving the setting of the village or that of York and the Minster. The areas designated Flood Zone 3a could easily be designated as forming part of such areas. Subject to appropriate measures being taken, such a designation would be capable of enhancing the biodiversity of the overall site. Question efficacy of site selection methodology / point scoring. Without allocation of this land as Safeguarded Land there would be no more development in Skelton for over 25 years, meaning housing needs would go unmet for a long period of time. Detailed comments provided, see response.	534/19488	DPP One
774 Land North of Railway Line adjacent to Millfield Lane.	Support – agree with technical officer recommendation to failing criteria 1	71/18989	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with technical officer recommendation to failing criteria 1	78/19027	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support - residential use of this land will destroy the compactness of Upper Poppleton and encroach upon farming land. Road network, schools and amenities cannot support this volume of housing. 'Road' of housing from the centre of York will destroy the green belt that surrounds Poppleton.	10578/22772	
	Support - agree with the technical officers' recommendations for failing criteria 1.	10734/26478	
	Support – greenfield site of historical importance. Would impact on Poppleton.	10771/20046	
775 Land at Boroughbridge Road/ Millfield Lane Site 1	Support – agree with technical officer recommendation to failing criteria 1	71/18990	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with technical officer recommendation to failing criteria 1	78/19028	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support – agree with the technical officers' recommendations for failing criteria 1.	10734/26479	

York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Appendix 2: Residential Site Assessment Proformas (continued)

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
777 Amalgamated Sites East of Earswick	Support – any development of this site, despite failing criteria, will have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.	77/18870	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Objection - the principle of taking Green Belt land for new development is wrong as it will significantly change the character of the village. It is unsustainable and will put serious strain on the infrastructure (roads and schools). It will therefore devalue properties in the parish. A proper new town should be planned close to main transport arteries like rail and the A1/A64. This would have to have its own services developed.	10014/25958	
	Objection - the principle of taking greenbelt land for new development is wrong as it will significantly change the character of the village. It is unsustainable and will put serious strain on the infrastructure (roads and schools). It will therefore devalue properties in the parish. A proper new town should be planned close to main transport arteries like rail and the A1/A64. This would have to have its own services developed.	10017/25962	
778 Land West of Chapel Fields	Objection – provides an overview of changes made and evidence produced to address those issues raised in the technical officer assessment. Additional detail submitted comprises a Transport Plan, Landscape Review and Plan and Archaeological Assessment and Historic Mapping. The proposed housing site would comprise 102 housing units, resulting in a small expansion of the western edge of the City. Request that site is allocated for housing.	9998/18512	Turley Associates
780 Site South of Knapton Open Space	Comment – disagree with officer assessment. The site impacts on the views from the A1237 regarding the setting and character of York and merits rejection on more substantial grounds.	45/18774	
781 Land to the West of Stresnall Road	Support – any development of this site, despite failing criteria, will have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.	77/18871	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
782 Foss Bank Farm	Support – any development of this site, despite failing criteria, will have a detrimental effect on the residents of Strensall / Towthorpe and villages beyond.	77/18872	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council
	Objection – site excluded from future development, the main reason being one of sustainability i.e. no school, doctors surgery etc. within a specified distance of our land. However it would appear 220 acres of land opposite the site (site 810) has been earmarked for future development. Unclear how this can be. If this site is not sustainable, then how is the land over the road. Informed that the developer of 810 will be required to build a school, shops etc. which will then make the site sustainable, if that is the case then surely this site should also be considered sustainable, removed from the greenbelt and safeguarded for future development.	1729/22233	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
782 Foss Bank Farm (continued)	Objection – site excluded from future development, the main reason being one of sustainability i.e. no school, doctors surgery etc. within a specified distance of our land. However it would appear 220 acres of land opposite the site (site 810) has been earmarked for future development. Unclear how this can be. If this site is not sustainable, then how is the land over the road. Informed that the developer of 810 will be required to build a school, shops etc. which will then make the site sustainable, if that is the case then surely this site should also be considered sustainable, removed from the greenbelt and safeguarded for future development.	10533/22738	
	Objection – would suggest that the site scores highly with regards to access to transport as there is a bus stop outside the entrance to the site with buses with a frequent service. Recommendations for site 810 should apply to this site. Site 782 should be included as safeguarded land within the local plan, in the same way site 810 is.	10537/22605	
789 Land to the West of Becksid Elvington	Objection – disagree with the Council’s decision to reject allocation or safeguarding of this land for residential development by excluding the land from the green belt. Initial assessment identified no reasons why the existing road network cannot accommodate development of the land. Some upgrading may be required, but none of the improvements are likely to be insurmountable and would mean that development and resulting traffic could not be accommodated within the existing road network. Development to the west of the proposed site did not uncover any archaeology. Therefore do not envisage that this site would be of archaeological interest. Appreciate that a desk based report would be required if the land is to be considered for allocation. However, such a report is not necessary if the land is only to be safeguarded. Does not see that the visual impacts of safeguarding the land would be harmful, or undermine the purposes of Green Belt given that the land does not fulfil Green Belt policy objectives. The appraisal does not acknowledge that the hedges and field patterns are not of historic significance or visual interest. There is no reason why the hedgerows could not be maintained as part of development as they would provide interest to the layout of a scheme, and help to create local character and identity. The appraisal also suggests development of the land would impact on the character of Church Lane, even though the site does not abut Church Lane and there is an existing belt of development between Church Lane and the area of land. Cannot see how development of the land would visually impact on the conservation area, given it is physically separate and should not be visible from within the conservation area. The appraisal suggests development of the land would impact on a number of residential receptors and PROW. However, no one has the right to a view, and development on the edge of settlements invariably abuts existing properties thereby changing existing views. The assessment is ambiguous because it is unclear whether the statement is intended to be positive or negative. There would be limited	6046/19498	Directions Planning Consultancy
		10076/24526	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>visual impact from the wider area given the sheltered nature of the land within the landscape. It is only from the west and south that development would be visible, but given that it would sit against a backdrop of existing development then it would not block views across open countryside. At present the western edge of Elvington consists of residential development where the road layout clearly envisaged development extending into this site. The western edge of Elvington is therefore not defensible in the long term as the pressures to see the land developed will continue into the future. The proposed area of land for safeguarding will, therefore, represent the development opportunity which has previously been identified and which the existing road layout is intended to facilitate. If the land is safeguarded then it allows the Council to identify appropriate boundary treatment along the western boundary of the site designed to establish a more defensible boundary. This would prevent the current situation arising again and the pressures of development extending any further to the west.</p> <p>Support - concern at proposals that would introduce a lot of new housing to the village.</p>		
<p>790 Land at Northfield , North of Knapton</p>	<p>Support – failed technical officer comments, agree with this assessment.</p>	<p>71/18991</p>	<p>Nether Poppleton Parish Council</p>
	<p>Support – failed technical officer comments, agree with this assessment.</p>	<p>78/19029</p>	<p>Upper Poppleton Parish Council</p>
	<p>Comment – indicates typo in officers’ comments.</p>	<p>9773/20226</p>	
	<p>Support – agree with the technical officers recommendations for failing the site</p>	<p>10734/26480</p>	
	<p>Support – a greenfield site of historic character. Will impact on the village of Poppleton and Knapton changing the natural environmental assets.</p>	<p>10771/20053</p>	
<p>796 Outskirts of Knapton Village</p>	<p>Comment – disagree with officer assessment. The site impacts on the views from the A1237 regarding the setting and character of York and merits rejection on more substantial grounds.</p>	<p>45/18775</p>	
	<p>Support – opposed to any development as this is a green field site of historic character. Would impact on the village of Poppleton and Knapton changing the natural environmental assets.</p>	<p>10771/20052</p>	