

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Level of development	Objection - continue to be seriously concerned about the scale of development proposed in the Local Plan. The inclusion of further sites in this consultation only increases the sense that the historic character of York will be irreparably harmed if these proposals are taken forward.	62/	Fulford Parish Council
	Objection – members and people living within the Parish take issue with the projections for housing growth based on the estimated increase in population, inward and international migration and employment-led growth. Serious reservations about the proposals’ likely effect on the draft Green Belt and the environment generally – a positive and widely-valued feature of Heworth Without. Level of housing growth proposed remains unsound because there is no evidence to demonstrate that the Council has any significant influence over the key drivers nor any structure plan to resolve them. There is no clear strategy about how employment and economic growth are to be delivered other than an indication of the main employers and categories of employment within the Authority. Until the latest census figures are available, the data on which the Preferred Options and Further Sites Consultation documents are based should be regarded as tentative at best.	65/	Heworth Without Parish Council
	Objection – housing targets should not be based on the local authority’s ambitions or dreams, but on accurate assessment of need, supported by evidence and able to stand up to scrutiny. Housing levels suggested are a ‘wish list’. Suggest that a target of 850 hoes per annum for the city could be achievable.	71/	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – housing targets should not be based on the local authority’s ambitions or dreams, but on accurate assessment of need, supported by evidence and able to stand up to scrutiny. Housing levels suggested are a ‘wish list’. Suggest that a target of 850 hoes per annum for the city could be achievable.	78/	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – York will always need some new housing and associated infrastructure for the growth of its inherent population but the levels proposed greatly exceed this.	122/	Knapton Lane Residents Association
	Objection – the absence of data is open to legal challenge. The Local Plan for future housing demand should be based on the predicted needs of local families, not simply on the basis of nationally imposed targets and developers wish lists.	533/23777	
	Comment – question the statistics used to predict the level of population growth, the number of jobs to be created and the match between jobs and housing. Of those jobs created, how many will be earning enough to buy any of these houses.	549/	
	Comment – agree that additional housing is required in York , but the Council should be realistic in its ambitions and consider the impact of the volume of building proposed. The Plan is highly ambitious and a complete overkill for an historical City and village	904/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	which need to be preserved.		
Level of development (continued)	Objection – concerned about the amount of housing the Council are planning	989/	
	Objection – need realistic housing targets which address the current shortfall of homes and follow realistic predictions of economic and population growth. Unsustainable scale of growth proposed. Intolerable strain on local infrastructure, roads, health services and schools. Use of brownfield sites as a priority.	995/	
	Objection – questions if the amount of housing is needed. The number is more to do with assisting the accounts of large land owners, house builders, estate agents and the general country's economy. It would be better to plan entirely new villages.	1150/23790	
	Objection – there is an apparent contradiction in the key growth factors used to determine housing needs. The additional sites put forward by developers for housing and the proposed additional 'safeguarded' land, all within the currently accepted York Green Belt, has accentuated the over provision of greenfield sites. Similarly, the allocation of sites for employment is far in excess of realistic requirements based on historic trends.	1306/	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)
	Objection – do not support Council's assessment of the need of the scale of development. Do not support the justification for providing over and above what has been assessed as York's needs, as is the case with the housing targets within the plan. Disappointed the consultation makes no reference to any consideration of reducing the housing targets to more sustainable levels that are supported by objectively assessed needs. Housing targets of 1090dpa (+15% buffer supply) are based on grossly inaccurate calculations of need and unrealistic assumptions on potential future economic growth and job creation in York. Estimated job growth figures are overambitious and fail to take into account the jobs that have been lost in the city over the past 10 years. Disparity between what is required for York and what is desired by the Council. Local Plans must be based on objectively assessed needs. If Council continues in its attempts to pursue inflated housing targets then it risks having the Local Plan thrown out by the Inspector. Urge the Council to give serious consideration to reducing the overall scale of development within the Plan, particularly housing. Also concerned about scale of strategic sites and the impact they will have on the amenity of the surrounding residents.	1355/	Julian Sturdy MP
	Comment – queried where the 22,000 housing requirement comes from. There is no hard and fast evidence that growth in population and jobs will occur. Aviva, the railways and Nestle, have cut back on jobs. The University has grown massively, but this is unlikely to continue, and the only real growth area is considered to be in	1392/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	technology – this is not likely to result in 22,000 houses.		
Level of development (continued)	Objection – concerned with the potential implications of the level of growth proposed, as the ambitious targets are likely to give rise to the creation of pressures on services and infrastructure (including road networks) which will in turn affect the quality of the environment. This is in the terms both of the impact on visual quality and of amenity. York has a sensitive landscape and the integration of development needs careful consideration given the cultural and environmental significance of the city’s wealth of archaeology and heritage assets. Consultation document represents an increase in the level of growth to that outlined in the Preferred Options document, making a greater impact on the environment that will in turn demand greater mitigation and compensation if negative consequences are to be avoided. We note that this increase is proposed notwithstanding the Council’s current review of housing requirements in light of the 2011 census based household and population projections which suggest lower levels of growth than indicated by previous statistics. This provides an opportunity to abandon new settlements and concentrate development on urban brownfield sites, sensitively located urban extensions and sustainable village extensions, rather than just to scale down each of the currently identified new settlement sites.	1592/	Directions Planning Consultancy on behalf of the York Civic Trust
	Objection – the local plan is far too aggressive in terms of growth targets for York.	1666/	
	Comment - independent assessment undertaken which raises a number of issues but confirms that the requirement of 1,090 dwellings a year appears to be a suitable level of dwelling provision taking into account the potential for about 6,400 workers to emerge from the existing population by virtue of reduced levels of unemployment and higher rates of activity amongst the over 60 age group. The report highlights that higher levels of dwelling provision might be required if these assumptions prove to be inaccurate or if economic growth proceeds faster than projected. The realistic delivery of dwellings from the allocations is likely to be significantly lower than the required delivery of 1,090 dwellings per year. The issue for both the completion rates within the plan period and for the potential requirement beyond 2030 is that the plan relies on very few sites and so delivery at best is going to be somewhat inconsistent or ‘lumpy’. An alternative is to make sure that there is a greater supply of sites especially in the longer term and to resist the temptation that having made decisions regarding major releases to define the inner green belt boundary so as to exclude any latitude should there be issues regarding deliverability or change in policies or circumstances which would favour locations next to the existing city boundary.	1741/	DLP Planning Consultants on behalf of Dennis and Christine Lancaster
	Objection – there is no justification of why the number of housing is needed and for	1903/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	whom.		
Level of development (continued)	Objection – although it is the government who are driving the programme for additional housing, queried why have the ignored advice and exceeded specified numbers for York.	1946/	
	Objection - the plan is based on building 1,250 houses annually up to 2030, which is 50% in excess of the anticipated demand	1956/	
	Comment – population growth has been set unrealistically high. The plan implies that new jobs will go to incoming residents. All these will need extra accommodation turning villages into dormitory settlements.	2172/	
	Comment – fail to understand the logic and sustainability of the Local Plan. It is impossible to understand the scale of affordable housing needed. Affordability in the authority remains a challenge and it is important to consider this issue in planning for future growth and change.	2484/17999	
	Objection- dismay at the proposals that have been submitted for the huge and ill-considered building programme of houses.	2631/23820	
	Objection – housing need is overestimated. It is not in aligned with Government requirements for Local Plan assessments.	2862/23827	
	Comment - the number of new houses proposed is too large.	3135/23858	
	Objection - too many houses proposed.	3117/	
	Objection – too many houses. Urban sprawl spoiling the special rural nature of the county.	3139/	
	Objection –there is not the demand for such a large number of new houses.	3162/	
	Comment - the most appropriate annual requirement should be 1,500 dwellings per annum. Serious concerns about the location strategy for housing requirements and housing density.	3235/	Yew Tree Associates
	Objection- opposed to the developments in other parts of the city. Industry is non existent yet the Council are pursuing a ludicrous high volume of housing.	3370/23894	
	Objection – experts consulted by the council and independent assessors, have demonstrated that a building target of 850 houses a year until 2030 would meet the market and affordable housing needs of York’s current population and future natural population growth. Despite this, the level of growth proposed is to build up to 1,250 houses a year until 2030. This figure is based on a set of subjective assumptions about future rapid economic growth for York at a rate well beyond that for the UK as a whole, and for surrounding Yorkshire & the Humber; the creation of thousands of well-paid jobs to be taken up by large numbers of migrants to the City who will require	3428/	Skelton Village Action Group

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	housing; and house building at a phenomenal rate almost 300% higher than has ever been achieved in York in the recent past.		
Level of development (continued)	Comment - queries the need to build so many homes and the demographics on which the Plan is based.	3893/21674	
	Objection –still to see any clear, evidence-based justification for the scale of housing development proposed in and around York. Fully accept that York urgently needs more housing but the proposed scaled of development defies logic.	4039/	
	Objection – believe the scale of development proposed by the Council is completely unsustainable and entirely inappropriate for a historic cathedral city, surrounded by greenbelt land and picturesque countryside.	4159/	
	Comment – queried whether York really needs thousands of extra houses. Where are the new occupiers coming from and where are they going to work. How will the services cope. The plans have proposed massive growth for York without explaining why it is justified by providing answers to these fundamental questions. Employment gets little mention in plans – residents will not find work in York but create further transport problems commuting to Leeds.	4301/	
	Objection – the city is at its capacity regarding the infrastructure. The congestion is bad. There is a lack of employment opportunities.	4394/23968	
	Comment – queried where are all the people going to come from to live in these proposed new homes. York is not expanding as a centre for commerce or industry. Manufacturing and industry has been leaving York for many years so there is no need for so many houses. The projected increase in housing need has been based on flawed information such as the increase of student population attending the universities and colleges in York. This type of data bears no resemblance to natural growth of a city such as York.	4396/	
	Objection - York should be growing organically, not via an explosion of 22,000 new homes, some 1,000 per year more than York is currently building	4654/	
	Comment – the proposed levels of growth does not add up. Does not understand how people will be able to afford houses.	4690/	
	Comment – there are enough houses already built and available.	4793/	
	Objection –the growth target being set and the subsequent calculation of the number of new homes required to service the growth are severely flawed and unrealistic in terms of achievability and desirability.	5152/	
Objection -22000 houses is far too many over the time scale which will alter the face of York and all the local villages	5194/		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Level of development (continued)	Objection – the councils plan to build huge numbers of new houses is out of proportion to that are required to accommodate any expected increase in employment. A much smaller number of new homes are more realistic and feasible to be sustained by the York city which needs to retain its character ad not become just an extension of Leeds.	5197/	
	Comment - do not accept that the case has been made for the overall amount of new housing which is proposed in the local plan. The estimates for growth in the need for extra housing, are not well founded ad are not supported by any factual evidence.	5210/	
	Objection - the council’s building programme is optimistic and is extremely unlikely if not impossible that developers will ever build 22,000 homes in York area over the next 15 years as the demand will not be there.	5274/	
	Comment – housing targets are underpinned by investment in infrastructure and services. The evidence is dated, fragmented or non existent.	5357/24002	
	Objection – this is a massive increase in the number of homes. The nature of York and its environs will be changes forever. There should be detailed plans for infrastructure and how this will be financed.	5408/24005	
	Objection -opposed to the number of new houses proposed.	5528/	
	Objection – the council have not disclosed the research conducted by Arup. Without the full facts it is difficult to comment fully on whether the scale of the proposals is justified by the evidence. It is questionable whether the proposed numbers are actually necessary. The proposed number represents a 10% increase in the size of the city which would alter its character irretrievably. No articulated protection is being offered for greenbelt land and for green spaces. No transport strategy has been fully articulated. It is unclear how many houses are going to be affordable homes or social housing. This affects the existing population in the areas surrounding the new housing areas and there may be issues of integration. No thought seems to have been given to how neighbourhoods and homes are created – or if this has been considered the residents have not been told about it.	5634/	
	Objection – have not adhered to Arup’s report which has been completely disregarded as they state d their expectation was for circa 800 jobs per year being created. The Council have inflated this to 1000 an increase of 25%. Not adhering to the NPPF.	5834/	
	Objection – issue with suggestion need 22,000 extra homes. Basis for figures appears suspect. Extremely unlikely that the number of jobs are creditable. Queried whether he council know of new jobs being created.	6217/	
	Comment – plans for housing development is disproportional to the demand. Local authority should not be encouraging population growth.	6242/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Level of development (continued)	Objection – do not consider that the council have identified enough land within allocated strategic sites to meet the housing needs of York. The council’s reliance on delivery mainly from larger strategic sites needs to be supported by a number of smaller site allocations, as there is growing doubt that the strategic sites, which carry a number of constraints, can meet their anticipated capacity.	6351/	Johnson Brook
	Objection – no need for the population of York to grow so much and so quickly. Not enough jobs or supportive infrastructure for so many people.	6502/	
	Objection – no need for the population of York to grow so much and so quickly. Not enough jobs or supportive infrastructure for so many people.	6503/	
	Objection – housing target numbers are too high.	6513/	Huntington and New Earswick Councillors
	Objection – concerned that York’s infrastructure can not cope with 22,000 extra homes or in fact whether the city needs such a quantity of new homes in the life of the plan. There appears to be no realistic evidence to support this level of development based on either housing or employment requirements. If the Council is simply intent on significantly growing the City’s population, which threatens the very fabric of historic York, how does it propose to provide employment for all the extra net immigration into the city. The Arup report would seem to back this argument suggesting that around 800/850 homes per year would be more appropriate to accommodate future economic growth.	6514/	Cllr Paul Doughty, Conservative Councillor for Strensall Ward
	Comment - no economic basis for the planned large-scale housing development.	6834/	
	Objection – the size and basis of the local plan development seem based on aspirational grounds and not the actual needs of York people.	7251/24083	
	Objection – the Arup report states that it will be important to continue to review the position taken on housing numbers. This has not been done and therefore the consultations are premature and flawed.	7313/	Cllr Nigel Ayre, on behalf of Heworth Without Ward
	Comment – the size and basis of developments in York seem to be based on aspirational grounds and not the actual needs of the York residents. 16,000 jobs are promised provided for or as a result of all this extra housing, unclear where this figure has come from.	9639/	
	Comment – the proposals appear to be aspirational rather than based on need. Where is the proof that so many homes are required over the next 15 years.	9253/	
	Objection – proposed level of housing growth will not however meet the Council’s affordable housing needs. The council must ensure that the extent of housing allocations proposed is sufficient to meet, in full, objectively assessed need.	9254/	HOW Planning

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
Level of development (continued)	Objection- York does not need the proposed level of new development, given the fact that there are very few jobs in the city at present and large employers are not coming to the city.	9275/	
	Objection - disagree with the number of new homes as suggested, such a high number is not needed.	9279/	
	Objection – opposed to the amount of housing that is being proposed in the area, particularly using existing Green Belt. York is a historic city which is reflected in the infrastructure, particularly the roads. There is little opportunity to widen, improve or change the roads into the city and the proposed development will make the city even more congested. The majority of residents of new developments will not work in York and will travel to Leeds and West Riding.	9327/	
	Comment – the planning assumptions for the need for new work places and houses need revisiting. some of the commercial land which is available in York has not been taken up e.g. Poppleton Business Park, Terry’s site and many offices in the centre are vacant.	9411/	
	Comment – the current proposals need to be reduced or they will create a suburban ‘wasteland’ of new houses nobody can afford to buy, in which so-called ‘quality of life’ is non-existent.	9434/	
	Objection – too many new houses planned.	9436/	
	Objection - the projected need for new housing is grossly overstated.	9441/	
	Comment – the proposed new houses are not for the locals, but for people wanting to move to York from different areas. York and its area used to be a beautiful historic city, but with the expansion of the University and increased development of other villages, the time has come to put a stop to all this expansion.	9448/	
	Objection – the need for such a large increase in housing stock is not evident.	9464/24126	
	Comment – question where the demand for housing originates, the cost of housing in York and infrastructure improvements are needed.	9465/24130	
	Comment – the council has created a number of 16,000 jobs created in York by 2030 and the prospect of all the employment land required but how have these figures been arrived at. There is plenty of opportunity for developments for both employment and housing use if the realistic figures for York’s growth over the next 20 years are taken into account.	9471/	
	Comment – the Local Plan has to be based on proven local need, not on the council’s aspiration growth ambitions which will change the whole aspect of York. The requirements should be met by an extension of the urban area and supplemented by	9473/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	limited development in the larger villages.		
Level of development (continued)	Objection –unclear on the justification/demand for building so many houses.	9490/	
	Objection – York is growing too big and too fast.	9506/	
	Comment – if Brownfield development sites have not yet been developed, then the demand for housing in York is not as high as is required in the report.	9519/	
	Objection – the council has taken their projected requirement of 22,000 homes from an “independent” survey, presumably financed by the council. Queried if anyone challenged the figures. Unclear why York’s population should increase by 70,000 people over the next 15 years from its existing 200,000 when there is no heavy industry to provide mass jobs. The modern university technology firms do not have labour intensive requirements and the trend is to work from home which can be situated anywhere.	9578/	
	Objection – this plan allows for too many houses and will take too much from the greenbelt.	9624/24150	
	Objection – too many new houses are planned.	9625/	
	Objection – there is no need for the additional housing which is being proposed. There is no employment in York to support an increased population.	9660/	
	Comment – queried whether there are enough jobs for all the extra people in York. Are we to be a dormitory for Leeds.	9666/	
	Objection –the consequences of being over-optimistic could be quite damaging for York, not merely aesthetically, but more importantly socially and economically. The rate of growth of employment numbers in York has historically been less than would be needed to result in the 16,000 increase in the period of the Local Plan, something exceptional would have to take place. It is difficult to see how it could be consistent with a high-skilled, higher-waged work force economy. It would be better to put resources into encouraging, facilitating and leading increased innovation and its exploitation, with its organic growth opportunity for skilled employment.	9704/	
	Objection – yet to see proof that the city needs quite so many houses.	9708/	
	Objection – do not believe that there is a need for additional major developments in York, already more than 20,000 new homes proposed. The City is not growing at a rate to warrant this.	9722/	
	Objection - York’s working population cannot be expanding. Development will cater for commuters, as an overspill of Leeds.	9818/24216	
Objection – 22000 new houses are too many for York. At 14.5% this is more than double the rate for Yorkshire and Humber. It will put huge pressure on the	9819/24217		

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	infrastructure. The character of York and nearby villages will be ruined.		
Level of development (continued)	Comment – York does need more houses but the level proposed will reduce house values and more jobs will be needed, this is a vicious circle which will continue until York is a massive city.	9866/24271	
	Objection – question where people are coming from and where they will work. How will the infrastructure cope with such expansion, it is already at capacity.	9913/24358	
	Objection – very concerned over legitimacy of the assumption relating to the anticipated growth in employment opportunities and consequential requirement for 22,000 new homes. This is optimistic and entirely aspirational and not based on advice that the Council has been provided with.	10002/	Earswick Action Group
	Objection – no evident need for such a huge increase in the housing stock. Growth in Housing requirement as set out by Arup ha been exceeded purely.	10136/	
	Objection – fewer houses should be proposed.	10139/25909	
	Comment - not demonstrated need for any additional housing development.	10220/	
	Objection - having paid a significant sum of ratepayers money for an expert ARUP report, the Council has chosen to ignore it and instead choose an arbitrary figure to try and justify it.	10231/	
	Comment –concerns remain regarding the proposed significant intrusion into the area of land long established as York’s Green Belt for the provision of the grossly inflated and unrealistic housing targets of over 1,000 houses per year, figures which are completely unsupported by any statistical evidence regarding current or future populations, housing or employment trends.	10313/	CYC Conservative Group
	Objection – the proposed development in villages is too great and will swamp everything.	10344/26037	
	Objection – there is no evidence that demonstrates that the level of housing proposed is needed.	10387/26080	
	Comment – there is a need for new affordable housing but queried whether we need expansion on such a scale. There is a danger that such major expansion in economically unstable times could lead to ghost estates. There should be small scale expansion.	10430/	
	Objection – no demand for this number of houses. No corresponding increase in job opportunities. More commuting.	10617/	
	Objection- question the need for proposed volume of housing.	10841/	
	Objection –question the housing numbers.	10873/25876	
Objection - building thousands of homes, especially on green belt land will completely	10930/		

**York Local Plan Further Sites Consultation – Summary Of Responses
Non FSC - Level of Development**

November 2015

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	spoil the image of the city. Queried where the jobs are coming from for new residents or will York become another suburb of Leeds.		
Level of development (continued)	Objection –ill considered building programme of houses. Employment and population is not increasing near the level able to sustain such a huge programme.	11373/	