

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Wind Farms</b>	Comment-supportive of the omission in the further sites consultation of numerous wind farms throughout the rural area.	71/	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Comment –supportive of the omission in the further sites consultation of numerous wind farms throughout the rural area.	78/	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection –surprised not to see any mention of the 40+ areas of search for onshore wind power in the further sites document and as they have not been recommended to be withdrawn, can only presume, in extreme disappointment that these are still being considered.	1355/	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection – the proposed installation of wind turbines to the surrounding areas is a definite no. They are not efficient and the majority of those installed seem to stand idle.	2421/19183	
	Objection – development of windfarms north of York is insensitive to the local environment, and its appeal to tourists and residents. It does not prove consistent electricity supply due to reliability of wind. If want a greener power supply then solar panels are more effective as well as being less intrusive. Proposals are at cross-purposes with the status of York as a cathedral city – it would radically alter its status to residents, tourists and as a cherished heritage city.	2739/	
	Objection - there is little information in the Local Plan to make a proper assessment of the wind farm proposals. Queried what steps have York Council taken to ensure that the energy in versus the energy out ratio is high enough to warrant the massive expenditure and subsidy on wind turbines around York. Would have a significant impact visually in an historical landscape. Queried if the council going to prepare visual representations of the proposed development so that residents can assess the impact. Recent report by Credit Suisse states that the prices paid for the electricity generated by wind turbines is double the average wholesale price. This is driving up the cost of electricity for businesses and ordinary consumers. Queried if the council consider that this is ethical. Also queried what the council will do to help people affected with their energy bills if they are adding to the upward pressure on prices.	4626/	
	Comment – support the omission in the further sites report of numerous wind farms throughout the rural area.	4647/	
	Comment - support the omission in the further sties report of numerous wind farms throughout the rural area	4648/19689	
	Objection - Onshore wind is not only unsightly but inefficient.	4654/	
	Objection –the proposed scale of wind farms remains unsustainably high and will be a huge detriment to the city and its character. It will put an enormous strain on the	5744/	

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	city, its resources and quality of life.		
<b>Wind Farms (continued)</b>	Support –wind turbines rather than houses, roads and development on green belt land.	6502/	
	Support –wind turbines rather than houses, roads and development on green belt land.	6503/	
	Comment – note that the wind farm proposals circle York and some are actually on the proposed development sites. Can't take them seriously as it is nonsensical to develop the site for housing and a wind farm.	9253/	
	Objection – wind farms are blight on the landscape.	9278/	
	Comment –lack of mention of wind turbines sites noted in the further sites and assumes and welcomes if it is indeed the case, the fact that factors including changing subsidies now significantly reduce the or eliminate the threat from these. We note the addition of solar farms, but caution that these installations require careful siting and must only be developed at appropriate locations and on a scale which will not overwhelm or dominate the existing development.	10313/	CYC Conservative Group
	Objection – opposed to proposed wind farms.	10707/	
	Comment - supportive of the omission in the further sties report of numerous wind farms throughout the rural area. They should be out to sea.	10732/	
<b>Flood Risk</b>	Objection – opposed to developing on Green Belt land as fields are needed to soak up rainwater. Clifton Ings holds an enormous amount of water when the flood gates are opened, but we need more floodplains.	989/	
	Objection – tramacing 200+ acres will reduce drainage. York has a high water table and this could lead to more flooding. Where will the water supply come from and where will the sewerage go to.	1903/	
	Objection – the drains needs to be looked at in the area at the end of Forest Way and the Stray gate. The road is dimpling in several places here, and yet another large sink hole is developing.	1946/	
	Objection – the Local Plan does not make developers build in areas with the lowest flood risk. It does not address water quality and resources, or the protection of rivers.	10617/	
<b>Underused/empty properties</b>	Comment – Council needs to look at vacant properties owned by landlords and enforce them to let.	904/	
	Comment – before building on Green Belt, the Council should consider the renovation of empty houses (over 600,000) in the UK. Turning rooms above shops into living quarters, for example, or converting buildings such as the renovation of the White Swan.	1582/19126	

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>Underused/empty properties (continued)</b>	Comment – all empty properties should be occupied first.	7031/24075	
	Comment - before any green belt is allocated any and all brownfield sites must be used first. This includes all the empty properties that scattered in and around York.	7297/	
	Comment - need affordable homes in inner cities where people work. Should concentrate on the underused residential space in towns before looking at greenfields.	9253/	
	Comment - interested in finding out some statistics with regard to current numbers of accepted building applications which have not been commenced, brown sites still to be developed and derelict empty properties within the York area.	9413/	
<b>Historic Environment</b>	Comment – York with its surrounding villages and rural area is a historic city with evidence of settlement, wars and differing land uses over many years. All this needs to be preserved – not just concreted over.	71/	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Comment – York with its surrounding villages and rural area is a historic city with evidence of settlement, wars and differing land uses over many years. All this needs to be preserved – not just concreted over.	78/	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Objection – Charm of York spoilt by the development on green belt land.	6502/	
	Objection – Charm of York spoilt by the development on green belt land.	6503/	
	Comment – York has always been a historic city in a wonderful rural surrounding area. With proposals like this the area will merge to become a 'soulless' urban area totally destroying the character, charm and history of this area, just making York (and Elvington) another 'Leeds'.	9470/	
<b>Pollution</b>	Comment – concerns of air and noise pollution, particularly in the North of York caused by severe congestion. Adding homes to this will only make the situation worse.	2484/	
<b>Tourism</b>	Comment – whilst accepting that tourism is of importance to the City, there is a need to ensure that there is a balance for the local population. A City of tourists doesn't work, so putting much reliance on one industry could be dangerous for the future.	9327/	
	Objection – Concerns about the impact on tourism.	10136/	
<b>Concept of Safeguarding Land</b>	Comment - understand that 'Safeguarded Lane' will not be in the originally proposed Green Belt and could only be used after a future review of the Plan. However, the Plan is not clear on what would trigger a review of the Plan, and the Parish Council is concerned that a major further development could be triggered at any time just to meet the published targets in the overall Plan.	59/	Dunnington Parish Council

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Concept of Safeguarding Land (continued)</b>	Comment – consider that the term ‘safeguarded land’ is miss-used. The implication for the word being safeguarded not protected from not for. This subject was debated in a Westminster Hall debate last year on Planning, Housing Supply and Countryside. It was categorically agreed that there was nothing in the Localism Act, in the NPPF or in any aspect of the Government Planning Policy that required Councils to safeguard land for development beyond the 15 year life of a Plan.	71/	Nether Poppleton Parish Council
	Comment – consider that the term ‘safeguarded land’ is miss-used. The implication for the word being safeguarded not protected from not for. This subject was debated in a Westminster Hall debate last year on Planning, Housing Supply and Countryside. It was categorically agreed that there was nothing in the Localism Act, in the NPPF or in any aspect of the Government Planning Policy that required Councils to safeguard land for development beyond the 15 year life of a Plan.	78/	Upper Poppleton Parish Council
	Support –support the Council’s identification of Safeguarded Land because this means that the Local Plan will be responsive to changing circumstances and will ensure that once defined, the Green Belt will endure and will be in accordance with national policy.	534/	DPP One
	Comment – the term ‘safeguarded land’ is misleading and to everyone outside the council it means safeguarding against development.	1008/	
	Objection – there are no requirements on the authority within the NPPF to ‘safeguard’ land for future development. Concerned that once land has been removed from the green belt, then development is practically guaranteed to occur on the site at some point in the future. Paragraph 85 of the NPPF states that local authorities ‘make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time’. Fear that the Council may sacrifice the long-term interests of local residents for short-term gain by permitted development ahead of schedule. Urge the removal of all safeguarded allocations from the Plan as soon as possible. These are unnecessary incursions onto the greenbelt and will lead to an excessive attack on the greenbelt, which is already under great threat from housing, wind and solar farm, traveller and employment allocations. The permanence of the greenbelt should be protected, as should its role in promoting urban regeneration.	1355/	Julian Sturdy MP
	Objection- there is no requirement in the Localism Act 2011, NPPF, or in any aspect of the Government Planning Policy that requires land to be safeguarded for development beyond the 15 year life of the plan.	2559/23912	
	Objection – Misuse of safeguarded in the Local Plan as applied to sites in the context of possible future development. The word should only pertain to land which is safe	3447/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	from exploitation and guarded against development.		
<b>Concept of Safeguarding Land (continued)</b>	Objection – the word should only pertain to land which is safe from exploitation and guarded against development.	4443/23973	
	Comment –it is not a requirement to safeguard land in the local plan, so why are the Council adding further to the controversy by allocating SF4 for future development.	5274/	
	Objection - the terms are used to conceal. In particular the use of the term "Safeguarded Land" is duplicitous given that most people would naturally assume that this meant that the land was "safe" from development whereas in fact it actually means the opposite. Purposefully written in order to deceive the reader.	5882/	
	Objection - there is no central government pressure for councils to 'safeguard' any land - once this land is removed from the Green Belt, it will be immediately subjected to developer's plans (something I understand has already happened).	9114/	
	Comment – history has shown us that safeguarding is a complete misnomer and developers could try to develop on this land at any time within the 15yr proposal. There has been no recommendation from the government to safeguard land for use in the future, only for plans to develop.	9471/	
	Comment – 'safeguarding' in this context, constitutes the very opposite of the word – land would be removed from the Green Belt for building on.	9473/	
	Comment – 'safeguarding' in this context is totally misleading.	9473/	
	Comment – why does land have to be 'safeguarded' for the future? Surely Green Belt is protected. We have to protect our countryside to grow crops and bio fuels for our children's future.	9484/	
	Comment – the term safeguarding is miss-leading, it should be called development land.	9518/	
	Comment – use of the word 'safeguarded' is misleading. Everyone feels that it means areas safeguarded against development.	9556/	
	Objection – opposed to the term 'safeguarding'.	9726	
	Objection – the word 'safeguard' is misleading and the council is attempting to get this past the residents by using underhand means.	10166/	
	Comment – Green Belt is under attack.	10223/	
	Comment – use of the word 'safeguarding' is misleading in this process. Could explain on all documentation going out to its citizens that it in fact means the opposite to 'safeguarding' and that it means 'intended for development'	10426/	
Comment - term "Safeguarded land" mis-used. Should be protection 'from' further development and not 'for' those purposes. No accurate assessment of need supported	10734/		

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	by evidence.		
<b>Concept of Safeguarding Land (continued)</b>	Objection - the terms are used to conceal. In particular the use of the term "Safeguarded Land" is duplicitous given that most people would naturally assume that this meant that the land was "safe" from development whereas in fact it actually means the opposite. This is appalling for a Council that prides itself on the use of Plain English. Moreover, I believe that this has been purposefully written in order to deceive the reader.	10767/	
	Objection – the use of the term "safe guarded land" is duplicitous given that most people would naturally assume that this land is "safe" from development.	10881/25899	
<b>Sustainability</b>	Comment – 'York Central' has been thought of as a solution for decades, but if it is ever built, it will be unbelievably difficult to access, adding congestion to York. In contrast, building a Garden City gives the benefits of planning travel routes from the start. Pedestrians, cyclists and motor traffic would each be segregated. Provision would be made from the start for a hospital, schools and colleges, with playing fields, factories, warehouses, offices, shops, all giving employment. Access to a railway would be planned. A bus station (so far impossible to site in York) would be the public transport hub. The amenities would include playing fields, parks, theatres, cinemas, shopping centres. Best of all, because of plentiful land, housing would be cheaper and more spacious in the Garden City. Why not set up a working party to discuss ways of coping with York's housing crisis now and ways of dealing with it in the future.	1272/	
	Objection – the environment should be protected, not exploited.	9913/24358	
<b>Affordable Housing</b>	Comment – queried whether the council's affordable housing requirement is mandated, or if it is negotiable. In an area where there is little or no affordable housing, the requirement should be scrutinised.	58/	Deighton Parish Council
	Objection - Affordable housing is a problem in York as it is in many other authorities in North Yorkshire and beyond. Affordable Houses on the Grain Store failed at appeal on the grounds of viability. Arup makes it clear that basing projected housing growth on the need to address the backlog of affordable housing is risky and will be likely to have far-reaching environmental and other consequences.	65/	Heworth Without Parish Council/
	Objection - CYC has pursued an "affordable" housing policy which has killed off house building. The indications are that the policy is unstable, unworkable and unlikely to ever encourage developers to start building again. Re-consideration of this policy should be integral in any Local Plan to encourage urban regeneration.	4654/	
	Comment – houses that young people can either rent or buy is needed and jobs that	4690/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	pays a wage that makes decent housing affordable. It would be encouraging to see the Council generally making some genuine attempt to replace the housing stock lost when the Council Houses were sold. This problem is acute in York with some 5000 names on the waiting list for social housing. Building £500,000 houses in the satellite villages for people on large salaries who will be commuting to Leeds will not solve York's housing problem for those young people who have lived here all their lives and who, whilst he may be working, will be struggling find accommodation so they can begin to live independently.		
<b>Affordable Housing (continued)</b>	Objection - it is noted that the Council, in the Preferred Options Local Plan suggested several options for housing growth. This figure 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, on behalf of Barwood Strategic Land II LLP
	Comment - can't be denied that there is a shortfall of housing in York, if the 50% affordable housing policy had not been pursued a lot more houses would have been built.	9478/	
<b>York City Centre</b>	Comment – should provide homes in the city to bring it back to life. It is becoming a Disney style city, a living museum by day and a booze fuelled city of bars and clubs by night.	9443/24105	
	Objection- York City Centre is safeguarded and only there for tourists. York has gone down hill.	9449/24108	
<b>Economic Vision/ Economic Development</b>	Comment –if the Council is serious about encouraging employers to the city employers will want to know that the local housing market can accommodate their workforce.	187/	York & North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce
	Support – agree with the overall economic vision for sustainable economic development within the City of York.	244/	NTR Planning, on behalf of McArthurGlen
	Objection - regrettable that there is no assessment of how the additional and amended sites put forward may or may not impact on the overall housing and employment numbers provided for in the Plan. Note that whilst the document contains potential additional sites and amendments to existing sites, no sites have so far been withdrawn from the original plan.	386/	York Green Party
	Objection – important details about what new residents will be doing for a living and what new business will be re-locating to the city are conspicuous by their absence.	1666	
	Comment – the plan is based on 10 year old figures which do not reflect the fact over the last decade York has actually lost jobs.	2172/	
	Objection – queried on what basis was “inward migration” was calculated and how it	4654/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	relates to importing unemployment. Claim the above large scale developments are needed because York will create 1,000 jobs a year. If recent trends continue, this is unrealistic. There needs to be more transparency on the data and methodology used as a basis for such proposals. Leading Consultants, Arup, were asked to produce a report on possible economic growth. From the three cases they produced, even the best came nowhere near the suggested Council figure.		
<b>Economic Vision/ Economic Development (continued)</b>	Objection –no vision for how York will attract jobs and reinforce its communities. The evidence it produces to support its proposals in these areas is both flawed and self serving. Without jobs York will become a suburb of the Greater Leeds area. Its historic, actual and future hinterland is the contiguous area of the North Riding. This relationship is not explored.	5189/	
<b>Employment</b>	Objection – not enough jobs available for people to move to these developments from elsewhere in the country.	3162/	
	Objection - no evidence of the growth of employment opportunities which might draw people in from outside York	9334/	
	Objection - employment opportunities need to exist before the construction of additional homes and the infrastructure need to be improved before businesses would be willing to relocate.	10584/	
	Comment – queried if York has the economic growth to support the employment demand associated with the proposed 2000 new houses.	5507	
	Comment - the loss of small scale industry has turned parts of the centre into silent dormitories during the day. Does not see how sufficient large scale employment could be found for the envisaged new residents unless they commuted to Leeds Bradford or Manchester which, surely the council is against on environmental grounds.	10777	
<b>Gypsy and Travellers</b>	Comment – there would appear to be a gross over-estimate of the proven need for all Gypsy, Traveller and Show people sites in York since the existing privately run site at Fulford currently has plots. Where is the solid evidence of proven need?	1666/	
	Objection- dismay at the proposals that have been submitted for the huge and ill-considered building programme of travellers sites around York. Other towns such as Harrogate are actually decreasing traveller sites.	2631/23820	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>Gypsy and Travellers (continued)</b>	Objection – opposed to calculation of the number of extra gypsy/traveller pitches required in York. Highlights the double counting in the estimates and that the Council includes some 24 families who are in houses, but would prefer to be in caravans, but does not take into account the arc <sup>4</sup> estimate of 33 families on pitches who would prefer to be in caravans. By substantially overestimating potential future need, City of York Council is making things even more difficult for itself. There has been some recent movement of some of the traveller community away from York.	3376/	
	Objection - until CYC becomes capable of ensuring the travellers' sites we already have in York are managed properly, no new site should even be considered	4654/	
	Objection – queried why proposals are to put Traveller sites so near to residential housing. By the nature of the name Traveller these sites should be in areas with good access to main roads and in more isolated regions.	5528/	
	Objection – the wishes of many travellers to move into housing hasn't been taken into account when calculating the need for gypsy and traveller's site sin the York's district.	9766/	
	Comment – there are currently existing traveller pitches in York that are not filled.	9768/	
	Comment – question why more sites are needed, the current sites should meet demand.	10025/25974	
	Objection – object to the travellers site.	10139/25909	
	Objection - no to more travellers' sites anywhere.	10779/	
	Objection- do not need any more travellers' caravan sites.	10841/	
<b>Education</b>	Comment – issue of sufficient school spaces. Queried if new primary and secondary schools will be provided Sixth form provision should not be moved to a central provider to free up space in existing establishments. At 16 children are ill equipped to move into a 6 <sup>th</sup> form college. Secondary schools are a better environment for some children, whilst others are ready to move into a different environment. Queried how will the government initiative to make education compulsory to age 18 impact upon the local plan.	10726/	
<b>Universities</b>	Objection – the university of York is already stretching itself and has blotted lots of greenbelt.	9866/24271	
<b>Ageing Population</b>	Objection- consideration and provision must be made for York's ageing population. Some of the elderly live in houses with more than one bedroom- this could be freed up if retirement and care accommodation were included in development plans. York hospital is at bursting point. Smaller units like cottage hospitals need to be built for the elderly needing care freeing up hospital beds. These must be included in the Local	9449/24108	

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
	Plan.		
<b>Location of development</b>	Comment – York is distinctive because of its size. The surrounding villages are proper villages; this plan would mean villages lose their identity. What York needs is decent homes to rent on current empty office and brownfield sites. Villages should not become suburbs of York.	9866/24271	
<b>Safety Issues</b>	Objection – there is a great deal of concern over the safety issues which will arise from implementation of the plan. One such issue is children travelling to school.	9464/24127	
<b>Self-build</b>	Comment – Sun and Moon cottage and the bungalow, Bad Bargain lane are available for self build.	10006/25946	Waites and Moorey, Chartered Achitects and surveyors
<b>Open Space Study</b>	Comment – there is no reference to site within the Strensall with Towthorpe Parish boundary although it is known that there is already a shortfall in provision of Open Space. In addition there is a review taking place currently to address the errors in the 2008 Open Space Report from which data is taken to support the Local Plan.	77/18878	Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council