

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>ST4 Land Adjacent Hull Road and Grimston Bar</b>	Objection – opposed to consideration of this site for student housing. The University regularly promotes a collegiate philosophy for their students and has sufficient space on its Heslington East campus for much more student housing. This site should be providing good family accommodation and affordable housing. It should not be wasted on student housing.	48/18602	Heslington Parish Council
	Objection - this site should not be used for student housing. There is plenty of space on Heslington East for student housing and this site should be used for family housing and affordable housing.	4222/21724	
	Objection – should not build housing where it is not wanted.	5503/19204	
	Objection- destruction of Green Belt. Development will create health problems due to pollution and lack of food. Environmental impact due to run off and extra sewage.	5771/24050	
<b>ST5 York Central</b>	Comment –pleased to have been able to make input to the masterplanning and feasibility study being carried out on the York Central site. Doing further work on own masterplan to see how to make the most of the opportunities that the development of York Central will create. Most significant of these is improved connectivity across Leeman Road, ideally by closing the road and allowing the Museum to build a physical link between the two disjointed halves of the museum. This could add to the museum’s public offer and create a new improved entrance which would add greatly to the proposed public realm around the rear entrance to the station. 90% of visitors already arrive either on foot, by rail or with the park and ride bus service and our aim would be to improve on that proportion through the better connectivity to the station and the City Centre that the York Central development would provide.	198/19161	National Railway Museum
	Objection - concerned about the increased vehicular traffic especially Boroughbridge Road and the Bypass. An additional problem will be the pressure resulting from further housing etc on the Sugar Beet and Old Railway developments.	1598/17771	
	Support - disagree with building on greenfield sites until all brownfield sites have been used up. Many houses could be built within the city boundary on the tear drop site behind York station The Council said last year that a bridge would be built to make access to the site -	5194/21747	
	Support - brownfield sites in York such as York Central should be used to fulfil the need for future houses.	5567/20752	
<b>ST8 Land North of Monks Cross</b>	Comment – the council will be aware of the Ambulance Service move towards a Hub and Spoke strategy in the City whereby the Hub (recently constructed on the north eastern edge of the City Centre) acts as the central location for services from which the ‘spokes’ are located around the District in the from of parking bays with a small	259/	Johnson Brook on behalf of Yorkshire Ambulance Service

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>building containing amenity services for drivers whilst on stand-by. Such requirements could be an area of hard standing for emergency response vehicles and a modular building, or new ambulance service buildings. To align with the location of new residential development, the ambulance service needs to be able to ensure that emergency response times can be met in new residential areas. There are a number of strategic sites around York which could potentially trigger the requirement for additional ambulance service facilities. At the early master planning stages of the strategic sites, we recommended that consideration is given to the development of a small area of hard standing to accommodate an ambulance response building circa 5m by 4m with 24 hour access. Further investigation is underway for such provision at ST8.</p>		
<p><b>ST8 Land North of Monks Cross (continued)</b></p>	<p>Objection – the infrastructure cannot support more development. The access road of woodland way is narrow and congested. The surface water will become worse. The beauty of York is its small site. This will result in urban sprawl</p>	6547/24073	
	<p>Objection – opposed to building on green belt land. Don't have to build houses in Huntington, it is at saturation point now. No understanding of how this will affect the people where the homes are to be built – house prices will tumble, people will not want to live in a crowded estate, it will become a slum. It will change the look of Huntington for years to come.</p>	1045/	
	<p>Comment - Promote the residential development allocation and its associated physical, social and environmental infrastructure, in order to ensure an integrated sustainable master planned development using the comprehensive definition of sustainability. Submitted promotional masterplan and a technical appendix with an archaeological baseline, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Ecological Baseline, Transport Baseline, Noise Baseline, Air quality baseline, drainage baseline and sketch masterplan. It is anticipated that there will be circa 33ha of residential development, 12ha of public open space, 14ha of structural landscaping and 3ha for social infrastructure land uses. The Local Plan Preferred Options allocates the site for 1400 dwellings to be developed over the lifetime of the plan.</p>	1514/	Johnson Brook, on behalf of Monks Cross Consortium
	<p>Objection- opposed to the proposals. The site may flood.</p>	1897/	
	<p>Objection – this would destroy greenfields and hedgerows as well as natural habitats for wildlife. The fields are clearly needed to soak up water which otherwise would flood housing. The A1237 is unable to absorb the extra traffic. The infrastructure cannot support the number of new residents.</p>	2277/23804	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>ST8 Land North of Monks Cross (continued)</b>	Objection - ill conceived. North Lane is no more than a country lane, unable to cope with this sort of proposed development.	3799/	
	Objection - development at Monks Cross would add to increased volume of traffic. Should be earmarked as employment site. Current shops and offices car parking facilities always full. More parking is required now and in future.	6286/	
	Objection- opposed to building 1500 homes on green belt land. Village infrastructure will not cope with the amount of traffic generated. Questions raised over how schools will cope with increased population.	9284/	
	Objection- opposed to building 1500 homes on green belt land. Village infrastructure will not cope with the amount of traffic generated.	9285/	
	Objection – this would increase the number of houses in Huntington by 47%. There is no indication of improvements in infrastructure. Huntington suffers from traffic congestion and flooding. Question why York needs extra houses.	9810/24177	
	Objection – current infrastructure cannot cope, inadequate drainage is a major concern, over capacity for local schools and doctors and heavy traffic on local roads. The Council has a duty to protect wildlife and local fauna and flora. Opposed to the loss of green belt, farm land and the natural break from the other nearby communities creating urban sprawl. Would increase carbon footprint. Should use brownfield sites which would more than meet current housing demand.	9853/24260	
	Objection – the number of houses will be increased by 47%. This more development than can be tolerated. The water table in this area is exceedingly high. There is no information regarding corresponding increase of infrastructure.	10617/26111	
	Object – the ring road will grind to a halt	11165/	
<b>ST12 Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe</b>	Objection – the infrastructure, particularly the roads cannot cope resulting in a massive increase in congestion. These proposals would ruin the character of Copmanthorpe. There are a number of species on or near the developments sites that are red listed species of conservation.	1959/	
	Objection – roads in Copmanthorpe are very congested, particularly Manor Heath. Congestion is adding to poor air quality and pollution. The village requires substantial investment in new services, infrastructure and facilities, all before any development begins. This is valuable prime agricultural land, in the green belt and should not be used for building. Previous planning applications have been refused on this site due to its position in the greenbelt. The site is home it many species of wildlife, to sacrifice their habitats for unnecessary housing is indefensible and shows a total lack of care for, and interest in, the heritage of the area. The village is bordered by the A64 and	2172/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	the East Coast rail line, the land to the west is the only open aspect for residents and is greatly prized and appreciated. It is highly valued for its recreational opportunities and also its emotional effect that such an open, green space has on one. This landscape has been defined as ancient and undisturbed rural landscape, well cared-for and of high conservation and aesthetic value by the council.		
<b>ST12 Land at Manor Heath Road, Copmanthorpe (continued)</b>	Objection - opposed to the development of ST12, it is prime agricultural land. Any further housing will make already busy roads worse. The land is greenbelt which supports a diverse range of wildlife.	4423/23127	
	Comment – Green Belt land. High quality food producing land. Undermine the open aspect as you approach the city. Adjacent to the historical and archaeological significant Old Roman Road. Hedgerows are a home to wildlife. The village centre cannot sustain further traffic and strain on its resources as a result off any development of this site. Brownfield sites first. Unnecessary development of this site. If the Council adopted a more equitable approach to the distribution of new housing allocated to villages in its draft Local Plan, such that each village took a few new houses, then a development such as this on prime Green Belt land would not even need to be considered by the council. Dangerous and highly congested traffic. Require any early application to develop site ST12 to be called in and put on hold until the draft Local Plan process has run its course.	6292/	
	Objection –the infrastructure, particularly road, can't cope with the massive increase in the number of people and cars. There would be significant issues with congestion, pollution and road safety. There are a number of species present on or near the development sites that are red listed species of conservation concern including corn bunting, lapwing, yellow wagtail, linnets and brown hare.	9760/	
	Objection- 600+ houses is a disproportionate demand upon the village community. Traffic consequences will be horrific. Access to the A64, difficult now at many times, would become impossible at peak times and the extra traffic around the village shops and the schools in Low Green would be very dangerous. It is green belt land of high agricultural quality. , would undermine the open aspect as the city is approached, site is adjacent to an old roman road of historical and archaeological significance, the hedgerows are a home to wildlife and village cannot sustain any further traffic.	10800/19648	
<b>ST13 Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe</b>	Objection –development of this site will promote car usage due to ease of access to the ring road and bypass, and distance from the city centre. There is no definition to this and other sites selected to the west of Copmanthorpe along their western boundary. The development of this site would place pressure on the Green Belt for	1705/	Gladman Developments

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	further development in the future. The Green Belt in this area is functional in preventing urban sprawl. The release of these sites from the Green Belt would not be in compliance with the NPPF. The proposal is unsound. Accessing Askham Bryan College from this and other sites to the west of the village would mean navigating the busy and somewhat dangerous A64/A1237 junction that is not suitable for pedestrians or cyclists. Sites to the west of Copmanthorpe would only promote car usage to access anything beyond that available within the village. The area of land to the west of the village is open countryside and of high agricultural quality. Gladman believe it is critical for this area of land to be retained as part of the York Green Belt to prevent unrestricted urban sprawl of Copmanthorpe.		
<b>ST13 Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe (continued)</b>	Objection – the infrastructure, particularly the roads cannot cope resulting in a massive increase in congestion. These proposals would ruin the character of Copmanthorpe. There are a number of species on or near the developments sites that are red listed species of conservation.	1959/	
	Objection – opposed to the omission of a small parcel of land from the strategic housing allocation. The land in question relates to a small triangular parcel of open land which separates the allocation, known as ST13, from Moor Lane. The land in question forms a small part of one contiguous field. The whole field is well contained visually and physically. The land in question serves no green belt purpose or other purpose as it is shown on the Preferred Option Local Plan proposals map as being unallocated and lying within the settlement limits. Moreover, the current draft layout for the development of ST13 does not show any development on this parcel of land other than a potential access point. The draft layout shows access to be taken from Moor Lane as well as Barnfield Way. At a meeting held with officers of CYC it was made clear that they would prefer to see vehicle access to the site taken solely from Moor lane. Given the above, it would make sense to include the land in question into the allocation.	10097/	DPP One, on behalf of Shepherd Homes
<b>ST16 Terrys</b>	Support –Terry’s grounds and around the railway would provide enough brownfield land for plenty of affordable housing. Close to town so there would be less need to use cars.	505/	
	Support – Factory is closed and it is a Brownfield site so best suited for development.	5902/	
<b>ST17 Nestle South</b>	Support – Nestles grounds and around the railway would provide enough brownfield land for plenty of affordable housing. Close to town so there would be less need to use cars.	505/	
	Support – factory is closed and it is a Brownfield site so best suited for development.	5902/	

<b>Site, Para etc.</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Ref.</b>	<b>Name (where business or organisation)</b>
<b>ST18 Monks Cross North</b>	Comment – the site is suitable, available and deliverable.	1514/	Johnson Brook, on behalf of Monks Cross Consortium
<b>ST21 York Designer Outlet</b>	Objection – there should be no further extension of leisure activity on this site and no permanent leisure activities. This would not only be inappropriate in the context of the green belt but would also add to traffic congestion on the A19 and add to the nuisance and disturbance already experience by residents in Naburn Lane.	922/19128	
<b>ST22 Germany Beck</b>	Objection- proposals for ST22 alongside Site 183 (land to north of Escrick) should be refused.	20/23758	Stillingfleet Parish Council
<b>SF2 Land North of Clifton Moor</b>	Objection – concerned that this land is retained as safeguarded. This is unacceptable because it will inevitably result in access being made to Moorlands Lane from ST14. Would devastate the rural setting of Skelton which would become inundated with rat run traffic. Concerned that the safeguarded land encroaches on the Skelton Cemetery which is intended to be tranquil and in open countryside in perpetuity.	75/23764	Skelton Parish Council
	Objection – concerned with the proximity of any development in relation to the burial ground at Skelton with the development of so called 'safeguarded' land.	3476/23080	
	Objection – Increases not restricts urban sprawl. Merge Cliftongate new town with the farms, villages and cemetery of Skelton. Would remove the barrier which protects the wildlife, including rare bats, existing in the track of land from Moorlands Nature Reserve to Crooking Green in Skelton. Removes setting of York as traditional centre of rural community. Nothing to assist in urban regeneration. Land proposed is good arable land.	6177/	
	Objection – this is a threat to green areas and the narrow roads of Skelton. The term threatened land would be more honest.	6310/24068	
	Objection- Moor Lane and Corban Lane are already incredibly busy and dangerous at rush hours and cannot take more traffic. The roads are small and already congested. There are not enough facilities in Haxby or Skelton to accommodate the huge surge in local population. Construction of the housing would create noise and pollution in a protected Green Belt area and close to Moorlands Nature Reserve. Brownfield options should be fully explored before Green Belt. All Green Belt proposals should be abolished.	10007/25950	
	Objection – Moor Lane (leading to Skelton) and Corban Lane are already busy and dangerous at rush hours and cannot take more traffic. There is no way the local roads can cope with thousands more local homes. There are not enough facilities in Haxby or Skelton to accommodate the huge surge in local population that the proposed	10770/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	housing would create. Construction would create noise and pollution in a protected green belt area and close vicinity to Moorlands Nature Reserve. The increase in traffic would generate excessive pollution.		
<b>SF5 Land West of Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe</b>	Objection – opposed to the recommendation not to include part of site SF5 as a housing allocation, instead being retained as a Safeguarded Land allocation. Maintains that the site is viable and can be made available for development in the short to medium term, and would like to be included for consideration should any of the draft allocated sites be found unviable or unable to deliver previously identified housing numbers within the plan period.	6347/	O’Neill Associates on behalf of Mr Ibbotson
<b>H9 Land off Askham Lane</b>	Support – site is suitable for allocation, further evidence submitted including access appraisal and landscape scoping review. Objection –reiterate objection to development of this land as per the preferred options consultation response.	528/ 4334/	Smiths Gore Foxwood Residents Association
<b>H18 Land off Woodland Chase Clifton Moor</b>	Comment- it will be important that there is space allocated for a church in the new community.	10535/	
<b>H26 Land at Dauby Lane, Elvington</b>	Objection – the land is green belt. Putting houses on a site which is/has green belt, no public transport, no retail facilities barring on very small village shop, little or no local employment and a primary school and doctor’s surgery both of which are at or beyond capacity already is not sustainable development. Along with proposals at Church Lane the village could grow by over 25%. The place for house building on this scale can only be within the ring road, by extension of the existing urban area, not by expanding small villages with no facilities or public transport. Already only too well aware of how it takes to get an appointment with the doctor and how long the traffic queues are at Grimston Bar around 8am on weekdays.	9258/17818	
<b>H28 Land to the north of North Lane, Wheldrake</b>	Objection – the site represents the last ‘old stripland’ and is valued as a Green Wedge. It is the only significant area within the Village envelope that has open space/amenity/nature conservation potential. There is no traditional village green area, and, apart from some small open areas such as the Churchyard, the village is largely semi-urbanised housing surrounded by arable farmland. Deficit of Local Parks, natural and semi-natural open space and amenity Green Space. The Parish Council will identify that a right of way is likely to be confirmed along the western side of site H28 and there is potential for a linking path along the north side to Broad Highway which has potential as a ‘Quiet Lane’.	79/	Wheldrake Parish Council

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>H28 Land to the north of North Lane, Wheldrake (continued)</b>	Objection – the infrastructure, particularly the roads cannot cope resulting in a massive increase in congestion. These proposals would ruin the character of copmanthorpe. There are a number of species on or near the developments sites that are red listed species of conservation.	1959/	
<b>H29 Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe</b>	Support – site is deliverable and suitable for provision of around 70 homes. Site is in sustainable location in close proximity to the facilities available in Copmanthorpe. Ongoing technical work has not identified any issues that would preclude the development of the site. Site is available and achievable.	10272/	Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes
<b>H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington</b>	Objection - the only access is from Eastfield land, which is extremely narrow. There maybe as many as 350 extra cars from the development. Mill hill is the highest point in the village, development would cause serious s harm to the character and setting of the village on its northern boundary.	2505/	
	Objection - the site is considered to represent inappropriate development in the draft green belt area and size, scale and location especially on the field directly adjacent to Kerver Lane as this is land locked and has a public footpath running through it which would mean having to significantly alter access points on Eastfield Lane and Intake Lane, thus impacting on the open character of the village and approach to Hagg wood. Changing /widening the access on Kerver Lane would significantly impact the visual approach to Hagg wood and character of the lanes with direct access to this special wood/reserve. Increased traffic along these lanes will create safety issue for pedestrians. Will generate significant increase in vehicular movements and exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk. Junction cannot be improved without impact on the character of the village and setting of conservation area. The fields form an important and open natural gateway / vista to the Wolds providing an important habitat for many rare / protected and endangered animals.	2628/	
	Objection – detrimental effect on the rural approach to the village. Removal of green belt .Increase in traffic would have a significant effect at the junctions. Insufficient drainage facilities.	2941/	
	Objection – the site is in the Green Belt and as such should not be used to build houses. Recent planning applications have been rejected on the grounds that the development was not appropriate in the Green Belt and this sets a precedent. Access to the site from Eastfield Lane is inadequate. There is poor drainage and the danger of flooding in Dunnington. The water pressure in the houses at the east end of the built up area have poor water pressure. This will be made worse if more houses are built.	4626/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	The road is barely adequate for current traffic levels as it is used not only to serve houses in Stockhill Close and Eastfield Lane but also houses in Kerver Lane and the Holly Tree estate. The junction with Church Balk is dangerous. The development of this site will have a considerable visual impact and will alter the look and character of the village. The site is productive agricultural land.		
<b>H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – designated Green Belt should be protected. Dunnington is at maximum capacity and insufficient amenities and road infrastructure. Change of the whole village and destruction of its rural feel. No evidence of such demand for housing to scarify this food agricultural land. Congestion and crossing problems.	5212/	
	Objection – designated Green Belt should be protected. Dunnington is at maximum capacity and insufficient amenities and road infrastructure. Change of the whole village and destruction of its rural feel. No evidence of such demand for housing to scarify this food agricultural land. Congestion and crossing problems.	6959/	
	Support – this is a better option for development than H33 Water Tower, Dunnington.	9688/24163	
	Support – support retention of Site H31 as housing land allocation. Site is in sustainable location in close proximity to facilities in Dunnington. Site is available for development now and is controlled by national house builder. Site is considered to be achievable for residential development immediately.	10272/	Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes
	Objection - accessed off Eastfield Lane, lane is not currently wide enough for two way traffic at the site proposed for housing. The lane is used widely by pedestrians and its current use by road vehicles is unsafe. The road should be closed to traffic from the A166 entrance, as the Holtby Lane opposite has been, and is certainly not suitable in any way shape or form for the consideration of two way traffic or even access for up to 300 more homes. A recent application for a travellers site at this location was turned down due to the potential traffic demands on the lane, it cannot cope with the traffic associated with the two cars of each modern household, certainly not wide enough for the vehicles used and required by the emergency services to access (fire engines, ambulances etc). Productive agricultural land should be preserved by the local authority. Jobs provided by house building are short term and transient in nature. As greenbelt planning applications made by the Market Garden/Contract Landscapes business have been considered with the land as greenbelt and decisions made accordingly. The greenbelt should continue to be protected as it currently provides a natural habitat for deer, owls, newts and other endangered species. Drainage for the hill to the north west of the proposed sites. Flooding and drainage problems for the houses on Holly Tree Croft. Some parts of Kerver Lane are	10706/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	also affected. Further hard standing of such a large proportion of the land will significantly increase the problems associated with flooding already experienced by the community.		
<b>H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – land previously rejected. Construction traffic would be a danger. Additional houses would create a health and safety risk on the roads. Rising bollards is a possible solution. The school is near capacity. Sewerage and drainage are at capacity. Agricultural land would be destroyed.	10751/	
	Objection – land should remain green belt. Drainage services are at capacity. Undeveloped land used by residents for recreation. Increase in use of road not suitable for heavy traffic would cause a health hazard. School and doctors surgery are at capacity. Brownfield sites available to develop in the city.	10920/	
<b>H32 The Tannery, Strensall</b>	Comment – development is nearing completion on site H32 in last year’s Local Plan Consultation document – for 53 homes at the former Tannery in Strensall. Fully support this development in the planning process as this site was an eyesore, it was a good opportunity for the ward to make what is an appropriate sizeable contribution to the City’s housing requirements. It was an example of a Brownfield site, the type which the City Council should be promoting for development ahead of any ‘green’ location.	6514/	Cllr Paul Doughty, Conservative Councillor for Strensall Ward
<b>H33, Water Tower, Dunnington</b>	Objection –should be protected for long term expansion of Dunnington cemetery. Eastfield lane forms the ancient settlement boundary of Dunnington. To build here would ruin the open views across to Mill Hill and beyond. This site has been turned down for development on more than one occasion due to the visual impact on the green belt. In a village wide survey 68% of residents voted against development on H33	2903/	
	Objection – increase of traffic. The existing level of public transport cannot cope with additional dwellings. Drains cannot cope with further development.	2941/	
	Objection - there are other fields in the area where no crops flourish and could be easily accessed without major problems such as behind Spring bank Avenue.	2974/	
	Objection - there are other fields in the area where no crops flourish and could be easily accessed without major problems such as behind Spring bank Avenue.	2975/	
	Objection - visual environmental impact on the green belt and disruption to its living ecosystem. Relocation of the cemetery. Worsened vision in an already very dangerous corner and road for traffic.	3132/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>H33, Water Tower, Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection – location is an open green site. Outside village settlement area. Proposal of use the site for long term cemetery (not short term profit). Spoil of the open aspect of the area. Busy junction with poor visibility and more hazardous. Impact on the green belt. Agricultural land rented out to farmers. It will do nothing for York’s Housing stock. Other preferred development options.	3133/	
	Objection - the site is in the Green Belt and as such should not be used to build houses. The infrastructure in the village will not support the development of this number of houses. There is inadequate drainage in the village and there is a danger of flooding from surface water running off when there is heavy rain. Hard landscaping associated with housing will make this situation worse. The hill is an established village boundary and any development will be detrimental to the character, openness and visual amenity of the village. The hill is on the York Moraine and any development will be detrimental to the beauty of Mill Hill. Development will endanger ancient trees and hedgerows which are part of the original Enclosure Act landscape and part of the heritage of Dunnington. The lanes are inadequate for the current traffic and the junction on Church Balk is dangerous. The site is productive agricultural land.	4626/	
	Object – location is on the approach to the village. Field should be protected for the cemetery. Site has been turned down for development before. 68% of people voted against it.	6098/	
	Objection – site is in green belt land.	6170/	
	Objection – this is an open green site. On the site of the ancient moraine, outside the village area, effect the open character and setting of existing settlement, poor access and visibility, previous applications have been turned down, flooding issues, needed for food production, the majority of village residents do not want this development. Extension to the village cemetery proposed as an alternative. Also suggests site at Stockhill as a suitable site which was identified for development in the 1970.	9280/	
	Objection - the site is in the historical green belt of Dunnington and should remain as such. Please refuse building due to the visual impact on the Green Belt. Preferred alternative for development is Stockhill Church Balk	9684/	
	Objection - the site is in the historical green belt of Dunnington and should remain as such. Please refuse building due to the visual impact on the Green Belt. Preferred alternative for development is Stockhill Church Balk	9685/	
	Objection - the site is in the historical green belt of Dunnington and should remain as such. Please refuse building due to the visual impact on the Green Belt. Preferred alternative for development is Stockhill Church Balk.	9686/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>H33, Water Tower, Dunnington (continued)</b>	Objection - the site is in the historical green belt of Dunnington and should remain as such. Please refuse building due to the visual impact on the Green Belt. Preferred alternative for development is Stockhill Church Balk	9687/26343	
	Objection – this site is in the historical greenbelt. It should remain as such. There would be a visual impact on the greenbelt.	9688/24162	
	Objection - the proposed location is on the approach to the village and maintains an open visual amenity for all to enjoy. The field in question should be protected for long term expansion of Dunnington Cemetery. Eastfield land forms the ancient settlement boundary of Dunnington to build here would ruin the views across to Mill Hill and beyond. This site has been turned down for development on more than one occasion due to the visual impact on the green belt. In a village wide survey 68% of residents voted against development on H33. Alternative option is at Stockhill opposite water tower on Church Balk. A green buffer can be maintained between the small industrial estate and proposed new development. There are brownfield sites with York City and surrounding villages including Dunnington for all York housing needs	9689/	
	Objection – the site is in the historical green belt of Dunnington and should remain as such. Please refuse building due to the visual impact on the green belt.	9756/	
	Objection – this site should be preserved for an extension of the cemetery. Development would have a visual impact and ruin the open views towards Mill Hill. Preferred alternative for edvelopment is Stockhill Church Balk	9976/24525	
	Objection – no development on Green Belt, especially huge increase of traffic and pollution. Overwhelming of local infrastructure.	11418/	
<b>H34 Land North of Church Lane, Skelton</b>	Objection – access to land by developers would create a huge disturbance for residents.	3034/	
	Objection – to farming land and Green Belt land being concreted over to provide houses for a massive influx of people to York.	4301/	
	Objection –declared unsuitable for housing in 2011 and presumably still is. At the time permission was granted for three houses only on Church Lane with the proviso that no further houses were to be allowed. Access to the site will need to be through the extremely narrow roads adjacent to the conservation area. Application to build 65 new homes on the recently demolished Del Monte factory Site does not appear to have been taken into consideration as part of this process and clarification is needed on the point.	4275/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>H34 Land North of Church Lane, Skelton (continued)</b>	Objection – this has been declared unsuitable for development in the past and it still is. Access is too narrow, and dark and is fringed by hedges and shrubbery with no pedestrian footway. It would be totally unsuitable for heavy traffic.	6310/24066	
<b>H35 Land at Intake Lane, Dunnington</b>	Objection - the site is considered to represent inappropriate development in the draft green belt area and size, scale and location especially on the field directly adjacent to Kerver Lane as this is land locked and has a public footpath running through it which would mean having to significantly alter access points on Eastfield Lane and Intake Lane, thus impacting on the open character of the village and approach to Hagg wood. Changing /widening the access on Kerver Lane would significantly impact the visual approach to Hagg wood and character of the lanes with direct access to this special wood/reserve. Increased traffic along these lanes will create safety issue for pedestrians. Will generate significant increase in vehicular movements and exacerbate an already hazardous junction where it meets Church Balk. Junction cannot be improved without impact on the character of the village and setting of conservation area. The fields form an important and open natural gateway / vista to the Wolds providing an important habitat for many rare / protected and endangered animals.	2628/	
	Objection – according to the map distributed with the Local Plan there is no access to the land from Intake Lane. Therefore it appears that access would be via Eastfield Lane. All of the objections raised above therefore apply to this proposal.	4626/	
	Objection – designated Green Belt should be protected. Dunnington is at maximum capacity and insufficient amenities and road infrastructure. Change of the whole village and destruction of its rural feel. No evidence of such demand for housing to scarify this food agricultural land. Congestion and crossing problems.	6959/	
	Object – Land previously rejected. Construction traffic would be a danger. Additional houses would create a health and safety risk on the roads. Rising bollards is a possible solution. The school is near capacity. Sewerage and drainage are at capacity. Agricultural land would be destroyed.	10751/	
<b>H38 Land RO Rufforth Primary School, Rufforth</b>	Objection – there should be no further building of new homes at Middlewood Close end of Rufforth otherwise many houses will not be able to use their toilets resulting in blockage and disease.	2462/	

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
<b>H39 North of Church Lane, Elvington</b>	Objection - along with proposals at Dauby Lane the village could grow by over 25%. The place for house building on this scale can only be within the ring road, by extension of the existing urban area, not by expanding small villages with no facilities or public transport. Already only too well aware of how it takes to get an appointment with the doctor and how long the traffic queues are at Grimston Bar around 8am on weekdays.	9258/17819	
	Objection – in relation to the field between Alvin Walk and Church Lane, following a public enquiry in 1992/1993 the inspector concluded in his report that ‘There was no overriding need to make further provision of land for future development. Inappropriate to remove this site from the Green Belt, due to difficulties in relation to access that would cause harm to the character of the village or the amenities of existing residents’. The proposed traveller site is wholly inappropriate for a village, it will significant affect the character of the village. The proposed site is also situated in an inappropriate area. It will put additional pressure on existing infrastructure (sewage, water supply, electricity, roads etc.). It will transform Becksides from a safe dead end into a busier road. It will destroy the wildlife of this field. Development will negatively affect the character of the village and the quality of life of local residents. The school is already at full capacity. Access to see a GP in an already extremely busy surgery. The appalling state of the B1228 road, already ruined by the allowed HGV traffic which uses a listed bridge. Additional traffic on a road which hasn’t been properly resurfaced in 15 years. Elvington is prone to floods due to poor drainage systems. The proposed development will almost double Elvington’s population without any plans for amenities to cope with such a dramatic rise.	9551/	
<b>H40 West Fields, Copmanthorpe</b>	Objection – the infrastructure, particularly the roads cannot cope resulting in a massive increase in congestion. These proposals would ruin the character of Copmanthorpe. There are a number of species on or near the developments sites that are red listed species of conservation.	1959/	
<b>H43 Manor farm yard, Copmanthorpe</b>	Objection – the infrastructure, particularly the roads cannot cope resulting in a massive increase in congestion. These proposals would ruin the character of Copmanthorpe. There are a number of species on or near the developments sites that are red listed species of conservation.	1959/	
<b>E1 Hungate</b>	Objection - seek a change in policy direction for the site to become a primarily residential led scheme, with limited office provision, which is considered to better reflect market conditions; be more viable and therefore deliverable and assist in delivering part of the significant housing requirement in the early years of the	9940/	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Hungate (York) Regeneration Limited

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	emerging Local Plan. Office Market Assessment submitted. Uncertainty over market demand to facilitate office development at Hungate site contrary to para 22 of the NPPF and the proposed allocation should be reviewed in light of this. The Hungate site comprises a highly sustainable site for housing development, and provides a unique opportunity to provide a high quality, high density residential led development which facilitates the use of Brownfield land in close proximity to shops, services and public transport links.		
<b>E6 Common Lane, Dunnington</b>	Objection - the site is in the Green Belt and as such should not be used for commercial development. Site contributes to the buffer zone between the business/commercial area of Dunnington and the residential area. The existence of a buffer zone was one of the conditions for the granting of planning permission for the development of Chessingham Park. The site is too close to Hassaccar Nature Reserve. The development of the site would have a detrimental impact on the environment and the water courses at the site. Would also impact the Hassaccar Nature Reserve recognised as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). Would impact the openness and character of the village. Would have a significant visual impact as it is on one of the major routes into the village. Drainage is poor in Dunnington. The site is productive agricultural land. There is a dangerous junction at the end of Common Lane where it meets the Hull Road. It is a dangerous road to cross especially for children.	4626/	
<b>Preferred Options Policy CF4 Healthcare and Emergency Services</b>	Support – Bootham Park Hospital site is referenced as an area which the plan seeks to protect. The site is owned by NHS Property Services and whilst we are 'neighbours' we would support the redevelopment of this site, it is not fit for current purpose, but we do recognise that it might play an important part in the future of the City. I understand English Heritage would like to see the site retained for use by the NHS, whilst we are not the lead in the current discussions; we are participating in the ongoing discussion of the future and recognise the importance of this site to the City.	1895/	York Teaching Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
	Comment – Policy CF4 of the draft Local Plan sets out the Local Plan's intentions to support existing healthcare services and the provision of new healthcare facilities. St. Leonard's Hospice is a particularly important facility as it is the only hospice in the City. There is increasing demand for the services provided by the hospice and it is vital that the ability of the hospice to continue to function and, if necessary to expand, is not compromised. The role of the hospice should be acknowledged in the Local Plan and protected in Policy. In particular the site should be identified as an existing healthcare facility on the Local Plan Proposals Map (extent of site shown on	6142/	Keogh Planning on behalf of St. Leonard's Hospice

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	accompanying map submitted with representation).		
<p><b>Preferred Options Policy T5 Strategic Cycle and Pedestrian Network Links and Improvements</b></p>	<p>Objection – opposed to the proposed cycleway along the north boundary of the Portakabin site as illustrated on the Draft Local Plan Proposals Map. The main car park of the Portakabin site is located just inside the north boundary of the site along the route of the dismantled railway. Draft Local Plan Policy T5 proposed additions to the cycle network. The Local Plan Proposals Map shows the route of a 'Proposed Improvement to the Cycleway Network' running along the north boundary of the Portakabin site. Land within the Portakabin site is not available to accommodate the cycleway. Furthermore, the boundary of the Portakabin site with the land to the north is defined by a mixture of mature trees and hedgerow. The route of the proposed cycleway would therefore require the removal of these trees and hedgerow. We assume this is not the intention of the plan. The draft Plan proposals map should therefore be amended to indicate the route of the proposed cycleway away from the boundary of the Portakabin site. It may be possible to accommodate the route of the cycleway in part through the proposed residential development to the north of the site.</p>	4378/	Keogh Planning on behalf of Portakabin Limited
<p><b>Preferred Options Policy YC1 York Central Special Policy Area</b></p>	<p>Comment -suggests that the wording is amended to acknowledge that approximately 400 homes would be delivered in the initial phase of development, with a significant proportion of the remaining dwellings provided within the plan period, up to a total of approximately 1,500 dwellings. In transport terms, vehicle trips generated by commercial space, which will attract trips from across York and the wider City Region are likely to place a greater burden on the network than residential properties. Residential occupiers of the York Central site are likely to take sustainable modes of travel to work, given their proximity to the City Centre, the railway station and future business quarter. On this basis, it is considered that the York Central Site has the potential to contribute further additional housing stock to York, above and beyond the level currently suggested in the Local Plan. It is therefore suggested that the Plan is amended to state that York Central could provide between 1,100 and 1,500 dwellings, subject to infrastructure capacity and impact assessments, and the need to deliver a high quality new business quarter. Seek to establish that the land uses shown on the Concept Plan are indicative and non-prescriptive in their precise nature and extent. In particular, we would wish to emphasise that the mixed use area would be exactly that, with the flexibility to bring residential accommodation into this area in appropriate forms as part of a mixed-use scheme, and to develop distinct urban quarters within it. The boundary between the predominantly residential and mixed use</p>	199/	Arup, on behalf of Network Rail

Site, Para etc.	Comments	Ref.	Name (where business or organisation)
	<p>should not be considered as precise and a range of uses, including residential, will likely to be accommodated with each of the zones. Suggestion: Amend the Concept Plan to reflect this overlap in order to safeguard future flexibility. Seek to amend the Local Plan policy, so as to place less emphasis on Chancery Rise link being the 'first' bridge link, and the likelihood of providing a second link from Water End later in the scheme. Suggestion is that the wording of the Local plan is softened to refer to an anticipated new bridge from Holgate Road over the railway lines to serve the development site, with secondary bridge options available to provide additional highways capacity into the site should the need arise. The requirement to adopt Eco-Town standards may risk some uncertainty in terms of the standards that the development is required to meet, and also risks negatively impacting upon both public perception and viability. The reference to Eco Town principles may also deter potential developers by suggesting that they must allow for more onerous requirements than a conventional development site, causing them to seek development opportunities elsewhere, and thus placing York Central at a disadvantage. Suggestion is to remove the reference to seeking to deliver standards for eco-towns for York Central from the Local Plan.</p>		