

ASPECT OF PLAN COMMENTED UPON	REPRESENTOR	REPRESENTATION MADE	RESPONSE
Introduction	14 – City of York Council	Ref Para 1.4.3 - it is suggested that the discussion of the Local Plan would sit better under section 3.2 Local Planning Policy, however the last sentence in this paragraph remains necessary and it is suggested this sentence should read “Should this the examination of the Publication Draft Local Plan bring forward any changes.....”	The PC would be agreeable to these suggested amendments.
3.Policy Context for the NP – 3.1: National Planning Policy Context	14 – City of York Council	Ref Para 3.1.1 - it is suggested that the following changes are made to make reference to the newly published NPPF 2021: “The latest version of the NPPF was published in February 2019 2021 and replaced the previous iterations that were published in February 2019 , July 2018 and March 2012.”	The PC would be agreeable to the suggested amendment, with the additional reference to the latest publication date being July 2021 , should be examiner deem this update to be necessary. The PC would make the point that the new version of the NPPF was published after the submission of the NP in June 2021. As such, at the time of submission, the NP had taken account of the most up-to-date version of the NPPF available at the time, as required under the Basic Conditions.
3.Policy Context for the NP – 3.2: Local Planning Policy	14 – City of York Council	Ref Para 3.2.1 - it is suggested that this paragraph would benefit from greater clarity regarding the City of York Development Plan. The status of the City of York Development Plan can be found below. The development plan for York comprises the saved policies of the Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) relating to the general extent of the York Green Belt. These	The PC would be agreeable to amending para 3.2.1 in line with the clarifying text suggested. The PC would however question the need to refer to made (i.e. ‘adopted’) NPs for other

		<p>are policies YH9(C) and Y1 (C1 and C2) which relate to York's Green Belt and the key diagram insofar as it illustrates general extent of the Green Belt. It also includes the Upper and Nether Poppleton Neighbourhood Plan which was adopted in October 2017, the Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan which was adopted in December 2018, the Earswick Neighbourhood Plan adopted in June 2019 and the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan, adopted in July 2021. In accordance with The Neighbourhood Plan (General) Regulations 2012, these Neighbourhood Plans will be used when determining future planning applications within the identified Upper and Nether Poppleton, the Rufforth with Knapton, the Earswick and Huntington Neighbourhood Areas. The City of York Draft Local Plan Incorporating the Fourth Set of Changes was approved for Development Management purposes in April 2005 (DCLP). Whilst the DCLP does not form part of the statutory development plan, its policies are considered to be capable of being material considerations in the determination of planning applications where policies relevant to the application are consistent with those in the 2021 NPPF, although the weight that can be afforded to them is very limited. The Publication Draft City of York Local Plan 2018 (the emerging plan) was submitted for examination on 25 May 2018. In accordance with paragraph 48 of NPPF 2021, the emerging plan policies can be afforded weight according to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); b. the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and c. the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the previous NPPF published in March 2012. (NB: Under transitional arrangements plans 	<p>neighbourhood areas which have no bearing on the Strensall with Towthorpe NP area.</p>
--	--	---	---

	14 – City of York Council	<p>submitted for examination before 24 January 2019 will be assessed against the 2012 NPPF).</p> <p>The evidence base underpinning the emerging plan is also capable of being a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.</p> <p>Ref Para 3.2.2 - it is suggested that reference to subsequent consultations of the Regulation 19 Local Plan is made as follows: “Subsequent to the submission of the Publication Draft to the Secretary of State in May 2018, two further consultations were held on proposed modifications to the Publication Draft in June 2019 and May 2021. These consultations included consultation on new evidence base”.</p>	The PC would be agreeable to the suggested addition.
3. Policy Context for the NP - 3.3: Green Belt	14 – City of York Council	<p>Ref Para 3.3.4 - it is suggested that the following is included for clarity: “City of York Council are proposing a number of modifications to the submitted Local Plan, which include an amendment to move the village Green Belt Boundary to the centre of follow Ox Carr Lane. This boundary change was included as part of the June 2019 consultation on modifications following the proposed deletion of sites (i.e. ST35 (Queen Elizabeth Barracks) and H59 (Howard Road)), from the sites to be allocated for development during the Local Plan period.”</p>	The PC would be agreeable to the suggested amendment.
	14 – City of York Council	<p>Ref Para 3.3.5 - it is the suggested this paragraph is updated to include reference to the Publication Draft Local Plan May 2021 consultation and confirm the Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with this proposed modifications document 2021.</p>	The PC would be agreeable to the suggested amendment.
3. Policy Context for the NP - 3.4: Development Allocations	10 – Lichfields/Taylor Wimpey	Ref representation P3-4.	The PC makes the following points in respect of this representation:- 1. Table A at 3.4 was correct at the time of NP Submission in June 2021.

	12 – Natural England	<p>We note however that the Neighbourhood Plan may come forward ahead of the City of York Local Plan and includes reference to allocations and policies from the Local Plan which have not yet been adopted. As such, should changes be made to the Local Plan, there is a risk that the Neighbourhood Plan may no longer be in conformity with the Plan. We therefore recommend that this potential is acknowledged in the Neighbourhood Plan and that measures to ensure that the Plan is reviewed and any conflicts resolved in this circumstance are proposed.</p>	<p>2.The PC/NP is under absolutely no obligation to allocate any sites and has no community mandate so to do.</p> <p>3.The Brecks Lane site is proposed as Green Belt. NPs have no power to review Green Belt boundaries/take land out of Green Belt/allocate land within Green Belt, even if the Qualifying Body were so minded.</p> <p>4.The PC fully acknowledges that amendments to Table A may be required as a result of the Local Plan examination and would be agreeable to such amendments.</p> <p>5.The PC would be agreeable to amendments to Table A in respect of Use Class updates.</p> <p>The PC would point to Paras 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 which already specifically recognise the need for possible review and update.</p>
Aims	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	<p>3.1 The second of the Plan’s aims reads as follows: If the MoD were to dispose of the Queen Elizabeth Barracks for redevelopment, then the site at Towthorpe Moor Lane will be developed for a range of local employment generating businesses.</p>	<p>Re 3.2/Aim 2 – The PC would be agreeable to the NP aim reflecting the respondent’s assertion if this is indeed the factual position.</p>

		<p>3.2 The future of Towthorpe Lines is not linked to the future of QEB. These are standalone assets and should be treated as such in the NP.</p> <p>3.3 The aim for QEB should be reworded as follows: ‘When the barracks are vacated, to provide a framework that enables the site to be redeveloped or put to a suitable/ beneficial use thereby facilitating sustainable development subject, as necessary, to the impact of any proposed development being appropriately tested and addressed.’</p>	<p>Re 3.3/Aims 3 & 4 – The PC would be agreeable to the suggested amalgamation/re-wording of aims.</p>
Objectives	<p>11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation</p> <p>14 - City of York Council</p>	<p>3.4 DIO agrees that the NP should contribute to meeting York’s OAN for housing (Objective 1). However, the NP makes not a single housing allocation and so the NP fails to achieve this critical objective.</p> <p>3.5 DIO notes that the NP seeks to ensure that any housing proposed in the NP area is of a type and mix that meets the needs of existing and future residents (Objective 4). Yet there has been no assessment of the type of housing that the NP area needs and there is no such evidence underpinning the emerging YLP either. Accordingly, and so as to avoid the NP specifying objectives that are not clear and precise, we consider that Objective 4 should be deleted.</p> <p>It is noted that all objectives have a duplicated “to” when read with the preceding sentence. This duplication should be removed.</p>	<p>Re 3.4 – the objective is an acknowledgement that the PC/NP is happy to accept Local Plan housing allocations within the neighbourhood area, as reflected in NP policies setting out guidelines for sites that City of York have previously indicated may be allocated, i.e. QEB. The PC/NP is under absolutely no obligation to allocate any sites and has no community mandate so to do.</p> <p>Re 3.5 – the PC considers this to be a wholly reasonable aspiration of this NP or indeed any plan and one which would remain entirely valid whatever the evidence of need.</p> <p>The PC acknowledges the grammatical error and would be agreeable to proposed amendment.</p>

	14 - City of York Council	Objective 1 should be changed to “ To contribute to meeting York’s Objectively Assessed Housing Need housing requirement”.	The PC would be agreeable to the proposed amendment.
NP Policies: 5.1 Car Parking	14 – City of York Council	Ref Para 5.1.3 - it is suggested this paragraph is updated to reference the NPPF 2021 and associated paragraph references replacing paragraph 105 for paragraph 107. It is also suggested that policy would benefit from reference to Policy T8: Demand Management and the development of an up to date parking standards contained in a ‘Sustainable Transport for Development’ SPD.	The PC would be agreeable to the suggested update/amendment. That said, the SPD reference is unclear and no such SPD appears on the City of York website. The PC would require clarification on this matter.
	14 – City of York Council	Ref Para 5.1.6 - it is suggested that this paragraph references that the level of on-street parking is set by the local highway authority through a separate process to planning. The use of planning conditions and obligations to amend on-street parking is feasible in combination with amending traffic regulation orders.	The PC would be agreeable to including the additional suggested reference. It is unclear whether the final sentence of the representation is also suggested for inclusion.
Policy CP1: Safeguarding Existing Car Parking	14 – City of York Council	The following wording is suggested to improve the policy structure to ensure it is positive, clear and unambiguous with reference to the relevant use classes moved to be included as explanatory text. “Existing parking provision supporting places of employment, schools, shops, public houses, churches, community facilities, doctors, dentists or public services will be protected. Loss of parking spaces will be considered appropriate where it is demonstrated that the parking spaces are no longer required; or alternative provision in an accessible and comparable location is secured.”	The PC is agreeable to the suggested amendments.
Policy CP2: Increased Public Car Parking	14 – City of York Council	It is suggested that this policy is updated to ensure clarity. The policy and supporting text should acknowledge that development has to accommodate its own requirements and you cannot require a development proposal to correct existing problems. Where the	The PC would be agreeable to amendments as suggested, but would welcome specific recommendations as to how both

		<p>development site creates problems, additional provision could be encouraged. The policy should also be updated to reflect that City of York Council's Development Control Local Plan Appendix E: Car and Cycle Parking Standards (2005) does not make provision for visitor parking. It is also suggested that the wording around the acceptability of visitor car parking and additional parking associated with development adjacent to CP2-1 The Village area as shown on the Proposals Map will be considered acceptable where it is demonstrated it would positively enhance the sense of place and local sustainability and mitigate harmful impacts. Where it is proposed in a Conservation Area it would need to demonstrate it is compatible with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>the policy and supporting text should be amended in order to achieve the required clarity.</p>
<p>Policy CF1: Protections of Community Facilities & Services</p>	<p>11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation</p>	<p>4.1 Hurst Hall is included in the list of Community Facilities within Policy CF1 as facility CF1-11. On 15 July 2019, it was listed as an Asset of Community Value. It is shown in the wrong location on the Proposal Map, with the references: CF1-11 and CA3-3. Its actual location is shown below by the red line boundary.</p> <p>4.2 It is not necessary or appropriate for Hurst Hall to be identified as both an Asset of Community Value and a Community Facility under Policy CF1. The rules in respect of Assets of Community Value give the local community all the control they need in respect of Hurst Hall. When the Hall is disposed of (as part of the QEB sale or otherwise), the local community will have the ability to bid to purchase (and therefore retain) the asset. If they chose not to bid to purchase it, this will indicate that it does not have the value or future as a community facility that Policy CF1 seeks to protect. Or put another way, if the asset is not purchased by the community, one or more of the Policy CF1 criteria will have been satisfied at that point, rendering CF1 redundant. A further point to note is that if a proposal were to be advanced for the redevelopment of QEB, including Hurst Hall, the local infrastructure requirements arising</p>	<p>Ref 4.1 - The PC acknowledges the map error and is of course agreeable to it being corrected.</p> <p>Ref 4.2 -The PC makes the following points in respect of this representation:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.It is common practice for facilities such as Hurst Hall to be identified both as community facilities in a NP policy of this nature and as Assets of Community Value. Policy and asset registration fulfill different functions. It is incorrect to state that for a facility to be identified as both is not necessary or appropriate. 2.Asset of Community Value status does not give the community all it needs in respect of Hurst Hall. The

	14 – City of York Council	<p>from this would be fully assessed at the planning application stage and appropriate provision made for necessary community facilities. On balance, DIO considers that Hurst Hall should be removed from the list of Community Facilities contained within Policy CF1.</p> <p>It is suggested this policy is updated to improve clarity. It is suggested the policy is seeking to resist the loss of community facilities and as such, it is suggested this policy is re-phrased to identify planning considerations where the loss of community facilities would be acceptable and to place the onus on the applicant to demonstrate conformity with the policy.</p>	<p>ability to bid is subject to available resources. Any decision not to bid is very likely to be a reflection of the lack of available resources rather than the value or otherwise of the hall as a community facility.</p> <p>3.The PC does not accept that the inability of the community to purchase Hurst Hall/the asset constitutes failure to satisfy policy criteria, as this would be just one way of securing the continued community use, not the only way. As such, neither does the PC accept the redundancy of CF1 in this respect.</p> <p>4.While accepting that local infrastructure requirements would indeed be assessed as part of any planning application for QEB redevelopment, this has no bearing on the fact that Hurst Hall is considered to be an important community facility for the existing community – hence its policy listing and asset registration.</p> <p>The PC would be agreeable to policy rephrasing in order to improve clarity as suggested, but would welcome specific recommendations as to how the</p>
--	---------------------------	---	---

	<p>11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation</p>	<p>If Policy CF2 is, as its title suggests, designating Local Green Spaces, then it is demonstrably not consistent with the provisions of the NPPF and is not fit for purpose. Very few, if any of the land parcels identified under Policy CF2 meet the NPPF criteria for designation as Local Green Space.</p>	<p>areas etc. can all be designated as LGS. The title of Appendix 2 could perhaps be amended to 'Assessments for LGS Designation' to make the content crystal clear.</p> <p>The PC would strongly dispute this vague, general assertion which is not backed up by any examples or evidence.</p>
	<p>11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation</p>	<p>For land to qualify as Local Green Space, it must be demonstrably special and hold particular significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or the richness of its wildlife. Land will not qualify as Local Green Space if it is not accessible to the community, or if it is run of the mill open space. It must have some feature or characteristic, or must make some form of contribution to the local community that marks it out as being special.</p>	<p>The PC is well aware of the LGS criteria and considers that its LGS assessments in Appendix 2 demonstrate how each site meets the criteria. That said, it would be happy to review/amend as necessary all assessments in order to clarify the particular significance or demonstrable community value in each case (NB as already requested by the examiner in respect of amenity green spaces). The PC would point out that accessibility to the community is not a criterion for LGS designation, as asserted in the representation, ref national guidance and borne out by the many e.g.s of privately-owned/inaccessible designated LGS in 'made' NPs.</p>

	13 – Private Individual	Ref CF2-3 Land between River Foss and Westpit Lane. Objection – the land between Westpit Lane and River Foss is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964 with no public access permission. Land to the rear of 40 Westpit Lane purchased from Shepherd Homes in December 2014.	Neither private ownership nor lack of public access preclude LGS designation, provided the site in question satisfies LGS criteria. The PC considers that the extent of public access, namely a path along the river bank (NB used by walkers/dog walkers for many years), could be clarified in the assessment at Appendix 2 (CF2-3), in relation to the site’s community and recreational value and would be agreeable to making such a clarification.
	14 – City of York Council	It is suggested for clarity and ease of use of the document, that this section (and / or Appendix 2) make reference to the specific evidence base for the Local Plan, namely the Open Space and Green Infrastructure Update (September 2017).	The PC would be agreeable to this. It would however also make the point that the NP is at full liberty to deviate from City of York LGS evidence and to assess sites from the PC/community perspective and reach conclusions accordingly (NB the examiner has already requested the revisiting of assessments of amenity green space sites proposed as LGS, which the PC has undertaken).
Policy DH1: Promotion of Local Distinctiveness	10 – Lichfields/Taylor Wimpey	Ref representation P4-5	These comments, together with those of City of York Council below, highlight some shortcomings in policy wording regarding Character Areas which the PC would be happy

	<p>14 – City of York Council</p>	<p>Example <i>(NB of proposed wording amendment)</i> - Policy DH1 Character Areas.</p> <p>Strensall with Towthorpe is situated in a rural setting. All development should preserve or enhance the positive character of the neighbourhood plan area. An assessment of the neighbourhood plan area found there to be 21 character areas, which are presented under Appendix Four prepared by Woodhall Planning and Conservation. Any development within the character areas identified in the Village Design Statement and the Character Appraisal, will be supported where they are expected to preserve or enhance the positive identified key characteristics of the particular character area.</p> <p>Gardens and open spaces between buildings that contribute to the rural charm of the neighbourhood plan area should be retained. Subdivision of these spaces gardens and open spaces between buildings as a result of development will only be supported where it does not harm the character, openness, and visual amenity of the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>Within Strensall village specifically there are a number of large rear gardens which are considered important to the spatial qualities of Strensall and Towthorpe, and are worthy of retention. There are a number of large rear gardens along the west side of Moor Lane/Princess Road, both side of Lords Moor Lane (to the</p>	<p>to see addressed. However, given the different and in some cases conflicting (NB notably between the 2 representations below from city of York Council) suggestions as to rewording, the PC is content to await the examiner's recommendations re this aspect of the policy.</p> <p>These comments, together with those of Lichfields/Taylor Wimpey above, highlight some shortcomings in policy wording regarding Character Areas which the PC would be happy to see addressed. However, given the different and in some cases conflicting (NB notably between the representations here and below from city of York Council) suggestions as to rewording, the PC is content to await the examiner's recommendations re this aspect of the policy.</p>
--	----------------------------------	--	---

	<p>14 – City of York Council</p> <p>14 – City of York Council</p>	<p>north of York Golf Club) and along the north side of The Village. Their loss to development will be resisted where development would interfere with the existing spatial qualities of the area.</p> <p>It is suggested this policy would benefit from referencing Policy GB2 of the Publication Draft Local Plan which considers Development in Settlements in the Green Belt as Towthorpe is within the Green Belt and not inset from the Green Belt like Strensall.</p> <p>The following amendments are also suggested to assist ensure policies are positive, clear and unambiguous:</p> <p>-Character Areas Gardens and open spaces between buildings that contribute to the rural character charm of the neighbourhood plan area should be retained. Subdivision of these spaces as a result of development will only be supported where it does not harm the character and visual amenity.</p> <p>-Spaces In the first paragraph relating to spaces: “In particular allotments areas are to be” The loss of front or side gardens areas to hardstanding for vehicle parking should be avoided. This will be controlled by an assessment of appropriateness including impact on rural character as well as road safety condition in relation to new development.</p> <p>The Publication Draft Local Plan Policy GI6 (New Open Space Provision) states that “All residential development proposals should contribute to the provision of open space for recreation and amenity”. As such it is suggested the following wording is deleted and the policy used to describe the forms of open and green space that are acceptability in the character context of the plan area. Whilst the City of York Local Plan expects all development to provide green space, the Neighbourhood Plan is</p>	<p>The PC would be agreeable to this suggested amendment.</p> <p>1. These comments, together with those of Lichfields/Taylor Wimpey above, highlight some shortcomings in policy wording regarding Character Areas which the PC would be happy to see addressed. However, given the different and in some cases conflicting (NB notably between the representations here and above from City of York Council) suggestions as to rewording, the PC is content to await the examiner’s recommendations re this aspect of the policy.</p> <p>2. Ref the ‘Spaces’ section - It is unclear what the respondent is suggesting in respect of the first paragraph.</p> <p>3. Ref the ‘Spaces’ section – the PC would be agreeable to the suggested amendment of the second paragraph.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation</p>	<p>concerned to ensure larger schemes (over 10 units or 1000 sq m) provide open space as part of development.</p> <p>6.5 DIO have a major concern that DH1 and DH2 do not confine themselves to matters of local distinctiveness. Elements of DH1 are not specific to Strensall (i.e. Highways; Public Rights of Way; Spaces and Signage). It is plainly not necessary for all developments, in all locations in the Parish, to address all elements of DH1 and DH2 to deliver good design.</p> <p>6.6 These policies should focus on: a) Those parts of the Parish where special care needs to be taken (because of the presence of heritage assets or because it exhibits a very distinctive character); b) Otherwise requiring good design consistent with NPPF/NPPG and giving an indication of the factors that developers should consider - it should not, though, require each and every criterion to be addressed in tick box fashion. It must also not use phrases such as ‘preserve and enhance’ out of context. These impose a specific level of restraint that is reserved for heritage assets.</p> <p>6.7 Any duplication with the NPPF, NPPG or emerging York Local Plan policy should be removed from the NP (i.e. in relation to</p>	<p>4.The PC has no wish to duplicate Local Plan policy provision and would be agreeable to the suggested wording deletion should the examiner be satisfied that its inclusion does indeed constitute needless duplication.</p> <p>5.It is unclear what amendment is being suggested by “the policy used to describe the forms of open and green space that are acceptability in the character context of the plan area”. The PC would welcome a specific recommendation re wording to be included here.</p> <p>1.Ref 6.5 – while it is acknowledged that the ‘Signage’ section addresses generic matters, it is considered that the other sections referenced in the representation do relate to specific characteristics of the Strensall neighbourhood area, i.e. the area’s visual quality, the conservation areas, the village’s cut-throughs/snickets, local allotments, which do contribute to local distinctiveness.</p> <p>2.Ref 6.6 – The PC considers that the policy is in line with NPPF, all the more so given the updated NPPF’s new emphasis on locally distinctive design and the key role</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>'Spaces' and reference to open space provision on larger schemes). It is not clear what the section on 'Spaces' adds as major development schemes would be required to provide open space as part of the development in accordance with the YLP. Policy wording around Strensall Common SAC/SSSI is also not considered necessary, it is not clear what this criterion adds in addition to existing policy. NB ref also representation P15 re NPPF, NPPG and National Design Guide.</p>	<p>of NPs in delivering it. The PC notes that City of York Council take no issue with the use of 'preserve and enhance' in its response to this policy. 3.Ref 6.7 - The PC has no wish to duplicate Local Plan or national policy provision and would be agreeable to amendments to remove duplication should the examiner be satisfied that any duplication exists.</p>
<p>Policy DH2: General Design Principles</p>	<p>07 – Private Individual</p> <p>10 – Lichfields/Taylor Wimpey</p>	<p>We wish to draw attention to the comment by the City of York Council on the section of the plan on "Roof Form" (Consultation Statement, p. 139), which notes that this section is "very prescriptive" and proposes a less prescriptive wording. It also suggests inclusion of a statement accepting contemporary design that deviates from this model if it can demonstrate exceptional design. The final plan as submitted does not include such a statement. We regret that there is no acknowledgement that outstanding contemporary design can enhance the visual character of the village, and contribute to the "mix of building styles and sizes" that is recommended in the Design Guidelines (para. 8).</p> <p>Ref representation P5-6</p>	<p>The PC would be open to considering less prescriptive wording and some flexibility re contemporary design.</p> <p>The PC would be agreeable to policy wording amendments on 'Layout', 'Boundary Treatments' and 'Roof Form' along the lines suggested (see also separate response on 'Roof Forms' to comments from 07 Private</p>

	<p>11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation</p>	<p>6.5 DIO have a major concern that DH1 and DH2 do not confine themselves to matters of local distinctiveness. Large parts of DH2 are unnecessarily and unreasonably prescriptive. It is plainly not necessary for all developments, in all locations in the Parish, to address all elements of DH1 and DH2 to deliver good design.</p> <p>6.6 These policies should focus on: a) Those parts of the Parish where special care needs to be taken (because of the presence of heritage assets or because it exhibits a very distinctive character); b) Otherwise requiring good design consistent with NPPF/NPPG and giving an indication of the factors that developers should consider - it should not, though, require each and every criterion to be addressed in tick box fashion. It must also not use phrases such as ‘preserve and enhance’ out of context. These impose a specific level of restraint that is reserved for heritage assets.</p> <p>6.7 Any duplication with the NPPF, NPPG or emerging York Local Plan policy should be removed from the NP (NB ref also representation P15 re NPPF, NPPG and National Design Guide).</p>	<p>Individual above and City of York Council below).</p> <p>1.Ref 6.5 – Based on the VDS and Character Appraisal, it is considered that the policy does relate to local distinctiveness, in line with NPPF - all the more so given the updated NPPF’s new emphasis on locally distinctive design and the key role of NPs in delivering it.</p> <p>2.Ref 6.6 – The PC considers that the policy is in line with NPPF, all the more so given the updated NPPF’s new emphasis on locally distinctive design and the key role of NPs in delivering it. The PC notes that City of York Council take no issue with the use of ‘preserve and enhance’ in its response to this policy.</p> <p>3.Ref 6.7 - The PC has no wish to duplicate Local Plan or national policy provision and would be agreeable to amendments to remove duplication should the examiner be satisfied that any duplication exists.</p>
	<p>14 – City of York Council</p>	<p>It is suggested that this policy and / or supporting text references the protections within the NPPF with regards to heritage assets.</p>	<p>1.The PC is agreeable to the suggested amendment re the NPPF and heritage assets and would</p>

		<p>-Roof Form. As stated in CYC's 2019 Schedule of comments, this section seems very prescriptive, where it refers to within the Conservation Area new buildings up to a 7m span should be designated with a minimum roof pitch of 40 degrees. If it is extremely consistent it might justify this level of prescription but this must be justified. The following amendments are suggested to support use of positive, clear and unambiguous policies.</p> <p>-Roof form suggested wording "Roof forms and materials are expected to match desirable local characteristics, particularly in conservation areas. Plan depth should be sympathetic to desirable existing village plan forms so as to generate familiar pitched roof geometries and roof heights."</p>	<p>welcome a specific recommendation re wording to be included to achieve the desired end.</p> <p>2. Re 'Roof Forms' - the PC would be agreeable to the suggested amended wording or other similar wording to achieve the same end.</p>
Policy DH3: General Shopfront Design	14 – City of York Council	It is suggested these policies read more like guidance than policy and should be updated as stated in the general comments section. Updates should include a provision to identify if lighting is required.	The PC disagrees and considers that DH1 does read like a policy. Greater clarity regarding the exact updating sought, including with regard to lighting would be welcomed, in the form of recommended wording.
Policy DH4: Shopfront Signage	14 – City of York Council	It is suggested these policies read more like guidance than policy and should be updated as stated in the general comments section. Updates should include a provision to identify if lighting is required.	The PC disagrees and considers that DH1 does read like a policy. Greater clarity regarding the exact updating sought, including with regard to lighting would be welcomed, in the form of recommended wording.
DG3: Howard Road Design Guidance	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	8.1 It is not clear from the policies map as to the exact area this policy DG3 relates to although we assume it relates to the area shown by the Regulation 14 version of the plan.	1. Ref 8.1 – the PC acknowledges this omission from the Proposals Map and can confirm that the area in question is that shown on the

		<p>8.2 Howard Road has no special status in planning terms, it is not recognised for its design quality, its historic value or anything special about its character. This is acknowledged in paragraph 5.4.4 of the neighbourhood plan which indicates that development could come forward in this area, and this is contrary to the proposed CF2-6 designation identified in section 5. That the Neighbourhood Plan outlines design guidance for this area further shows an inconsistent approach has been taken to development in this location.</p> <p>8.3 The level of prescription included within DG3 is thus wholly inappropriate. This includes building heights and flexibility above two storey houses, specific boundary treatment requirements and materials.</p> <p>8.4 The general principles of good design articulated in NPPF/NPPG and emerging YLP should be enough to ensure appropriate outcomes here in design terms.</p>	<p>Regulation 14 map version. The PC is of course agreeable to the Proposals Map being amended accordingly.</p> <p>2.Ref 8.2 – Paragraph 5.4.4 allows for development within the Howard Road area as defined on the Regulation 14 Proposals Map. It is incorrect, as asserted, to state that 5.4.4 acknowledges “Howard Road has no special status in planning terms, it is not recognised for its design quality, its historic value or anything special about its character.” What is stated in 5.4.4 does not conflict with the proposed LGS status of CF2-6. 5.4.4 also needs to be read in conjunction with Paragraphs 5.4.5 and 5.4.17-20 for a complete picture of the NP’s approach and its context, in particular the fact that there is no longer a Local Plan allocation at Howard Road. The policy’s development guidance is based on the character appraisal included in the NP as Appendix 4.</p> <p>3.Ref 8.3 & 8.4 – the policy provisions are based on the character appraisal included in the NP as Appendix 4. The PC considers them to be in line with the NPPF - all the more so</p>
--	--	--	---

			given the updated NPPF's new emphasis on locally distinctive design and the key role of NPs in delivering it.
Policy DG4 – preamble	14 – City of York Council	Ref Para 5.4.22 - it is suggested that supporting information needs to reference Proposed Modification 70 – New Policy GI2a within City of York Local Plan Composite Modifications Schedule (April 2021) (EXCYC58). Policy GI2a directs residential and non-residential development to accord with an 'exclusion zone' and 'zone of influence' around the Strensall Common Special Area of Conservation (SAC).	The PC would be agreeable to the inclusion of such a reference in supporting information.
Policy DG4: Queen Elizabeth Barracks - Design	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation 11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	If the intention is for the NP to be adopted before the YLP is adopted, it must either contain provisions that commit the authors to a review at the point that the YLP is adopted, or build in sufficient flexibility to enable it to be in general conformity with the YLP whatever form it takes. As far as the QEB sites are concerned, this means, at the very least, allowing for their redevelopment in the event that they are allocated for development in the YLP, or in circumstances where it can be demonstrated via a planning application that the redevelopment of the sites would be appropriate and sustainable. 9.1 It is not clear from the policies map as to the exact area this policy DG4 relates to although we assume it is as shown by the Regulation 14 version of the plan. 9.2 Queen Elizabeth Barracks is not recognised for its historic or architectural value and the Parish has no evidence of the Barracks having any particular merit in these regards.	The PC would point to Paras 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 which already specifically recognise the need for possible review and update, in line with the respondent suggestion. Specifically re DG4/QEB, the first paragraph already allows for redevelopment via a planning application irrespective of a Local Plan allocation. The PC would be happy to extend the policy wording to also allow for a site allocation, i.e. in the event of..... 1.Ref 9.1 - the PC acknowledges this omission from the Proposals Map and can confirm that the area in question is that shown on the Regulation 14 map version. The PC is of course agreeable to the

		<p>9.3 It has no special value in historic or architectural terms by way of listed buildings or a conservation area. It consists of a mixture of permanent and temporary structures for military use with buildings heights up to three storeys, including a relatively prominent officer's mess building.</p> <p>9.4 DIO strongly object to the proposed retention of the hard surfaced former parade grounds and the identification of buildings historic interest when the authors of the NP have no evidence to support their assertions. The NP is not, for example, underpinned by any form of heritage assessment which examines the significance, in heritage terms, of the buildings and spaces highlighted as buildings of historic interest on page 40 of the NP.</p> <p>9.5 It is wholly inappropriate, and unjustified to require any future developer to redevelop the site in a manner that respects the existing character and layout of the site.</p> <p>9.6 Moreover, to require such would result in an inappropriately low-density development that does not make the best/ most efficient use of this brownfield asset, contrary to national planning policy (NPPF paragraphs 122 and 130).</p> <p>9.7 DIO do not object to requiring a layout that looks to the 'MoDs' past, but there is no justification for any prescription here, including in respect of building heights. DIO also note that the statement on scale is incongruous as an existing building is higher than two stories. The City of York Council had no objections to an application (02/01833/CGO) for the erection of three storey pitched roof medical centre where consent was granted on 5 September 2002. The existing scale in some cases is higher than two stories. This suggests scale of any new buildings could be at least 3 stories in appropriate areas of the site.</p> <p>9.8 The objective should be to facilitate and encourage the most beneficial, effective and efficient use of the site in support of sustainable growth objectives.</p>	<p>Proposals Map being amended accordingly.</p> <p>2.Ref 9.2 & 9.3 – the design guidelines are based on the Character Appraisal evidence included in the NP as Appendix 4.</p> <p>3.Ref 9.4 (historic interest) – the PC acknowledges the lack of detailed evidence to back-up the historic building policy requirement, but would nonetheless point to the MoD-sourced plan on P40 and Historic England's stated interest in what comes forward via any planning application. The PC would be agreeable to an amended policy requirement re the preparation of a heritage assessment, as part of any development proposal, to identify what is of historic/heritage value, with a view to perhaps identifying some buildings that could be retained as 'landmark/ centrepiece/gateway' features (this would be a 'look' to the MoD past as suggested by the respondent). The assessment could also make a full historical record of the site prior to any demolition/ redevelopment.</p> <p>4.Ref 9.4 (parade grounds), 9.5 & 9.7 (layout) – the PC would maintain that 'respecting the</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>character and existing layout' in order to 'preserve heritage interest' does not, for e.g. mean retaining parade grounds, but rather applying some of the layout principles of the existing site, i.e. large open spaces, lawned areas, axial roads, mature tree retention/new tree planting, in order to 'mimic' the camp layout and so 'look to the MoD's past' as suggested by the respondent. The PC would be agreeable to amending the policy wording in order to better reflect this policy intention.</p> <p>5.Ref 9.6 (density) – the PC would expect housing density to be determined by Local Plan policy.</p> <p>6.Ref 9.7 (building heights) – the PC accepts that there are already buildings of 3 storeys on site and a planning permission precedent for a 3 storey building, making it difficult to sustain a policy position stipulating only 2 storeys. It would be agreeable instead to an amended approach, where buildings "should be primarily 2 storeys, but where taller buildings may be acceptable in certain locations, subject to a thorough</p>
--	--	--	---

	14 – City of York Council	The title of DG4 should be amended to: ‘Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Materials and Design’. It is suggested the description of the existing form of the barracks is not policy and should be removed from policy and used as background and / or justification information and therefore an update to the policy references is required.	design analysis of the site and intended locations”. 7.Ref 9.8 – while the PC would agree with this in general terms, it is considered that there is a case for guiding the detail of the development via a design policy. The PC would be agreeable to the proposed retitling. It is unclear what is meant by required updated policy references as a result of moving the descriptive elements of the policy.
Policy DG5: Development Brief for the Redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Master Planning/Planning Principles	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation 11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	If the intention is for the NP to be adopted before the YLP is adopted, it must either contain provisions that commit the authors to a review at the point that the YLP is adopted, or build in sufficient flexibility to enable it to be in general conformity with the YLP whatever form it takes. As far as the QEB sites are concerned, this means, at the very least, allowing for their redevelopment in the event that they are allocated for development in the YLP, or in circumstances where it can be demonstrated via a planning application that the redevelopment of the sites would be appropriate and sustainable. 10.1 DIO objects to this policy as currently worded and makes the following observations:	The PC would point to Paras 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 which already specifically recognise the need for possible review and update, in line with the respondent suggestion. Specifically re DG4/QEB, the first paragraph already allows for redevelopment via a planning application irrespective of a Local Plan allocation. The PC would be happy to extend the policy wording to also allow for a site allocation, i.e. in the event of..... 1.Ref a) - the PC acknowledges this omission from the Proposals Map and can confirm that the area in question is that shown on the

		<p>a) It is not clear from the policies map as to the exact area this policy DG5 relates to although we assume it is as shown by the Regulation 14 version of the plan.</p> <p>b) Bullets 1, 2 and 3 are unnecessary and duplicate national planning policy and should be deleted.. In relation to Bullet 2, CYC's position on detailed Green Belt boundaries is being determined through the emerging Local Plan. DIO have been clear in its responses to CYC's Local Plan Examination in Public Additional Consultation in outlining how the site does not perform any Green Belt function at QEB.</p> <p>c) Bullet 4 is inappropriate and unjustified - see comments on CF1 (Section 4).</p> <p>d) Bullet 5 is inappropriate and unjustified - these are military facilities that will cease to be used when the Barracks closes in 2024. There will be no public access to the site at all post 2024 unless the site is sold/ redeveloped. If the site is redeveloped the developer will be required to deliver sport/ recreation facilities in line with national policy and the then adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>e) Bullet 6 and 7 duplicate LP policy and NPPF.</p> <p>f) Bullets 8, 9 and 10 are addressed by the emerging York Local Plan.</p> <p>10.2 This is not a 'Brief' it is repetition of higher-level planning policy and is unnecessary. It should be deleted in its entirety.</p>	<p>Regulation 14 map version. The PC is of course agreeable to the Proposals Map being amended accordingly.</p> <p>2.Ref b) – the PC does not consider these clauses to be unnecessary or duplication. However, the PC has no wish to duplicate Local Plan or national policy provision and would be agreeable to amendments to remove duplication should the examiner be satisfied that any duplication exists. The PC acknowledges that Green Belt boundaries are a matter for the Local Plan, not the NP.</p> <p>3.Ref c) – the PC disagrees – ref response to representation at CF1.</p> <p>4.Ref d) – through the policy, the PC seeks to retain/improve on an existing facility rather than see it lost unnecessarily, with the risk that new facilities may not be provided. Football teams in the Neighbourhood area have to travel outside the village on occasion as other village facilities are insufficient to cope with local demand. There is also demand for cricket facilities but no suitable site is available. The QEB's extensive grassed sports areas would meet this need.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>5.Ref e) - the PC does not consider these clauses to be duplication. However, the PC has no wish to duplicate Local Plan or national policy provision and would be agreeable to amendments to remove duplication should the examiner be satisfied that any duplication exists.</p> <p>6.Ref f) – while referring to the above point re duplication, the PC would also make the point that there is currently no guarantee that the emerging Local Plan will ultimately address these issues. As such, there is a clear case for retaining them in the NP – indeed this point applies to all potential NP/Local Plan duplication in this situation where there is no adopted development plan, and indeed never has been for the City of York – given this history, the PC’s eagerness to cover all bases is understandable.</p> <p>7.Ref 10.2 – the PC point re repetition/being unnecessary applies here. The PC would be happy to retitle the policy, e.g. as ‘Redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Master Planning/Planning Principles’. The</p>
--	--	--	---

			PC strongly disagrees with the suggested policy deletion.
Policy DG6 – preamble	14 – City of York Council	Ref Paras 5.5.1 & 5.5.5 - it is suggested that reference to the local survey by The Rural Housing Trust and the City of York Council in October 2008 is deleted from paragraph 5.5.1 and that paragraph 5.5.5 is deleted as this evidence base does not constitute an up to date evidence base.	The PC would be agreeable to these suggested amendments.
	14 – City of York Council	Ref Para 5.5.6 - CYC does not recognise the 3 properties in the rear gardens of 5/6 Northfields as being ‘affordable housing’ and as such this information should be checked for accuracy.	The PC’s evidence for the NP’s statement was documentation associated with planning applications 10/01784 and 09/01156. However, as CYC is presumed to be the authority on this matter, the PC is agreeable to the reference being amended.
	14 – City of York Council	Ref Section 5.5 - it is suggested that this section recognise change to affordable housing need since the SHMA 2016 and include reference to conformity with forthcoming supplementary planning guidance on housing and updates to evidence base as they become material.	The PC is agreeable to the suggested amendments and would welcome a specific recommendation re the exact wording to be included to achieve the desired end.
Policy DG6: Affordable Housing	10 – Lichfields/Taylor Wimpey	Ref representation P6-7	See City of York Council response immediately above.
	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	11.1 The Neighbourhood Plan needs to be clear about how the Parish needs are to be assessed and how the policy will be implemented. 11.2 There is no national policy or guidance that indicates how needs (mix/type) can be robustly assessed at this micro level.	1.Ref 11.1 - see City of York Council response immediately above. 2.Ref 11.2 – the PC is aware of many e.g.s of parish-level housing need assessments that have been

		<p>11.3 Affordable housing will need to be provided in conformity with the emerging Local Plan policy. The City of York Council has a Strategic Housing Market Assessment and affordable housing policies in the Local Plan should be adequate and ensure that an appropriate amount and type of Affordable Housing is delivered within qualifying developments.</p> <p>11.4 The policy is therefore considered unnecessary and should be deleted.</p>	<p>undertaken in support of NPs and accepted as the basis of policies in made NPs.</p> <p>3.Ref 11.3 – the PC fully accepts that Local Plan affordable housing policy, once adopted, will play a key role in determining levels of provision in the neighbourhood area.</p> <p>4.Ref 11.4 – the PC strongly objects to policy deletion. The PC would also make the point that there is currently no guarantee that the emerging Local Plan will ultimately address this issue. As such, there is a clear case for retaining policy in the NP – indeed this point applies to all potential NP/Local Plan duplication in this situation where there is no adopted development plan, and indeed never has been for the City of York – given this history, the PC’s eagerness to cover all bases is understandable.</p>
Community Actions – CA1: Highway Improvements	05 – Sustrans	<p>We’re showing the development of a new walking & cycling route from the centre of York (where the existing Foss Islands Path meets Wigginton Road) by New Earswick and out to Strensall (and beyond) via Haxby on our National Cycle Network (NCN) development plan. So we support the aspiration to create a public right of way by the River Foss between Haxby Moor Road and Towthorpe Road as a step towards this, and would like to suggest looking into the feasibility of creating it as an accessible multi-user</p>	<p>Ref CA1-5 – the PC welcomes this support and would be agreeable to including specific reference to it in support of the community action.</p>

	14 – City of York Council	<p>path for those who'd like to cycle as well as walk - and possibly ride horses too? If further discussions arise, Sustrans would be keen to be involved and bring its wide experience of developing traffic-free routes to such an undertaking.</p> <p>It is suggested this policy is updated to make reference to, and comply with Policy T1 (Sustainable Access) and Policy T5 (Strategic Cycle and Pedestrian Network Links and Improvements) of the Publication Draft Local Plan.</p>	The PC is agreeable to the suggested updates and would welcome a specific recommendation re the exact wording to be included to achieve the desired end. The PC would point out that this is a non-planning 'community action' not a policy and will not form part of the statutorily made NP.
Community Actions – CA2: Designation of Public Rights of Way	13 – Private Individual	<p>Ref CA2-7 Footpath from Westpit Lane to River Foss between 38 and 40 Westpit Lane.</p> <p>Objection – the land between Westpit Lane and River Foss is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964 with no public access permission.</p>	The PC nonetheless has an aspiration to pursue formal public right of way status for the specified route, based on historical usage, and will pursue it via the appropriate channels.
Community Actions – CA3: Designation of Assets of Community Value	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	DIO acknowledge the listing of 'Hirst Hall Community Centre' as an Asset of Community Value on 15 July 2019 and this is reflected by proposed policy CA3-3. It is therefore unclear what is meant by the statement in the regulation 16 version (June 2021) that the Parish Council is seeking designation of Hurst Hall (CA3-3) as Assets of Community Value.	The PC acknowledges this to be an error and would of course be agreeable to amendment to correct the error and update the situation.
Community Infrastructure Levy	14 – City of York Council	It is suggested that this section is updated to make reference to The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2019.	The PC is agreeable to the suggested update and would welcome a specific

			recommendation re the exact wording to be included to achieve the desired end.
Appendix 2: Local Green Space Designation	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	the assessments of these spaces, which are contained in Appendix 2 to the NP, make no reference to Local Green Space and, instead refer to the subject land as, variously, ‘amenity green space’, ‘play areas’, ‘cemeteries’ and ‘natural and semi natural open spaces’, amongst other things. The Policy must at the very least be clear about what it is designating.	The assessments at Appendix 2 do indeed refer to the proposed sites as ‘amenity green space’ etc., depending on the functions they provide. It is clear from national policy and guidance and from the precedents set by many ‘made’ NPs that amenity green spaces, play areas etc. can all be designated as LGS. The title of Appendix 2 could perhaps be amended to ‘Assessments for LGS Designation’ to make the content crystal clear.
	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	If Policy CF2 is, as its title suggests, designating Local Green Spaces, then it is demonstrably not consistent with the provisions of the NPPF and is not fit for purpose. Very few, if any of the land parcels identified under Policy CF2 meet the NPPF criteria for designation as Local Green Space.	The PC would strongly dispute this vague, general assertion which is not backed up by any examples or evidence.
	11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	Of the 42 ‘spaces’ that the NP proposes to designate as Local Green Spaces, 5 are owned by the MoD. These are: CF2-6: Howard Road Natural / Semi Natural CF2-10: Howard Road Playing Field (Outdoor Sports) CF2-11: Sports Ground (Located QEB) CF2-12: Tennis Courts (Located QEB) CF2-36: St Wilfrid’s Garrison Church, St Wilfrid’s Road. For land to qualify as Local Green Space, it must be demonstrably special and hold particular significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or the richness of its wildlife. Land will not	The PC is well aware of the LGS criteria and considers that its LGS assessments in Appendix 2 demonstrate how each site meets the criteria. That said, it would be happy to review/amend as necessary all assessments, particularly the 5 MOD-owned sites, in order to clarify the

	13 – Private Individual	<p>qualify as Local Green Space if it is not accessible to the community, or if it is run of the mill open space. It must have some feature or characteristic, or must make some form of contribution to the local community that marks it out as being special. None of the MoDs land listed above is in any way demonstrably special and neither does it hold any particular significance in any of the respects referred to by the NPPF. For completeness, we set out below the NPs assessment of these land parcels and add our own comments as appropriate – (<i>ref representation P10-14</i>). It is clear from the above that none of the MoD’s land qualifies as Local Green Space. The references to these land parcels should be removed from Policy CF2 and references to them should also be removed from the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Ref CF2-3 Objection - the status of the lane is NOT natural/semi-natural land, it is classed as ‘Agricultural’. Objection – local or community value/landscape value/ recreational value – the land has been privately-owned since December 2014 and has been fenced off leaving the riverbank as a permissive path only. The public has not had access to this land.</p>	<p>particular significance or demonstrable community value in each case (NB as already requested by the examiner in respect of amenity green spaces). The PC would strongly oppose deletion of the 5 MOD-owned sites from the policy/Proposals Map without it being given the opportunity to clarify the relevant site assessments as suggested, taking account of the respondent’s detailed points.</p> <p>1.The assessment describes the land rather than attributes status. In a City of York Council officer’s report, refusing a planning application on this land in January 2018, the land is described as “old meadow grassland habitat” (ref planning application 17/02675/FUL) 2.Neither private ownership nor lack of public access preclude LGS designation, provided the site in question satisfies LGS criteria. The PC considers that the extent of public access, namely a path along the river bank (NB used by walkers/dog walkers for many years), could be clarified in the assessment at Appendix 2, in relation to the site’s community and</p>
--	-------------------------	--	--

			recreational value and would be agreeable to making such a clarification.
Appendix 3: Local Connections Criteria for Affordable Housing	14 – City of York Council	Appendix 3 is important for Policy DG6 and could be inserted into a justification under the policy in the main Neighbourhood Plan document. It is also suggested that the following changes are made: “Remaining in perpetuity for local people notwithstanding any statutory provisions such as the Right to Buy or Right to Acquire.” “In support of meeting local affordable housing requirements, any new affordable housing is expected to be allocated to those with an assessed housing need and local connection to Strensall or Towthorpe in the first instance.” Make the family connection more explicit such as: “Has a close family member (mother, father, adult son, adult daughter, adult brother, adult sister): currently residing in the partnership area and who has been a resident for the last 5 years and with whom they have an established close relationship.” Make ‘other special circumstances more explicit such as: “Have an essential need to live close to another person, who currently lives in the area, and who has been resident for the last 5 years, to provide or receive essential daily care or support.”	The PC would be agreeable to all the suggested amendments.
Appendix 4: Woodhall Planning & Conservation Character Appraisal	10 – Lichfields/Taylor Wimpey 11 – Avison Young/Defence Infrastructure Organisation	ref representation P4-5 6.8 In relation the NP Appendix 4 Woodhall work, the following comments are made:	The PC considers this to be a reasonable request and would be agreeable to the production of an updated map clearly showing character area boundaries. 1.Ref 6.8a) – Woodhall Planning & Conservation are experts in their field and clearly hold a different

		<p>a) QEB cannot by definition be a landmark feature. There are no individual buildings of landmark quality visible from the public domain.</p> <p>b) QEB is considered to comprise a discrete character area - it should therefore be appropriate to redevelop it in a form/manner that is not beholden to the character / appearance of nearby character areas.</p> <p>c) The Woodhall report is nothing more than a simple description of what the settlement contains. It does not represent a technically robust assessment or indication of character/ features that must be replicated to deliver local distinctiveness.</p> <p>d) What it demonstrates is that Strensall is a patchwork of residential and other buildings interspersed with pockets of quality with no overall/ defining character or spatial coherence.</p> <p>6.9 The Appraisal provides absolutely no basis for prescriptive or detailed design policies. It would seem appropriate for NP policy to allow new developments the opportunity to create new unique, distinct character areas within and on the edge of Strensall.</p> <p>6.10 The NPPF, NPPG and National Design Guide are perfectly adequate to deliver design of the quality required in the NP area. The Design Policies in the NP are unnecessary, unnecessarily restrictive and without appropriate underpinning evidence.</p>	<p>view on which the PC is happy to rely.</p> <p>2.Ref 6.8b) – the PC is unclear on the point being made here.</p> <p>3.Ref 6.8c) & d) – the PC stands by the appraisal as the basis for NP policies.</p> <p>4.Ref 6.9 - the PC stands by the appraisal as the basis for NP policies.</p> <p>5.Ref 6.10 - the PC considers the policies to be in line with the NPPF - all the more so given the updated NPPF's new emphasis on locally distinctive design and the key role of NPs in delivering it.</p>
Appendix 5: Strensall with Towthorpe Village Design Statement	10 – Lichfields/Taylor Wimpey	Ref representation P7	The VDS is an historical document approved by City of York Council as an SPD and included as an evidential underpin to the NP. As such, it is not appropriate to request amendments to it as part of the NP process.
	13 – Private Individual	PA5-25 Ref Public Rights of Way and the wider network access.	The VDS is an historical document approved by City of York Council as

	13 – Private Individual	<p>Objection – the land between Westpit Lane and River Foss is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964 with no public access permission.</p> <p>Objection – please remove reference to the footpath to the South Bank of the River Foss and to the rear of 40 Westpit Lane, purchased from Shepherd Homes in December 2014.</p> <p>PA5-36/37 Ref Annex B – Strensall with Towthorpe boundaries.</p> <p>Objection – the land between Westpit Lane and River Foss is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964 with no public access permission. It is not Open Space.</p>	<p>an SPD and included as an evidential underpin to the NP. As such, it is not appropriate to request amendments to it as part of the NP process.</p> <p>The VDS is an historical document approved by City of York Council as an SPD and included as an evidential underpin to the NP. As such, it is not appropriate to request amendments to it as part of the NP process.</p>
Mapping	03- Private Individual	<p>Please can you correct a mistake on all of the plans All plans are marked with CA2 permissive footpath incorrectly. This is all private land with no current permission or right of way. I am aware of a DMMO application to make it a public right of way, but is yet to be decided upon. We haven't even had the consultation or hearing yet pre any outcome. Whilst I note that it is in the Strategic plan to get as many permissive rights of way as possible (Page 44, section 6.4), it is wholly incorrect to mark CA2 as in place. To confirm there is no permission (permissive footpath) there is no current right of way in place over my land. It is correctly signposted and the DMMO have al of the evidence of this. I also point out it is an active flood plain with access required for the Foss drainage board. This is the only reason it is not fully blocked off by gates. This is giving some people the misapprehension that this is common land and/or that they have permission to pass through. Incorrectly marking this in the neighbourhood plan fuels the issue and confusion further.</p>	<p>On the assumption that this comment relates to CA2-1 – the examiner has indicated that only sites/buildings referred to or designated in NP policies be shown on the Proposals Map. On this basis, the PC is agreeable to the removal of the CA permissive footpath notation. The PC is not aware of any other NP maps on which permissive footpaths are shown.</p>

	<p>13 – Private Individual</p>	<p>Ref Strensall with Towthorpe NP – Proposals Map Objection - the land between Westpit Lane and River Foss is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964 with no public access permission. It is not Existing Open Space. Objection – please remove reference to the Permissive Footpath and Existing Open Space to the land to the rear of 40 Westpit Lane which is privately owned land with a category of ‘Agricultural’ land (purchased from Shepherd Homes in December 2014).</p>	<p>1. On the assumption that the permissive footpath comment relates to CA2-1 – the examiner has indicated that only sites/buildings referred to or designated in NP policies be shown on the Proposals Map. On this basis, the PC is agreeable to the removal of the CA2-1 permissive footpath notation. 2. The NP is simply reflecting the designations applied to the land by City of York Council and has no power to amend those designations. The examiner has requested that only sites designated or referred to in NP policies be shown on the NP Proposals Map. This may result in the specific references to ‘existing open space’ and ‘the open space study’ being removed from the map. That said, the PC realises that the Proposals Map fails to show all proposed LGS on the map and that this error needs to be rectified.</p>
	<p>14 – City of York Council</p>	<p>Re Map A (P6) and Map B (P7) - it is suggested that these maps should be clearer. CYC can assist produce clearer maps of the Strensall with Towthorpe Boundary and Revised Neighbourhood Plan Area (June 2016) if required.</p>	<p>The PC would be agreeable to this and gratefully accepts the offer of city of York Council assistance.</p>

	14 – City of York Council	It is suggested the map showing the Local Plan Open spaces and Local Green Space Designations (<i>NB Appendix 2 A2-26</i>) be made clearer to read including the copyright.	The PC would be agreeable to the suggested map improvement. However, as Policy CF2 is proposing the designation of all LGS sites, whether already proposed within the Local Plan or newly proposed in the NP, it would be logical for this map, and the Proposals Map, to show all proposed LGS sites with the same notation.
General	14 – City of York Council	Enclosed with this letter is Appendix 1 which highlights those issues that we feel will provide a more robust approach to the Neighbourhood Plan and its prospective implementation through the development management process. Within Appendix 1, we comment on the need for the policy wording to be positive, clear and unambiguous in line with paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021. Many of the policies in their current format would be difficult to implement and do not meet the requirements of paragraph 16. Our recommendation is that this aspect is addressed and improved during the examination process.	The PC is generally agreeable to improving the policy wording as suggested and has responded positively in its above responses to detailed policy comments by City of York Council
	14 – City of York Council	Re policy justification - there should be a justification after each policy. For example reference to the Village Design Statement and the Character Appraisal within Policy DH1 and DH2 would be well placed within a justification section.	The PC considers that all NP policies are already well justified but would be happy to receive specific, detailed recommendations from the examiner, on an individual policy basis, as to how this could be improved.
	14 – City of York Council	Re NPPF - The document needs to be updated throughout to make reference to the 2021 NPPF as the most up to date National Policy.	The PC would be agreeable to the suggested updating, should the

	14 – City of York Council	Re Local Plan Proposed Modification May 2021 - the document needs to be updated throughout to make reference to the Local Plan Proposed Modifications and Evidence Base Consultation held between 25 May and 7 July 2021.	<p>examiner deem this update to be necessary. The PC would make the point that the new version of the NPPF was published after the submission of the NP in June 2021. As such, at the time of submission, the NP had taken account of the most up-to-date version of the NPPF available at the time, as required under the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>The PC would be agreeable to the proposed updating.</p>
Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)	14 – City of York Council	A HRA review of the Strensall and Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan was undertaken and shared with the Parish Council at the same time the Parish Council submitted the Neighbourhood Plan to the City of York Council (Spring / Summer 2021). Consequently, the Parish Council have reviewed but not reflected comments in this document. The conclusion of the HRA review has found no compelling reason to disagree with the conclusion of the Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council HRA. The Strensall and Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan HRA review also concludes: “There is no credible possibility of the Plan adversely affecting the integrity of any European sites and, consequently, this review is able to recommend that the City Council may give effect to the Plan”.	The PC is unclear as to whether the respondent is proposing that the HRA be amended to take account of comments in the council’s HRA review. Given the HRA review’s conclusion, there would appear to be no reason to amend the HRA, however the PC is happy to be guided by the examiner on this matter.