



A summary of the representations submitted to the independent examiner

Ref no	Name	Summary of Comments
Representations received at Submission consultation stage		
Strensall 001	Highways England	<p>Little formal comment to make at this point on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. Any planned development already identified in the wider Local Plan consultations has been accounted for through existing consultations.</p> <p>The current consultation shows the wider aspirations of the neighbourhood plan in a positive light and this is welcomed. Whilst it identifies a single site (Towthorpe Lines) for employment uses, in its current format, it cannot as yet be determined what the potential impact could be on the future safe operation of the strategic road network, although the GFA noted would be expected to generate circa 250 jobs, which would not cause immediate concern.</p>
Strensall 002	Strensall Resident	<p>All plans are marked with CA2 permissive footpaths incorrectly. This is all private land with no current permissive right of way. The DMMO application to make it a public right of way is yet to be determined. There is no permissive right of way over my land. However, it is an active flood plain with access required for the Foss Drainage Board.</p>
Strensall 003	Strensall Resident	<p>Land identified as CF2-3, CF2-40 and CH2-41 is shown as existing open space in the CYC Publication Draft Local Plan and Open Space Study update 2017. While part of CF2-3 can be described as such, the rest of the land is not open space, but private arable land fenced off by the owners. The parish council was made aware of this a few years ago, but the map was not amended. The designation should be amended.</p>

Strensall 004	Earswick Parish Council	Earswick Parish Council supports the Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan
Strensall 005	Sustrans	We are showing a new walking & cycling route from the City Centre to Strensall and beyond, via New Earswick on our National Cycle Network Development Plan. We therefore support the aspiration to create a public right of way by the River Foss between Haxby Moor Road and Towthorpe Road and would like to suggest looking into the feasibility of creating it as an accessible multi-user path for those who'd like to cycle as well as walk, and possibly horse riders too?
Strensall 006	North Yorkshire County Council	Our internal services have no comments to make on the Plan as we have no cross boundary issues.
Strensall 007	Strensall Resident	<p>We wish to draw attention to the comment by City of York Council on the section of the plan on 'Roof Form' (Consultation Statement P139) that this section is very prescriptive, and proposes a less prescriptive wording. It also suggests inclusion of a statement accepting contemporary sign design that deviates from this model if it can demonstrate exceptional design. This is not included in the submitted plan.</p> <p>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>
Strensall 008	Historic England	No further comments to make, following our previous response on 10 th July 2018, to an earlier version of the Plan.
Strensall 009	Avison Young (obo National Grid)	There are no records of National Grid assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Strensall 010	Lichfields	Representations provided in the context of Taylor Wimpey's land interest at Brecks Lane, Strensall. Taylor Wimpey generally supports the Neighbourhood Plan and recognises the modifications made in response to the Regulation 14 consultation, undertaken in 2019. However, it has continued concerns with the content of some parts of the STNP.

		<p>If the suggested changes are made to policies DH1 (Promotion of Local Distinctiveness), Figure 2 (Character Areas), DH2 (General Design Principles), DH6 (Affordable Housing) and the Strensall with Towthorpe Map, then the Plan will meet the Basic Conditions requirements. However, without these amendments, it is considered that the plan will not make the basic conditions test.</p> <p>The land at Brecks Lane should be identified in the SWTNP as a housing allocation to meet the needs of the local area, including for affordable housing. The SWTNP has the ability to include a housing allocation notwithstanding the absence in the current draft York Local Plan of such an allocation.</p>
Strensall 011	Avison Young (obo Defence Infrastructure Organisation)	<p>The response sets out the following observations and recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many policies are unnecessarily prescriptive; • Policies relating to Queen Elizabeth Barracks are unnecessarily restrictive; • Policies are not founded on robust proportionate evidence; • It is unclear how the Neighbourhood Plan will operate alongside the Local Plan; • The Neighbourhood Plan should encourage and make the most efficient / effective use of this major brownfield site in accordance with sustainable development objectives; • None of the MOD assets in the Neighbourhood Plan area meet the criteria for designation as Local Green Spaces and they should be removed from policy CF2; • DIO wish to participate in any examination of the NP.
Strensall 012	Natural England	<p>Natural England is broadly satisfied with the Plan and accompanying Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment. We note however, that the Neighbourhood Plan may come forward ahead of the City of York Local Plan and includes reference to allocations and</p>

		<p>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>Strensall 013</p>	<p>Strensall Resident (late submission)</p>	<p>Objections are made to the following open space sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CF2-3 (Land between River Foss and Westpit Lane): This is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964, with no public access. Land to rear of 40 Westpit Lane purchased from Shepherd Homes in December 2014. • CA2-7 (Footpath from Westpit Lane to River Foss between 38 and 40 Westpit Lane): This is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964, with no public access. • CF2-3 (Land to rear of 40 Westpit Lane): This is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964, with no public access. It is not natural/semi natural, its agricultural. It has been fenced off, leaving the riverbank as a permissive path only. No public access. • Page A5.25 – Public Rights of Way and the wider network access. Land between Westpit Lane and River Foss - this is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964, with no public access. Remove reference to footpath to the south bank of the River Foss and the rear of 40 Westpit Lane, purchased from Shepherd Homes in December 2014. • Page A5.36/37 Annex B – Strensall with Towthorpe boundaries. Land between Westpit Lane and the River Foss is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964, with no public access – it is not open space. • Strensall with Towthorpe Neighbourhood Plan – Proposals Map:

		<p>Land between Westpit Lane and the River Foss is privately owned land and has been so since at least 1964, with no public access – it is not open space. Remove reference to permissive footpath and existing open space 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>
Strensall 014	City of York Council response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General comment: policy wording is required to be positive, clear and unambiguous, in line with paragraph 16 of NPPF 2021 – many policies as drafted don't meet these requirements. • General comment: There should be a justification after each policy. • General comment: The document needs to be updated to make reference to NPPF 2021. • General comment: The document needs to be updated to make reference to the Local Plan Proposed Modifications and Evidence Base Consultation (25th May – 7th July 2021). • General comment: A HRA review of the Strensall with 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 – 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. • Maps A & B: These should be clearer. • Paragraph 1.4.3: discussion about the Local Plan would best sit under section 3.2 'Local Plan Planning Policy', some re-wording of the policy is required. • Paragraph 3.1.1: Changes should be made to reflect the latest version of the NPPF.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 3.2.1: This paragraph would benefit from greater clarity regarding the status of the City of York Local Plan. • Paragraph 3.2.2: Wording is suggested to make reference to the subsequent consultations of the Regulation 19 Local Plan. • Paragraph 3.3.4: Wording is suggested which clarify the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Ox Carr Lane. • Paragraph 3.3.5: It is suggested that this paragraph is updated to include reference to the Publication Draft Local Plan consultation (May 2021) and confirm that the Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with this Proposed Modifications document. • Objectives of the Plan and paragraph 4.2.1: all objectives have a duplicated “to” when read with the preceding sentence – duplication should be removed. Wording is suggested to Objective 1 to refer to York’s ‘housing requirement’. • Paragraph 5.1.3: This paragraph should be updated to reference NPPF 2021 (and reference to paragraph 105 needs to be updated to paragraph 107). Policy would benefit from reference to Policy T8 Demand Management and the forthcoming Sustainable Transport Development SPD. • Paragraph 5.1.6: It is suggested that this paragraph references that the level of on-street parking is feasible is set by the local highway authority through a separate process to planning and that the use of planning conditions & obligations to amend on-street parking is feasible in combination with amending traffic regulation orders. • Policy CP1: Wording is suggested which would 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.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy CP2: It is suggested that this policy is updated to ensure clarity and that the policy & supporting text should acknowledge that development has to accommodate its own requirements and that you cannot require a development proposal to correct existing problems. Other wording changes suggested to reflect that the City of York Council's Development Control Local Plan Appendix E (Car & Cycle Parking Standards (2005) does not include visitor parking. It is also suggested that wording around the acceptability of visitor car parking and additional parking associated with development adjacent to CP2-1 The Village area will be acceptable where it is demonstrated that it would positively enhance the sense of place and local sustainability and mitigate harmful impacts. • Policy CF1: It is suggested that the policy is updated to improve clarity, and is rephrased to identify planning considerations where loss of community facilities would be acceptable and place the onus on the applicant to demonstrate conformity with the policy. • Policy CF2: It is suggested that for clarity and ease of use of the document, this section (and / or Appendix 2) make reference to the specific evidence base for the Local Plan (Open Space and Green Infrastructure Update 2017). • Policy DH1: It is suggested that 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. Wording also suggested to assist to ensure the policy is positive, clear and unambiguous. • Policy DH2: It is suggested that the policy and / or supporting text
--	--	---

		<p>references the protections within the NPPF with regards to heritage assets. The section on Roof Forms is very prescriptive. Amended wording suggested to make the policy positive, clear and unambiguous.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policies DH3 & DH4: It is suggested that these policies read more like guidance than policies and should be updated as stated in the general comments section. Updates should include a provision to identify if lighting is required.• Policy DG4: The title of DG4 should be amended to: 'Queen Elizabeth Barracks – Materials and Design' & the description of existing form of the barracks is not policy and should be removed from the policy and used as background / justification.• Paragraph 5.4.22: It is suggested that supporting information needs to reference Proposed Modification 70 – New policy GI2a within the City of York Local Plan Composite Modifications Schedule (April 2021) (EX/CYC/58). Policy GI2a directs residential and non-residential development to accord with an 'exclusion zone' and 'zone of influence' around Strensall Common SAC.• Paragraphs 5.5.1 & 5.5.5: It is suggested that reference to the local survey by The Rural Housing Trust and 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 is not up to date.• Paragraph 5.5.6: CYC does not recognise the 3 properties in the rear gardens of 5/6 Northfields as being 'affordable housing' and this information should be checked for accuracy.• Section 5.5 Affordable Housing: It is suggested that this section recognise the change to affordable housing need since the SHMA 2016 and include reference to conformity with forthcoming supplementary planning
--	--	--

		<p>guidance on housing and updates to evidence base as they become material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Policy CA1: 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.• Section 7.0 Community Infrastructure Levy: It is suggested that this section is updated to make reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2019.• Appendix 2 Local Green Space Designation: It is suggested the map showing the Local Plan Open Spaces and Local Green Space Designations be made clearer to read, including the copyright.• Appendix 3 Local Connections Criteria for Affordable Housing: Appendix 3 is important for Policy DG6 and could be inserted into a justification under the policy in the main Neighbourhood Plan document. Wording suggestions also made to add clarity to the policy, including statutory provisions under the Right to Buy, new affordable housing is expected to be allocated to those with an assessed housing need, make family connections more explicit and make other special circumstances more explicit.
--	--	---