

**Earwick Parish Neighbourhood Plan**  
**Draft Plan Consultation Analysis**

**February 2017**

No.	Policy	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment to Plan
1	General	Environment Agency	The National Planning Practice Guidance refers planners, developers and advisors to the Environment Agency guidance on considering climate change in Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs). This guidance was updated in February 2016 and is available on Gov.uk. Climate change is something you may wish to look at and see how this will affect the area in the future.	Agreed, that the Plan should make reference to flooding.	The Plan will be amended to make reference to flooding.
2	General	Environment Agency	There is no flood Risk policy's within the draft plan. As the River Foss runs along the boundary of the plan area, which has this and surrounding area in FZ3, we suggest some policies are put in place. Although it has been said in the Green Spaces policy that this area should remain as a greenspace. Also. Huntingdon and Stockton Drain is within the site area which FZ3 is around this.	Agreed, that the Plan should make reference to flooding.	The Plan will be amended to make reference to flooding.
3	General	CYC	We appreciate that this (the Green Belt) is a complicated issue in the context of the emerging York Local Plan and emerging Neighbourhood Plans. We need to ensure that the terminology used when referring to the Green Belt in the context of the 2005 draft Local Plan, Regional Spatial Strategy, emerging Local Plan and emerging Neighbourhood Plan is clear and consistent across the Neighbourhood Plan and associated documents such as the SEA.	This and the later clarification provided by CYC in respect of the Green Belt is welcomed. We will ensure that terminology in relation to Green Belt is clear and	That the plan be amended so the terminology in relation to Green Belt is consistent.

				consistent.	
4	General	CYC	In addition, we believe that it is important to ensure that the terms/definitions of Green Infrastructure and Green Belt in the Plan are clear and consistent with terminology used elsewhere. For clarity we recommend that the following terminology is used as part of your Neighbourhood Plan: <b>Green Infrastructure:</b> <i>Green infrastructure is the physical environment within and between cities, towns and villages. It is a network of multifunctional open spaces including formal parks, gardens, woodlands, green corridors, waterways, street trees, nature reserves and open countryside.</i>	It is agreed that it would be useful if the same terminology was used in the Plan as that contained in the Local Plan.	That the Plan be amended to refer to Green Infrastructure, and that the same terminology used to describe it as that contained in the Local Plan.
5	General	Coal Authority	Thank you for consulting The Coal Authority on the above. Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on it.	That you have no specific comments is noted.	No change.
6	General	Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.	That you have no specific comments is noted.	No change.
7	General	Resident 1	I have read the draft Plan and I think that it is an excellent piece of work and I would like to offer my congratulations to all of those who have been involved in its production.	The support for, and congratulations on, the Plan is welcomed.	No change.
8	General	Resident 2	It looks to be a good plan. Thank You.	The support for the Plan is welcomed.	No change.
9	General	Resident 3	Totally support the Plan.	The support for the Plan is welcomed.	General
10	General	Resident 4	The Plan as its stands represents the majority of the views within the village and builds on the two	The support for the Plan is	General

			residents questionnaires. The Plan also reflects the views expressed by CYC in the latest draft version of the York Local Plan.	welcomed.	
11	General	Highways England	Whilst I have no formal comments at this point in regards to the Earswick proportion of the wider picture on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport, I would like to offer my thanks again for sending this through and keeping in touch.	That you have no specific comments is noted.	No change.
12	General	Carter Jonas	We have significant reservations about the approach adopted within the draft ENP and consider that it does not meet the basic conditions set out in paragraph 065 of the PPG in respect to aligning with the strategic approach and policies of the Local Plan, conforming to national policy and contributing to sustainable development.	Your significant reservations in respect to the approach within the draft ENP are noted. It has been drawn to the attention of the Parish Council. It is considered that the approach taken does meet the Basic Conditions. The absence of any further comments concerning this may also suggest that it meets the Basic Conditions.	No change.
13	General	Carter Jonas	The City of York Draft Local Plan Incorporating the Fourth Set of Changes was approved in April 2005. Whilst the 2005 York Draft Local Plan does not form part of the statutory development plan, its policies are considered to be capable of being material considerations and should be given due regard in	Without the provision of an up-to-date housing target for Earswick in an adopted Local Plan, the	That the relationship between the NP and the draft Local Plan in respect to housing requirements be amplified.

		<p>the formation of the ENP.</p> <p>Equally, the emerging Local Plan has reached a relatively advantaged stage of preparation and therefore its policies should also be given due consideration in the formulation of the ENP. Paragraph 009 of the PPG makes clear that the <i>“reasoning and evidence”</i> informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the emerging neighbourhood plan. Paragraph 009 of PPG goes on to state that <i>“for example up-to-date housing needs evidence is relevant to the question of whether a housing land supply in a neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development”</i>.</p> <p>The Draft ENP is explicit in that its principal objective is to prevent any development in the Green Belt and instead only seeks to allow modest development on brownfield sites. The document goes on to state that the Parish is not a sustainable location for future development. It appears that the only justification given for this approach is to protect the semi-rural character of the village and the <i>“character and openness”</i> of the surrounding countryside. However in the same token there is a wish to meet local housing needs and rebalance the housing stock within the village.</p> <p>We consider that this approach is not consistent with the strategic policies within both the existing and emerging Local Plan and is contrary to the national planning objective of boosting significantly the supply of housing. The ‘basic conditions’ set out in the PPG make it clear that neighbourhood plan policies should align with the requirements of the NPPF and the wider strategic policies for the area</p>	<p>Working Party has worked hard to develop an approach that is robust, reflects housing needs and aspirations and supports sustainable development. In preparing the Plan significant weight has been attached to the proposals contained in the emerging Local Plan. The NP, like the emerging Local Plan, does not propose any housing allocations for the Parish. It is considered that the approach for housing growth is suitable and sustainable. The absence of any significant objections to the amount of development proposed indicates</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>set out in the Council's Local Plan.</p> <p>The NPPF is also clear that neighbourhood plans should not introduce policies and proposals that would prevent development from going ahead. They are required to plan positively for new development, enabling sufficient growth to take place to meet the strategic development needs for the area. Policies that are clearly worded or intended to place an unjustified constraint on further sustainable development taking place would not be consistent with the requirements of the NPPF or meet the basic conditions set out in paragraph 065 of the PPG.</p> <p>Neither the existing nor emerging Local Plan seek to restrict development coming forward within Earswick.</p> <p>The City of York's Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies that there is a significant level of housing need with the City with a requirement to deliver 841 dwellings per annum from 2012 to 2032. It is clear that the Preferred Sites Consultation Document is proposing to remove a number of sites from the Green Belt within the villages surrounding the city and allocate them for housing. As such, the approach of preventing any planned development coming forward within the parish of Earswick to meet a proportion of the housing needs of the city would be contrary to the housing supply policies within the emerging Local Plan and would fail to align with the strategic development needs and priorities of the wider local area contrary to paragraphs 16 and 184 of the NPPF as well as the basic conditions for neighbourhood planning (e).</p>	<p>general support for the target. It is disputed that "No such evidence has been provided to support such an approach being adopted in the draft ENP". It is recognised that the relationship with the Local Plan could be strengthened including to reflect the latest state of play with its development.</p> <p>It is recognised that there are 'risks' associated with preparing a NP in advance of the preparation of a Local Plan. As you state there is nothing in legislation that would prevent the Parish Council doing so. The Parish Council is aware of these</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>The parish of Earswick clearly operates as part of the city of York and forms part of the Housing Market Area.</p> <p>The residents of Earswick are likely to work, go to school, shop and spend a significant amount of their leisure time within the city. There is a range of services and facilities within a 30 minutes' walk of the centre of the village including sports facilities, public houses, a church, retail opportunities, a doctor's surgery, and a primary and secondary school. The accessibility of the parish is clearly recognised within section 2 of the ENP.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are no environmental, ecological or landscape designations that would justify Earswick not meeting a proportion of the housing needs of the city. As a result, there is no justification for the Earswick Neighbourhood Plan not to plan positively to meet the development needs of the wider area and city which it clearly forms part of. The PPG makes clear that a blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing others from expanding should be avoided unless it is supported by robust evidence (paragraph 001). No such evidence has been provided to support such an approach being adopted in the draft ENP.</p> <p>Due to the current status of the emerging York Local Plan and the uncertainty about the level of growth that the Council may need to accommodate, we would question the Parish Council's ability to progress with a Neighbourhood Plan at this time and recommend that work on the Neighbourhood Plan is delayed to allow for the emerging Local Plan to be tested by an Planning</p>	<p>risks and consider that it is sensible and justifiable to prepare the NP even during this period of uncertainty.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. Whilst it is acknowledged that the PPG indicates that Neighbourhood Plans can come forward before an up-to-date Local Plan is in place, we would strongly question the ability to progress a Neighbourhood Plan within this vacuum. In order to meet the requirements of the Framework and the 'basic conditions', Neighbourhood Plans should be prepared to conform to up-to-date strategic policy requirements set out in Local Plans. When a Local Plan is emerging and has not yet been found 'sound' at public examination as in the case of York, there will be a lack of certainty over what scale of development a community must accommodate and therefore the correct approach the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan should take.		
14	General	CYC	It is advised that paragraph numbers should be inserted throughout the document for clarity	It is agreed that the introduction of paragraph numbers will add clarity.	That the Plan be amended as suggested.
15	General	Resident 5	We are in total support of the draft plan	The support for the Plan is welcomed.	No change.
16	General	Resident 6	The draft Neighbourhood Plan adequately covers the issues which concern me. It is a job well done.	The support for the Plan is welcomed.	No change.
17	General	Resident 7	Support the Plan	The support for the Plan is welcomed.	No change.
18	General	CYC	We consider the final paragraph on page 26/page 27 which sets out the role of the saved policies in the otherwise revoked RSS should be moved to the planning context section as it is fundamental to	This suggestion is welcomed.	That the Plan be amended as suggested.

			many of the NP policies.		
19	General	Resident 8	In principle I find the draft plan well considered and I concur with most of its contents	This support for the Plan is welcomed.	No change.
20	Introductory Section	CYC	Typo '20016'	That the proposed minor change in wording is agreed.	That the proposed minor change in wording is made.
21	Introductory Section - 4th Para	CYC	Please reference the core principle paragraph number – paragraph 17, point 5.	That the proposed minor change in wording is agreed.	That the proposed minor change in wording is made.
22	Introductory Section - 4th Para	CYC	It appears that this map has been stretched to fit the page. We suggest that the landscape orientation might fit better. As this is a CYC map, it must state our licence number as follows: 'Crown Copyright. City of York Council Licence Number 1000 20818'	That the proposed re formatting of the map, and the addition of the footnote, is agreed.	That the proposed changes to Fig 1 and associated wording are made.
23	The Vision and Objectives	Carter Jonas	The draft ENP would constrain the delivery of the important national planning policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing and would fail to contribute to achieving sustainable development for this reason. The Vision for the Parish states that it wishes for Earswick to continue to <i>“thrive as a vibrant and distinctive Parish”</i> and be a <i>“desirable place for all residents to live”</i> . The objectives of the neighbourhood plan seeks to ensure <i>“on-going improvements to public transport facilities and road... conditions”</i> as well as <i>“maintain and improve local facilities for all residents”</i> . Furthermore, the draft ENP goes onto recognise that the delivery of a choice of high quality homes is essential to support sustainable mixed and inclusive communities.	The vision and objectives were developed following consultation with the community. It is considered that the Plan does satisfactorily recognise that the provision of housing is important to supporting the sustainability. Indeed, one of the	No change.



			<p>The Draft ENP should recognise that the provision of housing is important to delivering the Vision and Objectives in terms of supporting the sustainability of the village. The PPG recognises that rural housing is essential to ensuring that rural communities continue to thrive and to maintain the viable use and retention of local facilities and deal with issues of affordability (paragraph 001). This clearly has been the case historically in Earswick with the development of the local pig farm in the 1990s delivering the vast majority of the community facilities in the village such as the village hall, tennis courts and bowling green / scented garden.</p> <p>The current approach of seeking to restrict development coming forward would only serve to weaken local services and exasperate issues of housing affordability, choice and the lack of a diverse house stock. As a result, the draft ENP would fail to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development contrary to basic conditions for a neighbourhood plan (paragraph 065).</p>	<p>objectives is to “Deliver modest housing development (on brownfield sites) that is sensitive to the environment, infrastructure constraints and improves the quality of life for all current and future residents”.</p>	
24	POLICY ENP 1: WINDFALL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT	Carter Jonas	<p>We consider that there is no planning basis for this policy and it is inconsistent with both local and national guidance. We would dispute that there will be new development opportunities on brownfield sites or infill developments within the village. As recognised within the draft ENP the majority of the housing within the Parish dates from the post war era, which was generally built to a density and layout that precludes this type of development coming forward. The few remaining opportunities have now largely been exhausted and would be further reduced by criteria h of Policy ENP 1 which</p>	<p>It is considered that the overall intention of the policy is in conformity with national and local policy as, amongst other things, it seeks to protect local character especially in the context of early</p>	<p>That the intro paragraph be amended to read “A proposal should demonstrate that they have taken into account the following, that it”, was introduced after will be supported... And criterion f to read “Conserves and</p>

		<p>seeks to restrict infill development within gardens. The ENP suggests that on average under one new dwelling a year comes forward through these routes. This level of growth is clearly insufficient to meet the significant housing needs within the parish and the wider area.</p> <p>The PPG makes clear that policies within a neighbourhood plan should be appropriately justified by evidence and must be sufficiently clear to be capable of being interpreted objectively by applicants and decision makers.</p> <p>We have a number of specific concerns about Policy ENP 1 in respect to:</p> <p>Criterion a) - there is no justification for attempting to restrict development proposals to small scale single dwellings schemes;</p> <p>Criteria b) – the Parish Council has not carried out a local need survey to determine the level of housing need within the Parish. However the evidence set out in the draft ENP suggests there is a significant level of housing need i.e. significantly ageing population, disproportionately high levels of home ownership, and lack of choice in respect to house tenure and size especially in relation to smaller houses. Nevertheless Earswick effectively operates as part of the City of York and therefore should help meet the significant housing needs of the wider area;</p> <p>Criteria c) – comments to follow;</p> <p>Criteria d) – no comments;</p> <p>Criteria e) – no comments;</p> <p>Criteria f) – the landscape and countryside surrounding Earswick is not designated and therefore does not warrant ‘special’ protection.</p>	<p>policies which support sustainable development. It seeks to provide an applicant/decision maker guidance on how to react to a development proposal. It is disputed that there will be no development opportunities on windfall or brownfield sites. It is recognised that the policy could be enhanced and clarified if the sentence “A proposal should demonstrate that they have taken into account the following, that it”, was introduced after will be supported...</p> <p>In terms of the specific comments raised a-it does not seek</p>	<p>where possible, enhances the distinctive qualities of the attractive landscape in which Earswick is situated”.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>There is no justification for the introduction of a test above and beyond that established in national planning policy. We would politely remind the Parish Council that the green belt is not a landscape designation;</p> <p>Criteria g) – no comments;</p> <p>Criteria h) – whilst we do not object to this criteria, it should be acknowledged that this would effectively stop the very few remaining development opportunities within the village coming forward; and</p> <p>Criteria I &amp; J) – no comments.</p>	<p>to restrict development to a single dwelling but ensure that any development supports local needs and sustainable development b-the parish council has undertaken further analysis to support this policy f-broadly agreed h - noted</p>	
25	POLICY ENP 1: WINDFALL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT	Resident 8	<p>As landowners on the periphery of the Village I would like to consider that some consideration be given to a small scale development that meets the local needs as the report reflects an imbalance in the housing stock that does not meet the needs of the villages senior citizens. There is little scope to extend the village boundary beyond the River Foss to the west so a development on our land to the east, coloured purple on the map, and accessed along Willow Grove would balance the village whilst ensuring that green spaces are retained in the centre of the village without impeding the views of dwellings on Strensall Road look eastwards. There does'nt seem to be any brownfield sites that would satisfy the remit and our land is poor agricultural (clay) that does not favour arable land. I would suggest 5/10 two bedroomed bungalows to be built every year over the lifetime of the Plan which</p>	<p>The Plan permits in principle small scale carefully controlled 'windfall' housing development. I understand that the site is interim Green Belt. Within the Green Belt development is strictly controlled in accordance with national and local policy. Neighbourhood plans cannot</p>	No change.

			would not adversely affect traffic flow on Strensall Road.	amend Green Belt policy.	
26	POLICY ENP 1: WINDFALL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT	Resident 9	Whilst supporting ENP 1 in its broadest form we object to any policy which may of itself prohibit any development which may incorporate a part of currently designated Green Belt. Page 20 para 8. Although currently there are voices articulating a zero growth policy, our view is that the ENP must provide for limited growth in housing stock over the term as described on page 21 paras 7-10 and page 22 para 1-3. It is in our view unlikely, and generally unknown that this could be achieved over the next 20 years by relying on windfall development. As national policy does not exclude Green Belt we should not specify its exclusion either. Carefully controlled small development even if it touches Green Belt should be considered on its merits in meeting the needs and aspirations of the village over the next 20 years. We believe that a variety in the mix of housing available in the village should be a key objective in the plan. This is our view is the best way to achieve a vibrant and cohesive village.	The general support for this Policy is welcomed. You are correct that national policy does not exclude 'windfall development' in the Green Belt; nor can a neighbourhood plan over-ride national Green Belt policy. This point will be made clearer in the text.	That the text be made clearer that National Planning policy permits some forms of development in the Green Belt including carefully controlled 'windfall development' and that policies in the neighbourhood plan cannot over-ride national planning policies.
27	POLICY ENP 2: HOUSING MIX	Resident 9	We therefore wholly support policy ENP 2 particularly given that local surveys highlighted support for a broader stock of housing (Page 24 paras 1-5). Secondly with Earswick having a relatively significant proportion of over 65's (page 16 para 4) the provision of smaller homes meets the housing needs of current and potential villagers of both ends of the housing spectrum. (Page 20 para 5).	The general support for this Policy is welcomed.	No change.
28	POLICY ENP 2: HOUSING MIX	Carter Jonas	We welcome this policy and its intention to widen the choice of housing within the village. However there is a clear contradiction between the	The general support for the policy is	No change.

		<p>aspiration of widening the choice of housing within the village and then seeking to severely restrict the amount of housing coming forward within the village. Furthermore no evidence has been produced which shows what the preferred housing mix should be within the Parish. The City of York has produced a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which identifies the housing needs across the city.</p> <p>However clearly if the preferred housing mix in SHMA is to be used in the context of ENP, then this is an acknowledgment that the Parish of Earswick operates as part of the wider York Housing Market Area and therefore should be accommodating a proportion of the development needs of the city.</p> <p>The supporting text to Policy ENP 1 clearly acknowledges that the level of housing growth is likely to be restricted to less 1 new dwelling a year and as previously set out we have significant reservations whether even this level of development will come forward in the future. As a result, we would question the purpose of the policy given by the Parish Council's own acknowledgement that sites of 5 or more dwellings will be unlikely to be coming forward within the Parish.</p> <p>There no realistic mechanism to enforce a housing mix policy on sites of below 5 units. Instead developers/landowners will naturally seek to maximise the value of their land by creating a property as large as possible proportionate to the size of the plot. Therefore the ENP would only serve to exacerbate the existing housing and demographic imbalances within the Parish and</p>	<p>welcomed. Your concerns "that there is a clear contradiction between the aspiration of widening the choice of housing within the village and then seeking to severely restrict the amount of housing coming forward within the village" is noted though it not considered that there is a contradiction. As previously considered, we do not agree that windfall development anticipated in the Plan will not come forward.</p> <p>Furthermore, it cannot be ruled out this may comprise sites of five or more dwellings e.g. a barn conversion.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			would fail to contribute to sustainable development for this reason	Where windfall development does take place it is important that it helps meet local needs.	
29	POLICY ENP 3: PROTECTING THE COUNTRYSIDE	CYC	<p>Whilst we understand the aim of this policy we are concerned with its deliverability and consistency with the NPPF. We would be happy to clarify and discuss this with you further.</p> <p>In summary, our concern relates to deliverability of the policy and ensuring it does not go beyond national policy, by in effect banning all development in 'the countryside' other than that which can demonstrate 'special circumstances'. Very special circumstances relate, in national policy, to development within the Green Belt. Paragraph 87 and 88 state:</p> <p>87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>Paragraphs 89 and 90 go on to state the exceptions to inappropriate development.</p> <p>In addition, there may be a number of cases in which 'permitted development' rights would apply. Also, the extent of the 'countryside' as defined by the</p>	<p>The concerns of CYC in respect of the Policy are noted. To a large extent they stem from uncertainty to the extent to which the Plan could deal with Green Belt issues. This has been clarified by CYC, which is welcomed. The Policy and supporting text will be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>That the Policy and the supporting text be significantly rewritten based on the guidance of CYC.</p>

		<p>Neighbourhood Plan would need to be shown on a proposals map. For further clarification regarding York's Green belt, please see below.</p> <p>It is our view that as a matter of principle neighbourhood plans cannot define GB boundaries, it is however within the scope of a neighbourhood plan to set an interim green belt boundary pending the Local Plan.</p> <p>Within this context the inspector for a neighbourhood plan would have to assess whether the neighbourhood plan is in line with the appropriate strategic policies i.e. the saved policies of the otherwise revoked Yorkshire and Humber Plan Regional Spatial Strategy (2008) (the RSS).</p> <p>Please be advised that it is only the emerging Local Plan which can set the detailed Green Belt boundaries and that this document, when adopted, will be establishing the boundaries for York for the first time. All references to York's Green Belt prior to adoption should refer to York's 'draft Green Belt'.</p> <p>In addition for the avoidance of doubt it should be noted that until a Local Plan for York is adopted, development management decisions relating to proposals falling within the general extent of the Green Belt have and will be made on the basis that the land in question should be treated as Green Belt.</p> <p>Within the context described if a neighbourhood plan sets an interim boundary before the City of York Local Plan is adopted, the neighbourhood plan would effectively give way once the City of York Local Plan comes forward because its the role of</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>this document to set the green belt boundary. In addition it should be noted that the City of York Local Plan would not be reviewing the green belt but would be establishing it for the first time as any neighbourhood plan would only fix an interim green belt. It should be stressed that in coming to a view on the final delineation of Green Belt boundaries in the City of York Local Plan careful consideration will be given to the interim boundaries within any neighbourhood plan. This recognises the amount of technical work and consultation underpinning the neighbourhood planning process.</p> <p>Please amend this paragraph in light of the above information.</p>		
30	POLICY ENP 3: PROTECTING THE COUNTRYSIDE	Resident 10	<p>Following the award of Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence 282 (which includes Earswick Parish land) to INEOS Shale, who may wish to explore fracking, I feel it would be prudent to state in the Neighbourhood Plan that <u>no commercial</u> development is supported in Earswick. Perhaps line 4, para 2, page 4 could be amended to state "Community sentiment strongly opposes any development (commercial or non-commercial) of the Green Belt within the boundaries of the Parish..." Likewise, line 6, page 26, Policy ENP 3 could be amended to say ..."non-commercial development will only be allowed in special circumstances where it is appropriate to a rural location."</p>	<p>The sentiments and aims are supported. However, regulations covering the preparation of a neighbourhood plan do not permit them to deal with mineral (including shale) issues.</p>	No change
31	POLICY ENP 4: LOCAL GREEN	Environment Agency	We support to see Policy ENP4	This support is welcomed.	No change.



	SPACES				
32	POLICY ENP 4: LOCAL GREEN SPACES	Resident 7	What are the exceptional circumstances for the Foss Lands Village Green Development?	It is recognised that there may be special exceptions where development on local green spaces may be acceptable. For example, where it may benefit its use for example the provision of changing rooms or toilets. It is accepted that these exceptional circumstances would benefit from further explanation.	That the supporting text be amended and clarified to explain further the exceptional circumstances where development on a local green space might be acceptable.
33	POLICY ENP 4: LOCAL GREEN SPACES	CYC	It appears that this map has been stretched to fit the page. Suggest that the landscape orientation might fit better. As this is a CYC map, it must say 'Crown Copyright. City of York Council Licence Number 1000 20818'.	That the proposed re formatting of the map is agreed. Please note however that this is not a CYC map.	That the proposed changes to the formatting is made.
34	POLICY ENP 4: LOCAL GREEN SPACES	Carter Jonas	We have reservations about the proposed designation of Site G1 'The Garden Village Green' and G5 'Land to the front of 6 Northlands' as Local Green Space. We are unsure of the planning function of this land and would question whether it should be allocated as Local Green Space. Paragraph 77 of the NPPF makes clear that a Local	The proposed Local Greens Spaces were identified following a detailed assessment of	No change

			Green Space designation is not appropriate for most green areas or open spaces and should only be used where the greenspace is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance.	each proposed site. The Parish Council has developed a background setting out the justification for the inclusion of each sites. This can be found on its website. We are confident that these and the other sites meet the criteria for designation as a Local Green Space.	
35	POLICY ENP 5: ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	CYC	As these sites are not recognised in the CYC Biodiversity Audit as SINCS (Sites as Importance for Nature Conservation) or SLIs (Sites of Local Interest), we consider that the policy may not be strong enough if you delegated a lower tier of nature conservation sites. The CYC Ecologist suggests that you might want to designate them as Local Green Space along with the other sites that you propose under policy ENP4 as these will be protected for their amenity value even if they are not protected for nature conservation reasons. We would be happy to discuss this with you further.	It is agreed that consideration should be given to the designation of the wildlife sites as local green spaces.	That consideration should be given to the designation of the wildlife sites as local green spaces.
36	POLICY ENP 5: ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	Environment Agency	We are supportive of policy ENP5: Ecology and Biodiversity and the possible enhancements of these sites. Our Biodiversity team would be happy to give any advice to help with the enhancements. This could be funded through local development as	The support for this policy is welcomed as well as the advice and support.	No change.

			a building condition.		
37	POLICY ENP 5: ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	Huntington Parish Council	The policy and supporting text and map should be more explicit that the bulk of the site EB2 - Diamond Jubilee Wood is in Huntington Parish.	These comments are welcomed.	That the policy, supporting text and map should be amended in respect to site EB2 - Diamond Jubilee Wood that it only relates to that part of it which is in Earswick Parish.
38	POLICY ENP 6: DISTINCTIVE VIEWS:	CYC	By specifically identifying 'view D1', we are concerned that you are discounting other significant views. We consider that the policy would be best if left more generic unless an evidence base document which assesses significant views is produced. It would also be useful to include a representation of this view on a map for clarity.	The view was identified following consultation and analysis. It is also shown on the Proposal Map. It is agreed that the Policy would be better if made more generic as you suggest.	The policy and supporting text be amended to make it more generic.
39	POLICY ENP 7: TREES AND WOODLANDS	No comments received			
40	POLICY ENP 8: BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES OF LOCAL HERITAGE INTEREST	CYC	We acknowledge your proposal to designate the Earswick signage as a heritage asset for the village. We would be happy to discuss this designation further with you and our Conservation Team. In addition, Historic England has produced an advice note on local heritage listing which you may find useful.	This acknowledgement and advice is welcomed.	No change.
41	POLICY ENP 9:	No comments			

	PROTECTING IMPORTANT COMMUNITY FACILITIES	received.			
42	POLICY ENP 10: NEW COMMUNITY FACILITIES	No comments received.			
43	POLICY ENP 11: ENHANCEMENTS TO TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS	CYC	We acknowledge and welcome the opportunity to explore ways to enhance connectivity between Earswick and wider York. We would be happy to discuss with you how to take forward proposals in the plan including feasibility of any proposed schemes. We suggest amending policy ENP11 as follows: e) "Ensuring that any applications for development identify and consider the additional level of traffic that they are likely to generate and mitigate the impacts of this".	We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further, as well as suggested rewording of Criterion e.	The Criterion e be amended to read "Ensuring that any applications for development identify and consider the additional level of traffic that they are likely to generate and mitigate the impacts of this", as suggested.
44	POLICY ENP 11: ENHANCEMENTS TO TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS	Resident 1	we think that there is justification for referring in the draft Plan to the two speed sensors that are placed at the northern and southern ends of the village and, perhaps, for something to be said about whether, from the results of the consultation, these are considered to be adequate. Two of the principal aims of the Plan are to ensure that the village continues to be a safe place to live and to seek improvements in the condition of its roads. For these reasons, we were rather surprised not to see more in the draft Plan about traffic/speed calming measures. I have spent the	It is agreed that the Plan could say more about localised transport issues and measures to address these as you suggest.	That the Plan be strengthened in respect localised transport issues and measures to address these.

			<p>last six or seven weekends planting bulbs in common areas at the northern boundary of the village and I have become deeply concerned at the speed at which some people drive along Strensall Road. This doesn't appear to be so much of a problem in the heart of the village where the two mini-roundabouts have the effect of calming traffic and reducing speeds but at the northern edge of the village, just before the point where the road has a national speed limit designation, and where some drivers accelerate and brake aggressively, it is becoming a major problem and the location of the bus stops are exacerbating this. There is a high concentration of young children in the Garden Village, who often play on the Green, and we would very much like to see some reasonable provision made in the draft Plan for some kind of measure that will help to address the wildly excessive speeds at which some people drive along this section of the road. Page 38 of the Plan says that there are no major roads within the village. I would take issue with this: the volume of traffic which uses Strensall Road and the nature of that traffic (commuters, military, heavy agricultural plant and machinery, blue light etc) tends to suggest that Strensall Road is a major road and we think that the Plan would be all the better for it were this to be recognised.</p>		
45	POLICY ENP 12: PROTECTING FOOTPATHS AND CYCLEWAYS	Local resident (at consultation event)	It might be helpful if these were shown on a map	That a map be included showing the existing footpaths and cycleways.	That a map showing the footpaths and cycleways be added.
46	POLICY ENP 13:	Local	The Plan should be more explicit that while levels of	The proposed	That the Plan be

	SAFE AND SECURE PARISH	Resident (at consultation event)	crime and anti-social behaviour are low it remains a major concern of the residents especially in light of some locally high profile incidents.	amendments are welcomed.	amended accordingly.
47	POLICY ENP 14: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS	CYC	Please be advised that S106 would remain in place alongside CIL. However, no more than five 106 contributions can be pooled. Also CIL/S106 can not be charged for the same piece of infrastructure/infrastructure type (to avoid double charging). We would be happy to discuss our S106 and emerging CIL charging with you to aid clarity.	This advice is noted.	That the Plan be amended to clarify this point.