

Earswick Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Draft Plan Consultation Analysis
Strategic Environmental Assessment & Hazard Regulations Assessment
Screening Report

No.	Reference	Respondent	Comment	Response	Amendment to Report
1	General	Environment Agency	We have considered the draft plan and its policies against those environmental characteristics of the area that fall within our remit and area of interest. Having considered the nature of the policies in the Plan, we consider that it is unlikely that significant negative impacts on environmental characteristics that fall within our remit and interest will result through the implementation of the plan. We have no further comments to make in this instance.	Your comment that the Plan is unlikely to have negative impacts on environmental characteristics is noted.	No change
2	General	Historic England	Having considered the SEA & HA Screening Report, we confirm that we concur with the conclusion that an SEA Screening Report will not be required.	Your comment that an SEA Screening Report is not required is noted.	No change.
3	General	Natural England	It is our advice, on the basis of the material supplied with		No change.

			<p>the consultation, that, in so far as our strategic environmental interests (including but not limited to statutory designated sites, landscapes and protected species, geology and soils) are concerned, that there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan.</p> <p>We have checked our records and based on the information provided, we can confirm that in our view the proposals contained within the plan will not have significant effects on sensitive sites that Natural England has a statutory duty to protect.</p> <p>Natural England is satisfied that this neighbourhood plan does not require a Habitat Regulation Assessment.</p>		
4	Para 1.5	CYC	<p>This statement is incorrect. This paragraph should be clarified to distinguish the Neighbourhood Plan and emerging Local Plan approaches. To be clear the emerging Local Plan follows a criteria based methodology based upon the spatial strategy which helps to determine the most sustainable and preferred site allocations; it does not state that „there should be no building development on any part of the existing Green Belt within the parish boundaries’.</p>	<p>The paragraph will be amended in line with the comments.</p>	<p>Document has been amended.</p>

			<p>Whilst the latest consultation draft of the emerging Local Plan (summer 2016) does not propose to allocate any sites within Earswick Parish, the Local Plan will only protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development in line with the National Planning Policy Framework. It should also be noted that references should also be to the “draft Green Belt” as the inner boundaries will be set through the emerging Local Plan.</p>		
5	Map, Page 5	CYC	<p>The Earswick Parish Map seems to be skewed and should be rectified for accurate representation. Also, whilst we appreciate the copy right statement is shown, please could this be amended to reference “City of York Council licence No. 1000 20818”.</p>	Map will be corrected.	Document has been amended.
6	Table 1, item 4	CYC	<p>For your information, the Habitat Regulation Assessment prepared for the Publication Draft Local Plan (2014) identified that recreational disturbance was the key vulnerability at Strensall Common and was looked at in more detail concluding that no significant effects were likely based upon the sites included in that edition of the Plan. We concur that the Earswick Neighbourhood Plan, given that it does not allocate sites for development and promotes conserving and enhancing the local nature conservation sites, is not likely to have a significant effect on the Natura 2000 network of sites, including Strensall</p>	Comments noted.	No change.

			Common.		
7	Table 1, item 5	CYC	There is merit in expanding this answer to set out the types of proposed uses at the local area level to ensure clarity of what the plan will do.	This item will be expanded	This item has been expanded to improve clarity
8	Table 1, item 6	CYC	We would advise expanding this answer to describe the type of future projects the plan will influence. Particular reference should be given to the Windfall policy and in what circumstances planning permission would be granted.	Agree with comments.	This item has been expanded with reference to the windfall policy.
9	Table 1, item 8	CYC	Reference to the Green Belt should be „Draft Greenbelt“. Reference should be made to the boundaries of the draft Green Belt being set through the emerging Local Plan. Furthermore, there is some uncertainty in relation to windfall development. Reference should be made as to the impacts of this policy and the magnitude of the effects.	Agreed.	This item has amended in line with the comments put forward.
10	Table 2, item 1	CYC	For clarity the answer to this question should expand on what projects and activities and allocating of resources will be. From our reading of the plan, there will be a positive influence for the local green infrastructure network, promoting of connectivity with other areas of York through enhanced sustainable transport corridors and support for	Agree to expand this section	This section has been amended accordingly.

			windfall housing development provided it meets conditions set out in policy. These provide a neighbourhood level framework whilst supporting the emerging Local Plan. In this case it is likely to have a positive impact but not significantly positive.		
11	Table 2, item 4	CYC	We consider that the answer to this question should be expanded to consider environmental problems in the neighbourhood plan area. For example, consideration for flood risk alongside the River Foss, heritage assets (designated and non-designated), landscape and nature conservation sites at a minimum to help identify whether the policies set out are likely to have a positive or negative effect on existing environmental problems. The answer should then be revised to reflect consideration of these points.	Agree to expand this question.	This section has been expanded to reflect the comments made
12	Table 2, item 6	CYC	The question of probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of effects is not adequately answered in relation to the policies set out in the plan. We consider that that policy in relation to heritage assets and nature conservation for example, may have a positive effect for at least the duration of the plan in conjunction with the emerging Local Plan. For clarity, further information with reference to probability, duration and frequency of effects should also be given in relation to the windfall policy and	Agree with comments.	Further information has been provided on the impact of windfall development.

			what the likely (uncertain) effects are from this type of development.		
13	Table 2, item 7	CYC	Cumulative impacts should also refer to the emerging Local Plan. Cumulative effects are likely to be positive, but not significant as a result of the policies on the Plan.	Agree with comments.	This section has been amended to refer to the emerging Local Plan.
14	Table 2, item 9	CYC	Reference could be made to policy ENP13 in the plan as an example of minimising risk to human health. Safety of residents is also referred to in safe crossing of the ring-road into Huntington as part of the transport policy.	Agree.	This section has been expanded and now refers to Policy ENP13 in more detail.
15	Table 2, item 10	CYC	For clarity, the potential for effects is likely to be limited to the neighbourhood plan area. The exception to this is the consideration for landscape, including support for openness, which is likely to have a wider positive impact on the historic character and setting of York.	Agree.	Reference now made to the wider positive impact on the historic character and setting of York.
16	Table 2, item 11	CYC	We recommend that further information is included in this answer. Consideration for the River Foss designation is required in relation to the policies. Also, referencing	Agree to amend and expand this section.	Table 2, item 11 amended accordingly

		<p>support for the landscape in the neighbourhood plan area.</p> <p>Consideration for landscape, including support for openness is likely to have a wider positive impact on the historic character and setting of York. Furthermore, given the plan does not allocate sites for development minimises vulnerability of the area to change although incremental windfall development does cause some uncertainty. Impacts of windfall development is likely to be minimised through application of the policy criteria together with policy in the emerging Local Plan but should be considered in the context of this question.</p> <p>In addition, the emerging Local Plan conserves area of Historic character and setting as part of the spatial strategy for locating development. Part of these areas fall within the Earswick Neighbourhood Plan Area. This is used as part of the Local Plan criteria for determining in suitable allocations as it sets out areas critically important for the historic character and setting of York. This section should refer to the impacts of the plan on these areas as they form a key evidence base underpinning the emerging Local Plan. An extract of these is attached.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

17	Para 6.8	CYC	Reference should be made to the windfall policy given that this is acceptable subject to the policy criteria in combination with the emerging local Plan. For clarity, this paragraph should be clear that proposals which come forward of a scale that may impact on Strensall Common, will be subject to further work to understand any effects/mitigation required..	Agree to amend in line with comments.	This paragraph has been expanded in response to the comments made.
18	Para 7.3	CYC	Subject to the amendments listed above, we concur with the conclusion that the Earswick Neighbourhood Plan, as proposed through the Pre-Submission Consultation, is unlikely to have significant environmental impacts. As such, SEA is not required.	Agreement that a full SEA is not required is noted.	No change.
19	Para 7.4	CYC	Subject to the amendments above, we concur that the Earswick Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to have an impact on Strensall Common or other sites in the Natura 2000 network and that an HRA is not required.	Agreement that an HRA is not required is noted.	No change.