

RESPONSE BY ELVINGTON PARISH COUNCIL TO CYC LOCAL PLAN 'PREFERRED SITES v2' PROPOSAL

INTRODUCTION.

The Local Plan Preferred Sites (second version) has been the subject of two public 'Drop In' sessions in order to assess public opinion.

The Parish Council does NOT oppose new residential (or industrial) developments – but the Parish Council has never been asked what the village actually needs. It is only ever asked to comment on CYC proposals and we consider that methodology simply wrong.

It has also become clear that any new residential development should provide a better mix of properties within the village – particularly needed are larger houses and affordable homes.

Looking at each site:

H39. Extension to Beckside.

The Parish Council identifies several problems:

- A Planning Inspector previously determined that H39 serves Green Belt purposes
- The extra traffic that would be generated from 32 houses would adversely impact on the existing residents of Beckside
- Density should have been commensurate with the existing Beckside development to minimise any 'difference' to the phases.

So, the Parish Council proposes that H39 is withdrawn from the Local Plan and is replaced by H26. Dauby Lane. However H26 should contain a mix of housing type, especially larger houses to meet a clearly identified local need. We consider a total of around 60 residences suitable for this site.

SP1. The Stables. Travelling Showpersons Site.

The previous Planning Inspector's decision was very clear. So, until CYC has determined its position regarding unlawful occupation and a current Planning Application for continued use (16/01443), the site must be withdrawn from the Local Plan.

ST15. Whinthorpe 2/The Airfield.

The Parish Council has concerns with the lack of information provided on the impact on the local area of new infrastructure generally – and particularly the transport links to the A64 and B1228. The effect on the surrounding countryside could be vast. The amount of information currently provided is insufficient to properly consider the site.

Furthermore it is thought absurd to split the airfield runway in the way proposed. The full-length runway should be retained for historical reasons and perhaps a strategic need, along with the existing recreational activities that currently take place. It is an asset for tourism, which is an economic strategic priority for York.

If ST15 is to be built, it should be much further north (to retain the airfield runway) and further west (to minimise the distance from the A64 – its principal access point). The A64 clearly separates the

site from Heslington and therefore, as it is proposed, ST15 is too close to the villages of Elvington and Wheldrake and is disproportionate in size to them. It would dominate the area, when it could and should be sited further away.

Due to underground fuel pipelines at the airfield, there could be a decontamination issue to be addressed.

E9. Elvington Industrial Estate.

The Parish Council supports this site being included in the Local Plan – but points out that it is not a ‘brownfield’ site as described (page 60) but is a grassy paddock.

ST26. Airfield Industrial Estate.

The Parish Council supports the extension proposed, but emphasises the need for detailed archaeological and ecological assessments before development. Units should be small, high value businesses consistent with a restriction to B1 and B8 use, as at present, and in line with CYC’s economic strategy.

However the Parish Council’s support is conditional on the imposition of a 7.5 tonne weight limit on Main Street (i.e. the road through the village centre). There are a lot of HGV movements currently through the village impacting on the safety of pedestrians – particularly our children walking and cycling to/from school. The extra traffic generated by ST26 would bring unacceptable increases to HGV traffic passing through the village.

Conclusion.

We ask that the Publication Draft incorporates ALL of the changes detailed above and it would then be a true reflection of local needs.

David Headlam, Parish Clerk
September 2016.