

# **Heslington Parish Neighbourhood Plan**

## **CONSULTATION STATEMENT**

### **Appendix 2:**

### **Pre-Submission Consultation**

### **Resident responses**

**September 2019**

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>The green and open spaces both in and around Heslington serve to retain and enhance the rural aspect of the Village and maintain the vestiges of its medieval plan. They continue the relationship between the outlying farms and the one farm that remains in the Village itself. The very pleasing wide verges and mature trees of Main Street [South] are typical of many Yorkshire villages and are, with the houses, an integral part of the attractive nature of this street. Similarly, the green verges throughout the remainder of the Village (particularly those seen on entering from the Fulford direction) add to the rural feel of the area. Boss Lane, an ancient public right of way and historic route out to village pasture, follows the winding hedgerows of the old field system leading to the Sportsfield and then via the Outgang to the Tilmire. The Lane passes the remains of one of the oldest orchards in the Village and the paddock behind Little Hall (possibly the only vestige of ridge and furrow of the medieval fields). This paddock was particularly valued in the Public Enquiry of 24 January 1990 by DoE Inspector K. Barton, who emphatically refused to pass it for development. The mixed hedgerows of Boss Lane, including several fine mature trees, together with the wide diversity of vegetation, are of great importance to wildlife. The fact that it is retained as an earth-surfaced pathway adds to its charm. This whole area, with paddocks on both sides, allotments and other fields, forms a vitally important green lung, ensuring a natural break between the Holmefield Estate, Halifax College and the houses on the west side of the Village Main Street [South]. The green belt should remain green and the open spaces retained; if these are lost then Heslington will lose its special nature and become another suburb of York. It is similarly important that the green space between the two campuses is never allowed to be lost or compromised.</p>	Website form	Gr	s12	<p>The importance of green open spaces plays a significant part in the plan and this support is welcomed.</p>	No change.
<p><b>Key</b></p> <p>Bu - Business Employment and Local Facilities  Ag -Agricultural and rural Enterprise  Ur - Urban design and Character  Ho - Housing  Gr - Local Green Environment  Tm - Transport and Movement  Un - University of York  Tr - Traffic-current issues  Co - Conservation area  Gen - General</p>					
<p>"Four further smaller points; 1.The cycle lane on University Road badly need to be hard surfaced. Its spongy nature means that it is often avoided by cyclists who still compete for space on the main road. 2. Off</p>	Website form	Tr	s14	<p>1 -4. These are considered a <i>CYC / UoY</i></p>	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
road bays for buses are required by the Library bridge; delays there often result in dangerous manoeuvres. 3. The chicanes should be removed and a 20mph limit imposed. Chicanes cause pollution. 4. Main Street needs more visits from traffic wardens.				<i>Highway Matter</i> and therefore outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.	
I thought this was an excellent effort balancing the wishes of current residents who wish to preserve what is special about Heslington whilst acknowledging the need for flexibility to allow the area to continue to develop. I am broadly in favour of the plan. I had a query about Policy HES 12 which may just reflect the way that these things need to be written. The policy starts off stating that development will be supported providing that it avoids significant harm. However it goes on to say that where significant harm can't be avoided it must be mitigated or compensated for. Surely if a development will <u>only</u> be supported if it avoids significant harm, mitigation and compensation don't come into it as they would only be required if harm occurred and if harm was going to occur the development wouldn't be supported. Perhaps the statements about mitigation and compensation are required as a fail safe but to my reading it suggests that actually development will be supported even if it is shown to cause harm as long as that harm is mitigated / compensated.	Website form	Gr	N/A	The support for the plan is welcomed.  Wording for policy on Green Infrastructure was advised by CYC to bring the policy in to line and avoid conflict with the NPPF/Draft Local Plan and reflect the mitigation hierarchy. The Plan allows for the possibility that whilst an unsupported development may be approved, balanced mitigation would be achieved.	No change.
The plan seems well thought out. We agree with what is in it, and cannot think of anything to add, so we support it as is.	Email to PClerk			The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change
<i>"I have today received a copy of HPC 'local green space'. It lists 14 potential spaces but sadly omits, either overlooked or by intent, our village green. Rather than write pages of observations which in any case may need explanations, I wondered if you would be good enough to call and see me."</i> Resident has highlighted verbally to a Parish Councillor that "The protection of the original village green does not get a mention in the flyer* re 'Preserve Heslington local green spaces'" that he has received. He says that the original village green is the grassed area along Main Street (South) in front of the old Midland bank.	Letter and Verbal to PC	Gr	s12	It is acknowledged that Main Street [South] wide green verges (without crossways) are fundamental to the rural appearance of the village.	Policy on LGS has been revised.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p><b>PRESERVE HESLINGTON'S LOCAL GREEN SPACES; MAKE YOUR VOICE HEARD!</b></p> <p>Through the Heslington Parish Council a short summary draft of The Heslington Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been circulated to residents. This is an important document and when adopted will form part of the statutory development plan together with the emerging City of York Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>In the full online document at Section 12 there is a highly significant section titled: <b>Designations: Local Green Spaces</b>. These are shown on the map overleaf. Full details can be found online at:</p> <p><a href="https://www.heslington.org.uk/perch/resources/heslington-parish-neighbourhood-plan-pre-submission.pdf">https://www.heslington.org.uk/perch/resources/heslington-parish-neighbourhood-plan-pre-submission.pdf</a></p> <p>The purpose of this idea is "to ensure that that Local Green Space is valued and protected" and the draft plan notes that: "there are currently no Local Green Space designations in the Parish." To qualify such spaces need to be "where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife;" and "where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land". The following are identified in the Neighbourhood Plan as potential Local Green Space designations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Allotments between the southern half of Boss Lane and Holmeffield</li> <li>2. Allotments on Low Lane</li> <li>3. Boss Lane and associated paddocks</li> <li>4. Campus West lake and grounds</li> <li>5. Church Field</li> <li>6. Dean's Acre</li> <li>7. Heslington Hall Gardens</li> <li>8. Heslington Hill, Mill Mound and Siwards How</li> <li>9. Heslington Parish (St Paul's) Church Yard</li> <li>10. Heslington Village Sports Field</li> <li>11. Lord Deramore's Primary School Grounds</li> <li>12. Pond Field</li> <li>13. Sports Fields between Holmeffield and Fulford Golf Course</li> <li>14. The Outgang</li> </ol> <p>It is very important that residents are fully aware that this is a unique chance for the village to make its views known about Heslington's setting and landscape. It is vital that these listed green spaces are registered as part of this plan and that this is accepted by CYC (and so far they have not objected). This can be achieved if the majority of residents support the idea. These Local Green Spaces then become adopted as part of the planning document, to be ratified by CYC.</p> <p>The aim must be to get this agreed and supported by votes by as many people as possible in the village. Please will you support this key idea so that the character of Heslington will be maintained? Please complete and sign the following and return it to Sinclair's Office (next to the Deramore in Main Street):</p> <p>NAME: ADDRESS: I support the Local Green Space designations as listed above: SIGNATURE and DATE</p>	Flyer*	Gr	s12	<p>* Independently prepared and circulated flyer by a local resident (not named).</p> <p>The support for the plan is welcomed.</p> <p>107 returns were received.</p>	Policy on LGS has been revised.
We completely support the draft Heslington Neighbourhood Plan	Resident	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
Wow a very well presented document a lot of time, effort has gone into such, thanks. The village is a little dead, the school has very few intake	Email	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
from the village, Deramore Arms struggles, the banks are moving out. York has a housing issue. New housing on the south east side of the village may indeed fulfil needs and enhance the quality of village life?					
The green spaces seeks to retain Boss Lane and the Bridleway down the side of the golf club, other public footpaths in the village? Why is part of the Uni sports field not denoted as green space?	Email	Gr	s12 HES16	Other footpaths do not meet the LGS designation tests. University sports fields are not considered to meet LGS designation tests.	No change.
Main St has a chicane speed calming scheme, this is awful, encourages aggressive driving, congests the road at rush hour leading to engines idling, unnecessary pollution. Please can such scheme be removed, a vertical scheme as deployed say in Fulford is much better.	Email	Tr		Existing calming schemes are considered a <i>CYC Highway Matters</i> and outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. However the HPNP supports less visually intrusive, safer and less polluting alternatives, which also take into account the needs of the disabled, to the current traffic calming chicanes.	Policy on Sustainable Transport has been clarified and revised.
I think it is very important to have a Neighbourhood Plan for Heslington so future developments won't change its character and any potential increase in traffic can be managed. Overall, I think it is excellent.	Resident	Gen Tr		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
Evidence of a lot of work having gone into the production of this. I commend the result and support it.	Resident			The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
The Plan is a sound, comprehensive and well-considered piece of work. There has clearly been a thorough approach to developing an evidence base. There is a good understanding of the local community's views set within the context of a shared village/university area. The wide consultation approaches are appreciated. The policy proposals to: (i) maintain the 'feel' of the village Main Street,	Resident	Gen Ur Tr	s5 s10 s14		

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
(ii) underpin the protections afforded by the Conservation Area, (iii) designate Local Green Spaces and (iv) raise the need for a concerted effort to tackle the growing problem of traffic congestion are all good. Sections 5, 10 and 14 are 'too wordy' and would benefit from being more concise.				Re: s5, 10 and 14. Draft Plan text is intended to provide the appropriate context, background and evidence that underpins the draft Policies.	Text has been reviewed in all sections to improve explanation, clarity, context and background.
Having read the Plan carefully, I fully support this draft Neighbourhood Plan	ResidentL			The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
I fully support this plan. I particularly endorse Policy Hes11 Local Green Space, which seeks to preserve and enhance wildlife and Local Green space. Also, Policy HES12 Green Environment. I agree that it is essential to avoid significant harm to the environment of Heslington. The plan outlines and suggests points of consideration, which create a real balance of perspective regarding the protection of the village and its environment with the prospective requirements of existing infrastructures such as the University. Thank you!	Website Email to PC	Gr	HES11 HES12	The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
[There is an error on the LGS map flyer.] The private house [and school buildings, etc] within Item 11 should be excluded.	Flyer	Gr	HES11	Agreed, map detail is not correct.	Map boundary designation details have been corrected.
You've done a brilliant job at putting together a thorough plan, and as a resident in Heslington Parish, it's reassuring to know that an accepted Neighbourhood Plan will be consulted in all future proposals, of whatever nature, in the Parish.	Resident			The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
I am concerned about the way traffic, and roads, are developed. Over the years, it has been increasingly more onerous and problematic to use a vehicle, as a resident, because of all the traffic "calming" hazards added on our local roads. I would like the HPNP to include wording related to highways development, particularly traffic "calming", cycle paths, bus routes, avoiding street 'clutter' with sensible placement of any necessary signage only, etc.	Resident	Tr	s14 s16	Existing traffic calming and bus routes are considered a <i>CYC/UoY Highway Matter</i> and therefore outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. HPNP supports less	Plan text (Community Actions) revised to include reference to street furniture, signage and lighting.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
				visually intrusive, safer and less polluting alternatives, which also take into account the needs of the disabled, to the current traffic calming chicanes. Cycle path provisions are covered in Policies.	Policy on Sustainable Transport has been revised and includes clearer reference to needs of the disabled.
I fully support all aspects of this Plan and look forward to its adoption by CYC for the benefit of all residents of the Parish of Heslington.	Resident			The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
I support the draft plan.	Resident			The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
<p>I feel the plan is extremely well constructed and detailed and contains many protections for retaining the wonderful character of Heslington. Well done. However, I have no confidence that the University will not continue to grow and upset the cultural balance between it and the village as it has over the last few years.</p> <p>1. There are many statistics in the plan so where is growth in student numbers shown for recent years? Full version 15.2.2 2nd para: <i>"the level of student housing capacity is retained at no less than 3,586 bed spaces unless the spaces are re-provided on Campus East"</i></p> <p>2. This seems to guarantee maintaining or increasing student numbers on Campus West! 15.2.2 3rd para: <i>"additional student housing shall be provided to cater for expansion of student numbers which is clearly evidenced in terms of demand. (Any additional student housing provision on Campus West (over and above the existing 3,586 bed spaces) shall be taken into account when assessing need)"</i></p> <p>3. <i>"expansion of student numbers which is clearly evidenced in terms of demand"</i> in the above para is so woolly it shows growth is entirely in the hands of the University. Evidenced by who; in what circumstances? Their recent and future policy of expansion is in my</p>	Resident	Ho	s15	<p>Re: Points 1-4 incl. Background Rationale and Evidence text in s15 (UoY) is taken from the City of York Local Plan - Publication Draft February 2018 (Policies ED1, 2 and 3) [<a href="https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/15308/local_plan_publication_draft_2018">https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/15308/local_plan_publication_draft_2018</a>]. Latest revisions to the York Draft Local Plan can be found on CYC website.</p>	For clarity, reference for source data for this text has been included.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>opinion a desire to increase income regardless of the impact of the village or infrastructure. If there is a case for increasing a department to achieve a critical mass for example, it could be achieved by reductions in demand in other departments.</p> <p>4. "an annual student accommodation survey shall be submitted to the Council". This implies a degree of control but what weight does it carry?</p> <p>5. I do not understand why the Plan does not acknowledge the problem of increased student numbers not housed on the campuses limiting the availability and cost of accommodation for York residents.</p> <p>I believe the village character is enhanced considerably by students but how can we ensure it remains this way. For example swearing seems to be socially acceptable amongst students but they do not constrain their use of it when on the buses which we use a lot. The University can alert students to this aspect of behaviour but are the powers for consultation and action by the University available to the village sufficiently strong, if not can they please be strengthened.</p>				<p>Student accommodation is a permitted use in some cases. A policy for HMO adds further consideration.</p> <p>Only development within the Parish of Heslington is covered by this Plan. Student behaviour is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>HPNP text revised to add weight to current CYC Article 4 Direction and planning rules which govern HMOs and to qualify provision of purpose built student accommodation.</p> <p>No change.</p>
I think that this plan is both competent and coherent – a neighbourhood plan is of great value and will benefit the community.	Website form	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
<p>I attended the meeting on Monday 11 February. In general the Plan is an excellent one. A number of questions:</p> <p>1. What is the status of the field in School Lane where donkeys are kept? Reply: This land is owned by the University: no buildings were to be permitted or access path between the campuses and the village.</p>	Resident	Gr  Ho	s13	It is understood this is land within the planning area development boundary for UoY Campus East. It is designated as green space in the UoY master plan and designated as	No change.



COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>2. What are the old school buildings to be retained [as]? Reply: Permission to change of use to houses. I have no objection.</p> <p>3. Under Policy HES: 1 it is noted that support to diversify the use of Public House will be supported. With ref. to The Deramore Arms, this could mean the first floor as Residential provided Ground Floor is retained as pub. I would not object to this but the brewers who own the pub may yet want to sell the pub and apply for change of use of the whole site to Residential. Would this either be a) supported or b) not supported?</p>		Ho	<p>s10</p> <p>s10</p>	<p>green open space in the York Draft Local Plan. It is also defined within the HPNP as the green 'buffer zone'.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Deramore Arms was listed as an Asset of Community Value on 13.3.2017. (<a href="https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/5882/list_of_successful_nominations">https://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/file/5882/list_of_successful_nominations</a>). HPNP policy on <i>New Housing</i> refers to 'infill development' and is further underpinned by other policies which acknowledge the distinctive vernacular and architectural character of Heslington. This area is also within the Heslington Conservation Area.</p>	No change.
<p>I welcome the work carried out to produce the Neighbourhood Plan and believe it is important to use all the tools to hand to influence planning decisions in our Parish. I am pleased that the Plan supports business and enterprise while protecting the essential character of the village. The University makes a huge contribution to life in Heslington but the needs of residents and that of the University do not always coincide and so the Village position must be managed assertively. For example the green open space "buffer zones" must be clearly defined and defended. I see the rural setting as a defining</p>	Card	Gr	HES10	<p>'Buffer zones' are indicated in the policy on Green Infrastructure and designated as Green Belt in the York Draft Local Plan.</p>	Noted. Boundary mapping on this area has been updated.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
characteristic of the Village and so it is critical that developments in housing and the University do not “close in” around the village leaving Heslington an island surrounded by an urban and commercial sprawl. I would encourage the Council to include the wide green verges that characterise the Main St to be included in the list of green open spaces.				Although Main Street verges are classified as CYC Highway they have been considered for designation as LGS.	Policy on LGS has been revised.
In Policy Hes 10 – Student accommodation, I would like to see a stronger and clearer position taken wrt Houses of Multiple Occupation. I would hope that the Parish Council would resist any further loss of family homes to HMO conversion and support the conversion of existing HMOs back into family homes.	Card	Ho		Policy for HMO adds further consideration.	HPNP text revised to add weight to current CYC Article 4 Direction and planning rules which govern HMOs.
Please ensure the fields on the road - Low Lane between School Lane and the Village are not built on – they are a special part of our lovely setting.	Card	Gr		No housing development is supported in this area	No change.
In August 2018 Campus West lake and grounds was registered as a Grade II Historic Parks and Gardens (List Entry Number: 1456517) by Historic England for its special historic interest, thereby rendering its inclusion as a designated LGS as redundant.		Gr	s12	Noted and agreed.	Removed from the proposed list of sites to be designated LGS and referenced as a significant green space in Heslington.
<p>1. What do I think? Overall it seems fine to me. There is necessarily quite a lot of motherhood-and-apple-pie but I saw nothing to object to.</p> <p>2. How could the plan be improved? Not by me.</p> <p>3. My overall opinion? The plan looks fine but I wasn’t sure who or how any action could be taken on all the answers particularly as some of them seemed individual bees in individual residents bonnets. I would just like to comment on two areas where there are a lot of comments:</p> <p>Traffic on University Road and Main Street (old Heslington Lane part). Is this something that comes under the Plan or is it purely a CYC matter? There is no doubt that the bumps and barriers slow down the traffic, causing bad and polluting congestion with very dubious safety gains over that from the traffic islands. Bus bays were asked for by various parties before the extensive work on University Road; they are needed more than ever. The bumps are unpleasant for those with bad</p>	Website form	Tr		<p>Policies in the Plan seek to ensure that new development is supported by a balanced mix of sustainable transport options and do not have an adverse impact on traffic safety and congestion. Existing traffic calming and bus routes are considered a <i>CYC / UoY Highway Matter</i> and</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
backs. The congestion is entirely contrary to the main thrust of the Plan. To have a pleasant village some action is needed. Relations between the University and the Village. The University has a track record of ignoring the village and officials e.g. the development at Kimberlow Hill was contrary to the Inspectors findings and on potential green-belt land while containing unattractive shops and a poorly designed and situated medical centre. It would seem that neither the Village nor members of the University have any leverage with the University administration. Maybe the City could have discussions with the new V-C when appointed?				therefore outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. Sustainable Transport Policy supports less visually intrusive, safer and less polluting alternatives, which also better take into account the needs of the disabled, to the current traffic calming chicanes.  The Plan seeks to foster effective and positive working relationships with all local stakeholders to achieve a balance between the unique identity of Heslington as a rural village area, the proximity of a thriving university and opportunities for growth.	Sustainable Transport policy revised to include clearer reference to needs of the disabled.  No change.
We wish to register our support for the designated green spaces in the plan (section 12) and our concerns about commercial development in the village which we would not support. The latter would increase traffic problems & there are more than adequate facilities on Heslington East.	Card	Gr Tr		Proposals for new commercial development in the village are covered in Policies HES: 1 and 2.	No change.
Policy HES1 and 2 - supported. Policy HES 3 – Possible renewable energy development could have an adverse effect on the historic character and setting of Heslington Village and also on the rural feel and identity of the area. This should be conditioned.	Card	Bu Ag Gr		All 'renewable energy development' proposals would be tested against national policy provisions	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>Policy HES 4 and 5 supported.</p> <p>Policy HES – para 11.2.2 should surely state at the end “It is important that: There ARE enough affordable/family/single person homes and that there SHOULD NOT BE MORE rented HMOs to students.”</p> <p>Policy HES 7 supported.</p> <p>Policy HES 8 – I agree that new housing should meet local needs but this should be for fulltime residents and not specifically for students.</p> <p>Policy 11 – This is excellent and fully supported. However the small scale development in the interpretation should include dedicated parking facilities for the Sportsfield.</p> <p>Policy 12 – This is fully supported. Local green spaces are too easily lost and must be protected.</p> <p>Policies 13, 14 and 15 and 16 – fully supported.</p> <p>Policy 17 is supported. The preservation of the buffer zone is vital to preserve the rural feel and identity of Heslington village.</p>		<p>Ho</p> <p>Un</p> <p>Gr</p> <p>Gr</p>	<p>11.2.2</p>	<p>and HPNP Policy HES: 2 – New Business Development.</p> <p>Policy for HMO adds further consideration.</p> <p>Policy proposals for student accommodation are covered in the HPNP.</p> <p>The Plan does not support conversion of local community open space for parking.</p> <p>The support for the plan is welcomed.</p>	<p>HPNP text revised to add weight to current CYC Article 4 Direction and planning rules which govern HMOs and to qualify provision of purpose built student accommodation.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
I really think a plan is a good idea and support it being adopted for Heslington Parish.	ResidentL	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
I have lived & worked in Heslington for 15 years – I think a Neighbourhood Plan is an excellent idea. We need to protect the character of the village, the tree-lined Main Street, wide grass verges and open ‘green’ spaces. My wife and I are concerned over the constant pressure from the University of York and encroachment in the village.	Resident	Gen		Noted. The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
<p>1. [Policy] Change of Use. This seems sensible. Change of use to residential seems less controversial than the other way round.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p>	ResidentL	Gen		Noted. The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>3. Agree with supporting local agriculture.</p> <p>4. Especially agree with bullet points 7 &amp; 8. Parking is a problem now &amp; looks likely to become more so. Building style &amp; materials definitely need to reflect the character of the village.</p> <p>5. Yes –bullet point #4 – maintain historic paths – we’ve had problems with motor bikes on bridle paths &amp; no help from the council to solve this problem. So it sounds admirable, but how is it going to be enforced and policed.</p> <p>6. OK. 7. Fine. 8. Yes.</p> <p>9. Community facilities are v important &amp; to be supported. 10. Yes.</p> <p>11. &amp; 12. V important. Need to be vigilant in support &amp; protection of our green spaces.</p> <p>13. &amp; 14. &amp; 15. A lot of vigilance needed to ensure this works well.</p> <p>17. The University and what it wants and needs, tends to hold sway over the village &amp; its residents. It’s a mixed blessing: many benefit, but disadvantages in the anti-social behaviour of students who’ve consumed too much alcohol.</p>				<p>Motor vehicle/ motor bike use is prohibited on bridleways, which are available only to walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Issues with Public Rights of Way can be reported to CYC or the Police.  <a href="https://www.york.gov.uk/info/20120/public_rights_of_way/1216/report_a_public_rights_of_way_problem">https://www.york.gov.uk/info/20120/public_rights_of_way/1216/report_a_public_rights_of_way_problem</a></p> <p>Noted. Addressing student behaviour is outside the remit of this Plan.</p>	<p>Policy revised to include clarification on restrictions affecting use of Bridleways.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>The origin and purpose of the Heslington Parish Neighbourhood Plan is explained clearly. The HPNP will form part of the York Draft Local Plan which includes Green Belt decisions (HPNP 5.1.3) and an ambitious housing programme (HPNP 5.1.1), both matters which will affect Heslington (HPNP 5.1.5). The HPNP has the admirable object of encouraging good planning and design and of avoiding or at least minimising the damage that insensitive or inappropriate developments can cause (and have caused in the past).</p>	Letter	Gen		<p>If ‘made’ by the City of York Council the HPNP will become part of the City of York Development Plan in accordance with Reg. 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended).</p>	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>I take it that the destruction of an old cottage or outbuilding to replace it with a cheap modern prefab would no longer be possible. But I wonder how effective will it be against widening roads from Elvington to Heslington and York to cope with increased traffic. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group have produced an excellent, thoroughly researched document based on the views of residents and extensive consultations with local organisations, businesses and the University of York on planning matters within the parish. Architectural, geographical, historical features of the village which contribute to Heslington retaining its distinctly attractive rural character, making it a real asset to the City of York, are systematically are briefly laid out (some I was not aware of). On a personal note, when I first saw Heslington in 1964, there were broad grass verges and a bus stop opposite the Main Street. The kerbs were needed to stop cars steadily widening the road by being parked on the grass. Regrettably, some attractive old farm cottages and buildings were demolished to make way for commercial developments, including a car park. I trust that there will be no more of that thoughtless development. Some suggestions/improvements: Local Facility table HPNP p. 20. There is one Local Facility missing: the Mobile Library comes to Heslington weekly (info in Outlook). There are two "Places of worship". Why not name them: Heslington Church (St Paul's) and More House Main Street.</p> <p>Typo: The "and/or" between Village Meeting Room and Holmefield [Community] Centre should be removed and the two facilities should be listed separately.</p> <p>While publications are not a planning matter, The Outlook, produced by the Church, and the Parish Council Newsletter, are delivered to each household in the parish each month. This provides a link to everyone in the village and keeps them up to date on village news and events. For the elderly these institutions can be invaluable and they form a part of</p>	Letter	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
			8.2 8.6	Table reflects the original survey questionnaire data collection format.	Text updated to include other examples given.
			8.2 8.6	Heslington Church (St Paul's) Local Ecumenical Partnership (LEP) and More House, Catholic Chaplaincy now included.	No change.
			8.2 8.6	Table reflects the original survey questionnaire data collection format.	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
the invisible fabric that makes up the village. But I'm not sure how you'd fit it in to your planning framework. The Meeting Room, where Parish Council meetings are held, is also a venue for local societies, such as the Yorkshire Country Women's Association, the Village Trust and University student groups; recently the Heslington Lunch Club has begun holding monthly lunches there. Is there some way planning considerations could be used to encourage the beneficial communal use of these facilities venues? Overall, I agree with all the recommendations of the Plan and congratulate the Working Group on a substantial contribution to protecting the features of Heslington that make it such a pleasant place to live.				Noted.  The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.  No change.
<p>We welcome continuing efforts to maintain and enhance Heslington and its parish's sub-rural character which includes all aspects of its design. Heslington is a wonderful place to live and I have lived here since 1975.</p> <p><b>General</b> We think it is most important that Heslington continues to be a flourishing community, which encourages agricultural and rural activity and maintains its unique character. It is most important that green spaces are not compromised or encroached on and that the village in its entirety does not become an island within university development.</p> <p><b>HE 17 University of York and Heslington</b> The presence of the university has had many positive benefits to residents including preservation of green spaces and public transport but it is easy for the needs of the relatively small number of permanent residents to be forgotten, or deliberately overlooked. Tension is inevitable between the needs of the University and residents of the parish. The University, because of its very size and economic importance has unequal power over the village and residents' lives.</p> <p><b>Transport and Movement</b> The nuisance of noise and traffic generated by students continues to jeopardize the benefits to residents of living in Heslington's unique setting. Traffic pollution threatens our green air and in this Heslington is not unique, of course.</p> <p><b>Housing</b></p> <p>1. This plan can be read as if only people living within the village may be</p>	Website	Gen		Noted.	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>considered to be <i>local</i> people.</p> <p>2. The area of Holmefield and West Moor Lanes have long terms owner-residents who have borne the brunt of college expansion and accompanying disruption from student footfall and noise, and large delivery-vehicle and other traffic.</p> <p>3. It should be remembered that although often regarded as such, this is not part of the university campus. That the university was allowed planning permission to build in this area was strongly resisted at the time (and nearly didn't get passed) and that was for around 400 graduate students. The number of college members now exceeds 2,700. The pressure on the quality of life, and infrastructure of the two estates with its privately owned un-adopted roads is considerable.</p> <p>4. Any efforts by the university to establish "commercial" services at Halifax college (as in their published plan) should be as rigorously scrutinized as it might be in Main Street, probably more so.</p> <p>5. West Moor Lane is an area of affordable housing and its nature should be preserved as such.</p> <p><b>"Sustainable Design Sympathetic with the Building Traditions of the Village"</b> The houses in Holmefield and West Moor Lane built in the 1970s should be brought into the protected area to maintain the character of the village as a whole and to protect it from further encroachment.</p> <p>It should be remembered that, in keeping with this plan, both estates were designed by the architects to reflect the rural nature of farm building in the parish, unlike some later housing development. West Moor Lane housing design drew heavily on low rise brick farm buildings and barns with pantile roofs still to be found dotted across the parish up to three decades ago and now many demolished. It also empathised green space within and around the houses and off road parking facility, bike sheds, closed off areas for rubbish etc. Consideration should be given to maintaining the building traditions of the village in this setting.</p> <p><b>Allotments</b> The allotments by Boss Lane should be protected,</p>				<p>Noted. The Plan applies to all residents of the Parish. Indeed will support all those who live, work, study or do business in the Parish.</p> <p>Noted. Determination of such housing usage/type is not within the remit of the Plan. HPNP policies add further support.</p> <p>Many of the sentiments expressed echo the aims of the Plan. However, determination of a Conservation Area Boundary is not within the remit of this Plan.</p> <p>The allotments between the southern half of Boss Lane and Holmefield and</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>



COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
maintained and expanded where possible. Every effort should be made to maintain the character of ancient ways eg Boss Lane.				Boss Lane are designated as LGS in the Plan.	
I fully support the neighbourhood plan. The University makes a valuable addition to the Parish with a constantly changing young population and excellent facilities for local people. To date, despite a substantial expansion by the University recently, Heslington has maintained its essentially rural nature. This has been greatly helped by the conditions approved by the Inspector in the Inquiry for the development of Campus East. These include traffic limitation, parking restriction and the establishment of a green buffer zone between the University and the village. It is important that the Neighbourhood Plan maintains this respectful relationship and that the aspects of the Parish which create that rural feel are recognised in any further expansion plans. The local green space allocation and green infrastructure (policies HES 11 and 12) play a very important part and must be implemented. To further respect the balance between the University and local people I feel the plan should support the article 4 direction from CYC addressing the definition and level of HMOs in our area.	Website	Gen  Gr  Ho	  HES 11 HES 12	The support for the plan is welcomed.   Policy for HMO adds further consideration.	No change.   HPNP text revised to add weight to current CYC Article 4 Direction and planning rules which govern HMOs.
This plan covers all our concerns and is well documented Our overall opinion is very satisfactory.	Postal	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
This Plan is a well-constructed and valuable document – congratulations to the authors. HES 1 and 2: Good emphasis on meeting needs of the community. HES 4: What are “active frontages”	Postal	Gen		“Active frontage” is an accepted planning term, used in the HPNP to mean elevations containing windows and doors that overlook the public realm, providing natural surveillance.	No change.
HES 5: Endorse strong statement on crossways on verges.	Postal			Policy on Urban Character seeks to retain wide green verges without crossways.	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
HES 8: Might be helpful to clarify “not to be provided remotely by financial contributions”.				Developer financial contributions (\$106 agreements) are a mechanism to provide support for affordable housing or infrastructure.	Policy Interpretation text has been reviewed and clarified.
HES 9: Presumably applies only in the case of large-scale developments?				Housing and Housing Mix Policies refers to “Development of housing on the strategic sites...”	No change.
HES 10: Would it be worth adding something about HMOs?				Policy for HMO adds further consideration.	HPNP text revised to add weight to current CYC Article 4 Direction and planning rules which govern HMOs.
HES 11: What are “ancillary developments in green spaces”? Does this statement detract from the general thrust of this section?				Interpretation text supporting the policy gives further explanation and examples of what is covered by small-scale ancillary development.	
HES12: In line1, might be worth adding “only” between “will and “be”.				Best practice guidance advocates the use of ‘positive’ language in development of Neighbourhood Plans. Subsequent text in policy expands on this point.	
I fully support the neighbourhood plan. In particular, the local green space allocation and green infrastructure (policies HES 11 and 12) play a	Website	Gen Gr		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>vital part in the maintenance of the rural feel of Heslington and should be fully implemented. Similarly any new developments proposed in the Local Plan should respect these same issues and transport policies (HES 13) will be very important in helping to preserve the rural nature of the village.</p> <p>To further respect the balance between the University and local people I feel the plan should support the article 4 direction from CYC addressing the definition and level of HMOs in our area.</p>		Ho		Policy for HMO adds further consideration.	HPNP text revised to add weight to current CYC Article 4 Direction and planning rules which govern HMOs.
<p>I could not complete the feedback form on line. Therefore I am writing to you before the deadline.</p> <p><b>Feedback to the Heslington Neighbourhood Plan.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ... may I suggest that we encourage those who serve food in our village i.e. the Charles the Deramore Arms, the university, to use food produced by our farmers and those who have allotments in our village.</li> <li>2. If our farmers do produce poultry at Christmas, (chicken, ducks, turkey, geese), local people should be encouraged to purchase poultry from our farmers instead of travelling to farms outside our village at Christmas time - which they do. And if there is other poultry, and products from poultry such as eggs, that local people should be encouraged to support the farmers.</li> <li>3. If our allotments and farmers produce fruit and vegetables, local people should be encouraged to support them and our local shops should put these locally produced foods in their shops.</li> <li>4. The local police provided a service to school pupils where the pupils were trained to use their bicycles, and to learn the hand signals, in the school play ground. The students from abroad are seen riding on the wrong side of the road, without hand signals and without lights. They may benefit from the training given by officers.</li> <li>5. There are women living in the housing for married overseas students who are not permitted to enter the local pubs. These women simply take their children to school on foot, and return home. They do not gain anything from their presence in our village. As suggested by other residents, a tea room, and/or coffee room would be a</li> </ol>	Email	Gen		<p>Noted. Policies HES: 1 and 2 cover community facilities.</p> <p>These matters are outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
welcome addition to our village. The reasons differ from what other residents have suggested, but it seems very valid to me.					
In our household we are both impressed by the well thought out and well worded policy statements. We have no additions to offer.	Website	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
Many thanks for this well thought-out and researched document. Below a few suggestions for possible improvement:	Website	Gen			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 5.1.4 on page 7: Whilst I too welcome the position on Green Belt, the time frame of 'at least 20 years' is quite short. Could a request be made to extend this time frame?</li> </ul>			5.1.4	Time frame for the Plan is determined by ensuring consistency the City of York Draft Local Plan. The Plan will be reviewed periodically.	HPNP is set to cover a 20 year period.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 8.2 on page 18: Can it be added that St. Paul's church is also known as Heslington Church Local Ecumenical Partnership? In addition, can 'offices' please be replaced with 'community meeting rooms'?</li> </ul>			8.2	Noted.	Text amended to "Heslington Church (St Paul's) Local Ecumenical Partnership (LEP) and community meeting rooms".
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 8.2 on page 18: It may be better to replace 'after-school group' with 'out-of-school club' as the group also runs before school (Breakfast club)</li> </ul>			8.2	Noted.	Text amended from after-school group to "out-of-school club".
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 10.9, Policy HES:4, page 31. Can it be included that all new housing is encouraged to include solar panels where appropriate?</li> </ul>		Gr		NPPF (2019) Para 148-154 provide national policy guidance for meeting the challenge of climate change.	No change.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Section 15.3, Policy HES 17, page 63, this includes a small error in that the paragraph is not stated, please can this be amended?</li> </ul>				Noted.	Text has been corrected.

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
Overall, I am in support of this plan, especially those sections that aim to protect the natural environment (Policies HES 11 and HES 12).				The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
HES: 9 Adequate off street parking should be provided with any new development.	Resident	Tr	HES:9	<p>Sustainable Transport policy advocates <i>“Providing a range of parking solutions as an integral part of layout, ensuring that parking does not dominate the street scene”</i>.</p> <p>Traffic in CA policy advocates <i>“Development will be supported ... taking account of parking...”</i></p> <p>Requiring off-street parking for all new development would be seen as overly prescriptive and fail to afford the necessary flexibility schemes may require.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Fully supportive of Heslington Neighbourhood Plan. Particularly supportive of policies to, protect the existing green spaces and the existing built heritage of the village. Also supportive of new developments being in keeping with the current character of the village. Supportive of local green space designations.[ Signed flyer attached]	Card	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
I think this is a clearly thought out plan. I don't see how the plan could be further improved at this point. My overall opinion is that this is a very good Neighbourhood Plan	Resident	Gen		The support for the plan is welcomed.	No change.
1. Plan a good idea as “has its own distinctive local policies with legal standing”, though not “the same legal standing as policies on	Card	Gen		A number of meetings were held with the	

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>planning” but nonetheless valuable, as residents have voiced what is valued and should be protected in our community.</p> <p>2. The continuing encroachment of the UOY upon the village &amp; its environs must be carefully monitored &amp; managed. This plan is a useful tool in that ongoing work. Might the UOY be persuaded to “buy in” to the plan, ie, consider &amp; possibly adopt the policies? Working together in this way could strengthen the plan.</p> <p>3. Overall the plan is a valuable document which provides a succinct yet comprehensive appraisal of the way forward for the village.</p>				<p>University of York in the development of this plan. The Plan, if adopted, will influence planning decisions within the whole Parish, including the UoY Campuses.</p> <p>The support for the plan is welcomed.</p>	No change.
<p><b>Response to the Draft Heslington Parish Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>We think this is an excellent document and we fully support it. We believe it will serve to protect the character and environment of our village for the next 15 years. We would like to make a few comments, which we hope might be constructive.</p> <p><u>Policy HES 3 - Farming</u></p> <p>We especially agree that the local farmers are CRUCIAL for the maintenance of Heslington's green infrastructure and hope that any new development will support and respect the rural working farms and all the farming businesses in Heslington. It must ensure that the farm traffic is accommodated and that it does not compromise any farming activities that need to come through the many Lanes and roads into the village; the farming vehicles and their activities are such an important part of our rural village life.</p> <p><u>Policy HES 6 - Conversion of Existing Buildings</u></p> <p>We support this policy but when old buildings are being converted would it be-possible to ensure that traditional materials are always used to match the original building? For example similar brickwork and wooden windows and doors rather than plastic/UPVC because even minor alterations to an old building can affect the historic character of the locality.</p> <p>In addition we note there is no guidance regarding solar panels or satellite dishes on roofs that would be visible within the conservation area. We ask if this could be included in the Plan for general guidance.</p>	Letter	<p>Ru</p> <p>Ho</p>		<p>Noted. Transport Policies cover vehicular access and traffic in the Heslington Conservation Area.</p> <p>Policy on Urban Character (Housing) covers “<i>Building conversions and extensions which respect the vernacular forms, scale and character of Heslington</i>”.</p> <p>Not covered by the HPNP. It is understood that the Parish Council is</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
<p>Policy HES 11 - Local Green Space.</p> <p>We fully support this policy and all the spaces identified, but most especially Dean's Acre, Pond Field and Church Field.</p> <p>NB. Recently a visually intrusive white plastic fence has partly replaced the existing wooden fencing surrounding Church Field. This is within the setting of Heslington Hall, the most important grade 1 listed building in the village and it conflicts with the conservation policies in the Plan.</p> <p>Thank you for all the hard work that has gone into producing this excellent Plan.</p>				<p>currently considering applying for an Article 4[2] Direction in relation to these matters.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The support for the plan is welcomed.</p>	
<p>I think this is a very well thought out proposal which I wholeheartedly support. Heslington is a very special village which currently just about manages the balance between historic village and neighbour to a rapidly (inexorably?) growing university.</p> <p>Care needs to be given particularly to the issue of housing for students. I think section 8-10 (inclusive) of this document need to be strengthened and made more specific around:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Heslington's housing stock must be kept for local families, not given to HMOs as that will ruin Heslington's character if left unchecked – just ask the residents of Badger Hill about what happened to their identity – it is just like a University campus extension on some roads.</li> <li>2. Section 10 – phrasing of this needs to be adjusted to take into account Heslington residents whose houses adjoin university land. Our worst fear on Walnut Close is that the University decide to build student accommodation on the car park to the rear of our houses – it would massively affect the quality of living for us. Ditto a multi-storey carpark which is rumoured to be under consideration by the University for that plot of land.</li> </ol> <p>I hope this helps. Happy to discuss any of this in more detail; if that would help.</p>	ResidentL	Ho	s11	<p>Policy for HMO adds further consideration.</p> <p>The York Draft Local Plan sets out the control parameters under which development of Campus West will be allowed. University of York campus sites West and East are allocated for: Education and uses ancillary to the primary purpose as a university. Whilst the Plan will have its own distinctive local policies, with legal standing, Neighbourhood Plans</p>	<p>HPNP text revised to add weight to current CYC Article 4 Direction and planning rules which govern HMOs.</p> <p>No change.</p>

COMMENT	SOURCE	TOPIC	PARA or Section	RESPONSE / COMMENT	ACTION / AMENDMENT TO PLAN
				must be consistent with York's planning policies.	
<p>Thank you for furnishing me with the details regarding the plans for Heslington Green Spaces, and the Heslington Neighbourhood Plan. I have read both with great interest. It is quite obvious that a great deal of hard work and dedication has been put into their composition and I very much applaud all those involved. Regarding the 'Green Spaces', I have one observation. I fully agree with the sites listed, 1 to 14, but sadly find that the village green, the grassy area between the entrance Little Hall and Lime Tree Farm, is not included. This could maybe be an oversight or even a deliberate omission!</p> <p>My understanding is that the named sites will be registered, and consequently protected, which of course is a much needed step in the right direction. I feel that if the village green is not registered it will be left open to face an undesirable fate.</p> <p>Not many months past, an application was made to construct a vehicle 'driveway' over the grass. Thankfully this application was turned down. But, there are nine properties who's occupiers, if they were so minded, could apply for a similar construction. Who knows, their application might be granted. With protection it would be a very definite 'No', without any chance of an appeal.</p> <p>I do not suggest that the present residents would apply for such a plan, but we all know, people don't always stay in the same place, they move home from time to time. New residents can't be expected to cherish the assets of Heslington as we do, so this could lead to further applications – and so on. We should surely adopt a 'belt and braces' attitude to protect the spaces that mean so much to us, the spaces that should be protected.</p> <p>I fully support the Local Green Spaces listed.</p>	Letter	Gen	s12	<p>Although Main Street verges are classified as CYC Highway they have been considered for designation as LGS.</p>	Policy on LGS has been revised.