

Meeting	Planning Committee B
Date	24 April 2025
Present	Councillors B Burton (Chair), Cullwick (Vice-Chair), Fenton, Melly, Orrell, Vassie, Warters and Whitcroft (Substitute)
Officers Present	Gareth Arnold, Development Manager Elizabeth Potter, Planning Officer Jodi Ingram, Lawyer (Planning)

75. Apologies for Absence (4.31 pm)

Apologies were received and noted from Cllrs Baxter and Nelson. Cllr Baxter was substituted by Cllr Whitcroft.

76. Declarations of Interest (4.31 pm)

Members were asked to declare at this point in the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interests or other registrable interests that they might have in the business on the agenda, if they had not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests.

Cllr Fenton noted, in relation to item 5c Honeysuckle House, he had attended meetings with officers and the retrofit installers, he did not consider himself to be pre-determined in the matter.

77. Minutes (4.32 pm)

Resolved: That the minutes of the last meeting held on 24 March 2025 were approved as a correct record.

78. Public Participation (4.32 pm)

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

79. Plans List (4.32 pm)

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Development Manager, relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views of consultees and officers.

**80. 13 Bankside Close, Upper Poppleton, York, YO26 6LH
[24/00804/FUL] (4.32 pm)**

Members considered a full application by Frank Rowell for the erection of 1no. detached dwelling to side.

The Development Manager gave a presentation on the plans and Members were provided with an update to the officer report which included an amendment to condition 6 and two additional conditions relating to bat and bird boxes. An informative was also added which covered the Party Wall Act.

Public Speakers

Ann Smith spoke in objection to the application. She questioned the accuracy of the sun path analysis and raised concerns regarding the impact of the development on the boundary hedge and lack of mitigation in place to protect it.

Susan Tucket also spoke in objection to the application. She noted that the parish council had rejected the application and stated that it did not fit in with the ethos of the village design statement and neighbourhood plan. She also stated that it would have a negative effect on resident amenity and lead to an increase in traffic.

She responded to questions from Members and explained that the houses on the street had more space around them and explained that she was concerned about safety.

Keith Rushby spoke in objection to the application and emphasised potential problems relating to an excess of vehicles and difficulties with parking on the road. He also referred to the design statement. In response to questions, he confirmed that there was no space to park in the hammerhead.

Jamie Pyper, the agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He stated that the proposal aligned with local and national

policy and confirmed the design was influenced by the local area and that the biodiversity net gain had been secured.

In response to questions from Members, he confirmed that the tree protection strategy would be submitted to the council prior to the work being undertaken and a construction management plan would also be made available. The impact on the hedge had not been assessed but that officers had found the plans for the boundary to be acceptable. The Party Wall Act was a civil matter and would be handled by a surveyor. Testing for the soakaway was to be completed once drainage priorities had been established.

Questions for officers followed and the following was reported:

- It was standard practice on smaller schemes to have the work hours of the site as an informative rather than a condition. If necessary, this could be enforced elsewhere in the council.
- The hedge was a matter of residential amenity between the neighbours and did not warrant a foundation design. There were no rights for the applicant to remove the hedge or go on neighbouring land.
- The sustainability of the location was confirmed, noting a bus route and station and some local shops.
- It was standard practice to produce sun diagrams for March to September.
- The Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan held full weight when considering the planning balance and the Village Design Statement provided supplementary planning guidance, officers considered the application was in accordance with the plans.
- To achieve biodiversity net gain, the applicant would purchase credit. Bird and bat boxes were part of the applicant's own ecological assessment and considered appropriate.

Following debate, the Chair proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application subject to the inclusion of additional conditions relating to the protection of the hedge. This was seconded by Cllr Melly. On being put to a vote, there were two votes in favour, five against and one abstention, therefore the motion fell.

There followed a discussion on the proposed grounds for refusal and Cllr Fenton subsequently moved refusal due to overdevelopment of the site. This was seconded by Cllr Warters. On being put to a vote there were six votes in favour and two against and therefore it was:

Resolved: That the application be refused.

Reason: The proposed development would result in the overdevelopment of the site which was contrary to policy D1 of the Local Plan and PNP4A and PNP6A of the Neighbourhood Plan. The projection of proposed dwelling along the side boundary rear of no.11 would result in a harmful overbearing impact; loss of space to the boundary contrary to Village Design Statement Guideline 17 harming the existing character of the area.

81. Mitrefinch House, Green Lane Industrial Estate Road, York, YO30 5YY [25/00110/FULM] (5.59 pm)

Members considered a major full application by Ben Warn, for the change of use from industrial storage/distribution building (use class B8) to sports and recreation facility including a wellness centre (use class E) with associated external alterations.

The Development Manager gave a presentation on the plans and the planning officer provided an update to the report which outlined two additional conditions relating to a full travel plan, following a consultation response from highways and a requirement to achieve a BREEAM rating of excellence following an undertaking from the applicant.

Public Speakers

Vannessa Warn spoke in support of the application and outlined the plans for the proposed facility. She highlighted the benefits of the wellbeing centre, creche and café and stated the intention to generate local employment on a brownfield site.

In response to questions from Members she outlined the plans for cycle parking and EV charging, stating that detailed plans were not yet in place, but they would consider the suggestions of the committee. She explained the reasoning for putting the creche on the first floor and noted her experience in running children's nurseries. Finally, she agreed to consider planting a hedge in the front of the security fence.

Following debate, which centred on amending conditions five and seven to include an accessible EV charging space and to include cycle spaces for non-standard cycles, Cllr Cullwick proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application. This was seconded by Cllr Melly. Members voted unanimously in favour of the motion, and it was therefore:

Resolved: That the application be approved.

Reason: The proposal would not result in the loss of employment land and would provide an additional sport and leisure facility in a suburban location with reasonable bus and cycle access. The proposal would not harm residential amenity and is considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Local Plan.

82. Honeysuckle House, Herdsman Road, York [24/02209/GRG3] (6.26 pm)

Members considered a General Regulations (Reg3) application for the installation of 27no. Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP) by City of York Council.

The Development Manager gave a presentation on the plans, there was no further update to the officer's report.

In response to questions, it was reported that there was not a condition relating to noise as it was felt that this would be neither necessary or reasonable. Should the air source heat pumps become noisy this could be dealt with by environmental health.

Following a brief debate, the Chair proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application, this was seconded by Cllr Cullwick.

Members voted six in favour with two abstentions, it was therefore:

Resolved: That the application be approved.

Reason: The proposed works would provide low carbon heating for the apartments and would not result in unacceptable harm to residential or visual amenity. The scheme is considered to comply with policies D1, ENV2, D11 and CC1 of the Local Plan.

83. Planning Appeal Performance and Decisions (6.36 pm)

The Development Manager presented a report which provided information on the planning appeal decision determined by the Planning Inspectorate between 01 October and 31 December 2024.

In response to questions from Members he confirmed that no costs were awarded on the lost appeal.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

Reason: To keep members informed of the current position of planning appeals against the council's decisions as determined by the Planning Inspectorate.

Cllr B Burton, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 6.40 pm].