
MEETING	PLANNING COMMITTEE
DATE	27 JUNE 2006
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS R WATSON (CHAIR), BARTLETT, CUTHBERTSON, HILL, HORTON, HYMAN, JAMIESON-BALL, MACDONALD, REID, SIMPSON-LAING, SMALLWOOD, I WAUDBY, M WAUDBY AND B WATSON
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS BLANCHARD, MOORE AND WILDE

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

At this point, members were asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they had in the business on this agenda.

Councillor Hyman declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 5 'Revised Development Brief for the Terry's Factory site' as he was a council representative on Science City York. He exercised his right to remain in the room and took part in the discussion.

2. **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee, held on 16th May 2006 and 24th May 2006, be approved and signed as a correct record.

3. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak, under the Council's Public Participation Scheme, on general issues within the remit of the Committee.

4. **PLANS LIST**

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development), relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views and the advice of consultees and officers.

4.a **Royal Masonic Benevolent Institute Homes, Connaught Court, St Oswald's Road (05/02546/OUT)**

Members considered an outline application, submitted by the Royal Masonic Benevolent Institution, for the erection of sheltered accommodation, extension to the Elderly Mentally Frail unit, residential development, relocation of the existing bowling green and provision of a new access road and car parking (revised scheme). (Ref: 05/0022/OUT)

Officers updated that an error had been made in informing neighbours about the site visit and committee date, and advised Members that it would not be appropriate to consider the application. Apologies were expressed to all concerned that the correct procedures had not been followed.

Officers also updated that the Applicant had submitted revised proposals and had asked for the plan to be substituted. Officers from Planning and Legal Services advised Members that it would be appropriate to defer the application, in order to allow for consultation on the revised proposal and for Officers to consider the changes and revise the report.

Some Members raised concerns that the Applicant had submitted revised proposals at a late stage before the meeting as this was unfair to objectors.

Members requested that it be noted that they raised concerns that the Applicant had submitted revised proposals at such a late stage. Members requested that a letter be written to the Agent for the Applicant requesting an explanation of their actions.

Members of the public who had registered to speak on the item all agreed to defer their right to speak until the application was considered again by the committee.

RESOLVED: (i) That the application be deferred to a future meeting.
 (ii) That a letter be written to the Agent for the Applicant requesting an explanation for the submission of revised proposals, at such a late stage before the meeting.

REASON: To ensure full consultation on the revisions submitted by the Applicant.

4.b Site Covered By Properties 1 To 7 And 15 To 22, Bleachfield, Heslington (06/00826/FULM)

Members considered a full major application, submitted by University of York, for demolition of university staff houses and erection of six student residences, comprising of 3 x three storey and 3 x four storey blocks with an associated utility building, parking and landscaping (revised scheme). (Ref: 06/00826/FULM)

Officers updated that an error had been made in informing neighbours about the site visit and committee date, and advised Members that it would not be appropriate to consider the application. Apologies were expressed to all concerned that the correct procedures had not been followed.

RESOLVED: That the application be deferred to a future meeting.

REASON: To ensure the correct procedures are followed.

5. REVISED DEVELOPMENT BRIEF FOR THE TERRY'S FACTORY SITE

This report described the consultation process carried out on the draft development brief for the Terry's Factory Site. It presented a revised brief which had been compiled in response to the concerns and suggestions raised, and sought its approval as draft supplementary planning guidance to the Development Control Local Plan.

Angela Michel and Paul Robinson spoke as representatives of The Stables Project, on the community based proposals.

Angela Michel spoke about the educational project which catered for 14 pupils who were outside mainstream education for a wide range of reasons. The project worked with pupils on their individual development. There was local community involvement, and the work space could be hired. The project had applied for funding from the Arts Council as the project did not have enough work space.

Paul Robinson outlined how the project met the objectives of the Brief and provided arts and cultural activities for adults and children. If the project was on the site there would be a useful educational link with Science City York, in terms of IT and industry. The project had been recognised by a range of council departments, and would provide jobs. The proposal included a café which would be the central focus of the learning centre.

Officers reported that the scheme was welcomed in terms of the development brief, and Officers could potentially facilitate dialogue with the developer.

Members discussed the following:

- The percentage of the site to be dedicated to Science City York had not been included. The emphasis was to be on Science City York, but the final percentage depended on the master planning process. At this stage Officers did not want to be prescriptive.
- Members raised that residents had made representation against a hotel venue on the site. Officer reported that there had been a mixed response to this proposal and the Tourism Bureau had set out evidence of a need for this.
- There was a desire for Knavesmire Primary School to gain a sports site. It was reported that on pg124 of the agenda, a paragraph had been added in respect of this, and would be discussed with the developer.
- It was raised that removal of the sentence 'The involvement of the local community in identifying needs is therefore important' on pg123, paragraph 8.2, weakened community involvement. It was reported that Officers were in a position to encourage the developer but not stipulate terms of the development.
- Members raised that there were a large number of comments relating to transport, and traffic on Bishopthorpe Road, yet Officers had not suggested changes in light of these comments. It was

reported that these issues could not be addressed as it was not known exactly what the issues would be. A Traffic Assessment would be carried out in due course and Officers would then consider traffic related comments.

- It was requested that Officers check that the fountain referred to on pg 134 of the consultation responses (Background paper), did in fact have no heritage value.
- The Brief mentioned that any trees that did not add quality to site would be removed. Concerns were raised why all trees could not be kept as the site was large and this would help to retain its character.

- Long bullet-pointed lists should be referenced with numbering.
- On pg119, bullet point 11, it was queried what the term 'legible' meant in that context. Officers reported that it was a design term used to describe making something understandable to the public. It was agreed that this term should be explained.
- On pg101, at 4.2, concerns were raised that use of the car park should be related to the site, and the brief should specify this.
- Information regarding the Public Art Strategy 1% for art policy should be brought forward into the Brief.
- It was requested that on pg125, at 8.9, the word 'encouraged' be changed to 'required', to ensure involvement of Knavesmire Primary School.
- It was requested that the section on bus services on pg 129, at 9.13, be strengthened, so that the financial assistance for bus services should continue until the development was fully occupied.
- Members requested that there should be a requirement for any discount sale affordable housing units that remain unsold, to be made available for affordable rent.

Members requested that their thanks be recorded to all those who had submitted comments.

RESOLVED: That the attached revised Development Brief be approved, with the above amendments, as non-statutory draft supplementary planning guidance to the City of York Development Control Local Plan, as a basis for negotiating an appropriate scheme to redevelop the site and for considering planning and listed building / conservation area consent applications.

REASON: 1. The redevelopment of the site is an important opportunity to provide quality accommodation for a range of uses that will support the York economy and a Development Brief is considered the most appropriate approach for the Council to set out a vision, objectives and clear guidance for a new sustainable employment led mixed use development to create a community of complementary uses.

2. The conservation importance and prominent setting of the site require detailed consideration and a Development Brief is considered the most appropriate approach for the Council to set out the key considerations for the site and requirements of potential developers.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

The Chair informed Members that an additional Planning Committee meeting had been arranged to consider the application for Bleachfield. Details of the site visit and meeting were as follows:

Site Visit: Wednesday 5th July 2006, 1.30pm (meet at Memorial Gardens)

Committee: Thursday 6th July 2006, 4.30pm, Council Chamber

COUNCILLOR R WATSON
Chair

The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 5.55 pm.