
Meeting	Planning Committee A
Date	8 May 2025
Present	Councillors Crawshaw (Chair), Fisher (Vice-Chair), J Burton, Clarke, Cullwick, Melly, Steward, Watson, B Burton (Substitute), Fenton (Substitute) and Rose (Substitute)
Apologies	Councillors Ayre, Whitcroft and Moroney

159. Apologies for Absence (4.36pm)

Apologies for absence were received and noted for Cllrs Ayre, Moroney and Whitcroft.

160. Declarations of Interest (4.36pm)

Members were asked to declare at this point in the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest or other registerable interest they might have in respect of business on the agenda, if they had not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests. There were none.

161. Minutes (4.39pm)

Resolved: That the minutes of the meetings held on 16 January, 5 February and 20 March 2025 be approved as a correct record.

162. Public Participation (4.39pm)

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on general matters within the remit of the Planning Committee A.

163. Plans List (4.39pm)

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

**164. Land to the South of Sugar Hill Farm, Stockton Lane, York
[24/02302/OUTM] (4.39pm)**

Members considered a Major Outline Application from Taylor Wimpey Ltd for up to 380 dwellings, community facilities/childcare provision, retail unit and associated works with access from Stockton Lane at Land to the South of Sugar Hill Farm Stockton Lane York.

The Head of Planning and Development gave a presentation on the application. A committee update was given by the Principal Planning Officer, who reported that a submission had been received from Cllr Warters, and there were updates to the scheme regarding drainage and archaeology. A request was also made to amend the description of development to include Gypsy and Traveller provision. He detailed why reason 7 was to be removed from the reasons for refusal.

Public Speakers

Cllr Ayre, Heworth Without Ward Cllr, spoke in objection to the application. He explained that the site was strategically important for housing and the applicant had made no attempt to strategically masterplan the site. He noted his concerns regarding education with the two schools put forward not suitable due to distance meaning primary school provision was needed on the site. He noted his concern regarding lack of consultation by the applicant. He added that 800 homes with infrastructure and community facilities were needed on the site.

Jennie Hanbidge, Agent for the Applicant, spoke in support of the application. She was joined by Ben Stevenson (Taylor Wimpey) to answer questions. She explained that Taylor Wimpey had a contractual interest in the in the northern half of ST7. She explained that each half of the site had its own vehicular access and the new community of two halves would be linked by walking, cycling and public transport but not by car. She explained that ST7 was allocated as a whole for 845 dwellings and that the progress for the southern half was lagging behind the north. She noted that they had no control over times for the southern half and added that the owners of the southern part of ST7 had agreed the masterplan. She explained that their technical consultants had been in discussion with the council on matters of highways, drainage and heritage and she requested a two month extension of time to continue dialogue. She added that the application had been amended to include Gypsy and Traveller provision.

The Chair addressed the points raised by the agent for the applicant. He noted that there was a significant number of points where information was required from the applicant and hadn't been forthcoming. He explained that the Local Plan policy SS9 made it clear that to masterplan for that site the applicant needed to undertake an extensive part of the research to demonstrate how the masterplan of the site works with the needs of the community. He added that there was no evidence that the design was based on any sort of information gathering to inform the design. He noted that the report showed how a significant number of policies were not met. He asked the agent for the applicant and applicant to demonstrate how the application met policy SS9, which made it clear that there had to be an evidence base for designing the masterplan.

The agent for the applicant explained that that they had a meeting with two officers in October at which they presented a framework focussing on ST7 as a whole with a focus on the northern parcel. She explained that it was not understood there was a u turn when it was made clear at that meeting. The Chair noted that the applicant did not enter into the preapplication process. The applicant explained that a letter was submitted to the council in August requesting a preapplication process on the northern part of the site. He added that it had been chased up with officers and there had been a virtual meeting in October and there was nothing forthcoming to that process.

Members then asked questions to the agent for the applicant and applicant to which they responded that concerning there being no pockets of open space and why a housing density that did not meet the needs of the Local Plan was chosen, it was felt that it was the right amount of housing for that parcel of land. The open space was indicative and would be dealt with at reserved matters stage. They added that if the north and south parcels were taken, they would meet the density. It was added that total number of units should be 372 and the application was for 380. The application had green space on the buffer with Bad Bargain Lane and they were open to discussions with the council about the green space.

The Chair noted the request for deferral and comments of the Local Plan team to which they explained that the request for deferral was to consider the reasons for refusal. It was added that there was a 17 page document regarding a social value audit that had been undertaken. They added that they had tried to engage through the preapplication process and had had no engagement from Officers and they were not opposed to delivering services and there were changes that could be made within the scope of the application. The Chair noted that it could be looked through and the correspondence found, adding that it was not appropriate to cast aspersions against officers.

The Chair proposed the officer recommendation to refuse the applications for all of the 6 reasons minus reason 7. This was seconded by Cllr Fisher and following a unanimous vote it was:

Resolved: That the application be refused.

Reasons:

1. The development proposals do not sufficiently determine or provide for the amount and type of non-residential uses, including open space and sports provision, required to support the allocation for 845 homes within what is a garden village site. In this respect the scheme is contrary to the Local Plan vision for delivering sustainable growth for York and community identity and cohesion within new settlements. The proposals are contrary to Local Plan policy DP3: Sustainable Communities, spatial strategy policies SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York, policy SS9 which is specific to the allocation and policies GI6 (open space and sport), HW2 (community facilities), HW3 (built sports), HW4 (childcare), HW7 (healthy places and Health Impact Assessment), ED6 (education), and CC2 (BREEAM Communities) in so far as they relate to strategic sites.
2. Due to the lack of a comprehensive masterplan for the overall strategic allocation, and the proposed type, design and distribution of uses (including landscaping and public realm) the site will lack distinct identity, will not sufficiently promote walking and cycling, or healthy lifestyles, and nor will it achieve the principles for garden villages and the social and environmental aspirations for new developments as set out in Local Plan policy DP3: Sustainable Communities. The proposals are contrary to policy DP3: Sustainable Communities, spatial strategy policies SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York, policy SS9 which is specific to the allocation (and advises that the site must be master planned) and policies D1: Place-making, D2: Landscape and Setting, H7: Healthy Places, GI3: Green Infrastructure Network, GI4: Trees and Hedgerows, GI6: Open Space and the specifics of the National Design Guide (referred to in policy D1).
3. The development proposals do not sufficiently provide the vision, nor the measures required to promote and facilitate, sustainable travel to support the allocation for 845 homes within

what is a garden village site. In this respect the scheme is contrary to the vision for delivering sustainable growth for York. The proposals are contrary to Local Plan spatial strategy policies SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York, policy SS9 which is specific to the allocation and policies T1, T5 and T7 in respect of sustainable access, the pedestrian and cycle network and demand management.

4. The development proposals do not sufficiently provide for the gypsy and traveller provision required on strategic sites. In this respect the scheme is contrary to the vision for delivering sustainable growth for York. The proposals are contrary to Local Plan spatial strategy policies SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York, policy SS9 which is specific to the allocation and policy H5 in respect of gypsy and traveller provision.
5. The 35 dwelling per hectare indicated within the proposals is not a net calculation as required by policy H2 because it omits all the open spaces (apart from grass verges) and the entire spine road. The scheme is on the basis that a low density is proposed, combined with very limited public open space within development parcels. The envisaged accommodation mix, including older persons and specialist housing, has not been supplied. Consequently the scheme is contrary to policies H2, H3 and H9 which are necessary to achieve the vision of the Local Plan in respect of providing an appropriate range of housing to meet the city's need, in a sustainable way, whilst protecting the special character and setting of the city, and to ensure Green Belt permeance, as explained in policies DP1: York sub-area and DP3: Sustainable Communities and SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York.
6. The proposals lack the level of site investigation required to describe the significance of archaeological deposits affected and allow for determination of sufficient mitigation. The site needs to be evaluated prior to determination of the application, to enable a mitigation strategy to evolve and to ensure that preservation in-situ of archaeological resource remains a possibility e.g. removing areas from the development plan to avoid excavation. As such the proposals are contrary to Local Plan policy D6: Archaeology.

The Chair thanked officers for the report.

Cllr J Crawshaw, Chair

[The meeting started at 4:00pm and finished at 5:09pm].