

Meeting	Planning Committee B
Date	12 June 2025
Present	Councillors Merrett (Chair), Cullwick (Vice-Chair), Fenton, Moroney, Orrell, Vassie, Warters, Baxter (Substitute) and Whitcroft (Substitute)
Officers Present	Gareth Arnold, Development Manager Jonathan Kenyon, Principal Officer, Development Management Jodi Ingram, Lawyer

1. Apologies for Absence (4.33 pm)

Apologies were received and noted from Cllrs Wilson and Nelson. They were substituted by Cllrs Whitcroft and Baxter respectively.

2. Declarations of Interest (4.34 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.

None were declared.

3. Minutes (4.34 pm)

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

4. Public Participation (4.35 pm)

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

5. Plans List (4.35 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.

**6. 5 Main Street, Heslington, York, YO10 5EA
[24/01377/FULM] (4.35 pm)**

Members considered a major full application by Miranda Lam for the change of use of offices (use class E) to 25no. bed purpose-built student accommodation, erection of a single storey extension to The Hive and associated external works.

The Development Manager gave a presentation on the plans and noted that the application had been deferred at committee in March 2025. Since then, the Local Plan proposal's map had been published showing the site to be within the university campus. Therefore, the application had been re-appraised and considered in accordance with policy ED1 and ED2 of the adopted Local Plan.

An update to the published report was provided by the Principal Officer, Development Management, this covered further representations from Heslington Parish Council and Heslington Village Trust and the officer's response to these, further information on the reason for deferral and an explanation of policy ED2: Campus West.

In response to questions on the plans, officers showed the location of the pub in relation to the site, the distance was approximately seventeen metres.

Public Speakers

David Blacketer spoke on behalf of the Parish Council in objection to the application, stating that the 24/7 operation of the proposed student housing would have a detrimental effect on residential amenity and the character and setting of the conservation area. He asked the committee to refuse the application.

In response to questions, he stated that the village was quiet at evening and weekends, the benefit would not outweigh the harm.

Nicholas Allen spoke on behalf on the Heslington Village Trust also in objection to the application, he stated that the site being within the

university campus was not correct and he believed that policy EC2 applied in this instance; the application should be judged on the loss of employment land.

Janet O'Neill, the agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. She noted the difficulties associated with working in a listed building, which was in a poor condition. She highlighted the user rights for university use and that a change of ownership did not remove those rights.

She responded to questions from Members and gave an indication of demand for student accommodation, reporting that there were two students for every student bed. It was not the intention to remove the Hive, although its condition had worsened recently, and this would be re-evaluated in due course.

In response to questions from Members, officers reported that the policy referred to the proposals map and campus, the sale of the land by the University did not affect its lawful use. It covered a range of uses including housing, sports and education and did not rule out other use. Ownership was not a material planning consideration. The adopted local plan has the full weight of Planning Act behind it. It was confirmed that the number of parking spaces would be reduced from nine to three. It was not considered reasonable to condition the construction management plan, however the working hours could be considered for a condition. A noise assessment had been addressed in condition 7.

Following debate, the Chair proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application, subject an amendment to condition 9 to specify swift boxes and the inclusion of an additional condition concerning the hours of demolition, construction, and deliveries to be included and an amendment to the positive and proactive approach informative regarding the committee's consideration of the loss of employment use. This was seconded by Cllr Cullwick.

On being put to a vote, with eight members in favour and one against it was:

Resolved: That the application be approved.

Reason: In principle the scheme is regarded policy compliant. The site is designed as part of the university campus in the adopted Local Plan and the relevant policy ED1 advises student housing will be permitted on campus. The scheme also has the following benefits:

It involves re-use of what were redundant university buildings to contribute towards meeting evidenced student housing need, in a sustainable location. The scheme accords with the sustainable development and environmental objectives of the Local Plan and NPPF; the reuse and environmental improvement of existing buildings is aligned with the objective to minimise waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

The proposals preserve and better reveal the significance of a listed building and would bring it into a sustainable new use, consistent with its conservation, improving its environmental performance and addressing defects which are causing the building to deteriorate. The proposals are beneficial in respect of the impact on the listed building. The scheme (as revised) does not harm the significance of heritage assets.

**7. 5 Main Street, Heslington, York, YO10 5EA [24/01378/LBC]
(5.47 pm)**

During consideration of item 5a, Members also considered the listed building consent application for internal and external alterations to facilitate change of use of offices (use class E) to purpose-built student accommodation.

The Chair proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application, and this was seconded by Cllr Cullwick. On being put to a vote, Members voted eight in favour and one against. It was therefore:

Resolved: That the application be approved.

Reason: The scheme does not conflict with Local Plan policy D5 as no harm to significance has been identified. The proposals are desirable in reverting the building back to its original domestic use; it is in accordance with NPPF paragraph 210 which states that “in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the

significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation”.

The scheme has been revised to address officer concerns in respect of impact on the original plan form. It will address existing issues with the building in a sympathetic way. The works to accommodate re-use, in terms of energy efficiency and fire safety are also sympathetic. The works adhere with NPPF paragraph 213 in that they have clear and convincing justification. No harm to significance has been identified and there is therefore no conflict with NPPF policy on heritage assets. It is recommended consent be granted subject to conditions.

8. Planning Appeal Performance and Decisions (5.48 pm)

The Development Manager presented a report which provided information on the planning appeal decision determined by the Planning Inspectorate between 01 January and 31 March 2025.

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 D Merrett, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.31 pm and finished at 5.53 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank