

Meeting	Planning Committee
Date	12 March 2026
Present	Councillors Crawshaw (Chair), Fisher (Vice-Chair), Ayre, J Burton, Clarke, Cullwick, Melly, Steward, Watson and Cllr Coles (Substitute)
In Attendance	Gareth Arnold – Development Manager Sandra Branigan - Senior Lawyer Lauren Cripps – Senior Planning Officer
Apologies	Councillor Whitcroft

14. Apologies for Absence (4:46pm)

Apologies for absence were received and accepted for Cllr Whitcroft.

15. Declarations of Interest (4:46pm)

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.

16. Minutes (4:46pm)

Resolved:

- I. That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 9 October 2025 be approved as a correct record subject to the following amendments:
 - Under speakers Spark York, Piccadilly, York [25/01151/FUL] the second sentence under Matthew Laverack's speaking slot to change from 'He' to 'Mr Laverack.'
 - Clarification on the proposers for the determination of the application for Spark York, Piccadilly, York [25/01151/FUL].

- II. That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 11 December 2025 be approved as a correct record subject to the following amendments:
- Listing of Cllr Baxter as a Substitute in the attendance list.
 - Under public speakers for Castle Car Park, Castlegate, York [22/00209/FULM], the second bullet point under speaker David Staniland to change to 'Regarding concern that the hostile vehicle measures would not prevent a terrorist attack, there was a condition for the submission of a hostile...'
 - Under the resolution the wording 'informal accessible' to change to 'interim access arrangements.'

17. Public Participation (4:49pm)

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.

18. Plans List (4:49pm)

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

19. Car Care Centre, 5 James Street, York, YO10 3WW [25/01608/FULM] (4:49pm)

Members considered a major full application from Study Inn Investments (James Street) Limited for the Demolition of existing motor cycle showroom (sui generis) and erection of a purpose-built student accommodation (sui generis) with up to 110 units and associated landscaping and parking at 5 James Street, York.

The Senior Planning Officer gave a presentation. Members asked questions on the presentation to which she explained that:

- The small trees were on the bus depot site and the tall narrow trees were part of the development.
- The plans showed 102 bedrooms. The Chair clarified that the number of bedrooms had reduced from 110 to 102.

The Senior Planning Officer gave an update on the application noting that the proposal description had had reduced from 110 to 102 bedrooms. There had also been two additional representations in objection to the proposal and an additional representation from the applicant with advice from Counsel which was detailed to Members. The Development Manager noted the officer planning balance and that the additional submissions have been taken into account and the officer recommendation remains as refuse.

Public Speakers

Paul Harris, Agent for the Applicant, spoke in support of the application. He explained that land was available in the city and employment came in many forms. He explained that the scheme would generate full time equivalent (FTE) jobs and there was not a loss of employment land. He noted the quality of the amenity space in the accommodation. He noted that the planting issue related to one tree. He added that the proposal was for employment use and would deliver student accommodation.

In response to Member questions, Paul Harris explained that:

- The FTE jobs created were front of house reception and general operatives. He was not certain on whether they were full time jobs or whether students could fill the jobs.
- There was a lot of cleaning roles as it was a fully serviced facility. The one full time member of staff to clean ten rooms was the number that had been given by the provider.
- A significant number of staff would work in the gym, spa and store.
- It was a commercial site marketed as was.
- It was not unusual for a commercial business not to have a board up while it was being marketed.
- The ability to enter into a nomination agreement was not in the gift of the applicant.
- The development was car free.
- Regarding arrangements for moving in and out days, the applicant was an experienced operator.
- Concerning the access arrangements with Dunlin House, the waste collection would be done by a private operator and would be collected by a small vehicle. If access to Dunlin House was not available, a smaller vehicle would be used.
- A key card granted access to where students were allowed to go in the accommodation. Students in the cluster flats could not access other parts of the building.

In response to Member questions, Officers explained that:

- There was no requirement for parking provision and the parking spaces were to be used for pick up and drop off.

- There were four adaptable cycle spaces in the cycle store.

Following debate Cllr Steward moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application. This was seconded by Cllr Fisher. Following a unanimous vote it was:

Resolved: That the application be refused.

Reasons:

- I. The height of the development is considered to be comparable to other nearby residential development and materials and detailing appear to be of good quality and appropriate for the location, however the overall footprint of the building is considered to be too large offering limited opportunities for meaningfully landscaping or amenity space. It is unclear if proposed planting would be viable. This is contrary to policy D1 and D2 of the Local Plan.
- II. The development would result in the loss of a site previously used for Use Class B2 and Use Class E uses. There are recognised constraints to the market attractiveness of the site including its proximity to residential uses. Marketing appears to present the site as a development opportunity, fundamentally the application has been unable to demonstrate that the proposal would meet the requirements of policies EC2.
- III. The site is well located for the universities and evidence suggests that there remains a general need for PBSA in the city. In general terms, individual room sizes are considered to be satisfactory. However, most rooms are single outlook with the outlook from the north elevation overlooking the bus depot considered to be poor. The poor quality amenity space and limited landscaping does little to create a suitable living environment. On balance the proposals are not considered to result in high quality living accommodation.
- IV. The proposed redevelopment of the site would conflict with policy EC2: Loss of Employment Land. The application does not demonstrate that the site is not viable in terms of market attractiveness, business operations, condition and/or compatibility with adjacent uses. The proposals are therefore contrary to the Local Plan in respect of delivering the city's economic ambitions by providing sufficient land to meet the level of growth set out in the Spatial Strategy in policy SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York.

- V. The proposed development fails to provide an acceptable quality of development by reason of the limited provision of external shared amenity space, limited planting and soft landscaping to provide an appropriate setting for a new residential building, together with a significant number of bedrooms that would provide a poor outlook. The scheme fails to meet the vision and development principles of the Local Plan and is contrary to policies DP2, SS1, D1 and D2 and paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Cllr Crawshaw, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.42pm and finished at 5.36pm].

This page is intentionally left blank