

City of York Council

Draft Committee Minutes

---

MEETING	LOCAL PLAN WORKING GROUP
DATE	3 SEPTEMBER 2012
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS MERRETT (CHAIR), BARTON, D'AGORNE, HORTON, REID, RICHES, SIMPSON-LAING, WATT (VICE- CHAIR) AND ALEXANDER (SUBSTITUTE)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR BARNES

---

**1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any interests they may have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

**2. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 2 April 2012 be approved and signed by the Chair 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.

**4. CITY OF YORK LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

Prior to consideration of this agenda item, Councillor Barton queried when the working group would be considering the motion on assisted housing which had been put forward by the Conservative Group and carried by full Council at the 12<sup>th</sup> July Council meeting.

The Chair advised that officers required some time to put together a detailed report on such an important and complex issue.

Councillor Barton expressed his dissatisfaction with this response, as he felt that following Council on 12 July an urgent item should have been brought to the working group for consideration. He then left the meeting.

Members then considered a report which outlined the way forward for the Council with regard to the City of York Development Plan following the decision of Council on 12<sup>th</sup> July to withdraw the Local Development Framework Core Strategy from the examination process.

A written representation had been received from Mr Chas Jones, in which he requested that consideration be given to restoring Green Belt protection of the land along Germany Beck. It was confirmed that Mr. Jones's comments would be fed into the consultation process and his comments would also be passed to Officers in Development Management and Design and Conservation for information.

Officers outlined the report and drew Members' attention to the Local Plan Work Programme, highlighted on page 12 of the agenda. Officers advised that it was imperative that York produced a Local Plan which was viable and deliverable.

Members commented as follows:

- Concerns were raised regarding how changes to government policy could affect the progression of the Local Plan. Officers advised that this was difficult to predict but the priority was to ensure that the plan was viable, represented the city's wishes and could be delivered with local support.
- In response to Members' questions about the Neighbourhood Shopping Parade Study, mentioned as part of the evidence base, officers advised that the study was not as crucial as some of the other studies but it would be time consuming. Members also queried progress with the Public Realm study. Officers confirmed that the work may cross reference with some of the work undertaken for Reinvigorate York.
- There was a need to ensure that there were no delays in delivering the plan so as to remove any uncertainty.

- Referring to paragraph 32 of the report, it would be beneficial to receive more detailed information regarding the estimated financial costs.
- Further work needed to be carried out in terms of gathering comments from local residents on issues such as transport – information should be available for residents to view on-line at the very least.
- Further consideration should be given as to how best to work collaboratively with neighbouring authorities and other relevant organisations on spatial planning and transport issues (including accessing minutes of their meetings).
- There needed to be a new retail study carried out.
- Members queried whether there will still be the same amount of money for local schemes if contributions are pooled for strategic schemes. Officers confirmed that Section 106 will still be used for smaller, local schemes and that it will be about finding the right balance.

- RESOLVED:
- (i) That Cabinet be made aware of the views of the LDF Working Group, as detailed above, on the contents of the report and the move towards the preparation of a new Local Plan for York.
  - (ii) That more detailed information be provided on the financial implications, as outlined in paragraph 32 of the report.
  - (iii) That it be recommended that the working group be renamed the Local Plan Working Group.

- REASONS:
- (i) To inform the preparation of a new Local Plan for York.
  - (ii) To ensure that the working group is able to able to make informed recommendations.
  - (iii) To recognise the working group's remit in terms of the development of a Local Plan.

## 5. CITY OF YORK COUNCIL SUBDIVISION OF DWELLINGS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Members considered a report which sought approval for the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the 'Subdivision of Dwellings', attached at Appendix A to the report. The SPD would be published as Council policy for determining planning applications.

Officers outlined the report and advised that this SPD, along with the SPD to be considered at item 6, would be used by planning officers and Planning Committee members when considering planning applications. The SPDs once finalised would be checked to ensure they stood up at Planning Appeals.

Members made the following comments:

- This SPD was particularly welcomed as Members had been trying to argue against sub-division of dwellings for a number of years at Planning Committees.
- Although Members recognised that the incentive for sub-division would continue, the SPD struck the right balance and would protect residents from poor quality conversions.
- Members queried issues on page 39 of the report and queried why the word 'homes' had been changed to 'flats. Officers advised that they would look at the wording.
- In relation to the diagram on page 39, the height scale on the diagram should be moved from the right to the left in order to clarify that the 2.3m minimum standard applied to all units.
- Page 44 – reference to food waste recycling should be included as it may be available to York residents in the future. Officers advised that the list referred to 'as currently provided' facilities.
- In relation to page 45 and the conversion of attics and basements, some Members commented that reference to the balance between insulation and ventilation should be included.
- Page 47 – Members asked why there was no reference to sustainability or a breeam standards. Officers advised that planning policy would still apply to any application but they would be happy to look at where policies could be cross referenced in the document.

The Chair advised that he was happy to recommend the document to Cabinet with the above comments. He asked the working group to delegate the finalising of the wording of any amendments to the Chair and officers.

RESOLVED: (i) That the comments of the LDF Working Group on the issues raised in the report be forwarded to Cabinet.

(ii) That it be recommended that the finalising of the wording of any amendments be delegated to the Chair and officers.

REASONS: (i) To help inform Cabinet when they consider the issues.

(ii) In order to finalise the document.

## **6. CITY OF YORK COUNCIL HOUSE EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

Members considered a report which sought approval for the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on House Extensions and Alterations (attached at Appendix A of the report), to be published as Council policy for determining planning applications.

Officers outlined the report and Members had the following comments:

- Paragraph 6.3 – Members asked that the implications for neighbours is made clear in respect of side windows.
- There should be the consistent use of metres or millimetres when referring to distances in the document.
- In reference to section 7.4 paragraph H, add the words ‘to enable the tree to reach maturity’.
- Paragraph 12.5 that relates to side extensions should refer to an additional set back sometimes being required where there is not a straight building line.

- Paragraph 13.6 – add the words ‘in plan’ so that the sentence reads ‘ Extensions that project beyond a 45 degrees line in plan will normally be unacceptable...’

RESOLVED:                    That the comments of the LDF Working Group on the issues raised in the report be forwarded to Cabinet.

REASON:                     To help inform Cabinet when they consider the issues.

Cllr Merrett, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 6.10 pm].