
MEETING	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP
DATE	24 AUGUST 2006
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS REID (CHAIR), D'AGORNE, HORTON, HYMAN, MACDONALD, MERRETT, SIMPSON-LAING, STEVE GALLOWAY AND LIVESLEY
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS WALLER AND R WATSON

5. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair invited Members to declare at this point any personal or prejudicial interests which they might have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Merrett declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 4 (Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction) as an employee of the rail transport industry, an honorary member of the Cyclists' Touring Club, a member of Cycling England and as his daughter attended St Paul's School.

Councillor Simpson-Laing declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 4 (Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction) as a resident of Leeman Road, as her daughter attended Poppleton Road School and as her father worked for Network Rail.

Councillor D'Agorne declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 4 (Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on Sustainable Design and Construction) as a member of the Cyclists' Touring Club and as a member of the York Open Planning Forum.

6. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the Minutes of the Local Development Framework Working Group meeting held on 31 July 2006 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record subject to the following amendments

- i) That Councillor D'Agorne declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 4 (York Central Area Action Plan: Issues and Options) as a member of the Cyclists' Touring Club and as a member of the York Open Planning Forum.
- ii) In Minute 4 (York Central Area Action Plan: Issues and Options) the inclusion in the

recommendation that the comments be incorporated into the revised document.

- iii) In Appendix 1, Section 10 - Community Facilities (ii) the comment is reworded as follows "That reference be made of the need to reprovide facilities that would be lost by the demolition of the Railway Institute prior to its replacement".
- iv) In Appendix 2, Section 5 - Baseline Information (xii) the deletion of the words "housing mix" and their replacement with "housing market standards".
- v) In Appendix 2, Section 8 - Framework and Setting of Objectives (iii) the deletion of the word "allow" prior to the word "comparison" and its replacement with "show".
- vi) In Appendix 1, under the "General" heading (i) rewording to state "That bullet pointed lists should comprise of no more that 4 points with longer lists being referenced by numbers".

7. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

8. DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE ON SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

Members received a report which sought their views on the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on 'Sustainable Design and Construction' and explained how this document fitted into other Council activities on sustainable development. It asked Members to recommend the SPG to Planning Committee for approval for consultation.

The report presented two options for the provision of guidance on sustainable development:

- Option A – To wait for the work on the Local Development Framework (LDF) to progress and provide that guidance in the Core Strategy, Development Control Development Plan Document and possibly a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD);
- Option B – To produce an interim SPG that provides advice on the existing Local Plan policy GP4a, and then develop further guidance through the LDF process, including the Core Strategy, Development Control Development Plan Document and possibly a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

It was proposed that Option B was taken forward and the draft SPG was attached as Annex 1 of the report.

Members considered an email, circulated at the meeting, from Barry Otley in which he detailed points that he wished the Group to consider when compiling the guidance. Consideration was also given to a letter from Roger McMeeking who expressed concern at the quality of the draft SPG and requested a number of additions.

Officers updated that the consultation draft report had become corrupted during transfer by email, which affected the style, and numbering and they confirmed that this would be corrected in the final version.

Officers pointed out that the Guidance would fill an interim gap on sustainability issues and that the approach taken with the draft document was to start at a low base line to make it accessible to all. They indicated that they would consider all comments, including the quality of English, prior to going out to consultation. It was agreed that Members would email any detailed comments to Kristina Peat.

Members supported major revisions to the document prior to consultation and asked that consideration should be given to the inclusion of

1. Details of the York context and what we are trying to achieve in sustainable developments.
2. The setting of a Building Research Establishment's Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) standard for sustainable development.
3. Standards to be achieved rather than "where possible" e.g. 4.5 (BREEAM).
4. Photographs should be capable of printing in black and white.
5. Specific details of the space required for the storage of materials for recycling.
6. "Did you know?" sections not to form part of the main document.
7. Finally, consideration should be given to reducing the size of the document and including measurements, amounts and targets to be met by developers.

RECOMMENDED: That consideration of the Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on 'Sustainable Design and Construction' be deferred to allow Officers to redraft the guide taking into account the above comments and including specific measurable bench marks prior to further consideration by the Group.

REASON: To ensure that a high quality guide on sustainable design and construction is produced.

9. OPEN SPACE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE UPDATE

Members received a report which updated them on the issues raised on the Draft Open Space Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), which was discussed at Planning Committee on 24th May 2006. It highlighted the fact that the Council would shortly be undertaking a Planning Policy Guidance 17 (PPG17) Assessment of open space needs for the City of

York (as required by paragraph 1 of PPG17), and outlined the relationship between the draft SPG and the PPG17 assessment.

At Planning Committee on 24th May 2006, Members had expressed concern regarding the proposed increase in maximum walking distance for outdoor sports facilities from 1,600m to 3,500m. They noted that whilst this approach was consistent with the Sport and Active Leisure Strategy, it was inconsistent with the approach taken in the draft Local Plan. It was argued that this change would result in a lack of provision in the central urban areas of the city, including for city centre schools, and an increase in car use, which would also impact on the city centre residents where car ownership was lower. It was suggested that further information needed to be provided about the type of facility that may be available at 3,500m and that a further category of smaller, formal facilities may be required at 1,600m.

The report presented two options for consideration:

- Option 1 – To reconsider the issues raised by Members at Planning Committee on 24th May 2006 following completion of the PPG17 Assessment of Open Space Needs and amend the SPG accordingly;
- Option 2 – To address the issues raised by Members at the Planning Committee on 24th May 2006 before the completion of the PPG17 Assessment of Open Space Needs, and approve the draft SPG for development control purposes.

Members questioned the anticipated timescales for each option, costs and the affect of delaying completion of the SPG.

RECOMMENDED: (i) That the issues considered in the report be noted;

(ii) That taking a report back to Planning Committee on the Open Space SPG be deferred until the outcomes of the PPG17 Assessment had been received;

(iii) That the consultants appointed to undertake the PPG17 Assessment be asked whether they think any of the issues raised by Members at Planning Committee could be addressed as part of the PPG17 Assessment.

REASON: (i) To inform Members of the Working Group;

(ii) To allow the results of the PPG17 Assessment to be incorporated into the Open Space SPG;

(iii) To allow the consultants undertaking the PPG17 Assessment to consider the relevant issues to make the PPG17 Assessment more comprehensive.

COUNCILLOR A REID

Chair

The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 5.55 pm.