

Appendix B: Consultation comments on draft Subdivision of Dwellings SPD:

| Respondent | Comments | Officer response | Potential Change to SPD |
|---|--|--|---|
| North Yorkshire County Council | The draft document would not seem to pose any significant strategic issues for the County Council, and indeed the principle of ensuring the continued supply of good quality family and starter homes in the City whilst balancing the needs of students and other communities is generally supported. Therefore as an officer, response on behalf of the County Council and from a strategic planning perspective, I do not wish to raise any objections or make any further detailed comments in relation to any of the consultation documents. | Noted | None |
| English Heritage | <p>Whilst we would broadly endorse the advice which the document provides, we are concerned that it contains no guidance, at all, for those considering the sub-division of a Listed Building. A large number of properties currently in residential use within the City are Listed. It is important that those proposing works to such properties take into account the possible impacts which their proposals might have upon the significance of these assets from the outset.</p> <p>We agree that an SEA would not be required for this document since the SPD does not provide a framework for other plans and strategies and is unlikely to have any significant environmental effects.</p> | Noted – it is accepted that given the historical importance of a significant buildings in the City that are used for residential purposes, | Add new section iii) after para 3.4 (page 11) on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. |
| The Coal Authority | Having reviewed your document, I can confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage. | Noted | None |
| Tom Langan (Resident) | More control | Noted | None |
| Earswick Parish Council | Fully support the proposals contained in this document. | Noted | None |
| Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council | Strensall With Towthorpe Parish Council felt that the conditions on sub-division of dwellings are excellent, providing excellent guidance for developers, residents, architects and planners. There was concern that no mention was made of conservation areas in the document. Can we presume there will be a separate document with advice on conservation areas? | Noted – see response to English Heritage comment above | See proposed change in response to English Heritage comments above |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <p>Environment Agency</p> | <p>We understand that this SPD relates to subdivision of existing buildings into smaller residential units such as conversion of existing non-residential buildings and vacant properties into dwellings, or subdivision of existing houses into maisonette and/or flats.</p> <p>We would like to highlight that development of an additional dwelling/s <u>does not fall</u> into our flood risk standing advice of householder and other minor extensions. Therefore proposals at planning application stage should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment (FRA) in line with paragraph 4.1.66 of your strategic flood risk assessment (SFRA). Perhaps this could be clarified within paragraph 3.14 regarding self-containment?</p> <p>We support paragraph 3.38 relating to the conversion of basements. Self-contained basement dwellings are 'highly vulnerable' development and should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3. We would like the following sentence regarding Flood Zone 2 to clarify further that a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required as part C of the Exception Test.</p> <p>In addition we would like the external web link to our flood risk standing advice to be included in the website list of Annex A: http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/82584.aspx</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree - this should be added to clarify position</p> <p>Agree - this should be added to clarify position</p> <p>Agree to add website reference</p> | <p>Add a new section (iv) on Flood Risk Issues to incorporate ref to Flood Risk Assessment being required in line with para 4.1.66 of the Council's SFRA . Also, remove para covering Flood Risk in 'Conversion of Attics and Basements' (formerly para 3.38) and incorporate in new section on Flood Risk Issues.</p> <p>Add website reference to Annex A.</p> |
| <p>Heslington Village Trust</p> | <p>The Trust supports both the overall objectives of the SPG and the detail.</p> | <p>Noted</p> | <p>None</p> |
| <p>CYC Development Management</p> | <p>It doesn't refer to studios, and given the space standards and guidance on use of rooms effectively makes them contrary to policy in conversions. Studio = a self contained flat</p> | <p>Agreed – studios should be considered as part of this SPD.</p> | <p>Add new section / para entitled 'Studios' as</p> |

| | | | |
|----------|--|--|-----------------|
| comments | <p>without a bedroom.</p> <p>The 51sq.m min floorspace would be v.large for this type of flat which is usually single person occupancy. Maybe there isn't a demand for this type of flat in York (from occupiers or developers). We could set out a lower separate floorspace category (total the 1 bed living room, kitchen – they need a sep kitchen and ½ a bedroom??) and maybe restrict the numbers of studios within a conversion so as to avoid cramming.</p> | | paragraph 3.12. |
|----------|--|--|-----------------|