

Meeting	Planning Committee A
Date	22 July 2024
Present	Councillors Crawshaw (Chair), Fisher (Vice-Chair), Ayre, J Burton, Clarke, Cullwick, Melly, Steward, Whitcroft, B Burton (Substitute for Cllr Moroney) and Fenton (Substitute for Cllr Wann)
In Attendance	Becky Eades – Head of Planning and Development Services Sandra Branigan – Senior Solicitor Tony Clarke - York Central Highway Authority Lead Louise Milnes - Senior Planning Officer (Largescale Sites)
Apologies	Councillors Wann and Moroney

103. Declarations of Interest (4.36pm)

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. Cllrs Steward and Ayre noted that they sat on the York Central Lead Members Steering Group and that they had not taken part in any decision making concerning York Central. There were no further declarations of interest.

104. Minutes (4.37pm)

Resolved: That the minutes of the last meeting held on 16 May 2024 were approved as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

- Under public speakers for the Bradleys Farm Shop [22/01733/FULM] application change The to She under Faye Simpson.
- In the second bullet point of Members clarification questions to officers on the Bradleys Farm Shop [22/01733/FULM] application change itw to it was.
- Under public speakers for the Pavers Ltd [23/00823/FULM] application, change her to he under Jason Paver.
- Under public speakers for the Pavers Ltd [23/00823/FULM] application, change 'The conveyor belt did not need to be in a straight row'

to 'The conveyor belt did not need to be in a straight line' under questions to Jason Paver.

105. Public Participation (4.38pm)

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 A.

106. Plans List (4.38pm)

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.

2a) York Central, Leeman Road, York [23/02255/REMM] (4.38pm)

Members considered a major reserved matters application from Homes England, Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd and Government Property Agency for layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and access for erection of a six storey (plus basement) office building (Use Class E (g) (i)) with ancillary uses and self-contained retail floorspace (Use Class E (b)) at ground floor, associated car and cycle parking, servicing and access, public realm and other associated infrastructure pursuant to outline planning permission 18/01884/OUTM at York Central, Leeman Road, York.

The Head of Planning and Development Services outlined and gave a presentation on the application. Members then asked a number of questions in relation to the application to which officers explained: The cycle route through the site including the quickest route into the site. They explained where the applicant would prefer the route to be and clarified the pedestrian access to the building. The part of the site being developed and that landscaping and other plots on the site would come forward through different planning applications. The building was in line with the design guide.

The areas in brown on the site plan showed the adopted highway. Hudson Boulevard would be adopted and the snicket through was yet to be agreed.

Members were provided with an update noting an amendment to paragraph 1.7 with the Biscuit Warehouse building now being demolished, a consultation response regarding amended plans from Yorkshire Water with no objections, and a change to paragraph 5.48 that should state additional width of 0.5m, not 2.5m. Members were also informed that the Council's Access Officer had been consulted on the proposals and involved throughout the application process and the Access Officer's comments were incorporated into the detailed Highways response. Officers noted representation from a York Disability Rights Forum Access Group member and York Access Forum member (representing the York ME Community).

Public Speakers

Flick Williams spoke in objection of the application on the failure to follow national guidance regarding tactile paving. She noted tactile paving uses and explained the purpose of coloured tactile paving. She expressed concern over the use of grey tactile paving and areas in York where grey contrasting tactile paving had faded due to weathering. She added that there had been no consultation with access groups. She noted that there needed to be consistency in tactile paving across the site. In response to Member questions she explained:

- That red tactile paving was used for controlled crossings and buff for non-controlled crossings and she was seeing grey tactile paving in conservation areas.
- The public sector equality duty guidance on tactile paving.

David Sweeting (Principal Planning Consultant, Avison Young) spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicants. He explained that the building would deliver the first commercial property on the site with 2600 government employees. There would be 16 blue badge spaces and 250 cycle spaces, of which 18 would be accessible. He explained that it would be expected that people would walk or cycle to the site and that the site had excellent public transport links. He noted that there would be 100% biodiversity net gain and that the scheme was within the parameters set and there would be occupation by 2027.

David Sweeting was joined by colleagues Allan Cooke (Development Partner for York Central, Arlington) and Adrian Kemp (Transport Consultant, WSP) to answer Member questions. They were asked and explained that:

- They had engaged with City of York Council (CYC) and had considered the key aims of the travel plan. They added that York had

excellent transport provision and they were aware of the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP). They added that the delivery of car zero vetted a positive balance.

- The scheme was not reliant of the development of a multi storey car park.
- There was an existing car park on site and it was expected that it would be a car free development. There was funding coming forward from Homes England for the S106. The applicant had delivered a scheme in Leeds and that would inform this development. There was zero car parking and displacement parking would be added through the travel plan. It was clarified that the application did not exclude blue badge car parking spaces.
- By having zero car parking provision, York Central was reliant on walking, cycling and public transport. They did not want to encourage car use and did not want car parking.
- Regarding tactile paving, the hard landscaping was agreed through the discharge of a condition and they would be happy to address the issue through the discharge of the condition.

[At this point using the presentation, the Head of Planning and Development Services demonstrated where the tactile paving was and noted that it would be worked out through the discharge of a condition].

- Regarding the management of Hudson Boulevard retail use had been brought in to bring active frontage and this would require plant space and cycle storage. It was believed that the scheme would promote active frontage.
- The use of the facades for birds had been discussed and there was a condition on the reserved matters regarding the provision of bird boxes. They could take the use of swift boxes to the developer but the developer had security concerns about the use of swift boxes.
- The Chair noted the concerns of the Ecology Officer that some wildlife was in high use areas. They explained that they had challenged that with Atkins and because of the temperature of the plant areas it was not suitable for bird/bat boxes. Condition 31 or the reserved matters application included bird/bat boxes and there were other areas on York Central where they could be delivered.
- Of the 2600 jobs, 1100 to 1300 would be employed on site.
- Detail was given on how people would arrive to the site.
- Cycle parking was explained and it was noted that this did not relate to the numbers of people on site.
- The blue badge requirements were explained and it was noted that the scheme was required to provide 2 blue badge spaces but provided 16.

- It was confirmed that Atkins had an Accessibility Officer to look at access. The cycle spaces and accessible cycle spaces were explained.
- Regarding accessibility the applicants would be looking at guidance, including Department for Transport (DfT) design guidance. They had engaged with the CYC Access Officer 3-4 months previously and the Access Officer's comments were included in the Highway's Officer's comments.
- The government property agent had discussed the design of the building with the end occupiers and the design factored in the history of York. The end occupier had their own design guide.
- Plot F1B included where the blue badge spaces were. It was noted that the end occupier had been informed that two blue badge spaces were needed. The use of the blue badge spaces would be monitored and there was a stipulation that they were within 50m of entrances and secondary entrances.
- It was confirmed that blue badge spaces did not impact on the delivery of plot F2 and it was explained how the number of blue badge spaces was calculated and that they would be monitored for plot F1B.
- Eight blue badge spaces were to be retained in perpetuity and the Chair noted that the working of condition 6 could be tightened to reflect that.
- Regarding why the cycle lane was not put where cyclists would go (as suggested by a Member), the applicants wanted to put an active frontage on Hudson Boulevard and it was explained that employees would be advised of the route that was safe . The cycle route could not be put straight across as there were trees in the way. [The Chair clarified that there were segregated cycle routes].
- In regard to the Cinder snicket, there were different widths at different points and if it was made 3m wide (LTN 1/20) it would impact on the southern end of the Cinder snicket.
- [At this point a Member explained that during consultation, Members were assured that here would be coloured tactile paving. The Chair advised that this was covered by the discharge of the outline planning conditions and the speaker would discuss this with officers. He added that there would be guidance from officers on the outline and reserved matters stages and within DfT guidance].
- It was confirmed that the concerns of the Highways Officer regarding city centre parking and the site wide parking strategy would be picked up. It was noted that the use of car travel to the site would be discouraged.

[The meeting adjourned from 6.08pm until 6.20pm]

Officers then answered further questions from Members:

- The Head of Planning and Development Services explained that discussions with the Access Officer regarding tactile paving related to the site and were ongoing. She explained that condition 24 of the outline planning permission included the materials for pavements and that officers would work with the Access Officer on that. The York Central Highway Authority Lead added that tactile paving for controlled crossings was brick colour and for other crossings could be buff or a different colour. He added that they could progress a buff tactile paving approach. Officers were asked and confirmed that they would be happy for a consistent approach through the site. They were also asked and confirmed that there was an ongoing conversation with groups such as York Access Forum. It was explained that the Access Officer would be working with those groups on the infrastructure works.
- Officers clarified that the Museum Square application related to red tactile paving and there was no controlled crossings on this application site. The guidance on different coloured paving would be followed and officers read out the condition as part of the National Railway Museum application.
- The S106 funding would come through from the outline planning permission. If there was a significant change of approach regarding car parking the S106 would be impacted.
- The travel plan was a condition and this would be worked through to ensure that there was a robust travel plan. Officers would work with applicants to make sure that what came through at the discharge of conditions was strong enough.
- There was at least 2% on street EV charging and for commercial there would be exclusive use of EV parking.
- The pedestrian/cycle path was cyclists in the middle and pedestrians on either side. The cycle route could not be changed as part of this application.
- The circular design area to the north east of the site was pedestrianised with cycle route across it. This would be delineated by different materials.
- Asked whether the cycle route at the corner could be widened for pedestrian safety reasons, officers confirmed the specifics of that would be looked at through the discharge of conditions.
- The drainage and landscaping scheme would use the same principles as Hudson Boulevard and the detail of the final species would be set out as part of the discharge of conditions.
- Regarding concerns about a homogenous approach, officers had consulted with the council architect and officers were satisfied with the bulk, scale and massing of the scheme.

- It was confirmed that conditions requested by consultees had been included and were in the report.

During debate a Member asked if there were any plans for blue badge parking across the site and the Head of Planning and Development Control advised that the Committee had to consider the application before it. Officers were also asked and confirmed that there would be controlled access to the blue badge bays for the building.

Cllr Fenton moved the Officer recommendation to delegate authority to the Head of Development of Services to determine the final detail of the planning conditions below then approve the application subject to planning conditions listed in the report and amended condition 6 to review 8 blue badge spaces in plots A and B in perpetuity and an additional informative for consistent approach to tactile paving. This was seconded by Cllr Cullwick. Following a unanimous vote in favour it was:

Resolved: That delegated authority to be given to the Head of Planning and Development Services to determine the final detail of the planning conditions below then approve the application subject to planning conditions listed in the report and amended condition 6 to review 8 blue badge spaces in plots A and B in perpetuity and an additional informative for consistent approach to tactile paving.

Reasons:

- i. The principle of development of the site for an office building with ancillary retail as part of the York Central development was approved at outline stage and the reserved matters application aligns with the parameter plans and Design Guide approved through Conditions 6 and 7 of the outline consent.
- ii. In terms of all design aspects, the proposed building accords with the design parameters set out at outline approval stage and offers a good design quality benchmark which should positively contribute to the townscape of York Central and the wider city. Material samples will come forward through the discharge of Condition 16 of the outline consent.
- iii. The proposals would have a less than substantial impact on the setting of heritage assets, however the harm is significantly outweighed by the public benefits arising from its contribution to the economy together with the social and environmental benefits the proposals will bring not only to the City of York but

also as a cornerstone of the York Central development.

- iv. In terms of highway impacts the layout and access is acceptable in highway terms. It is acknowledged that the development being zero parking, except for blue badge spaces with greater reliance on sustainable transport modes is a shift from what was anticipated at outline approval stage. However, it is accepted in principle on the basis that discharge of conditions on the outline consent, particularly with respect to a Full Travel Plan being submitted can further address any concerns regarding parking and travel behaviours.
- v. Impacts on habitats and ecology have been appropriately assessed and any outstanding matters addressed by condition on the outline consent.
- vi. There are no additional impacts identified with respect to drainage and flooding and it is noted that conditions attached on the outline consent would need to be discharged.
- vii. The proposals are in accordance with the outline consent Environmental Statement which set out the anticipated impacts with respect to air quality, noise and contamination subject to mitigation and a series of conditions to be discharged.
- viii. The proposals have been assessed in liaison with the Council's Highways Officers and Access Officer, taking into account the Council's duties under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED).

Cllr J Crawshaw, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30pm and finished at 7.27pm].