

---

Meeting	Local Plan Working Group
Date	5 December 2016
Present	Councillors Ayre (Chair), N Barnes, Carr (Vice-Chair), D'Agorne, Lisle, Mercer, Orrell, Reid, Steward, Warters, Williams and Flinders (Substitute for Councillor Derbyshire)
Apologies	Councillors Derbyshire and Levene

---

## **9. Declarations of Interest**

Members were asked to declare any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests, any prejudicial interests or any disclosable pecuniary interests which they might have in respect of business on the agenda. None were declared.

## **10. Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2016 be approved as a correct record and then signed by the Chair.

## **11. Public Participation**

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

## **12. City of York Local Plan - Update on Preferred Sites Consultation and Next Steps**

Members considered a report which provided an update on the Local Plan following the Preferred Sites consultation which took place over the period July –September 2016. It highlighted other factors that had arisen since the consultation and set out next steps.

Officers circulated a written representation from Jennifer Hubbard, Town Planning Consultant, which urged Members to treat the Ministry of Defence (MOD) sites in the report as windfall sites, rather than delay publication of the next consultation version of the plan.

Officers gave a brief background to the report and answered Member questions, stating that:

- The Department for Communities and Local Government had been consulted and were sympathetic to the delays caused by the MOD announcement. However, this was a verbal response and nothing had yet been received in writing.
- Other Local Authorities had been challenged for not properly considering brownfield sites such as the MOD land before greenfield release.
- The MOD had suggested they would seek planning permission for the sites before the military vacated them. Further clarity would be sought on this and on any other associated military land that may become available in York over the plan period.
- Embedding these additional sites into the plan, rather than classing them as windfall sites, would allow comprehensive technical work to take place, including transport modelling and a full assessment of the impact on infrastructure in the surrounding areas.
- Following the DCLG release of Sub-National Household Projections in July, work on figures for York was currently being undertaken by GL Hearn. Until this analysis had taken place it was impossible to comment on the impact this may have on the plan. The figures would come back to LPWG for interrogation once complete. This work included looking at the alternative OAN's submitted as representations to the Preferred Sites consultation.
- Failure to meet the deadline for the plan would have financial implications; potentially a DCLG team would be embedded to complete the work and a surcharge applied to the Local Authority.
- North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) submitted two responses to the consultation as, after discussion with CYC who felt some of the issues raised in the initial response were inaccurate, they requested to withdraw the original response and submit a further response.

Members paid tribute to the work that officers had carried out up to this point.

During debate Members raised the following points:

- Thought needed to be given to whether it was preferable to follow the recommendations in the report and delay the plan – opening up the risk of not meeting the deadline, or to ignore the MOD sites (or include them as windfalls) and risk being penalised for not giving adequate consideration to brownfield sites.
- Some Members stressed the importance of not allowing this process to be taken out of the hands of local democracy. Missing the deadline could mean residents and their elected representatives losing their say.
- The MOD sites were large and had some complex planning issues. Some Members agreed that technical work was necessary to show that full and proper consideration was being given to the sites.
- The impact on the Northern Ringroad should not be underestimated and consideration needed to be given to whether other sites could be removed as recompense, should the plan eventually include the Strensall sites. It would also be important to look at potential transport impacts of the Imphal Barracks site on the Fulford Road corridor.

Officers confirmed that they were already in communication with the MOD and that a full report would be brought to the LPWG as soon as possible (early 2017) with further information on a revised timetable, if the sites were considered to represent 'reasonable alternatives' following technical assessment.

Members then considered the following options:

- Option 1: That the LPWG request that the Executive approve the recommendations set out below.
  - (i) Note the progress on the production of a sound Local Plan following the Preferred Sites Consultation, and the additional issues arising post consultation that require further consideration.
  - (ii) Instruct Officers to produce a further report on housing need following the DCLG release of the Sub National Household Projections (SNHP) and the consideration of the alternative objective assessment of housing needs submitted through the Preferred Sites Consultation.

- (iii) Instruct Officers to produce a report highlighting the implications of the disposal of MOD land for the supply of housing land within the Local Plan.
  - (iv) Request from Officers a further detailed report highlighting implications to the Local Development Scheme, including any budget implications.
  - (v) Note the impact of the additional costs that will arise and to the requirement to consider as part of the future years budget process.
- Option 2: That the LPWG request that the Executive instruct Officers to undertake additional work not highlighted within this report.

Resolved: That, in accordance with Option 1, the LPWG request that the Executive approve the recommendations set out in the Officer's report.

Reason:

- (i) To produce an NPPF compliant Local Plan.
- (ii) To ensure the costs of developing the Local Plan are clearly budgeted.

### **13. EPetition: Ownership of Property and Land in York Plans**

Members received a report which asked them to acknowledge the receipt of an ePetition entitled 'Ownership of Property and Land in York Plans', which was submitted by lead petitioner Geoff Beacon on 10 July 2016 (this was subject to a further wording amendment by the petitioner), and to consider how it would be best dealt with by the Council.

Officers clarified to Members that the petition was being considered as it had received over 10 signatures.

Resolved: That Members noted the content of the ePetition and referred it to the Executive Member for Transport and Planning to be considered at a future Decision Session.

Reason: In order that the ePetition is considered, and actioned as appropriate, due to the nature of its content.

Councillor Ayre, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.30 pm and finished at 6.45 pm].