

MEETING	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP
DATE	3 OCTOBER 2011
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS MERRETT (CHAIR), LEVENE, POTTER, RICHES, SIMPSON-LAING, REID, BARTON AND D'AGORNE
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLOR WARTERS (ITEMS 1-3)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR WATT

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on the agenda. The following interests were declared:

- Councillor D'Agorne declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 – “City Centre Area Action Plan City Centre Movement and Accessibility Framework”, as a member of the Cycle Touring Club and York Cycle Campaign.
- Councillor Merrett declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 – “City Centre Area Action Plan City Centre Movement and Accessibility Framework”, as an honorary member of the Cycle Touring Club and a member of York Cycle Campaign.
- Councillor Potter declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 – “City Centre Area Action Plan City Centre Movement and Accessibility Framework”, as Operations Manager for York Wheels.
- Councillor Riches declared a personal interest in agenda item 5 – “Draft National Planning Policy Framework”, as a student member of RIBA.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2011 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/OTHER SPEAKERS

Councillor Warters had requested to speak at the meeting. He expressed concern at the cancellation of scheduled meetings of the group. He stated that previously the LDF Working Group had provided an opportunity for cross-party involvement and public consultation but he was concerned that this was no longer the case. He drew attention to decisions in respect of the Core Strategy that had been taken by the Cabinet at their meeting on 21 June 2011. Councillor Warters stated that he questioned the relevance of the LDF Working Group if its views were not taken into account.

4. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: CITY CENTRE AREA ACTION PLAN CITY CENTRE MOVEMENT AND ACCESSIBILITY FRAMEWORK

Members received a report that advised them of the production of a City Centre Movement and Accessibility Framework as an evidence base document for the City Centre Area Action Plan.

The Framework had been produced by a multi-disciplinary consultant team as part of the Yorkshire Forward funded Renaissance programme. Key stakeholders had been consulted in the production of the report.

Officers explained that the framework was a visionary document that made a series of recommendations to help inform policies and projects relating to movement and accessibility. The production of the framework was part of a process in developing the vision for the city centre to be included in the City Centre Area Action Plan preferred options document.

Members were asked to consider the following options:

Option 1: To approve the City Centre Movement and Accessibility proposals, as included in the draft Area Action Plan Preferred Options policy in paragraph 33 of the report for inclusion in the City Centre Area Action Preferred Options document, which would be put out for consultation.

Option 2: To seek amendments to the strategy and main proposals and/or further work to be undertaken to review these proposals.

The Chair stated that it was acknowledged that comprehensive modelling had not yet been carried out to ascertain how it might work in practice and he drew attention to the need for full consultation to be carried out with residents.

Members commented on the need to address traffic issues and congestion in the city centre and to look at ways at reducing pollution.

Members stated that it was important that inaccuracies in the document were addressed prior to the consultation on the City Centre Area Action Plan taking place.

The following amendments to the document were put forward:

Reference	Members' Comments
General	There needed to be greater clarity regarding the different phases – there were currently inconsistencies in the proposed timescales.
Page 10 Para 18	Make improvements to grammar to ensure greater clarity.
Page 28 Para 2	Note that issues in respect of the city centre cannot be seen in isolation. Issues in respect of the outer ring road also have an impact.
Page 30 Bullet point 4	Concerns expressed regarding the use of the term "Great Street". "Route" may be a more appropriate term.
Page 35	Figure of 6,500 houses may be misleading
Page 46	No mention has been made of the new council offices and how this could impact on travel plans.
Page 50/51	More emphasis required as to the new supermarket buildings in this area and the impact on traffic.
Page 58	Account should be taken of the fact that consultation had previously taken place in respect of Micklegate Bar, although it was acknowledged that the views put forward at the time of the previous consultation may have changed.
Page 62	There were inconsistencies in the report in respect of St George's Field. Whilst there

	were some references in the document to the possibility of a two-storey car park, there were also references to enhancing the area.
Page 62	Suggestions in respect of the Foss area should also take into account developments already proposed by the Castle Museum.
Page 64	Issues in respect of routes for people travelling from the East Riding and Selby to the railway station need to be given more consideration. It was noted that an aspiration of York Central was for there to be a major transport interchange in place.
Page 72	There is lack of clarity regarding the hours of operation of footstreets. The wording should be amended to address this matter.
Page 72	Reference is made to “subject to legislation”. In the shorter term, and pending the introduction of new legislation, measures should be put in place to address issues in respect of moving traffic offences.
Page 76	Residents of Leeman Road should be exempt and should have access to Leeman Road. Further consideration needs to be done in respect of the installation of a traffic control system.
Page 84	Further consideration should be given to the suggested removal of kerbs. In some instances these are in place to protect medieval buildings. Some disabled people also find them to be helpful.
Page 84	Any changes to the Green Badge Scheme would need to be carefully considered and be subject to consultation with the Equality Advisory Group.
Page 85	Reference is made to “St Leonard’s Place, the current Council offices car park”. As this car park will no longer be in the council’s ownership, they will not be able to determine that it will be a disabled only car park.
Page 89	It should be acknowledged that reducing the evening charge tariffs and removing

	the two-tier parking charges would impact on revenue levels.
Page 90	Esplanade car park is outside of the city walls.
Page 94	Referring to the bus fleet, Members stated that it was important to acknowledge that lower emission vehicles had been introduced and had made an impact. It was, however, recognised that it was the bus companies who determined which vehicles were used although the council could influence this, as it had with the Park and Ride contract.
Page 94	When making recommendations regarding pre-paid tickets, care must be taken to avoid putting in place measures that resulted in social exclusion.
Page 97	It was suggested that there was a need to address the current problems in respect of insufficient cycle parking.
Page 98	The views of the Blind and Partially Sighted Society should be obtained in respect of the suggestions regarding High Ousegate.
Page 106	It is important that taxis are recognised as public transport. More consideration needs to be given to suggestions in respect of Duncombe Place and the taxi rank at the Station Entrance.
Page 117	Although the removal of guardrail by the Tourist Information Centre had improved the situation – still more could be done.
Page 119	Terminology used should be “20mph zone” not “20mph speed limit”.
Page 120	More clarity required in respect of improvements to St George’s Field
Page 130	Reference to Leeman Road to make clear residents would be exempt.
General	There should be greater clarity within the document as to whether the measures are intended to address issues in respect of pollution, traffic management or both. Further consideration should be given in respect of arrangements for low emission cars or electric cars.

It was agreed that it was important that all Members were consulted on the document, as not all wards were represented by the LDF working group. Members also stressed the importance of ensuring that when public consultation took place, the document was presented as a vision for the city and it was not prescriptive. The timescales within the document would also be subject to budgetary considerations.

- RESOLVED:(i) That the York City Centre Movement and Accessibility Framework be noted and that the LDF's comments on the framework, as detailed above, be noted.
- (ii) That the Draft City Centre Area Action Plan preferred option for movement and accessibility be agreed for consultation, taking into account the comments of the LDF Working Group, as detailed above.

REASON: To help progress the plans to the next stage of development.

5. DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Members considered a report that informed them of the content of the Government's draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). A presentation was given on the proposed planning reforms.

It was noted that consultation on the draft framework had begun on 25 July 2011 and would end on 17 October 2011. Cabinet would be considering the Council's response on 4 October 2011.

Members noted the draft response to the consultation statement, as detailed in Annex C of the report, and were asked to consider whether or not they wished to recommend to Cabinet that the proposed response be amended prior to its submission to the Department of Communities and Local Government.

Members made the following general comments in respect of the NPPF:

- Whilst accepting that there was a need to make national policy more concise and accessible, concerns were expressed that the proposed simplification of planning law had gone too far.
- There would be an unfair balance in terms of the interests of developers and local communities.
- The use of the term “sustainable development” is not adequately defined.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the non-inclusion of a ‘brownfield first’ target.
- Undesignated assets had not been afforded a sufficient level of protection, for example areas of open green space.
- The framework did not provide sufficient control of advertising.
- It was imperative that transitional arrangements were in place to cover the gap between the new NPPF being in place and the adoption of Local Plans particularly given that PINS have been instructed to begin implementing the NPPF.
- The framework had contradictory elements. Whilst there was recognition of Neighbourhood Plans, there were statements in respect of a presumption in favour of development.
- More needed to be done to ensure that there was an adequate supply of affordable housing.

Members recommended that the issues of Brownfield First and a clearer requirement on affordable housing be specifically reflected within the “General Comments” of the Council’s response to the draft NPPF, and other comments picked up in the appropriate section of the text. It was also requested that the introductory “General” issues section be amended to read “Headline”. They also recommended that the following amendments be made to the wording of the response in Annex C:

Reference	Members’ comments
General comment (iii)	Delete the second sentence. Add text specifically about the importance of transitional arrangements to allow LAs and York in particular to get up to

	date plans in place.
General comment (iv)	More detail required regarding SPDs playing a key role and usually having a financial impact. This should not be precluded, provided that the financial burdens are taken account of in the overall assessment of the plan's viability testing.
General comment (v)	Need to be more explicit as to what is being referred to eg local green space.
2(b) para 48	Clarify what is meant by 'positively prepared' test of soundness.
5(a)	Recommend that this be amended to read "Disagree", as there would be more uncertainty for business in terms of interpretation unless issues in respect of the oversimplification were addressed.
6(a)	Recommend that this be amended to read "strongly disagree". The importance of sequential testing was stressed.
7(a)	Recommend that this be amended to read "strongly disagree".
8(a)	More detailed comments should be included. The Council should provide a response on this issue as siting of communication infrastructure is a key issue for York.
10(a)	Recommend that this be amended to read "disagree" to reflect concerns raised, including issues in respect of affordable housing and

	windfalls.
14(g)	Recommend that this be amended to read “strongly disagree”.
15(a)	Recommend that this be amended to read “strongly disagree”.

RESOLVED: That, subject to the amendments detailed above, Cabinet be recommended to approve the response to the consultation.

REASON: So that representation can be made in an appropriate timescale on the NPPF.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Referring to issues raised by Councillor Warters under agenda item 3, the Chair reminded Members that although regular meetings of the LDF Working Group had been scheduled, this was to ensure that the group could consider business as it arose and in a timely manner. If there were no items of business requiring attention at a particular time then meetings would be cancelled.

Councillor D Merrett, Chair
 [The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 6.30 pm].