

Annex 11: Planning and Transportation

A summary of Planning and Transportation Issues

Note; Issues relating to enabling Development are contained in Annex 12.

1. A three stage site selection exercise was undertaken adopting the sequential approach set out in PPS4 starting with Areas of Search across the City, which identified a long list of sites, which has now been narrowed down to a short list. Detailed planning analysis, transportation studies and development appraisals have been prepared and developed at all three stages. These have involved CYC internal professional team and external specialist support.
2. This work is underpinned by the following documents:
 - York Community stadium Planning Issues. A detailed paper examining all planning issues and methodology for the Council's site selection Process (this document will remain confidential as it contains commercially sensitive information).
 - York Community Stadium – Initial Planning and development Advice. Prepared by Savills (this document will remain confidential as it contains commercially sensitive information).
 - York Community Stadium – Transport study (this document will remain confidential as it contains commercially sensitive information).
3. When the outline business case was presented to the Executive in June 2009, it was clear that the project could not be delivered without some form of enabling development to close the funding gap. Due to the nature of the city, only two sites have been identified that can deliver all facilities on one site. The other sites would require the delivery of facilities on split sites. In all cases it is more cost effective to deliver some sports facilities off-site, notwithstanding the location.

Summary of Planning & transportation study:

Part 1 Site Finding

4. In order to create a long-list of potential sites for the community stadium project, there was first a search for brownfield/greenfield sites of a suitable size within the York urban area. Then a search for green belt sites adjacent to the York urban area following a process of 'sieving out' areas of constraint – consistent with the spatial strategy of the emerging Core Strategy.
5. This produced a long-list of 20 sites. These sites were analysed against a range of criteria, including both planning and delivery issues. This produced a short-list of sites at Monks Cross, Hull Road and Haxby

Annex 11: Planning and Transportation

Road. This process has produced a 'sequential test' of sites. PPS4 identifies intensive sports and recreation uses as a town centre use to which the test applies.

Part 2 – Appraisal of Short-listed Sites

6. The short-listed sites have been analysed in detail with supporting work from Savills and Halcrow. This included a review of a number of issues including: accessibility, landscape, nature conservation, hydrology, environmental protection, archaeology, open space and sustainability. There are a number of detailed site issues that the community stadium project would have to address, however none of these would prevent the project going ahead.

Part 3 – Delivery and Planning Policy

7. The conclusions of development appraisal work is that the community stadium can only be delivered with a financial contribution from enabling development. This approach has been used to deliver other stadia in the UK. This would involve use of a S106 agreement to link the delivery of the stadium to the enabling development. A range of development options have been produced to outline how this might work on the short-listed sites. The potential of a range of enabling uses has been reviewed. There is limited capacity in the city for further out-of-centre retail development. Through the LDF there is a need to provide sufficient sites for both employment and residential uses. An exception to planning policy may be necessary to deliver the value needed to fund the stadium. A decision will need to balance the degree of planning harm associated with the enabling development against the wider social, cultural and economic benefits of the sporting development that it would help to secure

Part 4 – Conclusions

8. Huntington Stadium and Monks Cross South combined would present the planning case with the least risk, with the community stadium replacing the existing stadium and enabling development on Monks Cross South, a site already committed for development. This option would allow the full stadium model and the enabling development to be delivered on a single site.
9. The other sites would be more complex in planning terms. The split sites would require additional S106 contribution from the redevelopment of Huntington Stadium/Monks Cross South.
10. Hull Road/Heslington East is considerably more constrained sites in planning terms due to the green belt status.
11. The full planning study is a background paper to this report.

Annex 11: Planning and Transportation

Summary of specific issues relating to the short-listed sites

Bootham Crescent

- The site is the most central, thus most sequentially desirable and only true brownfield site. It is close to the largest population base and is likely to be a popular choice with the football fans.
- It is a very tight site, surrounded by residential properties and there is limited scope for car parking. The master planning exercise demonstrates that it would be possible to get the maximum size stadium on site, however this does not take account of residential amenity and other important planning issues.
- Although this scores highly for green travel opportunities, it is limiting for the generation of non-match day revenue and other commercial opportunity.
- This option would require a split site solution, thus more complex. It will require two separate planning applications.
- As with Mille Crux, the enabling development guidelines and recent supreme court ruling will have a significant impact on this site as a deliverable option as there may be limitations on the amount of funds that could be transferred from Monks Cross as an enabling development.
- Not only will it require enabling development from two separate sites, it will require a greater quantum of enabling development at Monks Cross (to make up for the additional funding gap), adding further planning risk.

Hull Road

- The site is part of the green belt and consequently very special circumstances would need to be demonstrated except for the outdoor recreational uses.
- The SoS Call-In decision established the campus extension as low density development in the green belt. It set density and building height limits, setting the importance of the open nature of the site.
- The package of development would involve significant commercial development. The university also has aspirations to increase the built development footprint by c. 10 hectares. The overall package of development may be too much for such a sensitive location.
- Commercial advice and market testing has demonstrated that there is sufficient uplift value in the site to deliver the project.

As with the Monks Cross development appraisal, retail would offer a greater commercial value, but add further risk. As the site has been identified in the draft SHLAA a housing led proposal would reduce the risk however may not provide the uplift required unless s106 contributions were reviewed.

Annex 11: Planning and Transportation

Mille Crux / Nestle

- This site is an open and attractive site on one of the city's main routes to the ring road. It provides an important green and open space. Part of the land (to the west) is Green Belt.
- The site is equi-distanced between the two existing stadium sites. It has good access and excellent opportunities for green travel / transportation measures.
- This option would require a split site solution, thus more complex. It will require two separate planning applications.
- As with Bootham Crescent, enabling development guidelines and recent supreme court ruling will have a significant impact on this site as there may be limitations on the amount of funds that could be transferred from Monks Cross as an enabling development.
- Not only will it require enabling development from two separate sites, the amount required from Monks Cross will be similar to that required for the single site scheme proposed there, adding complexity and planning risk.

Monks Cross

- The two parcels of land that make up the development site are not in the green belt.
- There is an extant outline planning permission for business use for the vanguard site.
- HSBC had a development option for this site, but it has now lapsed. The owner and developer are keen to bring forward a new development scheme.
- As the stadium is directly adjacent to the vanguard site it could form part of a comprehensive development site. This would strengthen the planning case for enabling development considerably. There would be a direct relationship between the enabling uses and the gain and could form part of the application site, thus there is a strong case for enabling development.
- The land value of the site based on extant consents / existing uses is relatively low in the current market. The site is commercially attractive and has potential to be used for a range of more valuable uses, although contrary to planning policy.
- There is market interest in the site for retail and residential uses. Both are contrary to policy. However, it is felt there is a strong planning case that could be developed for enabling development.
- Consideration needs to be given to the archaeological interests around the site. Further feasibility work would be needed to assess the impact this may have on the scheduled ancient monument. Initial advice is that the land to the west could be enhanced to be a feature of potential stadium redevelopment – offering greater community access.