
MEETING	WEST & CITY CENTRE AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
DATE	7 DECEMBER 2011
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS WATSON (CHAIR), GILLIES (VICE-CHAIR), CRISP, GALVIN, GUNNELL, JEFFRIES, ORRELL, REID AND SEMLYEN

30. INSPECTION OF SITES

The following sites were inspected before the meeting.

Site	Attended by	Reason for Visit
Plot 6, Great North Way, Nether Poppleton	Councillors Crisp, Jeffries and Watson	To familiarise Members with the site.
Artful Dodger, 47-51 Micklegate	Councillors Jeffries and Watson	To familiarise new Members with the site at the request of Cllr Watson.

31. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point in the meeting, Members were invited to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. No interests were declared.

32. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the West and City Centre Area Planning Sub Committee held on 17 November 2011 be approved and signed by the chair as a correct record.

33. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on general issues within the remit of the Sub-Committee.

34. PLANS LIST

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development), relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views and advice of consultees and officers.

34a 47 Hunters Way, York, YO24 1JL (11/02819/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Dr Daniel Crowley for a single storey side and rear extension.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbours and the impact upon the streetscene. As such the proposal complies with Policies H7 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and City of York Supplementary Planning Guidance to Householders (Approved March 2001)

34b Artful Dodger 47 - 51 Micklegate York YO1 6LJ (10/00965/LBC)

Members considered an application for listed building consent from Mr Marc Allinson for replacement lighting to the front of the building.

Members were advised that the lights were required to ensure security as the positioning of the street lights did not provide adequate light for the building.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to impact upon the historic character and integrity of the Listed Building. As such the proposal complies with Policy HE4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

**34c Artful Dodger 47 - 51 Micklegate York YO1 6LJ
(10/00966/LBC)**

Members considered an application for listed building consent from Mr Marc Allinson for internal alterations at ground and first floor levels including the installation of a new staircase from the rear bar area and replacement windows to the rear.

Members discussed the reasons for the staircase and the general background to the application. Officers confirmed that the Conservation Architect was satisfied with the proposals.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to impact upon the historic character and integrity of the Listed Building. As such the proposal complies with Policy HE4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

**34d Plot 6 Great North Way Nether Poppleton York
(11/02318/FULM)**

Members considered a major full application (13 weeks) from Miss Tracey Kay for the erection of a three storey 64 bed care home for older people.

Officers advised that the consultation response had now been received from the Ecology Officer whose comments are based on the mitigation report that was received on 2 December 2011. He made the following comments:

- *With regard to the actual proposals, this involves the translocation of the existing sward to another receptor site and this also is acceptable as the best alternative option if retention on site cannot be secured. This will provide an opportunity to retain the existing unusual diversity rather than simply provide an alternative that is similar to the general interest elsewhere in the City.*
- *A number of sites were discussed but the nearby Council owned site at Batchelor Hill was proposed as being the most suitable both in habitat compatibility terms and for future security.*
- *The proposed outline method of translocation referred to in the report is acceptable.*
- *On the basis of the mitigation report believe an adequate compensation for the wildlife interest can be achieved and would withdraw any objection on nature conservation grounds.*

Officers advised, that for these reasons, the third reason for refusal has been withdrawn but that if the application was approved a condition could require a management plan.

Officers also advised that additional drainage information has been submitted. They advised that the Flood Risk Management Team had stated that there is information outstanding however they consider there is sufficient information already submitted that the additional information can be sought via condition if members were minded to approve. For these reasons the proposed second reason for refusal is withdrawn.

Officers also advised that additional information compiled by the group marketing the site had been received. The information included how the site was marketed and that this site has been

marketed since March 2011. In addition a letter from the owner of the land - Evans Property Group stated that the site had been marketed (of varying intensities) continuously for a 10 year period. In January 2011 Evans Business Group took the decision to dispose of the land.

Officers advised Members that the position of the Planning Policy team remained the same with regard to retaining the site for employment uses. Their response was as follows:

- *The loss of employment sites has been resisted in the past, and this site has been identified in the Employment Land Review (ELR) as appropriate for B1(a) both in terms of market preference and suitability, it formed part of the Annex of future employment sites that went to Full Council in June and is identified in the Core Strategy Supporting Paper on employment. It is not therefore a peripheral site.*
- *As part of the ELR, the consultants considered the attractiveness of the site for inward investment and it received a positive result, hence it was ranked quite highly. It is also questionable whether a care home should be located in a business park.*

On the issue of employment land, officers acknowledged the marketing information showed that there had been little demand for the site. However they reminded Members that there was an established need for employment land in the city and this site had been identified as scoring highly for this use.

Officers responded to Members specific queries regarding this issue.

The Council's Ecologist/Countryside Officer provided advice to the Committee at the request of the Chair. He acknowledged that the land and surrounding open land had been given outline consent for development by Harrogate Council when the area fell within the Harrogate boundary therefore it would be unreasonable to object to the application.. He explained that a nature conservation interest had been identified and during the last few years intensive survey work has been carried out across York and the Poppleton site had fulfilled the required criteria . He explained to Members that the main interest was as a brown field site in that material had been brought in from elsewhere and plants had flourished which would not normally occur in the Vale of York, leading to wildlife interest. However it

would be possible to move the habitat and recreate it in a different, more sustainable, location.

Representations were received from the planning and development manager for Ideal Carehomes in support of the application. With the agreement of the Chair, he distributed copies of a brochure entitled "Choosing Your Care Home". He explained that the company's philosophy is to provide the best possible quality of care in the best possible facilities at an affordable rate and that this site would allow them to achieve this in York. It would also introduce a new social care provider into the city and generate employment. He noted that the ecological and drainage issues have been resolved but acknowledged that the issues surrounding employment land still needed to be dealt with. He reminded Members that the site had been granted outline planning permission 15 years previously but still remained undeveloped. He stated that, if approved, the development would generate 40+ jobs and that this should be considered an appropriate use of land to provide employment. In response to a query, he confirmed that the home would provide affordable residential and dementia care. He acknowledged that the site may not be the perfect site for a care home but that it was acceptable for this purpose.

Members acknowledged it was not possible to determine if the demand for employment use would increase over the next 20 years or not. However they noted officers reasons for recommending refusal of the application and agreed that it was important not to dismiss land allocations and targets for employment.

Members stated that while they were happy with the quality of the care home, they did not feel that the site was suitable as it was quite isolated and in an awkward position with little opportunity for residents to go for walks nearby. They noted that the gardens would be extensively landscaped and activities would be on offer to residents however they noted that it would be a screened in facility with very little in the way of outlook for residents.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON; The application site lies within an area which is designated as a standard employment site in the Local Plan and the emerging Core

Strategy. It is considered that it has not been proven that there is a sufficient supply of employment land to meet immediate and longer term requirements or that this site is no longer required in quantitative and qualitative terms for employment purposes and therefore is contrary to Policy E3b of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan (2005) and Policy CS16 of the emerging City of York Council Core Strategy (2011) which seeks to ensure that existing employment sites are protected to allow York's economy to realise its potential.

Councillor B Watson, Chair

[The meeting started at 3.00 pm and finished at 4.25 pm].