

---

MEETING	LOCAL PLAN WORKING GROUP
DATE	22 APRIL 2013
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS MERRETT (CHAIR), BARNES, BARTON, D'AGORNE, HORTON, REID, RICHES, SIMPSON-LAING AND WATT (VICE-CHAIR)
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLORS ALEXANDER, GUNNELL AND WARTERS

---

## **12. 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 may have in respect of the business on the agenda.

Councillor D'Agorne declared a personal interest in agenda item 4 as an employee of York College, which was referred to in the document.

## **13. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 7 February 2013 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

## **14. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was reported that there was one registration to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme and that two Members had also requested to speak.

Mr Keogh, representing the York Chamber of Commerce, spoke in respect of agenda item 4 – City of York Local Plan. He stated that the drawing up of the draft Local Plan was welcomed as it provided an essential framework. He fully supported the housing targets to ensure that the housing needs of the city's workforce were catered for. It would also stimulate the building industry and lead to increased employment. The improvements

to transportation were also welcomed. The main concerns related to the employment land provision. Mr Keogh expressed concern that the land that was proposed for this purpose may not be sufficient or be in the right location. Further representations about this matter would be made during the consultation process and York Chamber of Commerce would continue to work with the Council regarding these issues.

Councillor Warters spoke in respect of agenda item 4 – City of York Local Plan. He expressed concern at the cancellation of Local Plan Working Group meetings and stated that the Working Group had not been sufficiently involved in the drafting of the Local Plan. He queried the purpose of the Working Group and stated that there had not been cross-party input or debate.

Councillor Watt, as a member of the committee, expressed his concern that a press conference had been held on the draft Local Plan prior to the document being issued to members of the Local Plan Working Group. He stated that the plan was an attack on rural areas and expressed strong concerns about the impact that the Plan would have on Skelton. Councillor Watt then left the meeting.

Councillor Alexander spoke in respect of agenda item 4 – City of York Local Plan. He stated that many people of his generation had given up hope of home ownership. The lack of housing supply in the city was a cause of concern. He drew attention to the links between jobs and housing. Councillor Alexander stated that the Council was keen to develop brownfield sites, for example the development at Terry's, but there was insufficient brownfield sites to meet demand. He stated that the target that had been set would be difficult to achieve at first but that there was a moral obligation to provide more housing in the city.

## **15. CITY OF YORK LOCAL PLAN - PREFERRED OPTIONS**

Members considered a report which presented the Local Plan Preferred Options and Proposals Map. A report on this issue was due to be considered in detail by Cabinet at a meeting on 30 April 2013. The Local Plan Working Group's recommendations would be presented to Cabinet to help inform any decisions taken.

The Chair stated that the Plan sought to accommodate business needs and provide a more substantial housing supply. The target of 1090 aimed to meet existing and expected economic growth but whilst care had been taken in choosing sites it was also important to maintain York's setting. Allocations concentrated on larger sites would create new communities and would provide the necessary facilities and transport infrastructure.

Councillor Barton stated that he was very concerned that the documentation referred to Holme Hill. He stated that this was a farm and not an area of land. This had caused significant problems for the residents concerned. Officers were asked to look into this matter and consider an alternative approach.

Some concerns were expressed at the short timescale within which members of the Working Group had been expected to study the documentation and at the fact that a press conference had been called prior to the agenda papers being published. Concerns were also expressed that some of the supporting documentation had been made available on-line only and was not easily accessible.

Members went through the documentation and raised the following issues:

#### Figure 1 in the report

- Concerns were expressed that the map showed all sites considered for development potential but the documentation did not provide reasons as to why some of the sites had been ruled out. The rationale needed to be made public at the consultation stage.

#### Section 1: Strategic Framework

- Para 1.7 - In respect of the "duty to co-operate" more information should be included as to the bodies that would be consulted, particularly in respect of cross boundary impacts.

#### Section 2: Spatial Portrait

- Para 2.59 – the references to journey to work patterns do not place sufficient emphasis on the journeys of people who live in York but who work in another area. It would be useful if, during the consultation process, work could be carried out to ascertain the reasons for this and also why people choose to commute into York but not live here. Do the reasons only relate to housing?
- Para 2.69 and 2.70 – need to be kept updated to reflect the changing situation.

### Section 5: Spatial Strategy

- Employment growth (page 44) – greater clarity needed, for example as to how the expectation of employment had been arrived at, including the three options and an explanation of what is meant by a “policy on” scenario.
- Page 45 – it was noted that the figure of 47,500 people should read “55,000”
- Greater clarity required in respect of the four housing growth options.
- Officers responded to Members’ questions regarding windfalls.
- Concerns were raised regarding the identified new settlement at “Holme Hill” and as to whether a settlement of this size would be sustainable. Members suggested that there would be a need to provide more detailed information on this issue as part of the consultation process.

### Section 6: York City Centre

- Page 65 – “residential” to be included in the list of development types that are acceptable in principle.

### Section 7: York Central

- Members noted that the proposals reflected the work that had been taking place and that it would provide a key opportunity for a new central business quarter.

### Section 9: Retail

- It was suggested that some of the work that had taken place on neighbourhood parades and local retailing should be

included in the evidence base. Officers confirmed that work on neighbourhood parades had been undertaken and would be available at consultation.

### Section 10: Housing Growth and Distribution

- Better cross referencing with Section 5 “Spatial Strategy” was suggested. It was noted that there were four options for housing growth in this section and that there needed to be consistency within the documentation.
- It was suggested that reference be made as to how scenarios such as boom and bust would be accommodated.
- Table 10.1 H6 – amend wording “land to rear of Wilberforce Home”.

### Section 11: Aiding Choice in the Housing Market

- Officers gave an update on how it was intended to redraft ACHM3 to provide greater clarity.
- The correction needed to the key denoting areas of search for Gypsy and Traveller sites and Showpeople Yard on the proposals map was noted.
- It was agreed that a link be provided to demonstrate the Council’s legal duties in respect of gypsies and travellers.
- Information to be included clarifying the difference between a pitch and a plot.
- Consideration to be given as to whether more information could be included on house prices/wages and medium and mean wage comparisons as part of the contextual information regarding the range of housing choice.
- Officers to ascertain if information is available regarding any correlation between shared housing and a shortage of new homes.

### Section 12: Affordable Housing

- Page 135 (alternatives) – no reference to minor developments.

### Section 14: Education, Skills and Training

- Accuracy of the statement “the number of residents leaving the area for Further Education studies has significantly

reduced from 125 to 34 over the last four years” to be checked.

### Section 15: Universities

- Consideration to be given as to whether there was scope to increase the figure of 3,586 bed spaces at Heslington West.
- Policy U5 – Light pollution should be a consideration in the development of York St John University sport pitch allocations where flood lighting is proposed.

### Section 17: Green infrastructure

- It was noted that greater clarity was needed on the Proposals Map re areas which had dual designation as open space and green belt.
- Page 188 – further consideration should be given to the reference “require only major development ...”

### Section 18: Green Belt

- For greater clarity all sites in Policy GB5 should be identified on the proposals map as major developed sites in the green belt.
- Include reference to the fact that renewable energy in the green belt would be considered appropriate.
- Consideration to be given to the situation in respect of the latest legislation for telecommunication masts and amend plan if relevant.

### Section 19: Flood Risk Management

- Councillor Barton drew attention to a map indicating the flood risks in the area referred to in the document as “Holme Hill”. Officers confirmed that they were aware of the information and fully discussed the issue with Flood Risk and Drainage Management colleagues, also that the approach they were advocating fitted with the NPPF. In addition, officers would consult with the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards.

### Section 20: Climate Change

- Consideration to be given to the title of the section, one suggestion was that it focuses on renewable energy and sustainable design and construction.
- Purpose of Figure 20.1 is unclear.
- Paragraph 20.6 to be made more accessible.
- Cross-referencing to be included, as this section was focussed on design and did not make reference to other issues such as transportation.
- Page 227 – correction to paragraph reference required.
- Page 231 – further consideration to be given to the wording in respect of light pollution etc.

### Section 22: Waste and Minerals

- There is no mention of “fracking”. It should be considered whether it is appropriate to do so.

### Section 23: Transport

- Need to cross reference air quality to this section.
- Paragraph 23.9 – need to clarify that this is two-way
- Page 251 point iv – needs greater clarity.
- Greater clarity needed in definitions such as frequency of service and the distinctions between the expected services to suburban areas compared to rural villages.
- Page 260 – location of pedestrian/cycle bridge referred to in (iii) to be checked.
- Page 265 – protection for residential areas – consideration to be given to the impact on areas such as Monks Cross.

### Section 25: Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

- Discussion took place regarding the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 monies.

### General Issues:

- It was noted that reference had been made to some of the major sites being of sufficient size to require the provision of a primary school although detailed information had not been provided. Members suggested that the situation in respect of secondary school provision would also need to be considered. Officers confirmed that such issues would need

to be given more detailed consideration as the submission developed.

- Clarification was sought as to how the development control policies would link to the Local Plan. Officers stated that the document would replace the previous Local Plan but would need to be supplemented by planning documents which interpreted aspects of the policy.

- RESOLVED:
- (i) That, taking into account the points listed above, it be recommended to Cabinet that the document attached as Annex A to the report, subject to the specific amendments to policies agreed at the meeting and further work being done by officers to address the key issues raised at the meeting, along with supporting information, be approved for public consultation.
  - (ii) That it be recommended to Cabinet that the making of any incidental changes to the draft document that are necessary as a result of their recommendations be delegated to the Director of City and Environmental Services, in consultation with the Cabinet Member.
  - (iii) That it be recommended to Cabinet that the approval of a Consultation Strategy and associated documents be delegated to the Director of City and Environmental Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member.
  - (iv) That it be recommended to Cabinet that the approval of supporting information and documentation to be published during public consultation be delegated



to the Director of City and Environmental Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member.

REASONS:  
can

- (i) So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan be progressed.
- (ii) So that changes recommended as a result of discussions at the Cabinet meeting can be made.
- (iii) To ensure that the proposed methods of consultation are satisfactory to Members.
- (iv) To ensure that the proposed methods of consultation are satisfactory to Members.

Cllr Merrett, Chair

[The meeting started at 5.00 pm and finished at 7.30 pm].