City of York Council	Committee Minutes
Meeting	Local Plan Working Group
Date	10 July 2017
Present	Councillors Ayre (Chair), Carr (Vice-Chair), N Barnes, Lisle, Looker, Mercer, Reid, Steward, Warters, Kramm (Substitute), Williams, Pavlovic (Substitute) and

Cuthbertson (Substitute)

Councillors Derbyshire, D'Agorne and Orrell

## 6. 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. No further declarations were declared.

## 7. Minutes

**Apologies** 

Resolved: That the minutes of the meeting held on 27 June be approved as a correct record and then signed by the Chair.

## 8. Public Participation

It was reported that there had been seven registrations to speak on item 4, City of York Local Plan, under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Jane Wright from the Rufforth Neighbourhood Plan Group spoke on the emerging Rufforth with Knapton Neighbourhood Plan. She stated that the Plan reflected the views of their whole community and it recommended a maximum of 40 extra houses in the Local Plan. She expressed their concerns over the additional housing allocation, which would increase the size of Rufforth by 50%, without services and infrastructure to support this development. These sites had been rejected by the Group and she asked the Council to reconsider the proposals and to respect the power granted to Parishes in the Localism Act.

Edie Jones, Chair of Upper and Nether Poppleton
Neighbourhood Group, spoke on Brownfield development. She
expressed the Groups views on why the use of Green Belt for
housing and employment would encourage Brownfield sites to
become less appealing to developers. She expressed concerns
on four sites, the former Civil Service ground, the Poppleton
Garden Centre and the two areas around Northminster
Business Park and suggested development on Brownfield Sites
should be a priority.

Richard France, the Managing Director of the Oakgate Group, spoke on the employment land element, in particular land east to the Designer Outlet. He confirmed that the 40 acre site had substantial infrastructure so could accommodate further development and that the land they also owned around the A64/A19 junctions could also be upgraded as necessary. He felt the site would complement city centre developments and could be deliverable very quickly and early in the Plan period. He confirmed their proposal was fully supported by a range of businesses and he requested the Committee consider this site as it could offer a sustainable employment location that would have little or no visual impact.

Derek Bowen, the Chair of Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan Group, confirmed their Plan was prepared in accordance with the rights granted to ensure that any development was inline with the wishes of a local community and reflected the opinions of residents, contained policies protecting the Green Belt and identified two sites for housing development. He asked Members not to amend present provisions in the draft Local Plan, which would directly affect the Copmanthorpe Neighbourhood Plan.

Dave Merrett spoke on social and overall housing provision and transport implications. He expressed his disappointment on proposals to address the affordable housing crisis in the city. He confirmed that the strategic Housing Market Assessment report made very clear the scale of this issue and he highlighted the problems with house prices and private sector rents in York. He felt the overall housing numbers should be increased, to ensure sufficient affordable housing was available. He raised concerns with the traffic congestion and the transport infrastructure.

Tony Fisher, spoke on behalf of Strensall Parish Council, regarding allocation of the barracks and land around Strensall. He confirmed the Parish Council felt the MOD site should be developed as soon as practically possible and not left to deteriorate. They hoped the development of 623 dwellings would obliterate the need to develop Green Belt within the Parish. The Parish welcomed the proposal for a new primary school on the MOD site, development of much needed social housing and Towthorpe Lines for business and employment opportunities. He also addressed concerns to some wording in Annex 3 Table 1, the transport infrastructure and the sewage flow at site ST9.

Ronald Clayton, Chair of Heworth Without Parish Council, spoke on two points. He raised issues regarding developing on Green Belt and the strategy of the Local Plan. He requested the Council consider the number of houses needed before they urbanised areas of York.

## 9. City of York Local Plan

Members considered a report that

- provided an update on the work undertaken on the Ministry of Defence (MOD) sites highlighted in previous reports to LPWG and Executive;
- sought their views on the methodology and studies carried out to inform the housing and employment that the City was tasked with accommodating;
- sought their views on the most appropriate way of accommodating this future growth;
- sought their approval of non-housing and employment site specific policies; and
- requested the approval for officers to undertake the necessary work to produce a draft plan based on the recommendations of the Executive for the purposes of consultation along with associated technical papers.

Officers gave an update and confirmed the report and appendices made up the Local Plan for York. It included the responses from the preferred sites consultation and also highlighted officers and various external organisations

responses to the future housing and employment needs, including the suitability of sites for future development.

In answer to some Members questions officers confirmed:

- a composite draft Local Plan would be opened for city wide consultation around September 2017 for six weeks. The comments raised would then be considered by the Local Plan Working Group and Executive around January 2018 before submitting it to the Planning Inspectorate around spring 2018, where the examination would take between 6 to 9 months.
- the Plan could be adopted around early 2019 and would set out the Green Belt boundaries for the next 20 years.
- the MOD sites identified for housing would be delivered from 2021 and 2031 and the transport infrastructure would continue to be considered in consultation with Strensall Parish Council.
- they would continue to receive clarity from the MOD regarding their properties being included in the housing stock for York.
- Neighbourhood Plans had to be produced in accordance with an adopted Local Plan.
- Local Plans could be subject to a review every 5 years.

In answer to Members questions regarding site H56, St John's Playing Fields on Windmill Lane the Head of Strategic Planning stated that the site was included in the site selection because Sport England had confirmed that the Haxby Road site provided a replacement for the recreational facilities provided by site H56. The officer felt that this meant the site was acceptable to be included in the Local Plan site selection.

The Assistant Director for Planning and Public Protection also clarified that site H56 would not be removed from the site selection regardless of any negative response received during the Regulation 18 consultation because the site already had planning permission and it would be perverse to remove a site from the Local Plan if it had a planning permission approved.

Following questions the Chair highlighted each recommendation and opened each one for debate where GL

Hearn's draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the housing allocation figures were discussed in great detail with all Members putting forward their views. Some Members stated their dissatisfaction to reject the evidence put forward and felt the housing allocation was underestimated. Further discussions took place around the economic needs for the city and the evidence base to ensure deliverability of the housing allocation of 867 dwellings per year and the desirability to produce a balanced Plan.

The Preferred Sites Consultation was then considered and during debate some Members made the following comments:

- Remove from Table 5 (page 22 of the report), Victoria Farm, Maythorpe and land rear of Rufforth Primary School.
- Consideration to be given to the transport infrastructure around the Boroughbridge Road area when the Civil Service and British Sugar sites were developed.
- Concerns over the size of the development land proposed at ST7.
- Business Parks and employment land should be explored more in the consultation
- Land to the west of Wigginton Road should not be developed.

Members noted that Executive could only delegate to officers and a detail discussion took place regarding delegation of powers to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection, the Leader and Deputy Leader.

The Committee thanked those officers who had worked on the Local Plan and agreed it was a long and complex exercise. Further appreciation was shown to the Head of Strategic Planning and his team.

Resolved: That the LPWG recommend to Executive:

(i) That on the basis of the housing analysis set out in paragraphs 82 - 92 of the report, the increased figure of 867 dwellings per annum, based on the latest revised sub national population and household projections published by the Office for National Statistics and the Department of

Communities and Local Government, be accepted.

That the recommendation prepared by GL Hearn in the draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment, to apply a further 10% to the above figure for market signals (to 953 dwellings per annum), be not accepted on the basis that Hearn's conclusions were speculative and arbitrary, rely too heavily on recent short-term unrepresentative trends and attach little or no weight to the special character and setting of York and other environmental considerations.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

(ii) That the employment land requirement included, arising from the draft ELR Addendum (Annex 2), be considered and agreed as the evidence base upon which the Local Plan should be progressed.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

(iii) That the increased figure to 867 dwellings per annum, be met by the changes to sites within Table 4 (page 21 of the report) and by the following changes to sites from Table 5 (page 22 of the report), the inclusion of Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Imphal Barracks, Nestle South, Grove House and the former Clifton Without Primary School, the deletion of Heworth Green North (H25) and Whiteland Field, Haxby (H54) and the change from a housing site to an employment site of Poppleton Garden Centre. The rest of the changes included in Table 5 should not be included.

That the changes to employment sites highlighted in Table 6 (page 25 of the report) be accepted and to accept the following changes to sites listed in Table 7 (page 25 of the report) – the changes to York Central, the inclusion of Towthorpe Lines and Whitehall Grange, the inclusion of ST19 Land at Northminster Business Park based on the Preferred Sites Consultation (2016) position and the deletion of site ST6 – Land at Grimston Bar. The rest of the changes included in Table 7 should not be included (this refers to the proposed extensions at ST26 and ST27 and two new sites listed).

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be

progressed.

(iv) That the revised policy approach to Gypsy and Traveller provision highlighted within the report and Annex 9 be agreed.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

(v) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader to approve all housing and employment growth related policies (including site specific planning principles) and the non-site related policy modifications at schedule (Annex 7) in accordance with the approved evidence base.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed

(vi) That the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, be delegated to approve changes to the non-site related policy modifications schedule (Annex 7) following the completion of viability work.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

(vii) That following the approval of the evidence base and policy in relation to housing and employment, authority be given to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader to produce a composite draft Local Plan for the purposes of consultation.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

(viii) That the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader be delegated the signing-off of further technical reports and assessments to support the draft Local Plan including, but not limited to the SA/ SEA, Viability Study and Transport Assessment.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

(ix) That the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader be delegate authority to approve a consultation strategy and associated material for the purposes of a city wide consultation starting in September 2017 and to undertake consultation on a composite plan in accordance with that agreed strategy.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.

(x) That the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader be delegate authority to approve a revised Local Development Scheme as per the timetable highlighted in paragraphs 98 to 101 of the report.

That the Leader and Deputy Leader keep Group Leaders informed through Group Leaders meetings.

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed.