
MEETING	PLANNING COMMITTEE
DATE	6 JULY 2006
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS R WATSON (CHAIR), CUTHBERTSON, HORTON, JAMIESON-BALL, LIVESLEY, MACDONALD, MOORE, REID, SIMPSON-LAING, I WAUDBY, M WAUDBY AND B WATSON
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS BARTLETT, BLANCHARD, HILL, HYMAN, SMALLWOOD AND WILDE

7. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

At this point Members were asked to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they had in the business on this agenda. No interests were declared.

8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there were no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on agenda items or items within the remit of the committee.

9. PLANS LIST

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

a. **Site Covered By Properties 1 To 7 And 15 To 22, Bleachfield, Heslington (06/00826/FULM)**

Members considered an full application, submitted by University of York, for the demolition of university staff houses and erection of six student residences, comprising 3 x three storey and 3 x four storey blocks with associated utility building, parking and landscaping (revised scheme). (Ref: 06/00826/FULM).

An update was provided by Officers as follows:

- The site address should be '2-22 Bleachfield', as according to the site boundary defined on the submitted plans.
- Condition 7 – insert requirement 'to implement in accordance with the approved method statement'.
- Conditions 11-14 should be amended to a single condition as follows:

11. A site investigation shall be undertaken based upon the findings of the desk study.
 - a. The investigation shall be carried out in accordance with BS10175: Investigation of potentially contaminated land: code of practice. The results of the investigation shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing prior to any development commencing on the site.
 - b. A risk-based remedial strategy (which shall have due regard for UK adopted policy on risk assessment and shall be developed in full consultation with the appropriate regulator(s)) shall be developed based on the findings of the site investigation. The remedial strategy shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The approved strategy shall be fully implemented prior to any development commencing on site.
 - c. A validation report shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority, detailing sample locations and contaminant concentrations prior to any development commencing on site.
 - d. Any contamination detected during site works that has not been considered within the remedial strategy shall be reported to the local planning authority. Any remediation for this contamination shall be agreed with the local planning authority and fully implemented prior to any further development of the site.
 - e. A timetable of proposed remedial works shall be submitted to the local planning authority prior to any works being undertaken on site.

Reason: To protect the health and safety of workers on site and residents of the proposed dwellings, and to ensure the integrity of construction materials.

- Conditions 15-27 – following the deletion of conditions 12, 13 and 14, conditions 15 onwards will need renumbering.
- Condition 27 (as numbered in the report) – the last words of this conditions should read ‘by the local planning authority’.
- It was reported that a further letter of objection had been received from a resident of Heworth Green. Copies were circulated.

Representation were made in objection to the proposal on the grounds of loss of amenity, loss of design quality and lack of sustainability. Representations were made in support by the Agent for the Applicant.

Members clarified that there were recycling facilities and these were located in the communal kitchens. Such provision was University policy. Members queried about accommodation for disabled students, and requested a condition, if the application was approved, to ensure there was a parking space for each disabled students who could be accommodated on the site. It was requested that Officers slightly reword condition 7, so the list of prohibited activities in paragraph three was clear. Members requested a condition, if the application was approved, to ensure a travel plan was in place for students arriving and leaving the site at each end of the terms.

Some Members supported the application and the increase in on-site good quality university accommodation.

Some Members raised concerns about design of the buildings and context. Some Members also raised concerns about disabled access to the buildings and the lost family accommodation.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON:

In its simplistic block layout and massing, and repetitive, unrefined architectural design, the scheme fails to achieve the standards required by Policy ED6 of the Draft Development Control Local Plan (incorporating the 4th set of changes) which states that new development should be of a high standard of design appropriate to the setting of the University. In particular the scheme fails to respond to the special landscape character of the site which is intrinsic to the identity of the University Campus, and thereby does not meet criteria set out in the Council's Development Brief for the Heslington Campus. In addition the unsympathetic site planning and design are inappropriate to the 'gateway' context of the site, such that overall the proposal is in conflict with PPS 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) which states that design which is inappropriate to context and fails to take opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted.

COUNCILLOR R WATSON
Chair

The meeting started at 4.40 pm and finished at 5.55 pm.