

---

MEETING	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP
DATE	4 DECEMBER 2006
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS REID (CHAIR), HORTON, HYMAN, LIVESLEY (AS SUBSTITUTE FOR R WATSON), MACDONALD, MERRETT, SIMPSON-LAING AND WALLER
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS D'AGORNE AND R WATSON

---

## **22. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

No interests were declared.

## **23. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Local Development Framework Working Group meeting held on 7 November 2006 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record, with the following amendment:

- (i) To delete the words “and that they cannot represent residents’ views at these meetings” from point (ix) of Part Three of Appendix 1.

## **24. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council’s Public Participation Scheme.

## **25. COMMUTED SUM PAYMENTS FOR OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS**

Members received a report which sought comments on a revised approach towards implementing policy L1c (Provision of New Open Space in Development), with regard to commuted sum payments towards open space provision in new developments, and asked them to consider a more structured commuted sum payments process for use in considering planning applications for residential and employment, retail and leisure uses where appropriate.

The report presented two options for consideration:

- Option 1 – to approve a set of commuted sum payment figures, attached at Annex B of the report, for use with policy L1c;

- Option 2 – to continue calculating commuted sum payment figures on a site by site basis.

A schedule was circulated setting out the figures used to build up the costs for open space provision in the City of York. Members requested that a further breakdown be provided at Planning Committee, indicating equipment and labour costs and clarifying that land costs were not included. With regards to the cost per square metre of the play area at Holgate Park, Members suggested that the figure should be recalculated using the area of the play area, rather than that of the whole park.

Members proposed a number of amendments to the text accompanying the figures in Annex B, as detailed below.

**RECOMMENDED:** That Planning Committee be recommended to approve the commuted sum payment figures shown in Annex B of the report to support the application of policy L1c of the 4<sup>th</sup> Set of Changes to the City of York Local Plan, subject to the following amendments to the accompanying text:

- (i) To remove the words “in most situations” at the beginning of the second paragraph on residential developments and instead refer to developments of less than 10 dwellings and more than 10 dwellings where there is not enough space to meet open space requirements on site, as set out in policy L1c;
- (ii) To the heading of the table to clarify that the commuted sum required per dwelling excludes the land cost element;
- (iii) To the footnote to the table to clarify that the prices will be increased annually in line with the Building Costs Information Service Tender Price Index each April;
- (iv) To clarify that inflation to the time of payment must be added to the figures.

**REASON:** To give a degree of certainty and accountability regarding the Council’s approach towards requiring commuted sum payments for open space.

**26. INFORMATION REPORT - THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECENT DECISIONS OF THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE ON THE CORE STRATEGIES OF STAFFORD AND LICHFIELD**

Members received a report which advised them on the content of the recent reports by the Planning Inspectorate on the Core Strategies produced by Stafford Borough and Lichfield District Councils and the need

to reflect these decisions in the production of York's Local Development Framework (LDF).

The report explained that following public examination both Core Strategies had been found to be unsound. The Inspectors considered that the defects were so severe that re-wording would not address the problems and that both documents should be withdrawn, effectively forcing the authorities to go back to the first stage of document production, the 'Issues and Options' stage. Paragraphs 8-14 of the report highlighted the key points made by the Inspectorate.

Officers were carefully considering the lessons to be learned from the experience of these two authorities and monitoring the progression of other Core Strategies through the planning process to gain a good understanding of what was likely to lead to a successful plan. In addition they were seeking further professional advice to ensure that York's LDF was developed in the most appropriate way.

Officers also reported that South Cambridgeshire District Council and East Hams Council had had their Core Strategies approved and that they were therefore also looking to learn from their experiences too.

**RECOMMENDED:** That the recent decisions of the Planning Inspectorate on the Core Strategies produced by Stafford Borough and Lichfield District Councils and the potential implications for the City of York be noted.

**REASON:** To ensure York's LDF reflects these decisions.

**27. CITY OF YORK COUNCIL ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT FOR 2005/2006**

Members received a report which sought their views on the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) prior to sending it to the Secretary of State in December 2006.

The draft AMR was attached as Annex A of the report.

Officers reported that paragraph 6.5 of the AMR was to be amended to give all figures in kilometres and square kilometres. They also confirmed that if more up to date figures became available prior to submission of the AMR to the Secretary of State, then they would be included at the appropriate places within the document.

**RECOMMENDED:** (i) That the suggested amendments on the content of the AMR set out below be considered by officers:

- a) To use Plain English in the document, particularly the Executive Summary, to ensure it is understandable to members of the public, and to illustrate figures in tables

or charts rather than detailing them in text (eg: paragraph 1.9);

- b) To highlight key points from all sections of the document in the Executive Summary, not just housing and employment;
  - c) To make the summary table of core output indicators easier to understand, possibly by providing a user guide or glossary;
  - d) To include references to the draft Housing Market Assessment;
  - e) To point (iv) in the table at paragraph 5.23 to explain where the annual net additional requirement figure comes from;
  - f) To Figure 5.2 to ensure that it could be clearly understood when printed in black and white;
  - g) To paragraph 5.42 to clarify that the Third Set of Changes to the Local Plan *proposed* to increase the level of affordable housing to 50%;
  - h) To paragraph 5.76 to clarify that Members always considered the Environment Agency's advice carefully, even when they approved applications contrary to this advice;
  - i) To paragraph 6.60 to rephrase and clarify the information therein.
- (ii) That the making of any changes to the document that are necessary as a result of these comments be delegated to the Director of City Strategy and the Executive Member and Opposition Spokesperson for City Strategy.

REASON:

- (i) So that the report can be progressed through to submission to the Secretary of State.
- (ii) So that changes resulting from the comments at the meeting can be made and the report be submitted by the required deadline.

COUNCILLOR A REID

Chair

The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 5.45 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank