
Meeting	Planning Committee
Date	16 February 2017
Present	Councillors Reid (Chair), Derbyshire (Vice-Chair), Boyce, Ayre, Cullwick, Cuthbertson, D'Agorne, Dew, Doughty, Funnell, Galvin, Looker, Richardson, Shepherd and Warters

75. Site Visits

Application	Reason	In Attendance
Proposed Floating Arts Venue, South Esplanade, York (16/01769/FUL)	To allow Members to familiarise themselves with the site which is within a Conservation Area and in the vicinity of listed buildings, following receipt of both objections and support.	Cllrs Boyce, Cullwick, Cuthbertson, D'Agorne, Dew, Galvin and Reid
Rosti Automotive, Stamford Bridge, The Warehouse, Stamford Bridge Road, Dunnington, York (16/02812/FULM)	To allow Members to familiarise themselves with the site which is located in the Green Belt.	Cllrs Boyce, Cullwick, Cuthbertson, D'Agorne, Dew, Galvin and Reid

76. Declarations of Interest

Members were asked to declare, at this point in the meeting, any personal interests, not included on the Register of Interests, or any prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they may have in respect of business on the agenda.

Cllr Derbyshire declared a personal interest in relation to agenda items 4 b) and 4c) (The Guildhall, Coney Street, York) as her employer was a consultee of Historic England in relation to these applications.

Cllr D'Agorne declared a personal interest in relation to agenda item 4a) (Proposed Floating Arts Venue, South Esplanade, York) as he had previously attended events arranged in connection with the Arts Barge.

77. Minutes

Resolved: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 19 January 2017, be approved and then signed by the Chair as a correct record.

78. Public Participation

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on general matters within the remit of the Planning Committee.

79. Plans List

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

80. Proposed Floating Arts Venue, South Esplanade, York (16/01769/FUL)

Members considered a full application by the Arts Barge Project for the mooring of an Ouse Barge converted to create a floating Arts Venue adjacent to Tower Gardens/Skeldergate Bridge.

Officers circulated an update which provided:

- An example of the public access programme for the venue, showing event types and related noise levels provided by the applicant
- Make it York's review of available property in the city
- Officers comments in relation to alternative locations for the barge

- Amended reasons for refusal, to clarify that the public benefits of the development were not considered to outweigh the identified harm to the heritage assets
- Public Realm comments in relation to open space improvements and the re-landscaping of the riverside
- Details of nine third party representations in support
- Cllr Hayes comments in support of the application

Members questioned a number of points in relation to the update including:

- The reasons for refusal and alternative siting
- Had a precedent been set by adjacent cafe?
- Comparisons with other boats moored on the river
- Where the riverbank changed in character from commercial to residential development?

Sarah Doyle spoke, on behalf of local residents, to express their concerns at the impact of the proposals on the amenity of residents, particularly arising from anti-social behaviour and amplified music. She also raised river safety concerns in relation to customers and requested Members to protect the amenity and the character of the conservation area.

Honorary Alderman Brian Watson also raised objections to the proposed mooring of the barge and the dominant effects on the conservation area from the mooring poles and noise pollution.

Jan Dyl spoke as owner of Dyl's Cafe Bar situated adjacent to Skeldergate Bridge. He referred to the impact of the proposals on their family business which would change the ambience and openness of the area, particularly when the river was high. He referred to the effects of noise pollution, litter, late night drinking and river safety issues.

Bob Sydes, spoke as a Heritage Consultant and Research Associate at the University of York with experience in assessing the impact of development on historic buildings. He confirmed his support for the proposals and referred to the benefits of a high quality active river frontage. He considered that the development would not affect the setting or views and that the harm to heritage assets would be moderate.

Jane Gibson, spoke as Make it York Chair, also in support of the application which she felt would make better use of the river and provide a community use for residents and visitors of all

ages. The venue would provide an authentic cultural experience and help to keep the city relevant as a tourist designation and have a positive impact on local businesses.

Cllr Craghill, as one of the Ward Members, also confirmed Cllr Flinders' support for the proposals, which on balance they felt the benefits far outweighed any harm to the area. With the vessel being fully accessible and providing a variety of activities throughout the day, it was felt the proposals would be an asset to the city.

David Spencer, as the applicant's Architect, also spoke in support confirming their proposals for the sensitive restoration of a historic barge to provide a high quality inclusive venue. He stated that the mooring would not be out of character with the area and highlighted that, to provide financial viability, the venue would have low running costs.

In answer to Member questions, Officers and the applicant stated that:

- Whilst a number of alternative sites had been considered for the mooring of the barge, the site at the far side of the bridge was at a point where there was a kink in the river, adjacent to two lines of mature trees and did not allow the level access afforded at the preferred site
- The Environment Agency had been satisfied with the applicants emergency evacuation plans
- The deck housing provided disabled access, an accessible toilet and incorporated a lift to the lower deck
- It was not intended to sell alcohol at all scheduled events
- Officers had been satisfied that the noise levels within the barge were unlikely to result in a loss of amenity for local residents

The Legal Officer reminded Members of their statutory duty, when determining planning applications for developments which would affect a listed building, its setting or the Conservation Area, of their need to attach significant weight to the desirability of preventing harm to the character or appearance of the area or the preservation of the building or its setting when balancing such harm against the public benefits of the proposal,

Some Members supported refusal of the application for the reasons listed in the Officers revised reasons for refusal as they considered that the public benefits would not outweigh the harm caused to the designated heritage assets.

However, other Members felt that the public benefits of the development outweighed the concerns of local residents and the identified harm to the heritage assets. They felt that the venue would support the early evening economy, provide affordable performance space and, with a noise management plan in place, ensure that there was no loss of amenity for nearby residents.

Following further lengthy discussion, Cllr Shepherd moved refusal which was seconded by Cllr Warters for the reasons set out in the Officer update, copy added to online agenda. On being put to the vote this was lost.

Cllr Ayre then moved approval as he felt that the public benefits of the development outweighed the identified harm to the designated heritage assets in the vicinity, which was seconded by Cllr D'Agorne.

Officers outlined a number of conditions for inclusion in any approval which would be formulated by Officers, following the meeting, for subsequent agreement by the Chair and it was

Resolved: That approval be granted subject to delegated authority being granted to Officers to determine the precise wording of the conditions in consultation with the Chair.

Reason: The public benefits of the proposal in creating a permanent venue for the arts barge project in the City Centre outweigh the less than substantial harm to the designated heritage assets of the central historic core and the adjacent listed buildings, even when considerable importance and weight is attached to the desirability of preserving the significance of those heritage assets. Other impacts including the impact upon local residential amenity are considered to be acceptable in planning terms.

**81. The Guildhall, Coney Street, York, YO1 9QN
(16/01971/FULM)**

Consideration was given to a major full application by the City of York Council for the alteration and refurbishment of the Guildhall complex to create conference rooms, meeting rooms and offices, refurbishment and part rebuild of the existing south

range to provide a cafe and ancillary accommodation, and the erection of an extension on the north side of the complex to form a restaurant and office accommodation.

Officers circulated an update which covered both this and the following listed building application which confirmed that:

- Condition 2 required amendment to include a number of plan references
- York Civic Trust had submitted a further response maintaining their objections to the proposals owing to their impact on 10-14 Lendal
- Two further letters of objection received expressing concern in relation to the Guildhall building, specifically the additional opening, the proposed draught lobby and the proposed alterations to the existing screen and dais
- Historic England's supportive comments of the principle of the development subject to a number of points relating to the dais screen and seating, gutter details, glass roof over the southern courtyard and the new porch
- A3 colour plans, diagrams and visualisations of the Guildhall complex were also circulated

Members then questioned a number of points arising from the update, including:

- The reasons behind the delisting of the garages which it was explained had been a statutory process to exclude the 1930's garages from the listing
- Heritage statement and conservation plan for the Guildhall complex; it was confirmed that the statement had formed the basis for initial discussions and had recently been updated, however a conservation plan had not been produced
- Accessibility at both ends of the complex
- During construction and demolition works compliance with the hours of operation to protect local residents
- Security of civic party, which it was confirmed would be assessed as part of the management plan

The Council's Legal Officer reminded Members of their need to consider the planning balance and give significant weight to the importance and preservation of the listed building and its setting and the character and appearance of the conservation area even if the harm to the building was considered less than substantial.

Guy Bowyer, representing the York Conservation Trust, spoke in objection to the scheme, highlighting its impact on the Grade II building at 10-14 Lendal. He referred to the impact of the northern extension and to the affect on the residential amenity of occupants of the flats by virtue of the loss of daylight and the riverside aspect and the loss of privacy by virtue of noise pollution.

Honorary Alderman David Horton, also spoke in objection to the scheme, in particular to the lack of consultation, the demolition of the Mansion House garages and proposed alterations to the dais and formation of a new south side entrance to the Guildhall. He requested Members to reject the current scheme.

Honorary Alderman Brian Watson, also spoke in objection expressing his concern at the current scheme for the complex. He felt that the proposals would not enhance the Guildhall, in particular his concerns regarding proposals for the dais, the new access and the removal of the garages from the Guildhall Yard.

David Ruddock, a local resident spoke of his interest in the works and to his objection to the scheme, particularly the details provided for the additional doorway from the Guildhall and the loss of the existing dais and screen.

David Fraser, spoke as Chief Executive of the York Civic Trust to confirm the Trust's involvement from the inception development and to express his support for earlier proposals. He referred however to the number of drawing variations since December which the Trust had had insufficient time to consider which meant that the Trust were therefore unable to support the current application.

David Warburton spoke as the Council's Project Manager on the Guildhall project confirming his involvement in the project since 2013. He referred to the deterioration of the current complex and the need for updating and reuse of the building whilst also retaining its civic use and provide security for the future of the complex. He referred to ongoing discussions and management arrangements to cover the usage of the space and operational links with the Guildhall and Mansion House.

Members went on to raise a number of questions in relation to the earlier speakers' comments, including:

- The consultation undertaken on the various schemes

- Withdrawal of support from the Civic Trust
- Details of the design of the new screen and its prevention of noise
- Catering for large events
- Operational use of the Guildhall Yard
- Accessible access

Aidan Ridyard addressed the Committee as the lead Architect for the project referring to the unique building and the need for continuity of the civic function whilst providing a flexible modern workplace. He outlined the various uses proposed including the provision of a civic and event space within the central section of the building which would revitalise the site.

Charles Storr spoke as Business Growth Manager at Make it York referring to the central location of the building and its current underuse. He confirmed Make it York's support for the development and the provision of high quality office space for which there was a strong demand from small businesses.

Members questioned a number of additional points including:

- Disabled access to all areas
- Vertical orientation of windows in the first floor cafe area
- Creation of the new lobby area at the entrance to the Guildhall
- Assurances regarding demand for office space
- Importance of finding a long term future for the building
- Affect on amenity of future residents in Lendal
- Concerns regarding garaging of Lord Mayor's vehicles on site
- Design should be based on a Planning Brief developed with key stakeholder
- Availability of rooms prior to future Council meetings

Following further lengthy discussion Cllr Galvin moved refusal, which was seconded by Cllr Shepherd on the grounds of:

- Harm to a listed building with the insertion of a doorway in the southern wall
- Harm to the Guildhall with the removal of the dais
- Removal of the garages which have a use by future Lord Mayors
- Harm caused by reasons of overlooking of 10-14 Lendal

On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

Cllr Galvin then moved and Cllr Richardson seconded the inclusion, in any approval, of a condition to state that the garages should not be demolished until such time as a cafe operator had been appointed. On being put to the vote this motion was also lost.

Cllr Reid then moved the Officer recommendation for approval subject to the updated list of conditions and revision of the informative relating to the management arrangements for the usage of the Guildhall Yard, which was seconded by Cllr Cuthbertson and on being put to the vote it was

Resolved: That subject to the expiry of the consultation period in relation to the amended plans and no new planning issues being raised, delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection to approve the application subject to the conditions listed in the report and the following amended conditions and informative:

Amended Condition 2.

AL(0)0100.P1

AL(0)0101.P2 Block Plan

AL(0)1000.P1 Proposed Roof Plan in Context

AL(0)1200.P3 Proposed Site Plan

AL(0)1300.P8 Proposed Basement Plan

AL(0)1310.P4 Proposed Basement Plan - Referenced

AL(0)1400.P16 Proposed Ground Floor Plan

AL(0)1410.P9 Proposed Ground Floor Plan - Referenced

AL(0)1500.P11 Proposed First Floor Plan

AL(0)1510.P5 Proposed First Floor Plan - Referenced

AL(0)1600.P14 Proposed Second Floor Plan

AL(0)1610.P7 Proposed Second Floor Plan - Referenced

AL(0)1700.P14 Proposed Tower Plan

AL(0)1710.P7 Proposed Tower Plan – Referenced

AL(0)1900.P11 Proposed River Front Elevation

AL(0)1901.P9 Proposed North Annexe Elevation From Boat Yard

AL(0)1903.P6 Proposed River Front Elevation In Context

AL(0)1910.P8 Proposed South Range Elevation From Revs Bar

AL(0)1911.P7 Proposed Guildhall Elevation From Common Hall Yard

AL(0)1950.P8 Proposed Section AA - North Range

AL(0)1952.P5 Proposed Section CC - Secondary Entrance

AL(0)1953.P7 Proposed Section DD - South Range

Café/entrance

AL(0)1954.P10 Proposed Section EE 1 (north)

AL(0)1955.P8 Proposed Section EE 2 (south)

AL(0)1956.P4 Proposed Section FF

AL(0)1960.P7 Proposed Section JJ - Council Chamber

AL(0)1963.P11 Proposed Section MM - Restaurant

AL(0)1964.P9 Proposed Section NN - North Annexe From
Lendal

AL(10)0301.P4 Proposed Basement Demolition Plan: North

AL(10)0302.P4 Proposed Basement Demolition Plan: South

AL(10)0401.P4 Proposed Ground Floor Demolition Plan: North

AL(10)0402.P6 Proposed Ground Floor Demolition Plan: South

AL(10)0501.P5 Proposed First Floor Demolition Plan: North

AL(10)0502.P4 Proposed First Floor Demolition Plan: South

AL(10)0601.P4 Proposed Second Floor Demolition Plan: North

AL(10)0602.P4 Proposed Second Floor Demolition Plan: South

AL(10)0701.P4 Proposed Tower Demolition Plan

AL(10)0801.P4 Proposed Roof Demolition Plan

AL(80)1300.P4 Proposed Basement Fire Strategy Plan

AL(80)1301.P4 Proposed Basement Fire Strategy Plan: North

AL(80)1302.P4 Proposed Basement Fire Strategy Plan: South

AL(80)1400.P5 Proposed Ground Floor Fire Strategy Plan

AL(80)1401.P4 Proposed Ground Floor Fire Strategy Plan:
North

AL(80)1402.P5 Proposed Ground Floor Fire Strategy Plan:
South

AL(80)1500.P4 Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan

AL(80)1501.P4 Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan: North

AL(80)1502.P4 Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan: South

AL(80)1600.P4 Proposed Second Floor Fire Strategy Plan

AL(80)1601.P4 Proposed Second Floor Fire Strategy Plan:
North

AA(0)0100.P1 Proposed South Range WC Block Wall Detail

AA(0)0102.P1 Proposed Guildhall Glazed Draught Lobby
Details

AA(0)0103.P1 Proposed Guildhall & South Range Seating
Details

AA(0)0104.P1 Proposed Guildhall & South Range Entrance
Details

AA(0)0104A.P1 Proposed Guildhall & South Range Alternative

AA(0)0105.P1 Proposed Guildhall & South Range Slype Details

AA(0)0106.P1 Proposed South Range Café Window Details

AA(0)0107.P1 Proposed Benching Details

AA(0)0108.P2 Proposed Council Chamber Details

AA(0)0113.P3 Proposed River Terrace Balustrade Details

Additional Condition to replace Informative:

Prior to the commencement of internal refurbishment works a detailed management plan to include arrangements for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles (including delivery vehicles, provision for Mansion House associated parking within the Guildhall yard and the servicing of functions taking place within the complex) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thenceforth be undertaken in strict accordance with the terms of the management plan.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the Central Historic Core Conservation Area, the significance of this complex of historic assets, and to safeguard the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

Reason: Having attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of avoiding the harms identified to the heritage assets, it is considered that the increased degree of public usage of the complex together with the on-going investment to secure a viable economic use would constitute a substantial public benefit that would clearly outweigh these harms. The other impacts identified including the impact upon the amenity of adjacent existing and future occupiers, flood risk, and ecological impact are considered to have been satisfactorily addressed as to be acceptable in Planning terms.

82. The Guildhall, Coney Street, York, YO1 9QN (16/01972/LBC)

Consideration was given to an application for Listed Building Consent, by the City of York Council, for the alteration and refurbishment of the Guildhall complex to create conference rooms, meeting rooms and office, refurbishment and part rebuild of existing south range to provide a cafe and ancillary accommodation, and erection of an extension on the north side of the complex to form a restaurant and office accommodation.

The Officer update and speakers listed under application 16/01971/FULM above also refer to this application.

Resolved: That subject to the expiry of the consultation period in relation to the amended plans and no new planning issues being raised, delegated authority be

given to the Assistant Director of Planning and Public Protection to approve the application subject to the conditions listed in the report and the following amended condition:

Amended Condition 2.

AL(0)0100.P1

AL(0)0101.P2 Block Plan

AL(0)1000.P1 Proposed Roof Plan in Context

AL(0)1200.P3 Proposed Site Plan

AL(0)1300.P8 Proposed Basement Plan

AL(0)1310.P4 Proposed Basement Plan - Referenced

AL(0)1400.P16 Proposed Ground Floor Plan

AL(0)1410.P9 Proposed Ground Floor Plan - Referenced

AL(0)1500.P11 Proposed First Floor Plan

AL(0)1510.P5 Proposed First Floor Plan - Referenced

AL(0)1600.P14 Proposed Second Floor Plan

AL(0)1610.P7 Proposed Second Floor Plan - Referenced

AL(0)1700.P14 Proposed Tower Plan

AL(0)1710.P7 Proposed Tower Plan – Referenced

AL(0)1900.P11 Proposed River Front Elevation

AL(0)1901.P9 Proposed North Annexe Elevation From Boat Yard

AL(0)1903.P6 Proposed River Front Elevation In Context

AL(0)1910.P8 Proposed South Range Elevation From Revs Bar

AL(0)1911.P7 Proposed Guildhall Elevation From Common Hall Yard

AL(0)1950.P8 Proposed Section AA - North Range

AL(0)1952.P5 Proposed Section CC - Secondary Entrance

AL(0)1953.P7 Proposed Section DD - South Range Café/entrance

AL(0)1954.P10 Proposed Section EE 1 (north)

AL(0)1955.P8 Proposed Section EE 2 (south)

AL(0)1956.P4 Proposed Section FF

AL(0)1960.P7 Proposed Section JJ - Council Chamber

AL(0)1963.P11 Proposed Section MM - Restaurant

AL(0)1964.P9 Proposed Section NN - North Annexe From Lendal

AL(10)0301.P4 Proposed Basement Demolition Plan: North

AL(10)0302.P4 Proposed Basement Demolition Plan: South

AL(10)0401.P4 Proposed Ground Floor Demolition Plan: North

AL(10)0402.P6 Proposed Ground Floor Demolition Plan: South

AL(10)0501.P5 Proposed First Floor Demolition Plan: North

AL(10)0502.P4 Proposed First Floor Demolition Plan: South

AL(10)0601.P4 Proposed Second Floor Demolition Plan: North

AL(10)0602.P4 Proposed Second Floor Demolition Plan: South
AL(10)0701.P4 Proposed Tower Demolition Plan
AL(10)0801.P4 Proposed Roof Demolition Plan
AL(80)1300.P4 Proposed Basement Fire Strategy Plan
AL(80)1301.P4 Proposed Basement Fire Strategy Plan: North
AL(80)1302.P4 Proposed Basement Fire Strategy Plan: South
AL(80)1400.P5 Proposed Ground Floor Fire Strategy Plan
AL(80)1401.P4 Proposed Ground Floor Fire Strategy Plan:
North
AL(80)1402.P5 Proposed Ground Floor Fire Strategy Plan:
South
AL(80)1500.P4 Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan
AL(80)1501.P4 Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan: North
AL(80)1502.P4 Proposed First Floor Fire Strategy Plan: South
AL(80)1600.P4 Proposed Second Floor Fire Strategy Plan
AL(80)1601.P4 Proposed Second Floor Fire Strategy Plan:
North
AA(0)0100.P1 Proposed South Range WC Block Wall Detail
AA(0)0102.P1 Proposed Guildhall Glazed Draught Lobby
Details
AA(0)0103.P1 Proposed Guildhall & South Range Seating
Details
AA(0)0104.P1 Proposed Guildhall & South Range Entrance
Details
AA(0)0104A.P1 Proposed Guildhall & South Range Alternative
AA(0)0105.P1 Proposed Guildhall & South Range Slype Details
AA(0)0106.P1 Proposed South Range Café Window Details
AA(0)0107.P1 Proposed Benching Details
AA(0)0108.P2 Proposed Council Chamber Details
AA(0)0113.P3 Proposed River Terrace Balustrade Details

Reason: The scheme envisages the provision of a range of uses that would increase public interest in and usage of the site as well as affording a significant degree of investment that would secure the future of the site. It is felt this would amount to a substantial public benefit. Having attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of avoiding the less than substantial harms identified to the listed building complex, it is concluded that these harms are clearly outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal.

83. Rosti Automotive, Stamford Bridge, The Warehouse, Stamford Bridge Road, Dunnington, York (16/02812/FULM)

Members considered a major full application by Rosti Automotive Stamford Bridge, for an extension to an existing warehouse.

Officers circulated details of a substitute informative, in respect of the construction proposals for the site, relating to hours of work, deliveries, noise, plant and machinery, bonfires and contamination, for inclusion in the suggested conditions.

Members requested that the landscaping condition should be applied to the lifetime of the development rather than for a period of five years.

David Bolton, the applicant's agent, spoke in support of the application, acknowledging the site's Green Belt location and their submission of a case for 'very special circumstances' which sought to outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt. He confirmed that the facility was a key site in the Jaguar supply chain supporting 400 local jobs and had provided local investment of £5m. He also confirmed acceptance of the suggested alteration to the landscaping condition if permission was granted.

Following further discussion it was

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report and the following amended Condition and Informative:

Amended Condition 5

No development shall take place above foundation level until there has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a detailed landscaping scheme which shall illustrate the number, species, height and position of trees, shrubs and hard landscaping. This scheme shall be implemented within a period of six months of the completion of the development. Any trees or plants which within the lifetime of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless alternatives are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Informative:

The developer's attention should also be drawn to the following which should be attached to any planning approval as an informative.

1. All demolition and construction works and ancillary operations, including deliveries to and dispatch from the site shall be confined to the following hours:
Monday to Friday 08.00 to 18.00
Saturday 09.00 to 13.00
Not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
2. The work shall be carried out in such a manner so as to comply with the general recommendations of British Standards BS 5228-1:2009 + A1:2014 and BS 5228-2:2009 + A1:2014, a code of practice for "Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites".
3. Best practicable means shall be employed at all times in order to minimise noise, vibration, dust, odour and light emissions.
4. All plant and machinery to be operated, sited and maintained in order to minimise disturbance. All items of machinery powered by internal combustion engines must be properly silenced and/or fitted with effective and well-maintained mufflers in accordance with manufacturers instructions.
5. There shall be no bonfires on the site.
6. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, the findings must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. In such cases, an investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and where remediation (clean-up) is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Should City of York Council become aware at a later date

of suspect contaminated materials which have not been reported as described above, the council may consider taking action under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Reason: The facility is an intermediate component storage facility for a major motor component manufacturer who has a long running supply contract with Jaguar/Land Rover in the West Midlands. For an intermediate storage facility there are very specific locational requirements in terms of relationship to the host manufacturing site and the strategic highway network. At the same time the applicant has provided detailed information to demonstrate that the proposed extension to the facility could not reasonably be accommodated at either of the two local manufacturing plants and a detailed site search exercise which demonstrates that no other suitable non-Green Belt sites are available. It is felt that subject to appropriate landscaping the impact of the proposal upon the local landscape would be minimal and that the provision of the extension would safeguard local employment in the area. Having attached substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt in the overall planning balance, it is considered that the considerations set out above in support of the proposal are of sufficient weight to clearly outweigh all the harms identified so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify an exception to Green Belt policy in this case.

Cllr A Reid, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 9.10 pm].