

---

Meeting	Planning Committee
Date	12 May 2016
Present	Councillors Derbyshire (Vice-Chair, in the Chair), Galvin, S Barnes, Boyce, Cullwick, Cuthbertson, D'Agorne, Dew, Doughty, Funnell, Richardson, Shepherd, Warters and Hunter (as a Substitute for Cllr Reid)
Apologies	Councillors Reid and Ayre

---

### 97. Site Visits

Application	Reason	In Attendance
Plot 1B, White Rose Close, Nether Poppleton	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve	Cllrs Boyce, Cullwick, Dew, Galvin, Hunter, Richardson and Shepherd
Harewood Whin, Tinker Lane, Rufforth	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve	Cllrs Boyce, Cullwick, Dew, Galvin, Hunter, Richardson and Shepherd
York Racecourse	For Members to familiarise themselves with the site.	Cllrs Boyce, Cullwick, Dew, Galvin, Hunter, Richardson and Shepherd
Former Fire Station	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve	Cllrs Boyce, Cullwick, Dew, Galvin, Hunter, Richardson and Shepherd

### 98. Declarations of Interest

At this point in the meeting, members were asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or pecuniary interests they may have in the business on the agenda.

Cllr D'Agorne declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to plans item 4f (Fire Station, 18 Clifford Street) as a city of York council representative on the Fire Authority. He left the room during discussion of this item and did not take part in the vote on this application.

Cllr Richardson declared personal and prejudicial interest in plans item 4d (Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane, Upper Poppleton) as a member of the Foss Internal Drainage Board. He also declared a personal and prejudicial interest in relation to plans item 4f (Fire Station, 18 Clifford Street) as a City of York Council representative and Vice Chair on the Fire Authority. He left the room during consideration of both items and did not take part in the vote on either application.

#### **99. Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the last meeting held on 21 April 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

#### **100. Public Participation**

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

#### **101. Plans List**

Members then considered the following reports of the Assistant Director (Development Services, Planning and Regeneration) relating to the following planning applications, which outlined the proposals and relevant planning considerations and set out the views of the consultees and officers.

#### **102. Yorwaste, Harewood Whin, Tinker Lane, Rufforth, York (16/00635/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Yorwaste Ltd for the variation of condition 1 (removal by 31 December 2017) of

planning permission 12/01378/FUL for compost pad extension to allow retention and continued use until 31<sup>st</sup> December 2030.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Reason: The existing composting pad has not exceeded its 70,000 tonne capacity during the period of operation and there has been no material change in planning circumstances over that period. The odour management plan has also been effective in dealing with the management of the composting process and any potential sources of nuisance. The proposed retention of the compost pad would comply with the requirements of paragraph 90 of the National Planning Policy Framework and would not give rise to any harm to the open character of the Green Belt. As such the proposal is felt to be acceptable in Green Belt terms.

**103. Yorwaste, Harewood Whin, Tinker Lane, Rufforth, York (16/00357/FULM)**

Members considered a major full application by Yorwaste Ltd for the construction of a waste transfer station with associated ancillary buildings, hard-standings, car parking and alterations to access.

Officers advised that since the committee report had been prepared, a further 18 letters of representation had been received, objecting to the development if the proposed access alterations to the junction of Tinker Lane with the B1224 Wetherby Road were not carried out as envisaged; on the grounds of the significant impact upon the amenity of residents within Rufforth village caused by the passage of heavy goods vehicles associated with the site.

Highways Officers noted that a detailed Stage One Safety Audit had been submitted although further details were required by conditions to achieve a satisfactory solution in respect of the proposed junction improvements.

The Flood Risk Management Team had stated that having carried out an assessment of the submitted details it had no

objections and was content that recommended Condition 20 would source proper drainage details.

Officers advised the committee that the applicant had asked for omission of condition 22 relating a BREAMM assessment and requiring a very good rating. The architect and a BREEAM Assessor stated that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to apply BREEAM to a Waste Transfer Station as many of the points did not apply, and those that did were largely covered by separate planning conditions.

Officers responded that it was recognised that the structure was effectively an enclosed, unlit and unheated space (similar to agricultural buildings that are exempt from Part L of the Building Regulations and not subject BREEAM assessment). Officers had therefore requested that a high-level completed BREEAM pre-estimator assessment be undertaken by a qualified assessor, to show what level (if any) can be achieved. This could not be undertaken prior to Committee, and so officers suggested that delegated authority be granted in respect of the amendment or deletion of the condition, depending on the outcome of the assessment condition. They therefore advised that the recommendation had been updated and they were now advising deferral of the scheme for completion of high level pre-estimator BREEAM assessment and completion of the 106 Agreement and then seeking delegated authority to grant permission with amended conditions from the highway authority and amended or deleted condition 22.

Mr P Rawlings, Chairman of the Neighbourhood Planning Group for Rufforth and Knapton addressed the committee. He reminded members of the history of the site, He noted that Harewood Whin had been identified in both the Waste and Mineral Joint Plan and the draft local plan as a strategic site for waste management but reminded members that it was in the greenbelt and therefore inappropriate for development unless special circumstances could be proved. He advised members that the Neighbourhood and Planning Group had resolved to work with Yorwaste to reach a solution which met the strategic needs whilst minimising the effects on the community. He addressed the policies of the emerging neighbourhood plan which set out certain criteria. He stated that physical alterations to the site should be made to stop lorries travelling to the site coming through Rufforth to/from Allerton Park and expressed the view that the alterations as proposed by Yorwaste, and

backed up the a 106 agreement, would protect the green belt around the site.

Mrs Anne Powell, Chair of Rufforth with Knapton Parish Council then advised the committee that Rufforth residents were extremely concerned about the number of HGVs who regularly used the main road through the village explaining that there were a number of narrow footpaths which caused concern for parents walking with young children. She noted that the proposed revisions to the site access and exit road were not shown on the most recent revised site plan. She stated that the parish council strongly opposed any further development on the site until the promised realignment of site entrance had been completed.

Officers explained that the site entrance would be altered to physically prevent HGVs turning right out of the site towards the village of Rufforth and thereby forcing them to turn left in the direction of the ring road. CCTV monitoring of the site entrance had been identified as the best option to prevent vehicles from travelling through Rufforth to reach the site which would be controlled through section 106 agreement.

Members agreed that it was important to make the site as good as possible for local residents. They did however express concern about the enforcement of preventing HGVs from accessing the site through Rufforth Village and suggested that CCTV footage could be shared if issues arose in the future.

Geoff Derham, Group Operations Director for Yorwaste, confirmed that it was currently their policy, which was strictly adhered to, that any driver driving through Rufforth without prior consent and notified to the parish council, would be treated as a disciplinary offence. He advised that Yorwaste had proposed the physical layout changes to the junction at their cost and that they had also proposed to the parish council that they made changes to the signage at Allerton Park to prevent vehicles from driving through Rufforth Village. He advised that they would continue with driver management and that, once Allerton Park was open, 95% of vehicles would be within their direct control. He confirmed that Yorwaste had a good relationship with both the Planning Group and the Parish Council.

Members felt that the Pre-estimator BREAMM assessment was not needed and advised that this proposed condition be removed.

**Resolved:** That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Planning and Regeneration (in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Planning Committee) to approve the application subject to:

i Satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure:-

1. Agreement not to implement planning permission ref: 12/00908/FULM
2. The remaining land between the application site and the B1224 Wetherby Road remaining free from built development
3. Provision of an off road cycle route along the site frontage
4. CCTV control of the site access and

ii The conditions listed in the report, the additional conditions listed below and the deletion of condition 22 – BREAMM assessment.

#### Additional Condition

Within 3 months of planning permission being granted, detailed highway engineering drawings showing modifications to the junction of Height Lands Lane and B1224 Rufforth Road shall be submitted to the council. Such details shall incorporate measures to direct HGV traffic associated with the development to only undertake left turns from Height Lands Lane to B1224. The scheme will include any necessary traffic management, street lighting and CCTV.

Prior to the development hereby approved being brought into use the modified highway junction shall have been completed in accordance with the drawings which have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety and residential amenity.

#### Additional Condition

A full 3 Stage Road Safety Audit carried out in accordance with advice contained within the DMRB HD19/94 or equivalent and guidance issued by the council, shall be required for the modification works to the junction of Height Lands Lane and B1224 Rufforth Road which seek to incorporate measures to direct HGV traffic associated with the development to only undertake left turns from Height Lands Lane to B1224. A Stage 1 of the Road Safety Audit shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing on site.

Reason: To minimise the road safety risks associated with the changes imposed by the development.

#### **104. York Racecourse, Racecourse Road, Knavesmire, York, YO23 1EJ (15/02733/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by the Racecourse for the construction of a single lane service road adjacent to the racing surface.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

Reason: With regard to S72 and S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the proposal does not cause any harm to either the adjacent Conservations Areas or the setting of listed buildings. The application site is within the general extent of the Green Belt. The proposal constitutes inappropriate development for the purposes of paragraph 88 of the NPPF, and by definition causes harm to the Green Belt. The road would result in harm to the openness and permanence of the Green Belt. Cumulatively the safety and recovery of riders and horses, the economic benefits to the city, the limited visual impact on the Knavesmire, the absence of any harm to the adjacent Conservation Areas and the absence of any harm to the setting of

the listed building are considered to amount to 'very special circumstances' to clearly outweigh the definitional harm to the openness and permanence of the greenbelt and any other harm, even when substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt.

**105. Poppleton Garden Centre, Northfield Lane, Upper Poppleton, York, YO26 6QF (16/00878/FUL)**

Members considered a (retrospective) full application by Mr Ian Woods for the part use of the car park as a mobile storage unit for public use for bulk re sale or recycling of clothing, shoes and clothing accessories.

Officers advised the committee that there was an existing car wash and canopy adjacent to the proposed site, which did not have planning permission and was subject to a planning enforcement investigation.

Mr Ian Woods, the applicant, addressed the committee in support of the application. He advised that Smart Recycling allowed members of the public to recycle clothes for a cash reward. Employment would be provided for two people and would benefit York's economy. He advised that the location was sustainable with the Park and Ride scheme opposite, which in itself was a prominent building, and an established garden centre and car park. He advised members that there had been no public objections to the proposals.

Members noted that officers found the proposals to be harmful to the greenbelt and that very special circumstances needed to be demonstrated which outweighed the harm caused to the greenbelt.

Members acknowledged that if the applicant wished to put forward proposals to move the storage unit to a less prominent position in the car park which was further away from the footpath and the A59 then this would need to be considered through a new application.

Members agreed that the proposals constituted inappropriate development in the greenbelt and that very special circumstances had not been shown to justify the proposals.



They also agreed that the proposals would be unduly prominent and intrusive and would cause harm to the visual amenity and open character of the area and the setting of the A59 transport corridor.

Resolved: That delegated authority be given to the Assistant Director of Development Services, Planning and Regeneration (in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee) to refuse the application following the conclusion of the statutory consultation period, subject to no new material planning considerations being raised within any consultation responses during this period, due to end on 16 May 2016

Reason: The proposal conflicts with the essential characteristics of Green Belts (their openness and their permanence) and the purposes of including land within the Green Belt by resulting in encroachment of development into the countryside, the sprawl, merging and coalescence of development; and is harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The considerations put forward by the applicant do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and other harm (harm to visual amenity and character of the A59 transport corridor) when substantial weight is given to the harm to the Green Belt. As such very special circumstances do not exist to justify the proposal. The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy YH9 of the Yorkshire and Humber Plan and also conflict with Draft Development Control Local Plan (2005) policy GB1: Development in the Green Belt.

In addition the proposed change of use of the land and the modular unit, by virtue of its location adjacent to a junction on the A59 transport corridor, would be unduly prominent and intrusive in the streetscene in addition to creating a cluttered appearance. As such the proposed development would fail to respect the character of the area and cause harm to the visual amenity and open character and therefore would conflict with Policy SP3 and GP1 of the City of York Council

Development Control Local Plan (2005) and contrary to the core principles and part 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**106. Plot 1B - Call Centre, White Rose Close, Nether Poppleton, York (16/00179/FULM)**

Members considered a major full application by Mr Andrew Hodgson for the erection of a motor vehicle dealership with associated vehicle parking and display.

Officers advised that since the committee report had been prepared, a revised site plan has been submitted to address the concerns of Yorkshire Water in respect of the required stand-off from the high pressure water main and surface water sewer crossing the site. It demonstrated that the required stand off from built development, fencing and landscaping would be achieved in respect of the proposed development. This was now felt to be acceptable. Officers advised that Condition 2 should therefore be amended to accommodate 539-07 Rev E accordingly. They advised that no further comment had been received from Yorkshire Water.

Officers advised that further detailed clarification had been received from the applicant indicating that the site has been continuously advertised since 2006 but that no interest has been forthcoming in terms of any form of employment related development of the site. Forward Planning therefore indicated that the requirements of Draft Local Plan Policy had therefore been met and that they raised no objection to the proposal.

One Member raised concerns about the impact on the local surface water drainage network, in response to the concerns raised by the Internal Drainage Board in paragraph 4.10 with regard to increased water levels in the nearby water course. The council's drainage officer responded to these concerns, advising that the applicant had provided a comprehensive drainage design including surface water attenuation, comprehensive flood risk/drainage assessments and proposals for the use of permeable paving and restricted discharge.

One Member requested that an electric charging point be provided, to be consistent with what is provided by most garages selling electric vehicles. Mr Andrew Hodgson, the

applicant, had registered to speak at the meeting. He advised members that he was happy for an electric charging point to be installed on the premises.

Another Member suggested that that condition 5 (landscaping scheme) should be amended to require that landscaping scheme remained in place for the lifetime of the development rather than only 5 years as stated in the condition. This was supported by other members.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amendments to condition 2 (plans) and condition 5 (landscaping scheme).

#### Amended Condition 2

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:-

Drawing Refs:- 539-07E; SK001 P1; SK002 P1; 539-01; 539-02; 539-03; 539-04; 539-05; 539-06.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

#### Amended Condition 5

No development shall take place 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 during 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.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with the variety, suitability and disposition of species within the site.

Reason: It is accepted that this longstanding vacant site has been marketed unsuccessfully for the previously permitted employment use for a significant length of time, and that therefore it can be concluded having regard to the NPPF that there is no reasonable prospect of this allocated employment site being used for the employment use. The proposal would not materially harm local biodiversity and is acceptable in terms of its impact upon the local surface water drainage network and local public drainage infrastructure. The proposal is also felt to be acceptable in highway terms.

**107. Fire Station, 18 Clifford Street, York, YO1 9RD  
(15/02155/FULM)**

Members considered a major full application by Mr David Chapman (DC Architecture) for the demolition of buildings in the conservation area and building works to create 7 dwellings and a restaurant (Class A3) with 7 flats above.

Officers advised that the recommendation in the report “to approve subject to completion of a section 106 agreement”, was incorrect as the application did not have to be referred to the Secretary of State, despite the objection from Historic England.

They advised that an updated Archaeology Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) had been submitted which detailed the proposed mitigation & explained that the applicants would install a system which would collect and distribute rainwater to prevent water-logged deposits drying out.

A further objection from Historic England has been received dated 10.5.2016 advising that the application should be refused or deferred until the archaeology assessment (proposed in the WSI) had been conducted, the results understood & and the agreed mitigation strategy secured. Officers advised that the concerns Historic England had was that the heritage value of the archaeology that would be affected by the development was not yet fully understood. If post development monitoring were to indicate that deposits were degrading, then there was no proposal for excavation and, as such, the deposits would be lost

Officers advised that the following proposed additional conditions should be agreed if members were minded to approve the application:

- Protection of Buildings to be retained
- Exterior of 'lodge' to be recorded prior to demolition
- DRAINAGE
  - Drainage
  - Surface Water Discharge
- HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT
  - Removal of redundant crossings
  - Highway Improvement Works
  - HWAY31 – no mud on highway during construction
  - HWY40 – Dilapidation survey
- Approved Plans
- Cycle Parking

Officers advised that three further consultation responses had been received, from the conservation architect, Flood Risk Management Team and Highway Network Management, details of which were included in the officer update which has been appended to the agenda papers. Officers provided a response in relation to the issues raised in these consultation responses.

The Conservation Architect had submitted comments in relation to the lodge building, chapel and school room and the Clifford Street Extension. Officers concluded that they supported the scheme overall acknowledging that a convincing justification had been provided for demolition of the lodge building.

The Flood Risk Management Team confirmed that they did not object to the proposals but had recommended imposing the conditions listed above.

Highway Network Management requested a larger cycle store which was fit for purpose be required and that the traffic regulation order included the removal of future residents from the local residents parking scheme. Additionally it was proposed that one car parking space be lost close to the junction with Clifford Street and that conditions be added to remove any redundant dropped kerbs/crossing and to agree a method of works.

Mr Ian Milsted, Project Manager at York Archaeological Trust, addressed the committee. He provided members with a brief history of the site and advised that, to support the planning application, they had undertaken a programme of evaluation between July 2015 and February 2016. He explained the archaeological sequence identified during this evaluation and that the potential waterlogged organic archaeological deposits most likely dated from Roman to early medieval period. He advised that the impact of the proposals on these deposits would be minimal. He stated that the City of York Archaeologist supported the proposals but had advised that further evaluation work, to test further samples and monitor water levels, be undertaken as a non standard condition and in line with draft Historic England guidelines.

Janet O'Neil, of O'Neil Associates, the agent, spoke in support of the application. She advised Members that this was a challenging site to redevelop, which had been vacated by the fire service 2 years previously, and was in need of a new use. She asked Members to consider 3 main aspects:

1. flooding – development needed to be flood resistant hence, no habitable rooms on ground floor, windows blocked behind glass, floodgates, safe evacuation routes and the river front building designed not to leak.
2. Archaeology – need to preserve any archaeological remains where they lay and prevent further deterioration. Developer was willing to fully meet council's requirements as conditioned but it was not possible for clients to carry out 12 months monitoring before permission was granted as this would be outside their contact with North Yorkshire Fire Service
3. Design – this was a prominent site in the city centre. The architect had worked closely with officers and the final design represented a distinctive yet respectful scheme.

Some Members raised concerns about the introduction of the street trees shown in the plans which they felt were crammed in and created layout issues, expressing a preference to retain as much of the granite cobbles as possible instead of all the surface being in York Stone as proposed. Officers advised that the landscape architect would be reviewing the proposals but that it was possible to alter the landscaping condition to allow some flexibility while still ensuring good access along the street.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report, the additional conditions listed below and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure contributions towards education, open space and highways.

Additional Conditions:

Protection of buildings to be retained

Prior to works in the relevant area illustrated method statements which describe how the chapel and school room facades and the listed former friary wall would be retained and protected during construction shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out in adherence with the approved measures.

Reason: To protect listed structures and structures which are proposed to be retained and make a positive contribution to the character and distinctiveness of the setting.

Exterior of 'lodge' to be recorded prior to demolition

Prior to its demolition the "lodge" building shall be subject to a level 1 recording in accordance with Historic England guidance - Understanding Historic Buildings: A guide to good recording practice February 2006. The record shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to demolition.

Reason: To record and enhance our understanding of the historic environment, in accordance with paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**DRAINAGE**

The site shall be developed with separate systems of drainage for foul and surface water on and off site.

Reason: In the interest of satisfactory and sustainable drainage.

## Drainage

No development shall take place until details of the proposed means of foul and surface water drainage, including details of any balancing works and off site works, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

INFORMATIVE: Design considerations.

The developer's attention is drawn to Requirement H3 of the Building Regulations 2000 with regards to hierarchy for surface water dispersal and the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuD's).

Consideration should be given to discharge to soakaway, infiltration system and watercourse in that priority order. Surface water discharge to the existing public sewer network must only be as a last resort.

If the proposed method of surface water disposal is via soakaways, these should be shown to work through an appropriate assessment carried out under BRE Digest 365, (preferably carried out in winter), to prove that the ground has sufficient capacity to accept surface water discharge, and to prevent flooding of the surrounding land and the site itself. City of York Council's Flood Risk Management Team should witness the BRE Digest 365 test.

If SuDs methods can be proven to be unsuitable then in accordance with City of York Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, peak run-off from Brownfield developments must be attenuated to 70% of the existing rate (based on 140 l/s/ha of proven by way of CCTV drainage survey connected impermeable areas). Storage volume calculations, using computer modelling, must accommodate a 1:30 year storm with no surface flooding, along with no internal flooding of buildings or surface run-off from the site in a 1:100 year storm. Proposed areas within the model must also include an additional 20% allowance for climate change. The modelling must use a range of storm durations, with both summer and winter profiles, to find the worst-case volume required.



Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with these details for the proper and sustainable drainage of the site.

#### Surface water discharge

Unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority, there shall be no piped discharge of surface water from the development prior to the completion of the approved surface water drainage works and no buildings shall be occupied or brought into use prior to completion of the approved foul drainage works.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that no foul and surface water discharges take place until proper provision has been made for their disposal.

INFORMATIVE: The public sewer network does not have capacity to accept an unrestricted discharge of surface water. Surface water discharge to the existing public sewer network must only be as a last resort, the developer is required to eliminate other means of surface water disposal.

INFORMATIVE: Flood warning service  
Future occupants are advised to sign up to the Environment Agencies flood warning service.

### HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT

#### Removal of redundant crossings

Prior to first use of the development hereby approved all existing vehicular crossings not shown as being retained on the approved plans shall be removed by reinstating the kerb to match adjacent levels.

Reason: In the interests of good management of the highway and road safety.

#### Highway improvement works

The development hereby permitted shall not come into use until the following highway works (which definition shall include works associated with any

Traffic Regulation Order required as a result of the development, signing, lighting, drainage and other related works) have been carried out in accordance with details which shall have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, or arrangements entered into which ensure the same.

Highway works: Works as indicatively shown on the ground floor plan drawing including widening of existing footway to 3m, raising kerb to full height along the footway and the installation of dropped Yorkstone tactile crossing across Peckitt Street.

Reason: In the interests of the safe and free passage of highway users.

HWAY31 - No mud on highway during construction

HWAY40 - Dilapidation survey

INFORMATIVE: Highway management

Prior to works commencing the developer is advised to contact the council's highways department to agree the following items to minimise disruption on the highway network during construction -

- the routing that will be promoted by the contractors to use main arterial routes and avoid the peak network hours
- how vehicles are to access and egress the site
- how pedestrians are to be safely routed past the site
- details of any implications to the highway of demolition and waste removal vehicle operation
  - where contractors will park to avoid affecting the highway

how large vehicles will service the site

- where materials will be stored within the site

Approved Plans

Condition to be updated, to incorporate latest set of plans which were received on the 9.5.2016

Cycle Parking

Condition to be varied to ensure cycle store for the apartments is of adequate size

Reason:

The scheme would deliver acceptable re-development of a significant previously developed site in the city centre. There would be a low level of harm (certainly less than substantial harm) to designated heritage assets (i.e. to the conservation area due to the loss of the lodge, and to the area of archaeological importance). The scheme would be safe from flood risk. Even when attaching great weight to this harm, the public benefits of the scheme as described above were considered in the planning balance to justify the identified harm, and to allow residential development in flood zone 3. Conditions were necessary to agree the detailed design and ensure the proposed mitigation against flood risk. Subject to the adherence to the planning conditions proposed there would be no adverse impact on residential amenity and highway safety.

## **108. Appeals Performance and Decision Summaries**

Members considered a report which informed them of the Council's performance in relation to appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate between 1 January and 31 March 2016 and provided them with a summary of the salient points from appeals determined in that period.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

Reason: To inform Members of the current position in relation to planning appeals against the Council's decisions as determined by the Planning Inspectorate.

Cllr F Derbyshire, Vice Chair in the Chair  
[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 6.10 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank