

COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee: Planning Committee **Ward:** Heslington
Date: 26 October 2006 **Parish:** Heslington Parish Council

Reference: 06/01806/FULM
Application at: Properties 2 To 22 Inclusive Bleachfield Heslington York
For: 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
By: University Of York
Application Type: Major Full Application (13 weeks)
Target Date: 16 November 2006

1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This application is a re-submission of a previous scheme refused at the July Planning Committee. The reason for refusal was as follows:

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.

1.2 The site area is the same as before. It is known as Bleachfield and is situated to the northwestern edge of the main Heslington Campus. Access to this part of the campus is via University Road and is bounded to the south and east by Wentworth Way. The Biology buildings are to the south of the site with office buildings to the east. To the west is open space. This is in the Green Belt and is mainly open land with mature trees.

1.3 Within the application area the site is relatively open and is characterised by mature tree planting, grassed areas and attractive mounding. The site slopes significantly down from north to south, which has an overall fall of approx. 11 metres.

1.4 The site is presently developed by two storey houses in four small terraces. These are now derelict and boarded up but they offered 21 houses that were previously used for staff accommodation for the University. They were constructed in the 1970's and are of timber construction. They are currently derelict, unused and boarded up.

1.5 The proposal is to demolish these existing houses and in their place build six separate accommodation blocks to house 248 study bedrooms. Three of the blocks are four storeys high and three are three storeys high. A single storey utility building, with service access from Wentworth Way is proposed between blocks 1 and 2 on the northern edge of the site. A sub-station is proposed to the south of block 4. in the southwestern corner of the site. Each block has its own separate block for cycle storage.

1.6 No car parking (other than disabled parking) is proposed as part of the development, in accordance with the University's policy of not allowing students to have cars on the campus. The development will have a main pedestrian access and six disabled car parking spaces from the east onto Wentworth Way with a further smaller pedestrian access out from the south western corner onto a public footpath which links Wentworth Way with University Road. The rest of the site is entirely self-contained with no access in or out of the site. All the residential blocks face into the site in respect of 'secure by design' principles.

1.7 A landscaping scheme has been submitted which proposes to reinforce the planting around and within the site in lieu of the proposed loss of some of the existing trees in order to make way for the development. Large mature trees frame the site to its northern edge close to University Road and these are to be retained.

1.8 This scheme is almost identical in layout terms to the one already approved. There are changes however to the design of the properties.

2.0 POLICY CONTEXT

2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams East Area (1) 0003

2.2 Policies:

CYGP1
Design

CYGP3
Planning against crime

CYGP9
Landscaping

CYGP11
Accessibility

CYGB1
Development within the Green Belt

CYT4
Cycle parking standards

CYT5
Traffic and pedestrian safety

CYSP2
The York Green Belt

CYGP4A
Sustainability

CYSP3
Safeguarding the Historic Character and Setting of York

CYED6
University of York Heslington Campus

CYNE6
Species protected by law

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL.

3.1 Highway Network Management.

No objections. Previous comments remain relevant. Please include previous recommended conditions.

(Previous comments as follows) The six new residential blocks will lie between Heslington Road to the north and Wentworth Way to the south. No car parking facilities are to be provided in accordance with the agreed policy of capping the number of spaces at 1520 on the Heslington West campus. Four spaces for disabled students are to be created however, off a loop to be formed adjoining Wentworth Way, where taxis will also be able to deposit their passengers.

A new network of combined pedestrian/cycleways will link the blocks with the rest of the Campus and cycle routes beyond. These paths should be a minimum of 3 metres in width, in accordance with Highway Design guidelines, and a condition to this effect is recommended.

Covered secure cycle parking is to be provided in blocks adjoining each residential unit on the basis of one space per 2 bedrooms (the previously agreed standard). Cycle parking for visitors will be sited in small groups at the entrances to each block.

Servicing of this site is to take place via a new short cul-de-sac off Heslington Road. The bin store is to be sited at the head of this cul-de-sac.

The new accommodation will be conveniently located for existing bus stops on University Road and Heslington Road (near the Retreat). Service no.4 operates along this route, providing a ten-minute frequency service throughout the working day.

A transport statement submitted by the University's transport consultant demonstrates that the development lies in a sustainable location and the access arrangements incorporated into the design are likely to prove effective in encouraging non car borne trips.

There are no highway objections to this application subject to 6 conditions :

3.2 Archaeology.

Watching brief required on all groundworks. The site lies in an area identified as being of potential archaeological interest in a previous assessment of the campus.

3.3 Urban Design.

Whilst the design virtues of the existing blocks on this site are recognised, it is also acknowledged that these are "of their time", and it is appropriate, in the light of changes in the operation of the University in recent years, to move on with a higher density of development on this site (of 248 units) in order to meet the University's changing requirements for increased student accommodation to fit within the overall masterplan for Campus 1 (Heslington West).

The position of the new blocks follows closely the existing footprint of the original residential units here which are proposed for demolition at the north-west of the existing university campus. The scheme comprises a mixture of 3 & 4 storey residential blocks, with the lower blocks sited to minimise the visual impacts of the gable ends on the University Road approach. A single storey utility block is also proposed with a centralised bin/ recycling store, serviced from Wentworth Way. The residential blocks are all similar in their internal layouts with study bedrooms and en-suite bathrooms, and communal kitchens.

All the buildings layout and design have been influenced by the objectives of "Secured by Design", closed at the western end of the site. Cycle stores and walls link the blocks to ensure enclosure, so that access to all residential units is from inside the new enclosed courtyard. Cameras are also used to ensure security. The use of different storey heights helps to create a variety and massing interest across the site. To the south, the 4 storeys corresponds to the biology block which is further south. The mature trees within the site and adjacent to it also complement the scale and massing of the proposed layout, and new trees are being introduced to augment the layout. The topography is being retained where possible.

The primary student access to the site from the east is served by a small parking area with dedicated parking bays and a taxi drop-off point. A separate service access is maintained from Heslington Road to a service area north of the site.

The form of the blocks has developed in response to the University's brief, and to the palette of materials on neighbouring developments, with some of the design elements referring back to the earlier houses on the site (but also to hide downpipes and to reduce overall building heights). The architectural treatment & vocabulary is somewhat similar to the ISIS block that is adjacent (without imitating it), and this helps to soften and unify the elevational treatment here. The 3D modelling of the proposals is useful in explaining the spatial relationships and views through the scheme.

Still consider that unity would be enhanced by using a glazed canopy to the inner courtyard - (again, as used on the ISIS blocks) and a well-detailed external boundary treatment. However, overall the design solution aims to respect the existing principles of the campus whilst recognising the University's commercial & academic requirements.

3.4 EPU.

The environmental protection unit has no objections to this application, but wishes to make the following comments:

Contaminated land

It is understood that the site may have been put to previous uses that could result in land contamination (eg. the name 'Bleachfield' suggests some form of previous industrial/commercial use). From the historical maps of the area, it would also appear that ground levelling/infill has taken place to provide the flat terrace upon which the proposed development will be located - this could give rise to the generation of gas.

Both of these matters need to be fully explored and assessed to determine whether there is any potential impact on human health or ground water. Although a desk study has been

submitted by the applicant, it needs further work to better understand the site. However, these matters can be dealt with by condition. A watching brief is also recommended, should any unexpected land contamination be discovered.

Recommend conditions 10-12 to deal with this.

3.5 Landscape Architect.

No objections. Comments as before. Conditions relating to tree protection should be attached.

3.6 Ecology Officer.

Latest Bat survey reinforces those of last year although then there was a suspected roost in one of the trees, although this was not affected by the proposals. The presence of bats does not create an issue for the development. However the obvious value of the surrounding area for bats as evidenced by the forage activity recorded and the sites location in open wooded land adjacent to the Stray and the lake make this an attractive site and some enhancement work could be incorporated into the design of the buildings. This is supported by PPS9 and should be conditional of any new approval.

3.7 York Consultancy - Drainage.

The development is in a low risk flood zone 1 area and should not suffer from river flooding. No objections.

EXTERNAL.

3.8 Fishergate Planning Panel.

- i) Is inappropriate over development of the site. The University's award winning landscaping is being compromised by continuing development that is not in keeping with the original park like character as approved and built.
- ii) The erection of six buildings of 3 and 4 storeys will detrimentally alter the rural and open character of this part of the campus.
- iii) Increased traffic will add to existing traffic overload.

3.9 Hull Road Planning Panel.

No objections.

3.10 Heslington Parish Council.

It was noted that previously a number of architects had fought hard against demolition of Bleachfield, because of the architectural value of the buildings.

No objections to student houses being provided but a more appropriate design should be considered. Also agreed that the provision for more family housing should be made within the campus.

3.11 Environment Agency.

No objections. Recommend 2 conditions to control surface water drainage.

3.12 Yorkshire Water.

No objections. Comments and recommended conditions as before.

3.13 Police Architectural Liaison Officer.

Attended a meeting in December 2005 at the University to discuss security and 'designing out crime' issues relating to this development. Notes that most of the issues discussed have been incorporated into the plans. Since the application came in has further met with the Architect in order to clarify a few issues. As a result of this confirms the following:

- Access control measures will be fitted to the entrances to all the accommodation blocks.
- Landscaping to be provided to the vulnerable west facing gable of Block 3 in order to create a buffer zone of defensible space between the gable and open space beyond.
- Defensible space will be created around the other buildings utilising landscaping.
- Vulnerable ground floor windows will be fitted with laminated glass.
- Small narrow windows on the vulnerable gables of Blocks 3 and 4 will not have opening lights.
- The development will be covered by CCTV.
- Cycle stores all overlooked and secured by means of swipe card access control.
- Suitable lighting provided around the site.
- Hedging to be provided on the northern boundary which will imply an area of 'defensible space'.
- Fencing to 2 metres high will be provided between blocks 3 and 4 to form a secure boundary keeping access to the site to a minimum.

In light of the these proposed measures, no objections.

3.14 Ouse and Derwent IDB.

Recommend that the surface water from the development should be discharged directly or indirectly to the IDB maintained Lowmoor watercourse. In turn the lake acts as a balancing tank, which controls the rate of discharge.

3.15 Twentieth Century Society.

Objects to the proposed scheme which would compromise the present successful interplay of architecture and landscape.

3.15. Third Parties.

5 letters of objection received.

- Doesn't address the previous reason for refusal at all. Other than minor, token elevational changes, the scheme is the same. It is a hasty re-submission of the previous scheme. Much of the material has simply been re-submitted, a procedure which amounts to an insult to the planning committee. No change in substance has been made to the rejected scheme and therefore should be rejected again.
- Would be perverse in the extreme for the Authority to now grant permission since it makes no attempt to address any of the reasons for the original refusal.
- Almost certainly that the University have the objective of completing the scheme in time for October 2007 and will no doubt press for approval again to meet this date. This is not a good enough reason for granting consent to a scheme already damned by the Council and which is completely at odds with the Universities protestations for architecture of the highest quality at the new east campus.
- The block layout and massing, criticised as simplistic, remains unaltered. The 6 blocks do not combine to enclose a comprehensible space. They remain strewn about the site in a way reminiscent of a train crash.
- Design remains repetitive and unrefined.
- Scheme does not respond to the special landscape character of the area. The scheme is assertive and restless as opposed to the present which is of relaxed proportions.
- Simple and most sustainable approach is to retain the high quality housing they already have and refurbish it. They could have been used over the last 18 months instead of lying empty. It has not been shown why the existing high quality housing should be demolished.
- Recognised need for accommodation on campus but the design here is of a standard inadequate for the present campus and sets an unacceptable precedent for a future campus.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 The key issue is considered to be;

i) whether the revised scheme addresses the previous reason for refusal.

Policy Background / Green Belt.

4.2 The university campus lies within an area of Green Belt, as defined by the adopted North Yorkshire Structure Plan and the draft Local Plan. Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 sets out government policy regarding development in green belts, and Annex C of that document specifically refers to Higher Education institutions. The advice makes it clear that such institutions are subject to the same controls as other development in green belt, but at the same time stresses that more people should be encouraged to undertake higher or further education. The guidance states that local plan preparation should address the need for such institutions to expand by excluding them from green belt.

4.3 Policy ED6 of the emerging Local Plan (4th set of changes) seeks to exclude the Heslington Campus from the Green Belt and permit further university development. The policy contains a set of criteria including a maximum 20% development footprint of the campus area, appropriate height of buildings, good standard of design and no overall increase in car parking provision. These policy objectives are reiterated in the Heslington University Campus Development Brief adopted in August 1999.

4.4 The Development Brief and draft policy ED6 considers the implications of future development at the university on the green belt. It is considered that 20% was an acceptable limit for future expansion which would not significantly compromise the openness of the green belt.

Developed Footprint

4.5 The build footprint of the existing buildings is approximately 1957 square metres. The built footprint of the new proposals is approx. 2375 sqm, a net increase of 418sqm. This means the extra developed footprint area is within the threshold of 20% developed area within the Heslington campus. The footprint of the proposed six accommodation block buildings would be sited within a 'development area' identified in the brief and would not result in the loss of any of the University's important open spaces. A small wedge of defined open space does extend along the south western boundary of the site close to its boundary with Wentworth Way and within this wedge the electricity sub-station is proposed. However the building is on the very south western edge of this wedge and is only 30sqm in size and 3 metres high. It is immediately adjacent to Wentworth Way with open green space around it and it is 20 metres away from the nearest accommodation building (block 4) in a diagonal direction. Given this, officers do not consider the sub-station to unduly impact on, or compromise the objectives of this defined open space.

4.6 An important and defined 'tree belt' along the western boundary of the site the campus (with Heslington Stray) is untouched by the development.

Design.

4.7 The design and appearance of the proposal is the most contentious aspect of the application and was the basis of the previous refusal. The comments of Fishergate Planning Panel and Heslington Parish Council are similar to those expressed before and the objections received from interested third parties all also reflect continued concern over this issue.

4.8 The existing area of Bleachfield is one of the most attractive and open spaces within the Heslington campus. Even though it is within the defined development boundary of the campus, it has retained a more open feel because of the low rise nature of the existing buildings and their immediate environs and also the gently sloping, contoured character of the land, all of which is grassed. Added to this is the presence of several large mature trees both within the site and on its edge (along with a plentiful supply of less mature planting) and the ambiance of the area is generally open and quite peaceful. Officers acknowledge that this character will be altered as a result of this scheme.

4.9 The revised scheme has changed little in terms of footprint and layout. This is mainly due to the confines of the site and the need to contain development within the central portion of the site away from the protected trees. It also requires the number of bedrooms proposed (248) in order for it to be worthwhile and meet its stated aims and objectives. Where changes have been made is to the appearance of the buildings. They have more of a domestic feel to them now instead of the somewhat sanitised, 'business park' feel of the previous scheme. The main changes are the introduction of more timber boarding to better reflect the adjacent Isis buildings and alterations to the roof design.

4.10 This revised scheme does go some way to addressing the concerns members had previously and which consequently formed part of the basis of the refusal. Members are referred back to para. 3.3 of this report for the more detailed comments of the Urban design officer. Given the low rise nature of the existing houses and their fairly unique design, it is somewhat difficult to develop a scheme which complements successfully the 'old and the new' but which at the same time maintains the same developed footprint area and respects the extensive tree cover and openness of the site and its boundaries. Officers consider it critical to ensure that this be maintained as much as possible whilst at the same time acknowledging and understanding other pressures.

4.11 With regard to the retention of the existing buildings it is regrettable that these are to be lost as they do offer a unique character and form not seen anywhere else within the Heslington campus. However this also has to be weighed against the clearly changed circumstances since these were built in the 1970's. The University has expanded significantly and there is now significant pressure to include as much student accommodation within the campus as possible in order to reduce the pressure on private housing throughout the city. Point 7 of Policy ED6 supports and identifies this need. The University development brief of 1999 also supports this, stating clearly the need to reduce travel by private vehicle by providing the majority of student accommodation on campus. Therefore given that to refurbish the buildings would probably only offer a very limited number of study bedrooms it is unlikely that that option will go anywhere near to meeting those requirements. Increasingly the Planning Dept. is receiving applications to change family houses into Houses of Multiple Occupancy (plus many changes to houses which don't actually require planning permission) and this is slowly undermining the character of certain areas of the city. Officers consider this to be a significant material consideration when determining this application.

4.12 The urban design officer also states that whilst the design virtues of the existing blocks are recognised they are 'of their time' and given the other material considerations that now exist, it is appropriate to move onto a higher density development. Officers, whilst also fully recognising the merits of the buildings agree with this view.

Design and Site layout.

4.13 Therefore the next key issue is the design of the proposed scheme and how this compares to the refused scheme. Point 5 of policy ED6 encourages the need for 'a high standard of design appropriate to the setting of the University' and the development brief also extols the importance of good design in para. 5.18. Para. 5.19 also goes on to say that

'building heights will be contained within an envelope raising little above the mature forest tree canopy (eg. 3 or 4 storeys) of the framework planting...'

4.14 The six residencies are a mixture of three and four storey. The maximum height of the four storey buildings will be 13.8m above ground level with the three storey 10.8 metres above ground level. A plan has been submitted showing the buildings against the sloping land levels of the site from north to south and this shows that the height falls below the height of the mature trees both adjacent to and within the site boundary. Given that it is these which help to define the character of the site this is an important issue. The four storeys correspond to the Biology block buildings further south and therefore there is no objection to this size in principle. Given the above, the development will be well screened from the main public view on University Road by the large, mature trees on the northern boundary of the site by Heslington Road. This is particularly the case in summer when the trees are in full leaf but even in winter, views of the buildings will be filtered quite significantly.

4.15 The courtyard layout remains as part of the submitted scheme although officers do acknowledge that this did form part of the reason for refusal before. However, officers were of the view that the layout should be supported before and they have no reason to alter this view now. It is largely inevitable that a layout of this sort needs to be employed given the development constraints the site offers such as the topography of the land, the mature trees around the perimeter of the site and the aims and objectives of the scheme. It has been employed successfully elsewhere on the campus and has been based on the principles of Secure by Design, with entrances facing inwards and site security also provided by the siting of the cycle stores and boundary walls. This boundary treatment, particularly the more sensitive western side, needs to be carefully considered in design and appearance terms. Condition 24 is recommended here.

4.16 The main criticism of the previous scheme was that the buildings were very similar in appearance and lacked an element of imagination. This was the main reason for refusal before. It was felt that the buildings in the previous scheme resembled 'business park' style buildings. Officers fully acknowledged that the previous scheme resulted in a less memorable development than existing, largely because of the loss of the open space but also because of the somewhat bland design of the buildings. However, this is somewhat inevitable given what the University are seeking to achieve from the development as only the full retention and refurbishment of the existing buildings would fully retain the existing character and form as existing. Officers have already expressed the view that this is not viable and that the other material considerations discussed above, such as student housing need within the campus have to be weighed against this.

4.17 On this, officers have concluded that whilst the previous scheme was poor in terms of design, this scheme has made enough alterations to overcome some of the problems of the previous submission and the subsequent reason for refusal. They are more domestic in appearance, have an improved roof design, make better use of materials, in particular timber boarding, that reflect both the existing buildings on the site and the adjacent IRISS buildings.

Residential Amenity.

4.18. This was not considered an issue previously and nothing here changes that view. The blocks are sited well away from residential houses, the nearest one being approx. 150 metres away to the North West (111 Heslington Road and Garrow Bank). Furthermore the buildings are positioned on lower ground than either of these properties and a large number of mature trees stand between the development and these properties. Given that the height of the buildings do not exceed those already on campus and that they will be sited within the

campus boundary, it is not considered detrimental to the amenity of these residents. Condition 17 requires details of external illumination to be agreed in order to prevent harm as a result of light pollution.

Drainage and Flood Risk.

4.19 The Environment Agency have withdrawn their request for a full flood risk assessment and are now satisfied that, given the topography of the site, it is not at risk from river flooding. Conditions 14 and 15 are recommended to deal with drainage requirements / arrangements.

Sustainability.

4.20 In transport terms the development is highly sustainable. Regarding construction the development is sustainable inasmuch that it meets the basis requirements of the new Part L of the Building Regulations and actively encourages recycling. The applicants have committed to standard forms of sustainable development such as increased insulation to walls, floors etc, use of high efficiency condensing boilers, heat recovery systems, low energy light fittings and low volume flush toilet installations. They also state their intention to use materials from sustainable sources, in particular timber products. Whilst all this is very much welcomed it is somewhat regrettable that on such a large, high energy use scheme that facilities such as rainwater harvesting and solar gain cannot be incorporated into the development. However, the development does accord with the objectives of Policy GP4A of the draft local plan and given the wording of the policy and national guidance on this matter, officers do not consider that, this issue can be used in isolation as a reason for refusal. The University has committed itself to achieving 'very good' or 'excellent' in the standard Building Research Establishment BREEAM ratings for sustainable development and this is welcomed. Condition 25 is recommended on this and this will ensure that the development accords with Policy GP4A of the draft local plan.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 It is considered that the proposed development meets the criteria set out in Policy ED6 of the draft Local Plan and the general principles set out in the development brief for the University. The design and appearance of the scheme is considered to be acceptable. Officers supported the scheme previously and given the positive changes made to the appearance of the buildings, see no reason to not do so this time as well.

5.2 An agreement has been made with Government Office not to refer applications for development within the existing campus to the Secretary of State.

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve

- 1 TIME2 Development start within three years
- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following plans:-

- Drawing no's
- 1249/100 Revision D.
- 1249 - 300
- 1249 - 303
- 1249/200 Rev. A
- 1249-101
- 1249-002
- 1249/102 Rev. A
- 1249-304
- Landscape Proposals.

or any plans or details subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority as amendment to the approved plans.

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

- 3 VISQ8 Samples of exterior materials to be app
- 4 Large scale details of the items listed below shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development and the works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 1:20 sectional plans of all window reveals and door casements.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with these details.

- 5 LAND1 IN New Landscape details
- 6 None of the existing trees shown to be retained on the approved plans shall be wilfully damaged or destroyed or uprooted, felled, lopped or topped without the previous written consent of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees removed without such consent or dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased before the end of that period shall be replaced with trees of such size and species as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: The Local Planning Authority considers it important to safeguard these trees in a positive manner so as to secure their continued well being.

- 7 Before the commencement of development, including demolition, building operations, or the importing of materials and any excavations, a method statement regarding protection measures for the existing trees shown to be retained on the approved drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This statement shall include details of protective fencing, phasing of works, site access during demolition/construction, type of construction machinery/vehicles to be used, (including delivery and collection lorries and arrangements for loading/off-loading), parking arrangements for site vehicles and storage of materials, location of marketing cabin.

The following details must also provided : construction details and existing and proposed levels, where a change in surface material and/or levels are proposed within the canopy spread and possible rooting zone of a tree.

The protective fencing to BS5837 Part 8 shall be erected around all existing trees shown to be retained. Before commencement on site the protective fencing line shall be shown on a plan and agreed with the local authority and subsequently adhered to at all times during development to create exclusion zones. None of the following activities shall take place within the exclusion zone: excavation, raising of levels, storage of any materials or top soil, burning, parking or manoeuvring of vehicles, mechanical cultivation under the canopy spread of retained trees. There shall be no site huts, no marketing offices, no mixing of cement, no disposing of washings, no stored fuel, no new trenches, pipe runs for services or drains. The fencing shall remain secured in position throughout the construction process including the implementation of landscaping works. A notice stating 'tree protection zone - do not remove' shall be attached to each section of fencing.

Reason: To protect existing trees which are covered by a Tree Preservation Order and/or are considered to make a significant contribution to the amenity of this area.

- 8 HWAY19 Car and cycle parking laid out
- 9 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	

Reason: To protect the amenity of the area.

- 10 A desk study shall be undertaken in order to identify any potentially contaminative uses which have or are currently occurring on the site. This shall include a site description and a site walkover and shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to development of the site. Informative: This should, where possible date back to 1800.
- A site investigation shall be undertaken based upon the findings of this desk study. 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. A risk-based remedial strategy 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. Informative: The remedial strategy shall have due regard for UK adopted policy on risk assessment and shall be developed in full consultation with the appropriate regulator(s).

Reason: To protect human health and the wider environment.

- 11 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.

Reason: To protect human health and the wider environment.

- 12 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.

Reason: To protect human health and the wider environment.

- 13 ARCH2 Watching brief required

- 14 Development shall not begin until details of foul and surface water drainage works and a timetable of works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and carried out in accordance with these approved details. This shall include details of any balancing works and off-site works. The site shall be developed with separate systems of drainage for foul and surface water on and off site.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with these details for the proper drainage of the site and to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

- 15 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.

Reason. To ensure that no surface water discharges take place until the proper provision has been made for its disposal.

- 16 HT1 IN Height

- 17 Prior to the first occupation of the residences hereby approved details of any scheme of illumination for external areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and those details shall subsequently be implemented on site.

Reason: To protect the living conditions of nearby residential properties and to prevent light pollution.

- 18 HWAY10 Vehicular areas surfaced, details reqd

- 19 HWAY15 Gradients

- 20 HWAY18 Cycle parking details to be agreed

- 21 HWAY31 No mud on highway during construction

- 22 HWAY40 Dilapidation survey

- 23 Prior to the commencement of any works, a detailed method of works statement shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. This statement shall include the precautions to be taken to ensure the safety of the general public, the method of securing the site, access to the site and the route to be taken by vehicles transporting the demolition and construction material, and the hours during which this will be permitted.

Reason : To ensure that the works are carried out in a safe manner and with minimum disruption to users of the adjacent public highway.

- 24 VISQ4 Boundary details to be supplied
- 25 Prior to the commencement of development, details of the BREEAM assessment demonstrating that this development has achieved an 'excellent' standard must be submitted to and agreed in writing to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason. To ensure that the development is sustainable and accords with Policy GP4A of the draft City of York Local Plan.

7.0 INFORMATIVES:

Contact details:

Author: Matthew Parkinson Development Control Officer

Tel No: 01904 552405