
Meeting	Planning Committee
Date	7 May 2026
Present	Councillors Crawshaw (Chair), Fisher (Vice-Chair), Baxter (until 6.23pm), Burton (from 6.35pm), Cullwick, Steward (until 6.35pm), Whitcroft, Fenton (Substitute for Cllr Ayre), Moroney (Substitute for Cllr Melly), Orrell (Substitute for Cllr Watson) and Rose (Substitute for Cllr Clarke)
Apologies	Councillors Ayre, Clarke, Melly and Watson

24. Apologies for Absence (4:33pm)

Apologies for absence were received and noted for Cllrs Ayre, Clarke, Melly and Watson.

25. Declarations of Interest (4:36pm)

Members were asked to declare at this point in the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest or other registerable interest they might have in respect of business on the agenda, if they had not already done so in advance on the Register of Interests. Cllr Steward noted that he had attended St Peter's School and Cllr Burton noted that she had attended Queen Anne Grammar School. There were no further declarations of interest.

26. Public Participation (4:40pm)

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.

27. Minutes (4:40pm)

Resolved: That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 12 March 2026 be approved as a correct record subject to the word meaningfully being changed to meaningful in reason I of the resolution.

28. Plans List (4:40pm)

Members considered reports of the Head of Planning and Development, relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and

relevant policy considerations and setting out the views of consultees and officers.

29. 45 Hempland Lane, York YO31 1AT [25/01211/FUL] (4:40pm)

Members considered a full application from Swan Properties Ltd for the erection of 2 residential apartment buildings (use class C3) with associated parking, refuse, cycle stores, and landscaping following demolition of existing dwelling at 45 Hempland Lane York YO31 1AT.

The Head of Planning and Development outlined the plans for the application. She gave an update on the application noting that further representations and highways information had been received. She added that there were two amendments to the report at paragraph 5.27 relating to formatting and 5.49 referring to 10, not 6 trees.

Public Speakers

Antonia Gane, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. She explained her concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety due to speeding and the narrowness of Hempland Lane, increased vehicle trips and limited parking. She noted that there was no road markings for bus stop and added her concern for the safety of children travelling to Hempland School. She was asked and explained that 420 pupils attended Hempland School and many passed the drive to the site.

Kevin Holland, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application on behalf of 21 residents. He suggested that there was a number of omissions to the report. He noted concerns about highway safety and noise and light impact on biodiversity. He suggested that there was misleading information in the report on scale and massing, adding that the development was out of character for the area and was overbearing and dominant. He was asked and explained concerns regarding highway, the width of the access point and that there was no path to building 2. He noted a number of omissions and errors in the report. The Chair clarified the swept path analysis. Kevin Holland was asked about his concerns on the impact on woodland and he explained the impact of light from the buildings on protected species.

John Bonarius, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application. He noted that it was an overdevelopment of a biodiverse area. He added that there would be increased noise and vehicle movements, impact of light on neighbouring properties. He noted the development would cause traffic issues on Hempland Lane through increased parking and access and egress issues.

Cllr Ayre (Heworth Without Ward Cllr), spoke in objection to the application. He agreed with the comments from Cllr Webb as detailed in the committee update. He noted that Hempland Lane was a key route and noted his concerns that the site was not acceptable due to highways issues. He noted the development's negative impact on wildlife.

[The meeting adjourned from 5.08pm until 5.12pm]

In response to questions from Members, Cllr Ayre explained:

- The highways issues on Hempland Lane and safety concerns, and he believed that 5 or 6 homes would have been more suitable.
- The highways objection to the quantum of development on the site.
- There was a significant portion of children attending Hempland School passing the site when travelling to school and local amenities. He noted that there was a number of local nurseries.
- Regarding the development impacting parking, there was already on street parking from Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMOs), there was no extra space for onsite parking and there was also concerns about traffic spends on Hempland Lane.

Janet O'Neill (Agent for the Applicant) spoke in support of the application. She explained that it was a modest development for first time buyers and that sort of accommodation was needed. She noted that government policy was the efficient use of land and that York was a densely developed city surrounded by green belt. She added that it was a windfall site. Regarding highways concerns she noted the swept path analysis. She was asked and explained that:

- She was not concerned about the proximity of the building to woodland.
- Regarding concerns about the blind bend, drivers needed to drive with care.
- She didn't know where the proposed site to address biodiversity net gain would be located and it would be fixed for 30 years.
- The applicant did not have land in the local area that could be used to address biodiversity net gain.
- The applicant's highways consultant was satisfied with the width of access.
- Regarding waste disposal there was a number of private waste disposal contractors in York.

Members then asked officers questions to which the responded that:

- The first planning approval was for three buildings which had reduced to two buildings.
- The landscape architect's comments had been noted.

- The rooms had been measures in the scale plans and they exceeded minimum space standards
- The previous application on the site was not refused for highways reasons.
- Changing the bus stop position could not be conditioned.
- The swept path analysis was the resubmitted one.
- Highways looked at the highway design guide which was not currently in place. Planning looked at the NPPF and local planning policy and on balance found the application acceptable.
- It was explained what the committee could do in terms of the NPPF framework. The Senior Lawyer noted that the NPPF was detailed at paragraph 5.25 of the published report. This was read out by the Head of Planning and Development Services.
- Regarding the entrance of the site, a plan of the previous application was shown on the screen in the room. It was explained that the size of the pavement had increased, which wasn't in the previous application.
- The width of the access was 5.5m in the withdrawn guidance. The widths of the access was 4.6m at the nearest point, it swpt round to 5m and 4.5m at the pinch point and then to 4.9mIt was explained that what constituted as unacceptable harm was made on an application by application basis. The Senior Lawyer explained that should the committee refuse an application they must have sustainable, robust and defensible reasons for the refusal.
- Concerning planning consideration of the development being on a travel for children going to school, this was set out at paragraph 5.25 of the report, which referred to paragraph 117 of the NPPF.
- Regarding Condition 6, there was inherent building regulations that had to be met. If the regulations could not be met the developer would need to write to planning officers.
- The 10% biodiversity net gain would be enforced if it could not be met.
- The ridge heights were based on the scale plans.
- How the separation distances were calculated was explained and it was noted that all windows in the neighbouring properties did not exceed 25 degrees.

During debate the Chair read out paragraph 73 of the NPPF. Cllr Baxter proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application. This was seconded by Cllr Whitcroft. Following a vote with six voting in favour, and three against it was;

Resolved: That the application be approved.

Reasons:

- i. The proposal seeks consent for the demolition of an existing residential bungalow and the erection of 2no. new buildings to provide 8no. flats at No.45 Hempland Lane, Heworth.
- ii. The application site lies within a suburban area of the city, in a sustainable and accessible location and in a predominantly residential area. The apartments would contribute to the city's housing stock, and, on balance, it is considered that they would do so without undue harm to the character and appearance, visual amenity, highway safety, residential amenity of existing and future occupiers, natural environment or flood risk, subject to the imposed conditions. In light of the above, It is considered it complies with national planning guidance, as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and the City of York Local Plan 2018. Approval is therefore recommended.

[The meeting adjourned from 6.23pm until 6.35pm, during which time Cllr Baxter left the meeting].

30. Willow House, 34 Long Close Lane, York YO10 4UP [25/02537/FULM] (6:35pm)

[Cllr Burton joined the meeting and Cllr Steward gave apologies and left the meeting].

Cllr Whitcroft noted that he attended university with Sam Fitzpatrick (in attendance remotely to answer questions along with the applicant) and had not been in contact with them regarding the application.

Members considered a major full application from City of York Council for the Erection of 36 dwellings (use class C3) with associated open space, landscaping, access and parking following demolition of existing care home and garage blocks at Willow House 34 Long Close Lane York YO10 4UP.

The Head of Planning and Development gave a presentation on the application. She was asked and clarified the location of the Corsican pine tree. She explained that the scheme was a complete mix of house that noted that there was no lift in the proposal. She then gave an update on the application noting amendments to conditions.

Public Speakers

Zoe Dunn spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant. She explained that she was please to speak in support of completely

affordable housing which was a mix of council housing and shared ownership. She thanked Lisa Otter and their team for their work and thanked officers at the pre application stage of the application.

Zoe Dunn was joined by Rob Moorhouse (remote) and Sam FitzPatrick (remote) to answer Member questions. They were asked and explained that:

- They had addressed some comments from highways. It was explained that cycle parking met LTN 1/20.
- The design was deliverable and was designed to Passivhaus but did not necessarily meet Passivhaus certification.
- A 60% social rent and 40% shared housing split would be met.
- Tracking had been carried out for CYC refuse vehicles using the turning circle. The turning circle meant that three trees didn't need to be removed.
- The scheme was in an R18 zone and a carriage survey of R18 showed that it was only 50% full. It was a car free development in an accessible location.
- There were four disabled car parking spaces for wheelchair accessible homes. The development provided a range of accessible units. Every unit could be made accessible.

Lisa Otter spoke in support of the application on behalf of the applicant. She explained that the scheme delivered 36 new affordable homes. She added that the landscape was friendly and that sustainability was central to the design process. She thanked local residents for their engagement in the consultation. She thanked officers noting that the development was designed for the present and the future.

Lisa Otter was joined by Emily Ingham (remote) and Sophie Cole (remote) to answer Member questions. In response to Member questions, they explained that:

- It was a strategy of the scheme that residents couldn't apply for car permits as the scheme was car free. The applicant would need to work with the highways team about visitor parking.
- The levels of sustainability were very high which meant that running costs were very low for residents.
- Paragraph 5.104 of the published report detailed the open space arrangements and calculations. The open space met the minimum requirements.

During debate Cllr Burton proposed the officer recommendation to approve the application, and amendments to Conditions 6, 7, 10, 20, 23, 25 and 27 as detailed in the committee update. This was seconded by Cllr Whitcroft. Following a unanimous vote in favour it was;

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to updated Conditions 6, 7, 10, 20, 23, 25 and 27 as detailed in the committee update

Reasons:

- i. The application seeks consent for the erection of 36no. dwellings (use class C3) with associated open space, landscaping, access and parking following demolition of an existing care home and garage blocks at Willow House, Long Close Lane.
- ii. The application site lies within an urban area of the city, in a sustainable and accessible location and in a predominantly residential area. The development would contribute to the city's housing stock and provision of affordable housing. Whilst redevelopment of the brownfield site is considered to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset that is the City Walls, it is considered that the public benefits outweigh the less than substantial harm identified in respect of the impact upon the designated heritage assets.
- iii. The scheme is considered otherwise acceptable with regard to its design, layout and appearance, impact on highway safety, residential amenity of existing and future occupiers and the natural environment, subject to the imposed conditions. In light of the above, It is considered it complies with national planning guidance, as contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the City of York Local Plan. Approval is therefore recommended.

Cllr Crawshaw, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 7.26 pm].