
MEETING	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP
DATE	4 JANUARY 2010
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS STEVE GALLOWAY (CHAIR), POTTER (VICE-CHAIR), D'AGORNE, MERRETT, REID, SIMPSON-LAING, R WATSON AND WATT

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they might have in the business on the agenda. No interests were declared.

7. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Local Development Framework Group held on 7 September 2009 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

Councillor Merrett requested a number of amendments to the minutes and agreed to email the Democracy Officer with the in depth explanations, but the amendments were briefly as follows:

Minute Item 2 Public Participation – be amended to state that the unanswered letters highlighted by the Speaker are to be replied to by Officers.

Minute Item 4 – Green Infrastructure.

- That it be made clear that once Local Green Corridors are identified, they should form a constraint on planning.
- That further information on Local Green Corridors and Local Green Wedges be brought to the LDF Working Group in Summer 2010.
- That resolution (iii) be amended to include the additional areas highlighted by Members.

Minute Item 5 – Biodiversity Audit.

- Railway owned land should be identified on the document as area's of potential interest which warrant further investigation.

- Parish Councils and other groups that would be interested in identifying further areas of ridge and furrow be consulted.

8. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that two people had registered to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Tom Hughes, from the Meadlands Area Residents Association spoke in relation to item 6. He queried why Green Belt Land was being included in the Core Strategy if the feedback from the City Wide Consultation indicates the majority of respondents want to save the land. He also queried the minutes of the last meeting, in particular the interest declared by Councillor Watson. He asked who the Client's are that Councillor Watson represents as he understood the landowners were City of York Council and asked Councillor Watson to reply.

Mark Warters commented that he had not received a reply to his letters further to the meeting of the 7 September. He also made comments on item 6 of the agenda, City-Wide Leaflet feedback as he felt there had been inadequate consultation given the level of response.

9. YORK NORTHWEST AREA ACTION PLAN - PROGRESS REPORT AND NEXT STEPS.

Members considered a report which outlines the current position with York Northwest and which sets out a programme of work to move the York Central project forward. Members were asked to note the progress with York Northwest and to endorse the approach outlined.

Officers introduced the report and updated Members on the progress made with the York Northwest Area Action Plan and outlined the intended joint approach with the York Central Consortium in order to identify a way forward. Members raised various comments and questions which were addressed by Officers. These included:

Whether it was possible for Councillors to have access to the proposals mentioned in paragraph 14 of the report. Officers advised that the document is a Leeds City Council document but is a Public document and they can provide Members with an email link.

- Whether Officers had a 'back up' plan if the proposals for the York Northwest site encountered difficulties and what is being done in the wider LDF process. Officers advised that other sites are coming forward and that the Core Strategy would be flexible enough to deal with a large site not coming forward.
- Members queried the need to include a requirement for lifetime housing.

- A Member queried the impact on the City Centre should Option 4 'Residential with Retail at York Central' be taken forward.
- Appendix 1 Option 2 – Members queried the educational facilities as the consultation identified a specific requirement to look at a Secondary School site. Officers advised that the Options in appendix 1 are not final solutions and educational facilities would be taken into account.
- Also in reference to Appendix 1 Option 2, members queried whether a school playing field on the site would mean that other open space provision would be taken out. Officers advised it is too early to comment on this.
- Members commented that further discussion is required concerning the provision for secondary school on the site, e.g.: if there are enough students in the combined areas for a new school.
- Officers advised that in order to understand why the procurement process had stalled they will be looking at why the bids were not acceptable. Educational facilities and other specifics would be looked into again. Officers asked Members to note that the contaminated land may challenge parts of the site and the Land Use Model would be utilised in order to establish what is feasible.

Members queried when the LDF Working Group would receive a further update. Officers advised it would be mid February before any further details would be made public.

RESOLVED: (i) That Members note the progress with the York Northwest AAP.

REASON: To ensure that work being undertaken for York Northwest is progressed.

RESOLVED: (ii) That Members endorse the joint approach for York Central and the joint programme of work outlined in Appendix 2 to the Officers report.

REASON: To ensure the regeneration of the area is delivered which will meet the objectives for the area.

10. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: CITY CENTRE ACTION PLAN - PROGRESS TOWARD PREFERRED OPTIONS.

Members received a report which outlined the progress on the City Centre Action Plan (AAP). It presented the following; appraisals of options and emerging preferred options, progress on ongoing consultation, progress on background documents and further work required, next steps in preparation of a Preferred Options document.

Since the last report to Members in January 2009 Officers have been involved in the following areas of work:

- Completion of the Options Appraisals (Annex A to report).
- Progressed the evidence base.
- Worked on the People Changing Places project alongside Beam
- Progressed discussions on key projects such as the riverside, cultural quarter, Minster Piazza.
- Ongoing consultation including a presentation to the Without Walls Board in March and York Civic Trust in September.
- Production of a Vision Prospectus.

Members received a presentation from Officers, reminding them of the importance of the City Centre AAP, especially the importance of the City Centre to York's economy due to tourist spend. The presentation also outlined the work completed to date.

Members queried the delay in the City Centre Plan Process. Officers advised that there had been some slippage, but they were now satisfied with the timetable. Officers advised that in order to move the City Centre AAP it is important to decide which of the Emerging Preferred Options should be taken forward as Preferred Options and invited Members to make comments. Members commented as follows, by reference to the Issues and Options Questions detailed in Annex A of the Officers report:

- Question 4 – Members reiterated concern regarding retail at York Central.
- Question 8 – Offices in the City Centre have declined and significant employment sites are being lost as a result. Members felt that Options 2 and 3 should be considered as preferred options to support the principle of Office Quarters. Concern was expressed over option 4 that change of use and loss of larger offices should be resisted as far as possible.
- Question 9 – it was highlighted that the size of office development should be clearly specified and not referred to as 'small or medium sized'.
- Question 12 – Members requested that Options 2 and 3 be kept in.
- Question 13 – The potential for Option 3 should be reviewed.
- Question 15 – A Member noted that options 1 and 2 were potentially prejudiced by the proposed St. Sampsons Square Taxi Rank.
- Question 17 – members commented that Officers should consider including an Archaeology policy.
- Question 21 – Option 3 to still be considered.
- Question 22 – Members queried Option 5 and which other areas were being looked at as potential foot streets. Officers advised that this is still being looked into and there is no definitive answer at the moment.
- Question 23 – Members queried Option 4 and the provision of a children's play area. Officers advised that there is specific allocation for a City Centre play area under the Playbuilder Scheme which will ensure provision in the City Centre.

- Question 29 – Members commented that the wording of Option 2 should be strengthened to emphasise that off-site facilities are a last resort.
- Question 32 – Option 2 – any option should minimise energy consumption and not increase light pollution.
- Question 33 – Members commented that the late night park and ride services in the City had not been successful and felt Officers should consider this fact when looking at Option 1 and look at the diversion of stage carriage services to provide late night connections.
- Question 34 – Any options for housing over shops should consider how accessible they are and the need for outdoor space.
- Question 35 – Ensure that the sites are suitable for future development in all respects and not just for affordable housing. Members commented that the affordable housing threshold will be set through the Core Strategy process.
- Question 38 – Members commented on the need for public open spaces at Castle Piccadilly.
- Question 48 – AAP boundary needs to be wide enough to include necessary transport projects.

Vision Prospectus

Members considered Annex C of the report which introduced to them a document entitled 'A Vision of York City Centre'. Officers advised that the document would be brought back to the next LDF meeting to be considered further and invited Members to email to them any detailed comments. Members made some initial comments on the document. These were as follows:

- Members queried whether the title 'A Vision of York City Centre' was the correct title for the document and suggested the word 'Prospectus' may be better terminology.
- Certain Members felt that the prospectus would be useful in encouraging vision and stimulating debate amongst interested parties. The prospectus is a step in the right direction and contained some refreshing ideas.
- Members commented that the public transport and air quality problems in the City centre need to be tackled.
- Members commented on the appearance of the document in general and felt the plastic pages were unnecessary and costly and that the number of white blank spaces did not look attractive.
- Members queried whether the document would be financially viable given the limited number of significant redevelopment opportunities in the City centre.
- Some Members expressed concern at the very limited reference to the wider environment and sustainability agendas including responding to the climate change agenda and its application on access to and from the City Centre.
- The Council's Equalities department should be consulted on the style of the document further.

RESOLVED: (i) That Members contact Officers with any further comments on the Vision Prospectus and that it be brought back to the next meeting of the LDF Working Group for further consideration.

REASON: So that changes recommended as a result of discussions at this meeting and after the meeting via email, can be reported to Members and the report can progress through to the Executive.

RESOLVED (ii) That Members noted and commented on the Options Appraisals as detailed above, as a basis for drafting the preferred options and undertaking further background work.

REASON: To ensure that the LDF City Centre Area Action Plan can be progressed to its next stage of development as highlighted in the Council's Local Development Scheme.

RESOLVED (iii) That Members noted the next steps in preparing the Preferred Options document for presentation to them in 2010.

REASON: To ensure that the LDF City Centre Action Plan can be progressed to its next stage of development as highlighted in the Council's Local Development Scheme.

11. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - CORE STRATEGY PREFERRED OPTIONS CITY-WIDE LEAFLET FEEDBACK.

Members considered the first of two reports, which advises them of the outcome of the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation, carried out in Summer 2009. Annex B to the report sets out the results from the Core Strategy Preferred Options City-wide leaflet consultation.

A wide range of methods were used as part of the Preferred Options Consultation and Annex A to the Officers report sets out the full range of consultation events held. The leaflet helped to ensure that all residents of York were aware of the consultation, whilst the specific events enabled more in depth discussion with interested parties.

Members received a presentation of the sample profile for postcodes following the Core Strategy Preferred Options City-wide leaflet consultation. Officers advised that the survey is just one aspect of the consultation process.

Members commented on the survey results as follows:

- It would be useful for Member's to have the population figures for each postcode area in order to understand the response figures clearly in relation to each other.
- Whether the 'not answered' data was available. Officers confirmed any non-responses had been taken out of the data and could be made available if required.
- As some of the responses contradict each other, it was queried how much weight would be given to this survey further down the line. Officers advised that the results of the other methods of consultation such as Workshops, would also be taken into account, which should clarify any contradictions once all the data is brought together.
- Some Members asked their concerns to be recorded over the validity of the response to the housing questions given the wording of the question and responses received.
- Comments were made regarding the lack of support for the maximum development approved and for suggested retail on the York Central site.
- Whether the questionnaire included a question on the respondent's demographics. Officers advised it did not but the consultation process would ensure that a wide range of views would be received.
- Members pointed out that there was a conflict in that the respondents wished for more jobs and homes in York but were reluctant to identify where they should be located.

RESOLVED: That Members note the comments received from consultees in response to the Preferred Options city-wide questionnaire, and support their consideration in informing the production of the Core Strategy submission draft and, where relevant, other emerging LDF documents.

REASON: To help inform Members of the consultation responses ahead of the next stage of the Core Strategy production.

Cllr S F Galloway, Chair
 [The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 7.30 pm].