
MEETING	PLANNING COMMITTEE
DATE	20 DECEMBER 2012
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS HORTON (CHAIR), CUNNINGHAM-CROSS, GALVIN (VICE-CHAIR), AYRE, BOYCE, BURTON, D'AGORNE, DOUGHTY, FIRTH, HEALEY (SUBSTITUTE), KING, MCILVEEN, REID, RICHES, SIMPSON-LAING AND WILLIAMS
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS WISEMAN

29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Councillor Williams declared a personal interest as his employer Yorkshire Water had requested a condition.

30. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2012 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record, subject to the addition of an informative regarding affordable housing to minute item 28b.

31. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Councils Public Participation Scheme.

32. PLANS LIST

Members considered a report of the Assistant Director (City Development and Sustainability) relating to the following planning application, which outlined the proposal and relevant planning considerations and set out the views of the consultees and officers

32a Land Adjacent to and to the rear of Windy Ridge and Brecks Lane, Huntington, York. (12/02979/FULM).

Members considered a major full application submitted by Mr. Paul Butler, for a residential development of 87 dwellings with associated access and infrastructure.

Officers circulated a Committee update, the main points of which were:

- Two additional letters of objection had been received from local residents. The letters made similar points to those summarised in paragraph 3.14 of the committee report, with the addition of reference to the poor design of the proposed houses, the lack of the 'Cambridge' design which is an affordable housing type and that the small existing trees to the north of the site should be retained.
- Suggested condition 2 in the committee report did not contain a list of suggested approved plans as they were still being finalised, these were now available.
- An additional condition is proposed to cover the location and design of a sub-station and pump station which are required to be located on the site.

Members then went on to question the officers on a number of points, including:

- The provision of a crossing on New Lane and where it is proposed to be located. Officers advised that this matter will be subject to further discussion with the applicant and highways officers and a consultation.
- The retention of the hedgerow along the boundary of New lane and whether there will be a condition to stipulate how the hedge will be maintained. Officers advised the Section 106 would include a management plan to cover this.

Jay Everett spoke on behalf of Portakabin. He advised that they had concerns about how the scheme could impact on their operations both now and in the future. He felt that noise generated by Portakabin may impact upon residents at the site and the concern was based on issues that had arisen with residents that already live nearby. He welcomed the work that Barratts had undertaken to mitigate against noise but suggested that the building of a bund along the boundary with Portakabin would be useful.

Paul Butler spoke on behalf of Barratt Homes. He advised that the development will provide homes and jobs for York and will protect the ecological value of the site. Barratts are working to find a solution with Portakabin regarding noise, however the Council's Environmental protection Unit are satisfied with the suggestion of a 3 metre high acoustic barrier and green planting.

Members went on to question a number of points including:

- The advantages and disadvantages of a fence over a bund. Officers explained that a bund would affect the value of the grassland due to its width, therefore a fence is preferable.
- The significance of the grassland. The Council's Countryside Officer responded to advise that there is less than 100 hectares of that type of grassland left in York and that the applicant has been working with officers to ensure that as much as possible is retained.
- The Environmental Protections Officers opinion on the potential for noise nuisance. It was confirmed that EPU are satisfied with a fence and can not foresee a problem with noise. Any future noise issues would be dealt with appropriately.

Following further discussion it was:

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the Section 106 agreement.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report.

CLLR Horton, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 5.20 pm].