

---

Meeting	Planning Committee
Date	27 October 2016
Present	Councillors Reid (Chair), Derbyshire (Vice-Chair), Boyce, Ayre, Cuthbertson, Dew, Doughty (apart from Minute Items 38a) 38b) 38d) 38e) 38f), Funnell, Galvin, Looker, Richardson, Shepherd, Warters, Hunter (Substitute for Councillor Cullwick) and Craghill (Substitute for Councillor D'Agorne)
Apologies	Councillors Cullwick and D'Agorne
In Attendance	Councillors Cullwick, Hayes, Mercer, Orrell and Runciman

---

### 35. Site Visits

Application	Reason	In Attendance
Clifford's Tower, Tower Street	As the Officer recommendation was for approval and objections had been received.	Councillors Boyce, Cullwick, D'Agorne, Dew, Funnell, Galvin and Reid.
Naburn Marina, Naburn Lane	As the Officer recommendation was for approval and the application was situated in the Green Belt.	Councillors Boyce, Cullwick, D'Agorne, Dew, Galvin and Reid.
St Peter's Boat House, Westminster Road	As the Officer recommendation was for approval and the proposal constituted 'inappropriate development' for the purposes of paragraph 88 of the NPPF.	Councillors Boyce, Cullwick, D'Agorne, Dew, Galvin and Reid.

Former Unit A1, Parkside Commercial Centre, Terry Avenue	As the Officer recommendation was for approval and objections had been received.	Councillors Boyce, Cullwick, D'Agorne, Dew, Galvin and Reid.
Naburn Lock Caravan Park, Naburn Lock Track	As the Officer recommendation was for approval and the proposal was in the Green Belt.	Councillors Boyce, Cullwick, D'Agorne, Dew, Galvin and Reid.
York Designer Outlet, St Nicholas Avenue	As the Officer recommendation was for approval and the proposal was in the Green Belt.	Councillors Boyce, Cullwick, D'Agorne, Dew, Galvin and Reid.

### 36. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests that they might have had in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Derbyshire declared a personal non prejudicial interest in plans item 4a (Clifford's Tower, Tower Street) as her employer was a consultee for building work on Clifford's Tower.

Councillor Cuthbertson declared a personal non prejudicial interest in the same item as one of council's appointed representatives on York Museums Trust.

### 37. **Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the last Planning Committee held on 15 September 2016 be approved and then signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### 38. **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.

**39. Plans List**

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Development Services, Planning and Regeneration) relating to the following planning applications outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views of consultees and Officers.

**40. Clifford's Tower, Tower Street, York, YO1 9SA (16/01642/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by English Heritage for the erection of a visitor centre at the base of the motte, café unit on the roof deck, installation of a new staircase, tower floor, walkways, balustrading, roof-deck and restoration works.

Officers circulated an update to Members which covered the following points, a copy of which was attached to the online agenda following the meeting:

Five third party representations had been received following publication of the agenda which raised the following concerns:

- Clifford's Tower is associated with one of the worst periods of intolerance and religious hatred in English history, which ultimately saw around 150 Jewish people commit suicide rather than face the prospect of burning to death in 1190. It is considered that a cafe is completely at odds with what should be a site of reflection and commemoration. If there must be a visitor site, the suggestion would be to build it as an extension to the castle museum.
- The proposals may compromise future aspirations regarding public realm enhancement within the area
- The proposal makes little concession to less able visitors and the true public benefits of the scheme are questioned.

### Conservation Areas Advisory Panel

The Panel was disappointed that the main scheme had not progressed from the pre-app proposal. They did not agree with the principle of the proposal, considering that the opportunity should be taken to provide a free-standing building which could relate to and explain the whole Eye of York site, its buildings and history: Clifford's Tower, the Castle Museum, the Prison, the Crown Court etc

### Council for British Archaeology (CBA)

Whilst the current proposals represent the beginnings of a potentially acceptable scheme, further work should be undertaken to make these appropriate for the sensitivities and significance of this heritage asset;

- The CBA feels that a detailed archaeological mitigation strategy should be submitted as part of a full and robust proposal;
- The CBA feels that the proposals miss opportunities to enhance the visitor experience at this iconic York structure;
- The CBA has concerns regarding the character and extent of the proposed internal access arrangements; and
- The CBA has concerns regarding the character, extent and location of the proposed Visitor Centre.

Regarding a recent feasibility study that had been conducted for a new independent building within the area of Clifford's Tower, Members were informed that a report would be received later in the new year about the land ownership. The land was part of the Southern Gateway project and there were time constraints attached, it was leased to English Heritage by the Council.

It was reported that two speakers had registered to speak in objection:

Alderman Brian Watson stated that the Tower was one of the most visited tourist attractions in England but did not receive many return visits. He stated that the steps up the mound were an important feature. The design of the visitor centre and the addition of a café did not add value. He felt that the Officer recommendation should have been refusal in particular due to the Southern Gateway feasibility study.

Councillor Johnny Hayes MBE addressed the Committee as a local resident and expressed the view that that the application would cause harm to the archaeology and was financially driven. He added that the design of the building was off-putting, and the position at the base of the mound had been the focus of most objections.

It was reported that one speaker had registered to speak in support:

Jeremy Ashbee, Head Properties Curator for English Heritage, informed Members how English Heritage felt that the facilities provided on the site were currently inadequate and did not pay justice to the significance of the Tower or castle site. Members were informed that within the visitor centre, there would be a chance for visitors who were less mobile to experience climbing the tower at ground level. The visitor centre would also allow for murals from the castle wall to be displayed.

In response to questions from Members, the applicant advised that;

- The visitor centre was located at the base of the motte to allow for a staged ascent of the tower and also to view the 17<sup>th</sup> century wall.
- A location for a building had been considered in the car park, visitors would have to be clearly directed some way away from the visitor centre towards the Tower, and it was felt the interpretation would lose its impact if the centre was some distance away.
- The visitor centre would contain a toilet and a space small for selling tickets and drinks.
- There would be unrestricted access to the Tower with CCTV coverage of the roof deck.
- There would be an interpretation of the events of 1190 within the visitor centre to commemorate York's Jewish heritage.

Members entered debate during which the following views and points were expressed;

- The visitor centre could be located in the car park in association with the Southern Gateway project.

- More of the archaeology and prison wall would be visible from the roof deck of the Tower.
- The height of the visitor centre would be a third of the height of the mound, therefore it would intrude on the mound itself.
- The application would improve the fabric of the building and interpretation.

Councillor Warters asked that his vote against approval of the application be recorded in the minutes.

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

Reason: (i) There would be some minor harm to designated heritage assets, i.e. on archaeological deposits and through changes to the familiar view of Clifford's Tower from the Eye of York. Having attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of avoiding such harm, the local planning authority has concluded that it is outweighed by the application's public benefits and by the new building having been carefully designed to make an architectural contribution in its own right without challenging the dominance or character of the existing structures. The majority of identified views within the conservation area would be preserved.

(ii) The application accords with national planning policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and with the emerging policies in the Draft York Local Plan (2014 Publication Draft).

**41. Naburn Marina, Naburn Lane, Naburn, York YO19 4RW (16/01558/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Mr P Bleakley for a replacement garage/workshop building (revised scheme).

Officers reported that there had been no objections from the Flood Risk Management Officer to the application.

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

Reason: It is considered that the other considerations put forward by the applicant together with the mitigation of other harm through the imposition of appropriate planning conditions clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm (impact on openness), and thereby amount to very special circumstances to allow the inappropriate development in the York Green Belt even when substantial weight is given to such harm.

**42. St Peters Boat House, Westminster Road, York (16/01325/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by St Peter's School for the demolition of a boathouse and construction of a replacement boathouse, extension of boat repair block to accommodate sports facilities and amenities and extension of steps to river.

In their update to Members, Officers stated that there was an error in the report at paragraph 4.15; which stated that in the 2005 Draft Local Plan proposals, the site was identified as Green Belt land. This was incorrect, it was not included as Green Belt. In addition, revised drawings submitted by the applicant illustrated that an ash tree would be retained.

It was reported that one speaker had registered to speak in objection:

Mr Pugsley, a user of the riverside footpath, spoke in objection to the application. He felt that the large steps were unnecessary, unsightly and would damage the natural habitat. He added that the application site was also on a national cycle path and so would cause congestion for other users of the path. He questioned why the proposal prioritised an activity that did not take place all year round.

It was reported that one speaker had registered to speak in support:

Janet O'Neill, the agent for the applicant spoke in support of the proposal. She highlighted an audit that showed that rowing was

growing in popularity but lacked facilities. The current boathouse was too small and it was dangerous for users to retrieve boats from the river in front of the boathouse. She explained that the steps would allow for a number of boats to launch simultaneously. As there would be an impact on the green belt, the boathouse would be painted green and hand diggings had been carried out due to a veteran tree on site.

In response to questions from Members, the applicant outlined that;

- St Peter's School would need to balance their partnership with York City Rowing Club, who had access to the boathouse to work with other schools in the city.
- The steps would be lengthened to allow for a number of boats to be launched at the same time and also because the students were timetable restricted, and wished to lengthen their access on the water.

Members entered debate and the following views and points were expressed;

- There were opportunities for roosting bats within the design of the boathouse which could be conditioned, if planning permission was granted.
- There would be minimal impact to the habitat caused by the application.
- A more secure facility was needed for the storage of boats.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report and an amended and additional condition;

Amended condition:

2. Drawing no 2. 2014-273/1303 rev. K 'Site Layout Plan' dated 24/10/16

Additional condition:

12. The design of the lower boathouse shall include features which are suitable to accommodate roosting bats, the



details of which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before construction of the building commences. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To enhance the existing habitats of this protected species in the locality, in accordance with Paragraph 118 of National Policy Planning Framework.

Reason: Other considerations, together with mitigation of other harm through planning conditions, clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt, even when affording this harm considerable substantial weight, and any other harm. This, therefore, amounts to the 'very special circumstances' necessary to justify the development.

**43. Former Unit A1, Parkside Commercial Centre, Terry Avenue, York (15/02321/FULM)**

Members considered a full major application by Mr Paul Manku for the erection of a 97 bedroom hotel.

Officers provided a written update, a copy of which was attached to the online agenda. They advised that since the publication of the agenda comments had been received from the following:

Councillor Hayes objected to the application as he felt the development was too large and would not be in keeping with its location on the riverside. It would also overshadow the houses on Lower Ebor Street. He added that there were concerns about the amount of traffic that would be generated in a tranquil area and felt that the riverside would be diminished with a development of the size proposed.

There had been comments received from the caravan club:

- There was limited space for a landscape buffer and landscaping conditions were requested to maintain the setting of the caravan park, by giving privacy at the boundary & limiting light pollution.

- There is potential for noise during construction. A condition is asked for, to approve a CEMP & restrict times of working (note a CEMP is required under condition 7).
- Potential noise from the aparthotel, because the proposed use could operate as a venue for conferences, functions and events and therefore will be operational late in to evening and over the weekends, unlike the approved hotel. A condition is requested that these extra uses are not permitted.
- Conditions are also requested to control noise, cooking odour and times of deliveries

Comments received from local residents included:

- The Council will be held liable for any issues, loss or damages whatsoever created by the scheme. This includes road traffic noise, nuisance, damage, disruption, deterioration in any aspect generally, any nuisance, damage and disruption caused locally by the proposed build itself or afterwards by any nuisance, damage, disruption or similar which in any way results in loss of amenity, enjoyment or reduction in value of property or wellbeing.
- The Council are representatives of local residents and should not ignore the significant level of public objection to the scheme.
- The caravan club is well-managed and does not tolerate anti-social behaviour. It is noted that there is curfew and occupants need to be back on site in the evening.
- The Environment Agency (EA) had proposed improved flood defences for the area which are unlikely to occur if this development were to go ahead.

A written objection on behalf of Duke's Wharf residents had been received from AAH Planning. It stated that the scheme was not compliant with recent Environment Agency (EA) policy on recommended finished floor levels.

This objection suggested that the application be deferred to allow the applicants to remodel against the most up-to-date climate change figures.

Members were informed that the Council's Drainage Engineer had provided further technical information, details of which were included in the Officer update, which was published online.

It was reported that there were two registrations to speak in objection to the application:

Robert Walker, spoke on behalf of the residents at Duke's Wharf flats. He highlighted to Members that the proposed development would increase activity on the site, and the access would be parallel to Duke's Wharf flats. He advised that the site had been flooded forty five times since 2001 and commented on finished floor levels.

John Railton, another Duke's Wharf resident made comments on how he felt that the hotel could attract anti social behaviour and that the caravan club would be adversely affected by overlooking.

One speaker had registered to speak in support:

Mike Hitchmough, the architect for the applicant, spoke about how he felt that aparthotel model would support the revitalisation of the local area. He indicated that the building had twenty three fewer rooms, than originally proposed, and that the emergency exit had been located away from Lower Ebor Street.

It was confirmed that the evacuation arrangements in the event of a flood were via gates in to the caravan club and then into Vine Street.

In response to points raised by objectors, the architect responded that discussions were ongoing with the Environment Agency to increase the flood defence wall. The business model of the aparthotel also allowed for it to be closed for part of the year. In regards to anti social behaviour, the applicant had met with Clementhorpe Residents Association to discuss these concerns.

A Member of Council had registered to speak in objection:

Councillor Hayes spoke as the Ward Member. He underlined that the site sat at the tip of a green wedge of land and informed Members how the site was also located within a Conservation

Area. He felt that the proposal was out of scale and was also concerned about flooding and traffic.

The Council's Flood Risk Engineer informed the Committee that a flood barrier in the area would not be jeopardised by approving the application. He also added that the ground floor level of the proposed hotel was 600m above the modelled flood level and was protected up to a 1 in 1000 year storm. There was also a dry land evacuation route from the hotel. He added that the Environment Agency had objected to the application as they felt by approving the application, the Council might deviate from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Members entered into debate during which the following views and points were expressed;

- The trees on the site would be protected and there would be more flood storage offered than previously.
- The proposal was contrary to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, it was overbearing and unattractive.
- There had been no comments received from Economic Development Officers, when it could have a detrimental effect on economic growth in the area- particularly in relation to the caravan park
- There would be a greater traffic impact from an Aparthotel.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report and the following amended and additional condition which are stated below;

### 19 Landscaping

A detailed landscaping scheme, following the principles shown on the approved landscaping plans, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first use of the development hereby approved. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Details shall be provided showing how the landscaping/stepped entrance around the front/east entrance will be introduced without harm to tree roots. The hard landscaping measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme prior to first occupation. The soft landscaping measures shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme within 6

months of first occupation. Any trees or plants which within 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, in the interests of visual amenity and the setting of heritage assets.

## 20 External Lighting

Prior to installation details of any external lighting to be installed shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include design and location of light fittings, and the level of luminance measured in lux, in the vertical and horizontal planes. The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reason: (i) The principle of developing a city centre use at this edge of centre site has been accepted previously and is again justified for the proposed hotel use; there would be no material impact on the vitality and viability of the city centre.

(ii) The scheme adheres to the design principles approved previously. The design and proposed materials are appropriate to the locality and the landscaping scheme would improve the condition of the site. There would not be harm to the conservation area.

(iii) The building would be reasonably safe from flooding and would not increase flood risk elsewhere. Appropriate management arrangements would be put in place to protect future users. The proposal meets the requirements of the NPPF sequential and exception tests and is acceptable when considered against national planning policy on flood risk. There is justification

to outweigh the presumption against developing a hotel on this site established in the local SFRA which dates from 2013, when read in conjunction with the NPPF and Environment Agency advice.

(iv) The scheme discourages private car use and the car parking provision on site is minimal. There would be no material impact on highway safety along Terry Avenue and its use for recreation would not be compromised.

(v) Terry Avenue is a popular recreational route and the site is next door to a caravan site. There is no substantiated evidence that users of the hotel would cause additional noise disturbance compared to other users of the avenue at night. The scheme would improve the appearance of the site and the building has been designed so there would be no undue impact on neighbour's amenity. There are no amenity grounds to oppose the application. There is no unacceptable harm to amenity on which grounds the application could reasonably be refused.

**44. Naburn Lock Caravan Park, Naburn Lock Track, Naburn, York (16/01853/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Mr and Mrs Wilkinson for the use of the land for the siting of 15 touring caravans/camping pitches.

An Officer update which included three suggested additional conditions if planning permission was granted, was circulated to Members. This was published with the agenda following the meeting.

One speaker had registered to speak in support of the application:

Kevin Robinson, the agent for the applicant explained to the Committee how the high occupancy rates at the caravan park meant that people had to be turned away. He underlined the economic benefits that the proposal would bring to Naburn village and also pointed out the sustainable transport links.

A Member of Council had registered to speak in support of the application:

Councillor Mercer highlighted that the land proposed for the additional pitches would be well screened from roads, would not produce noise after 11pm and would not be visible from other properties. She stated the additional pitches would also benefit the local public house and that the proximity of the bus stop would encourage visitors to travel into York.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report and the following three additional conditions;

- (i) Details of any scheme for illumination of all external areas of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within 8 weeks of the permission being granted and the agreed scheme shall thenceforth be implemented on site on first usage of the authorised pitches and thereafter.

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

- (ii) Details of all machinery, plant and equipment to be installed in or located on the use hereby permitted, which is audible outside of the site boundary when in use, shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval prior to the pitches hereby authorised being first brought into use. These details shall include maximum (LA<sub>max</sub> (f)) and average sound levels (LA<sub>eq</sub>), octave band noise levels and any proposed noise mitigation measures. All such approved machinery, plant and equipment shall not be used on the site except in accordance with the prior written approval of the local planning authority. The machinery, plant or equipment and any approved noise mitigation measures shall be fully implemented and operational before the proposed use first opens and shall be appropriately maintained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residential

- (iii) A noise management scheme shall be agreed with the local planning authority which shall specify the provisions to be made for the control of noise emanating from the site. The scheme should in particular, address noise from customers on site and the handling of noise complaints received by the camping site. The scheme shall be approved by the local planning authority within 8 weeks of the permission being granted and once approved implemented and adhered to on first implementation of the pitches and thereafter.

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residential dwellings.

Reason: It is considered that a case for "very special circumstances" has been submitted in respect of the proposed development which would clearly outweigh any harm caused to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness together with any other harm. The potential impacts of the previous proposal upon the setting of Naburn Banqueting House and the residential amenity of neighbouring properties have also been effectively addressed. The scheme is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

**45. York Designer Outlet, St Nicholas Avenue, York, YO19 4TA (16/01483/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Drew Kirby for a change of use of part of car park to a 12 hole artificial all weather putting course.

Officers provided a written update to Members, this was published with the agenda online after the meeting. In the update they advised that;

There was an error in the report, in paragraph 1.2 the fencing height was 1.2m not 1.5m as stated.

Comments received from Landscape Architect

- Considers that the proposal would slightly enhance the visual and physical landscape. Would involve the removal



of 2 small trees and includes the planting of 25 small species trees

- The boundary fence follows the kerb line so there would be no impact on existing trees to be retained
- A condition is recommended to secure a method statement to ensure that adequate tree protection is observed during the construction phase

Officers advised that an additional condition be included regarding protection measures for existing trees.

#### Comments received from Flood Risk Engineer

- Notes that the proposal involves breaking up of the existing tarmac to ensure free drainage
- No objections are raised on flood risk or drainage grounds

One speaker had registered to speak in support of the application:

Simon Laws, the agent for the applicant informed the Committee about the landscaping aspects of the application. The features would be Historic York landmarks. The site itself would result in a loss of six car parking spaces.

Resolved: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report and the additional landscaping condition detailed below.

#### Additional condition

Before the commencement of development including demolition, excavations and building operations, an Arboricultural 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. Amongst others, this statement shall include details and locations of protective fencing and method of installation, site rules and prohibitions, arrangements for loading/off-loading, parking arrangements for site vehicles, locations for stored materials, locations and means of installing utilities, location of site compound and marketing suite where applicable. The document shall also include methodology for removing the existing surface and installing the proposed surfacing and planting. A copy of the document will be available for inspection on site at all times.

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 and/or development.

Reason: (i) The proposal would have no significant impact on openness, nor would the proposal conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. It is considered that the proposal would complement the existing retail function of the site, potentially making it more attractive as a retail destination thus bringing economic benefits to the area.

(ii) It is considered that taken together, the site circumstances and other considerations referred to above, even when attaching substantial weight to the harm to the Green Belt, amount to very special circumstances in this case that are sufficient to clearly outweigh the potential harm to the Green Belt and any other harm.

**46. Land To The North Of Avon Drive, Huntington, York (16/01073/OUTM)**

Members considered an outline major application by Pilcher Homes Ltd for the erection of 67 dwellings.

It was reported that three people had registered to speak in objection to the application.

David Trayhorn, a local resident spoke about the detrimental effect that the development would have on the carbon footprint of the area from the increase in houses and traffic. He felt that the local infrastructure needed to be improved before any new development was approved.

Roy Brown, a local resident, felt that no very special circumstances had been demonstrated by the applicant for building in the green belt. He felt that the land was the final natural barrier that remained between Earswick and Huntington and stopped the two villages from coalescence.

Professor Hartley, a local resident, spoke regarding a consultation document which had been circulated by the applicant. She informed the Committee that it was incorrect that he had consulted widely with residents, as those on Strensall Road had not been informed of the planned development.

Two speakers had registered in support of the application:

Simon Chadwick, the agent for the applicant stated that the application site was not in the green belt and that until York had an adopted up to date Local Plan special circumstances could not be demonstrated. He added that the development would be bounded by the ring road on two sides and therefore could not be classified as sprawl. He advised that the Committee approve the application on the basis of sustainable housing.

Robert Pilcher the applicant, spoke about the history of development on Avon Drive and referred to the previous application submitted. He informed the Committee about the alterations.

In response to Members' questions, the applicant responded:

- The information leaflets were circulated by a company which were told to look at certain areas in York.
- There would be 27 starter homes on the site.
- No planning permission had been necessary on the original Avon Drive site sixty years ago.
- Changes had been made to the application as a result of consultation with Members, the leaflets were for information.

Diane Geogheghan- Breen, Chair of Huntington Parish Council, spoke in regards to the community effect that the development would have, such as on local schools and on GP surgeries.

Councillor Cullwick spoke as the Ward Member. He referred to the previous Draft Local Plan which did not include development on the site. He was unaware of the leaflets that had been circulated and wanted to know about the geographic location of the "likes" on the New Homes for York Facebook page, which had been established in association with the application.

During debate some Members felt that although it was an attractive development, the draft local plan had located the site

within the Green Belt. They added that they were concerned about the coalescence between the two villages.

Others expressed the view that the location was appropriate and the applicant had considered access and a number of the new properties would be affordable starter homes and the city needed more housing.

Resolved: That the application be refused.

Reason: Policy YH9 and Y1 of the Yorkshire and Humber Plan - Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026 defines the general extent of the Green Belt around York with an outer boundary about 6 miles from the city centre. The application site is located in the Green Belt as identified in the 2005 City of York Draft Local Plan. It is considered that the proposed development of up to 67 houses and associated infrastructure constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt as set out in section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt. No 'very special circumstances' have been put forward by the applicant that would outweigh harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, including the impact on the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with the purposes of including land within Green Belt. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to advice within the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular section 9 'Protecting Green Belt Land' and policy GB1 'Development in the Green Belt' of the 2005 City of York Draft Local Plan.

Cllr A Reid, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.35 pm and finished at 8.30 pm].