
MEETING	PLANNING COMMITTEE
DATE	19 FEBRUARY 2008
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS SIMPSON-LAING (VICE-CHAIR), CREGAN (not for item 48), CRISP, D'AGORNE, FIRTH, SUE GALLOWAY, GALVIN, HUDSON, JAMIESON-BALL, KING, MOORE, REID, B WATSON, HYMAN (SUBSTITUTE), PIERCE (SUBSTITUTE)(not for item 47a) AND GILLIES (SUBSTITUTE)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS R WATSON, HORTON AND WISEMAN

43. INSPECTION OF SITES

The following sites were inspected before the meeting:

Site	Attended by	Reason for Visit
Land to the West of Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick, York	Councillors Sue Galloway, Reid, Gillies, Crisp.	As objections had been received and the application was recommended for approval.

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited at this point to declare any personal or prejudicial interests they may have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Pierce declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Plans Item 4a (Land to the West of Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick, York) as he was a Member of the Derwenthorpe Development Panel. He left the room and took no part in the discussions thereon.

Councillor Hyman declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Plans Item 4a (Land to the West of Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick, York) as his father used to live in Meadlands.

Councillor D'Agorne declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Plans Item 4a (Land to the West of Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick, York) as he was a Member of the Whiz Go Car Club and a member of York Cycle Campaign.

Councillor Jamieson-Ball declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Plans Item 4a (Land to the West of Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick, York) as he was a Member of the Whiz Go Car Club.

45. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meetings held on 22 November 2007 and 17 December 2007 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

46. 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 Committee.

47. PLANS LIST

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

47a Land to the West of Metcalfe Lane, Osbaldwick, York.

Members considered a major reserved matters application, submitted by the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust, for the residential development for 64 dwellings, including public open space, associated footpaths, cycleways, roads, engineering works and landscaping (Phase 1).

Officers updated on the following points:

- Bus stops within Phase 1 – negotiations have continued between the Council's Highways Department and the developers. This has led to a revised plan which shows indicative positions of the proposed bus stops within Phase 1. Two options have been offered, the first is that there would be a bus stop within the centre of the community along the Avenue. The second option is to have one stop located close to the entrance of Neighbourhood D adjacent to Osbaldwick Village and one stop along the Avenue located just South of the Sustrans cycle track. The exact details of these bus stops is not required to be approved as part of the reserved matters application but the proposed locations provide a degree of security that bus stops can be installed when required. Highway Network Management have confirmed that they are happy with the proposed bus stop locations.
- Consultation Response from the Landscape Officer – The content and arrangement of the landscape masterplan and supplementary information conforms with the objectives of the outline application. It is acceptable for any outstanding matters regarding the finer landscape details to be agreed under condition.
- An additional letter of objection had been received which raised the following points:
 - No details of the under grounding of pylons has been submitted

- No construction management plan has been submitted
- No details of a sewage pumping facility has been submitted
- There is no explanation as to the ownership of the site
- Objections to the removal of the hedge.

The issues raised above had been covered in the Planning Officer's report.

- Conditions – As a result of consultation responses some plans have been amended slightly. Therefore some of the plan numbers shown within Condition 2 should be amended to:
 - Revised Site Plan Drawing Number 2138_PL_101B
 - Revised Landscape Masterplan Drawing Number LA/WS/L/-90/01 Revision E
 - Revised General Arrangement Drawing Number LA/S1/L/-/90/01 Revision B

Members raised the following questions:

- In relation to the condition 31 laid out in the committee report dated 31 January 2005 a question was asked regarding the submission of a Drainage Plan. The Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development) responded that work on this was ongoing with consultation in relation to this taking place. There was nothing in the scheme presented before the committee to indicate that it could not proceed on the basis of the details put forward today. The conditions were considered in the course of the Public Inquiry process and were not necessarily the same as those set out in the committee report that was presented on 31 January 2005. The Legal Adviser for the Council clarified that the conditions proposed by the Secretary of State prevailed.
- In response to a question from a Member Officers clarified that LEAP was a 'Local Equipped Area of Play' measuring not less than 400 square metres in area and designed for play primarily for children aged 4 to 10 years. NEAP was a 'Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play' of not less than 1,000 square metres and designed for play primarily for children aged 4 to 16 years.

Representations, in objection, were received from a representative of Meadlands Area Residents Association who said that the application lacked detail and responses from various departments and external bodies were still outstanding. He noted that a sustainability statement had not been received in relation to this application.

Representations were also received, in objection, from a representative of the Friends of Osbaldwick Meadows. He stated that the scheme remained unpopular with many local residents and would remain unresolved until the outcome of the Village Green Inquiry was known. He claimed that there was documentary evidence that the hedgerow around the site was subject to an Enclosure Award and was therefore protected.

Representations were received, in objection, on behalf of Osbaldwick Parish Council who raised concerns regarding foul water discharge, surface water, soil tests and traffic.

Representations were received in support of the scheme from a representative of the applicant who said that the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust had been addressing the issues raised above. Derwenthorpe would be a distinctive, high standard development, priority would be given to cycles and pedestrians and the homes would meet a high sustainability level. Energy efficiency was a very important part of the scheme.

The following responses were received in relation to Members questions:

- In response to a question regarding ground sourcing heat pumps the applicant's representative responded that the applicants had been considering a variety of ways of heating the proposed homes. One suggested solution had been to look at a community heating scheme where the heating and hot water came from a central point rather than form individual boilers.
- In response to a question regarding how the applicant would ensure the landscape would be maintained and trees retained the applicant's representative responded that the majority of trees would be in public places and therefore the condition of them could be easily monitored.
- In response to a question regarding the car parking spaces to be used in connection with the car sharing club it was noted that this condition would need to be discharged prior to development.
- In response to a question regarding the location of the 5 residential units of Ecohomes Standard Innovative Plus (detailed in section 6.1 of the Section 106 agreement) the applicant's representative said that it had not been decided where these homes would be situated.
- In response to a question regarding paragraph 4.10 of the report it was not known which of the sustainable schemes would be used on the proposed development. The applicant's representative indicated that a range of the criteria would be met and they were committed to a very high level of sustainability.
- In response to a question regarding the outline thinking in relation to traffic on the site the applicant said that there would be:
 - a bespoke and regular bus service through the heart of the site
 - for each first resident into a home there would be an offer of money towards a bus pass or a cycle
 - 6 car parking spaces for the use of the car club and the provision of up to 2 cars for the use of the club
 - a number of pedestrian and cycle links to existing networks and a Sustrans update.
- In response to questions regarding composting and lifetime homes the applicant's representative responded that composting would not be done centrally but each home would have an individual facility for this. The applicant was committed to building lifetime homes and disability needs would be factored into the designs. The homes would be

adaptable and very flexible in terms of space, layout and sustainable features.

- In response to a question relating to recycling it was stated that there would be three centralised points for dropping off recycling.

Some Members felt that the designs of the proposed development were very innovative and they felt encouraged by the 40% social housing figure and the work that was being done in relation to sustainability. They felt that it was a very forward thinking scheme that kept the environment in mind. Other Members felt disappointed at the lack of commitment to specific sustainability criteria and felt that even though it was a move in the right direction it was not as forward thinking as it could be.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the following amended condition:¹

Amended Condition 2

- Revised Site Plan Drawing Number 2138_PL_101B
- Revised Landscape Masterplan Drawing Number LA/WS/L/-90/01 Revision E
- Revised General Arrangement Drawing Number LA/S1/L/-90/01 Revision B

REASON: That the proposal, subject to the conditions outlined in the report and the above amended condition, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to layout, design, external appearance and landscaping. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, GP3, GP4a, GP9, NE1, NE6, NE7, T2b, T4 and T7c of the City of York Draft Local Plan.

Action Required

1. To issue the decision notice and include on weekly planning decision list within agreed time scales. JB

48. THE SINGLE NATIONAL PLANNING APPLICATION FORM (1APP) AND VALIDATION CHECKLIST.

Members considered a report that advised them of a validation checklist for consultation prior to its adoption for use in the registration and validation of planning applications. The Government is introducing a new standard electronic application form for applications for planning permission made under the Town and Country Planning system and Listed Building and Conservation Area consent regime. The intention of the electronic form is to simplify the process for applicants and agents submitting applications on line by tailoring itself to the type of application being submitted. Alongside this and to support the use of the standard application form, the

Government is also introducing new information requirements for the validation of planning applications by local planning authorities.

Officers updated that the following amendments had been made to the Validation Requirements For Planning and Other Applications Submitted Under the Town and Country Planning Acts (Pre-Consultation Draft February 2008):

- Under the 4th bullet point beneath the heading Local Requirements (Page 134 of the agenda) entitled Parking Provision – ‘Where a scheme ... demands are met within the application site *bearing in mind the City of York Council’s maximum parking standards.*’
- The second bullet point on Page 141 of the agenda under the heading Open Space Assessment – to remove the word certain from the third sentence so that it reads ‘*It is also expected that with residential schemes new open spaces will...*’
- The first bullet point on page 142 of the agenda under the heading Planning Statement – to change the final sentence to read ‘*For all new developments applicants will be expected to have regard to the Council’s guidance on Sustainable Buildings, and to the Code for Sustainable Homes for residential development. The Guidance can be viewed at...*’
- The final bullet point on page 143 of the agenda - to add in ‘*... by all modes of transport, for example foot, bicycle or car, as well as giving...*’

Members raised concerns regarding the short three week consultation period and were informed that this was in order to meet the Government deadline of 6th April for implementation.

Some Members welcomed the proposals but felt that the costs of development were too high.

Members were presented with the following options:

Option A Do not approve and adopt the Validation Checklist (with local criteria).

Option B To approve the Validation Checklist (with local criteria) for public consultation over a 3 week period.

Option C To approve the Validation Checklist (with local criteria) without public consultation.

RESOLVED: (i) That Members agree Option B to approve the Validation Checklist for public consultation over a 3 week period to include:¹

- Consultation with planning consultants and agents
- Consultation with community groups and amenity societies not listed in paragraph 8 of the report
- Consultations with Parish Councils and Planning Panels

- Placement of the document on the Council Website, in public libraries and Council offices
- (ii) That Members agree to receive comments and consider the consultation responses at the March Planning Committee meeting.²

REASON: In order that the checklist can be adopted before 6th April 2008.

Action Required

1. To Instigate the agreed consultation process JB
2. Prepare a report detailing the consultation responses for presentation at the Planning Committee Meeting scheduled for 27th March 2008. JB

Councillor Simpson-Laing, In the Chair
[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 6.00 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank