
MEETING	WEST & CITY CENTRE AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
DATE	1 JULY 2008
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS SUE GALLOWAY (VICE-CHAIR, IN THE CHAIR), STEVE GALLOWAY, GALVIN, GILLIES, LOOKER, REID, MOORE (SUBSTITUTE), SIMPSON-LAING (SUBSTITUTE) AND BOWGETT (SUBSTITUTE)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLORS HORTON, CRISP AND SUNDERLAND

1. INSPECTION OF SITES

The following site was inspected before the meeting.

Site	Attended by	Reason for visit
Algarth, Wetherby Road Rufforth, York	Councillors Gillies, Galvin and Horton	At the request of Councillor Horton

2. 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. None were declared.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that nobody had registered to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on general issues with the remit of the Sub-Committee.

4. 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

4a Algarth, Wetherby Road, Rufforth, York, YO23 3QF (08/00841/FULM)

Members considered a full application submitted by Cala Management Ltd, for the demolition of Algarth and Hambleton View and erection of eighteen no. 2, 3, 4 and 5 bed houses, one no. 2 bed flat with associated access, detached garages and parking.

The case officer updated members on the application and stated that planning permission was sought for the erection of 19 dwellings after the demolition of 2 existing bungalows (Algarth and Hambleton View) adjacent to Wetherby Road, Rufforth. The proposed scheme involved a mixture of 2 and 2½ storey dwellings.

Representations were received in objection to the application from a representative of Rufforth and Knapton Parish Council. The main concerns raised were:

- The impact it would have on the site which was classed as 'washed over' Green Belt
- The density of the development which they felt was too high in a rural area.
- Access to the proposed site which was on a bend and opposite the village shop.

Members expressed concerns regarding the density of the development, access to the development and the drainage and flooding problems in the area. Concern was also raised at the Parish Council comments regarding the high provision of affordable housing on this site.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused

REASON: 1. The proposed development would constitute inappropriate development that would have a harmful impact upon the character and openness of the Green Belt and 'washed over' Green Belt, due to its scale, design and siting. The proposal would also contribute to the loss of open space within this rural village, which would be a detriment to the area and the surrounding Green Belt. The scheme would also undermine the rural nature of this approach into the village. Furthermore, the scheme would set a precedent for future inappropriate development, which would cumulatively undermine the character of Rufforth and the Green Belt. As a consequence the proposal is contrary to parts (a), (b), (c) of policy GB1 and also the essential criteria listed as part of this policy. Also parts (a), (b) and (c) of policy GB2 and policy GP10 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

2. The density of the development is too high in relation to the existing character and form of Rufforth. The 2-storey and 2½ storey proposed

dwelling would look out of character within Rufforth when viewed in this context. As a consequence the proposed scheme fails to satisfy draft Local Policy GP10, parts (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (g) and (i) of policy GP1 and also PPS1, PPG2 and PPS3 and also design guidelines 10, 11, 15, 17, 18 and 25 of Rufforth's Village Design Statement

3. The Scheme if approved would have a detrimental impact upon the amenity of adjacent neighbouring dwellings. In particular there would be significant detrimental impact upon 'Pinecroft' due to overlooking of neighbours private rear gardens and overshadowing. The scheme would also create intrusion due to being overbearing and un-neighbourly. As a consequence the proposal fails to satisfy policy part (i) of draft policy GP1 of City of York Local Plan and PPS1 and PPS3.

4. The development makes no provision for open space provision, to meet the needs of future residents and the local community. The development is thus considered to conflict with policy L1c 'Provision Of New Open Space in Development' of the City Of York Draft Local Plan Incorporating the 4th set of changes - Development Control Local Plan (Approved April 2005) that would require a commuted payment towards off site provision.

5. Inadequate drainage details have been submitted. It has not been proven by the applicants, that the development would not cause flooding to nearby residents or the local drainage system. Draft policy GP15a of the City York Local Plan and PPG25 require applicants to provide adequate information and implement measures to prevent flooding. The applicants have not proven that the scheme would not affect neighbours in terms of water run-off or overload the adjacent public drains.

6. No sustainability statement has been submitted, furthermore no details have been submitted regarding how the proposal satisfies points (a) to (i) of the policy GP4a. Policy GP4a requires the submission of a sustainability statement with every planning application. Without this document the Council cannot judge the sustainability of the scheme against this

policy or the requirements of policy GP1 (j) which requires applications to accord with sustainable design principles.

7. Due to the layout and siting of the dwellings within the site, such a high density scheme does not allow for adequate soft landscaping which would add to the amenity of the scheme and create a sense of place. As a consequence the proposal does not create a definable character or distinctive quality of place for the scheme as sought by 'Better Places to Live by Design: A companion Guide to PPG3'. As such the proposal would not be compatible with the well established rural character of the area is therefore contrary to national planning guidance PPS1 and PPS3 and also policies GP1, GP9, NE1 and H5a of the City of York Draft Local Plan (incorporating 4th set of changes) – 2005 and also design guideline 6 of Rufforth's Village Design Statement.

Councillor Sue Galloway, Chair

[The meeting started at 12.00 pm and finished at 12.08 pm].