

## COMMITTEE REPORT

**Committee:** Planning Committee      **Ward:** Heslington  
**Date:** 2 October 2008      **Parish:** Heslington Parish Council

**Reference:** 08/01751/REMM  
**Application at:** Proposed University Campus Lying Between Field Lane  
Common Lane A64 Trunk Road And Hull Road York  
**For:** Reserved matters application for erection of Theatre, Film and  
Television building following previous approval of outline  
application 04/01700/OUT  
**By:** University Of York  
**Application Type:** Major Reserved Matters Application (13w)  
**Target Date:** 7 October 2008

### 1.0 PROPOSAL

1.1 This is a reserved matters application for the erection of a building to house the University's newly formed Theatre, Film and Television Department. The site of this facility amounts to 1.26ha and it is to be located in the south western corner of cluster one.

1.2 The application proposes to erect a building with a footprint of approximately 42m x 67m to a height of approximately 14m. Being situated in the south western corner of cluster one, the building will share a western boundary with the western vista and to the east with future applications for the computer science and Law and Management Buildings. The building will be faced with many different materials, copper; cedar cladding, coloured cement panels and metal sheeting. Service access is via the northern access road (to Field Lane) and provision for the turning of service vehicles to the western side of the building is shown. Two disabled spaces are included within the application plans, together with cycling parking for up to 98 cycles. These spaces are sheltered to some extent by the over sailing screening room. A further area for cycle parking is shown for staff use to the west of the proposed building.

1.3 Set on 3 levels, the 6114sqm of floor space will allow the building to house three principle areas performance, public and viewing. Stage 1 with 204 seats, Black Box 1 with 120 seats and a screening room with 144 seats. Also within the building are a large and small TV studio, rehearsal room, administrative rooms, knowledge transfer room, technician's workshop, set storage area and workshop.

1.4 Ancillary buildings on the layout plan include a chiller unit, staff cycle storage facility and sub station. No details of the design of these buildings have been submitted, but the applicant has asked that if this application be approved, the details of these building be determined by way of a condition.

1.5 Since originally submitted the extent of the red line defining the application site has now been amended. As originally submitted, the application sought consideration of landscaping details to the west of the proposed building. However,

in order to provide one consistent landscape plan, this area of the site has now been withdrawn from consideration at this time.

#### Planning History

1.6 Planning Permission 04/1700/OUT was granted by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in May 2007 for the development of a University Campus. Condition 1 of that permission was amended by way of an application under Section 73 to allow a variation to approved slab levels. Both of these permissions are subject to a Section 106 agreement.

1.7 Reserved Matters Approval 08/00032/REMM allowed the erection of a 600 bed college including access, disabled parking, cycle parking and landscaping following the application for the development of a university campus and represented the first approval of reserved matters for what is known as Cluster one of the overall development.

1.8 The second reserved matters application 08/01136/REMM related to the landscaping to western part of the site and this has also been approved. In terms of the outline permission, all of the pre development conditions have been discharged where this relates to the development of Cluster one. This includes the Master Plan.

## **2.0 POLICY CONTEXT**

### 2.1 Development Plan Allocation:

Conservation Area Heslington 0029

Contaminated Land

City Boundary York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams East Area (1) 0003

Floodzone 3 Flood Zone 3

Listed Buildings Grade 2; Heslington Anglican And Methodist Church Field Lane

Listed Buildings Grade 2; Railings, Gates, And Piers 30m N Heslington Hall

Listed Buildings Grade 2; 5 Main Street Heslington

Schools Lord Deramore's Primary 0208

### 2.2 Policies:

CYGP1  
Design

CYGP4A  
Sustainability

CYGP9  
Landscaping

CGP15A  
Development and Flood Risk

CYNE7  
Habitat protection and creation

CYED9  
University of York New Campus

CYT4  
Cycle parking standards

CYED9  
University of York New Campus

### **3.0 CONSULTATIONS**

#### 3.1. Internal

3.2. Environmental Health A number of planning conditions relating to environmental protection issues were implemented at outline permission and included the following conditions :-

Condition 14 - The CEMP submitted to and agreed as part of planning application 08/00032/REMM shall be adhered to at all times during this development. Noise levels during the development must not exceed the levels specified within condition 21 of the outline planning permission. Condition 22 of the outline permission relates to the use of any machinery plant or equipment to be installed which will be audible outside of the site boundary have been submitted. These details must be provided as soon as they are known so that any mitigation measures, if any, can be agreed. If piling is to be used condition 30 of the outline needs to be satisfied. Conditions 31 & 35 - With regard to land contamination issues, conditions 31 and 35 from the original outline application (04/01700/OUT) remain relevant and will continue to do so throughout the whole university site development, however long this may take. The environmental protection unit would, therefore, expect these conditions to be complied with and information submitted periodically to comply with the requirements imposed.

#### 3.3. Sustainability Officer

This is on the whole a good Sustainability Statement. In particular I welcome the University commitment to achieving BREEAM very good with a target of achieving excellent for the scheme. I also welcome the proposed reduction of 10% on CO2 emissions for the building below current Building Regulations Part L. However, there is no firm commitment to renewable energy generation for this building, nor how such renewable energy generation may feed into the Universities commitment to achieve 10% on site renewable energy generation for the whole of Heslington East campus.

This statement is very sufficient in ensuring energy demand and CO2 emissions are low for the building, however, I would like to see the Universities commitment to achieve 10% on site renewable energy generation for the whole of the Heslington East campus reiterated here, and with some proposals for this particular building. Ideally by now they should have a firm energy strategy for the campus, incorporating 10% renewable energy generation for the whole campus. They should be telling us exactly how this buildings will embed such a strategy (i.e. detailing small scale renewable technologies into the building or outlining a campus wide approach involving large scale renewable energy technology's i.e. wind turbine).

In Appendix 10 I would like to see the University's commitment to achieve 10% on site renewable energy generation for the whole of the Heslington East campus reiterated here, and with some specific proposals to generate 10% of the buildings energy demand from renewable energy (or if more appropriate, and depending on the University forthcoming energy strategy, a campus wide, large scale renewable energy source i.e. a wind turbine that will generate 10% or more of the new campus's total energy demand).

It is disappointing to see no grey water systems, mention of sourcing materials locally or specific materials with a high rating in the Green Guide. The use of Sustainable Drainage Schemes is welcomed.

No comments relating to sustainable construction and mitigating the impact such construction can have on the local community and the environment (nor of a Site Waste Management Plan that would summarise most of this information).

3.4. Highways- The Highways comments will form part of an update at the Committee.

3.5. Urban Design, Conservation and Sustainable Development Urban design observations.

The height restrictions previously imposed appear to be respected

The architectural forms reflect the many changes in the nature of further education described as well as in architectural fashion. Whereas the original campus was a fine example of its time and has matured well, this new campus has - appropriately - a quite different and more diverse architectural approach. As the Architects state, it has sought to create "clusterscape" by disposing several easily recognisable and in some cases iconic buildings in a way which leads the pedestrian around the spaces.

The materials proposed are interesting and certainly in the case of copper and timber, will mature over the first 5-10 years to give a warmth which will blend well with the maturing landscape. My only thought is that the buildings in Cluster One seem to use a very wide range - almost the whole palette of materials - whereas the Master Plan (H. Building character) refers to different clusters using a 'consistency of materials within building clusters'.

So much of the quality of such a large scheme will be appreciated as users come close to the buildings that the detailing will be of the greatest importance:

The design and access statement mentions a bin store near the service area to the TFTV building and this would need to be large enough to avoid any overflow. Groups of skips of various kinds would not be appropriate in the public areas - which effectively surround the building.

One of the consequences of the previously agreed height limits is that buildings designed within those limits will tend to have roof lines which maximise volume without exceeding the limits, tending to rule out vertical features which may have introduced interest. However, this is a given and as such any further discussion is not fruitful

It seems there is a lack of three dimensional information to help with an assessment of these proposals - that is not to criticise the drawings, but it is difficult to get a feel for the way these architecturally interesting buildings work together to form a cluster which does all the things required of it

External

3.6. Environment Agency - Confirm that Ouse and Internal Drainage Board should be consulted and offer no further comment.

3.7. Yorkshire Water - It is noted that this submitted details relate to part of the overall site and is more an overview. The Arup report appears to be satisfactory from a Yorkshire Water viewpoint and Yorkshire Water have no objection in principle to the separate systems of drainage on and off site.

3.8. Hull Road Planning Committee - Express concern about having to make decisions on such large applications. Feel strongly that due to the size and magnitude of the proposal, an officer of the team dealing with the applications should be available at their meetings.

3.9 Ouse and Derwent Drainage Board - The development forms part of the new University complex and surface water discharges will be directly into Board maintained water courses. The design of the retention lakes are still on going. The Board has concerns about the on going design of the lakes and feel this should have been completed prior to the commencement of work. In view of this recommend condition advising details of surface water drainage be agreed prior to commencement and the details submitted should include transitional arrangements while construction takes place.

3.10 Heslington Village Trust - No response received

3.11 Provost Vanburg College - No response received

3.12 Students Union - No response received

3.13 Badger Hill Residents Association - No response received

3.14 Smith and Nephew - No response received

3.15 Heslington Church - No response received

3.16 NYCC - No response received

3.17 Lord Deramores Primary - No response received

3.18 York Science Park - No response received

3.19 York and North Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce - No response received

3.20 York Natural Environment Panel

The landscaping brief should have been translated into the application with the inclusion of more detail. The current landscaping details are inadequate with regards, for example, the composition of tree planting, swale areas and orchard.

The tree planting negates the concept of vistas as viewed from the existing houses at the top of the site - as the trees grow a green canopy screen would be formed. Advocate a path through the vista area.

The emerging information would seem to indicate the lake is not feasible in terms of retaining a viable water level - other design features such as grey water harvesting will reduce run-off into the lake.

This is the first of many applications so it would be helpful to have a presentation by the landscape architects, for example at October's meeting when a more solid idea of the western and central vistas is formed.

Representations

1 letter of objection making the following points:

1/ Will the 150 car parking spaces be made available when this building comes into use

2/ Will the University Transit System (UTS) be functional before this building is brought into use? Feel this should be required. Likewise for cycle and pedestrian routes.

3/ Express concern that the large 4ft bus will travel along Field Lane at 10min intervals. No mention of this frequency made at the Inquiry as movement between campuses depicted as being via UTS with entrance to Field Lane being for delivery lorries and a few private cars

4/ As with Goodricke College the opportunity to incorporate solar technology has been passed by and this will be too expensive to install post construction. Hopefully the street lighting will incorporate solar to supplement the use of electricity

## **4.0 APPRAISAL**

### 4.0 APPRAISAL

#### 4.1 Key Issues

Principle of the Use

Scale and Appearance

Landscape

Transport Issues  
Sustainability  
Drainage  
Construction Impact

#### 4.2. Relevant Local Plan Policies

4.3. The Draft Local Plan including the 4th set of changes was approved in April 2005. Policy GP 1 relates to Design and sets out 12 criteria which should be considered when examining proposals for new build. It expects development policies to, amongst other things, be of a scale and mass appropriate to the surroundings, retain or enhance public views, ensure residents living near by will not be unduly affected and also that proposals accord with Policy GP4a and accord with sustainable design principles.

4.4 Policy GP4a concerns itself with the issue of sustainability and states that all proposals should have regard to 9 criteria summarised in the policy. This has been supplemented by an Interim Planning Statement on Sustainability which was approved for Development Control purposes in November 2007.

4.5. Policy GP9 advises development proposals will be required to incorporate a suitable landscaping scheme and that these should be planned as an integral part of the proposals, include an appropriate range of indigenous species, reflect the character of the locality, form a long term edge to developments which adjoin open countryside.

4.6 Policy GP15A relates to Development and Flood Risk. Criteria are included within this policy which advise that the use of sustainable drainage systems are to be encouraged in order to reduce surface water run off and that discharges should not exceed the capacity of existing and proposed receiving sewers and water courses and long term run off should always be less than the level of pre development rainfall run off.

4.7 Policy NE7 confirms that within new developments, measures to encourage the establishment of new habitats should be encouraged as part of the overall scheme.

4.8 Policy ED9 specifically relates to the University of York New Campus. It confirms the range of uses acceptable on the site and seeks a scale of development which is high quality to provide a mixed education and research environment. Further criteria relate to buildings being an appropriate height and need for a comprehensive landscaping scheme.

4.9 Cycle parking standards are covered in Policy T4. Here the Local Plan policy seeks an appropriate provision of cycle parking in accordance with standards set out in Appendix E.

#### 4.10 Principle of the Use

4.11 The principle of the use of the site as part of a new campus was accepted when the Secretary of State granted outline consent in 2007. Moreover, the

proposal accords with the adopted development brief, the land use plan C(i) approved as part of the outline consent and the draft masterplan for the campus.

#### 4.12 Scale and Appearance

4.13 The TFTV building will occupy a large footprint but one which is not going to appear inconsistent or out of character given the theme of development proposed by the Master plan for cluster one, where the height of the buildings is governed by a limit defined by the Inspector in approved plan c(ii). Its position to the south western part of the cluster, means it will effectively have a public face to all elevations. It is also a key building in terms of its relationship with the UTS and the incorporation of copper cladding to part of the building will make this a distinctive building in the context of its surroundings.

4.14 Whilst the building respects the height limitation imposed under the grant of outline permission, its function and use could have resulted in a design which could have attracted an unarticulated and bland elevational treatment. The use of a series of materials will serve to break up the mass and bulk and provide an attractive landmark building.

4.15 The distance from the Northern (nearest) corner of the TFTV building to the main gables of the two houses (no.s 39 at 40) which are either side of Badgerwood Walk at the junction with Field Lane is approx 326 metres. Therefore at this distance the TFTV building would not appear unduly large or out of keeping with the scale of existing buildings in the surrounding area. Moreover, the buildings would be partially screened from the north and west by landscaping, which would mature over time to reduce the apparent scale of the buildings

4.16 The applicant has agreed to a condition requiring details of all external materials (which would include colours) being submitted for approval. Officers consider that any approval should also include a condition requiring details of external features such as vents and louvers to be examined in further detail.

4.17 Therefore in the context of the Masterplan, the scale and design would be appropriate to the future buildings to which this proposal will be seen. The design is contemporary and interesting and the use of materials appropriate. In essence, the design element of the proposal accords with the aims of policy GP1.

#### 4.18 Landscape

4.19 Within the context of the outline permission, most of the landscape to the college would be at the perimeter of the campus, i.e. outside the 'allocated area' for the built development.

4.20 As originally submitted the landscaping was proposed along the western part of the TFTV building and this was to include a series of 5m bunds. However, this was withdrawn from consideration of this application at the applicants request. This is not considered to be detrimental to the consideration of this application, as it would allow the landscaping scheme for the western vista to be considered as a single entity in a future reserved matters application.

4.21 Still to be considered is the a small area of land which forms the link from the TFTV building to the UTS stop area. Indicative treatment of this area is shown, but lacks sufficient detail to be considered fully at this stage. Therefore, whilst the principle treatment of this area is considered acceptable, a more detailed consideration of the area can be given by way of condition. There is no reason to suggest that this mechanism for dealing with landscaping issues on this part of the site would not render this scheme contrary to the aims of policy GP9.

#### 4.22 Transport Issues

4.23 Vehicular access to the site would be restricted to service traffic, emergency vehicles and those students with a disabled parking permit. A permit-operated barrier system would control unauthorised vehicles from gaining access to the internal service roads within the college and the rest of the Cluster one development.

4.24 Cluster one will, ultimately, have an east-west pedestrian/cycle ribbon linking the new campus with the existing campus to the west and Grimston Bar to the east. The link will be built in phases as the development of the campus proceeds. The university has agreed that the first phase, between Heslington Village (Field Lane) and the college, would be in place prior to the TFTV building first being brought into use. This should be made a condition of approval. Condition 25 of the outline consent requires construction details of the pedestrian/cycle ribbon to be submitted for approval prior to construction.

4.25 The outline consent allows the new campus to have up to 1500 car parking spaces, 150 of which could be accessed from the new Field Lane roundabout, close to the new college. This forms part of a reserved matters application 08/02043/REMM which is currently under consideration. 132 of these spaces would be provided in a car park (incorporating bus stands) close to the north-east of Goodricke College. The parking spaces would be set aside, initially, for contractors' vehicles. The remaining 18 parking spaces are primarily for disabled residents of the college they would also be available for visitors to other parts of Cluster one including the TFTV Building. The route of bus service No.4 would be extended to this new interchange prior to occupation of the college and a condition attached to the development of Goodricke College secures this provision.

4.27 As the campus develops, a new university transit system (UTS) will link Heslington West with Grimston Bar, via the new campus. The provision of a UTS has been a key element of the university's transport strategy for some years. The TFTV building is located to the south western corner of cluster one and some distance away from the car park referred to above. The TFTV building has a direct link within the application site to the UTS and a condition requiring the UTS to be operational within 1 month of the TFTV building first being brought into use, is considered appropriate. This is appropriate because of the high capacity of the TFTV building, associated peak flows, distance from the bus interchange and limited on site car parking provision.

4.28 The parking and traffic impacts of the new TFTV building on the local area is of concern to the community forum and local residents. These concerns were addressed at the inquiry and subsequently by conditions of the outline consent. For example, traffic and parking availability is to be monitored annually and mitigation

measures agreed where appropriate. Officers consider that the measures outlined above, together with the sustainable transport infrastructure and the parking restrictions imposed by the outline consent, would be sufficient to safeguard the local community from the traffic and parking implications of the college and the campus as a whole.

#### 4.29 Sustainability

Condition 29 of the outline consent requires each reserved matters application to be accompanied by a statement on sustainability, which should conform to the sustainability principles contained in the masterplan. The Masterplan has now been approved. The masterplan should draw together and build upon the various strands of work on sustainability that were submitted with the outline planning application or as evidence at the public inquiry. The information submitted with each reserved matters application (including the current application for the TFTV building) should therefore provide some further detail.

4.30 To this end the TFTV application includes a general sustainability statement; where the University seek to achieve a BREEAM rating of very good. This achievement can be covered by condition which seeks the submission a formal BREEAM assessment at the design and build stage and then submission of final certification. The condition can state the minimum level to be achieved.

4.31 Over and above the commitments stated in the Masterplan for, Policy GP4a and the IPS seek to secure 10% provision of renewable energy and to exceed Part L of Building Regulations. The agent advises that the carbon emissions from the building will be below the requirement for part L of the Building Regulations and details of this can be secured by condition. The issue outstanding is one relating to timing of the development of the University Energy Strategy and how this relates to this application. The agent has reiterated the University has a commitment to achieving 10%renewable energy generation for the whole Heslington East Campus. This will be achieved via the use of solar or wind power and that it is likely that a shared facility will be provided, rather than one for each building. However no formal application has been submitted for these elements. Neither to they form part of this application. Against that background, a condition can be imposed which requires the submission of details as to how this can be achieved, prior to the commencement of development.

#### 4.32 Drainage

4.33 Surface water from the TFTV building will be drained by gravity to a lake along the southern side of the site. The water will be stored in the lake and released at agricultural rates into local watercourses. These principles were accepted by the inspector at the public inquiry. Condition 19 of the outline consent for the campus requires a sustainable drainage assessment for surface water to be carried out and for surface water drainage details to be submitted for approval. A sustainable drainage strategy (SUDS) has been submitted and approved as required by the outline condition. It is a high-level document, which has been accepted by the Environment Agency, Ouse & Derwent IDB.

4.34 Surface water from the TFTV building would be drained by a combination of proprietary channel products, using grated or slotted covers to collect water, and

open channels (swales). They would drain into the lake on the south side of the site. This method of drainage is sustainable and acceptable to officers, subject to the details being submitted for approval.

4.35 Badger Hill Outfall carries surface water from Badger Hill southwards, across the campus site, to receiving watercourses. Construction of the campus will require the sewer to be diverted. It will be intercepted where it crosses Field Lane and diverted around the site to discharge into the new lake. Yorkshire Water has carried out a feasibility study and options are being considered.

4.36 Condition 20 of the outline consent requires details of foul drainage to be submitted for approval. A foul water drainage strategy has been submitted and is the requirements of this condition for Cluster one discharged. Foul water from the TFTV building would be fed by gravity to the south-west corner of Cluster one where it would be pumped by a new pumping station to a new main sewer that would run alongside the northern service road. Yorkshire Water have been commissioned to develop the detail of the scheme. Details of foul drainage for the TFTV building should be submitted to the Council for approval.

4.37 Construction Impact

4.38 Condition 14 of the outline consent requires the university to submit for approval a campus-wide construction environmental management plan (CEMP). It has been submitted and approved by officers. The plan includes measures to minimise and mitigate construction impacts of the development, including the TFTV building. All contractors appointed to undertake construction work on the new campus would be required to work within the constraints imposed by the plan. One of the requirements is that contractors staff are required to park their vehicles within the 132 space car park to be constructed near the college. This should ensure that the residential properties fronting Field Lane would not be affected by such parking, which was a concern expressed by consultees. Other requirements of the CEMP relate to issues such as noise, contamination, air quality, ecology, protection of existing services and site management.

4.39 Representations made by the Hull Road Planning Committee advise they would like officer representation at their meetings. Officers have advised they are happy to have a meeting with the Committee to provide a context for proposals and also have advised the Committee of the existence of the forum, which seeks to keep a wider audience aware of existing and future proposals at the site. Other representations seek to ensure the 150 car parking spaces to the north of Goodricke College are brought into use, the UTS and the pedestrian cycle link are all operational when the TFTV building is brought into use and Officers see no reason why this cannot be achieved by condition. No details of the street lighting have been provided for consideration at this stage and therefore Officers are not able to comment about the introduction of solar power for street lighting.

## **5.0 CONCLUSION**

5.1. The principle of the use of the land for this purpose has been agreed and planning permission granted. This application is one of a number of reserved matters applications expected to be submitted between now and the end of 2008, which seek

approval for Cluster one. The design of the TFTV building is acceptable and subject to conditions regarding materials, will form distinctive and attractive building. The means of access to the site and movement of people to and from it can be proposed via the pedestrian/cycle links and the UTS. This also can be secured by condition.

5.2. The unresolved and outstanding matter before the Committee remains that of how the University intends to communicate its commitment of seeking in excess of 10% renewable energy. Officers are not seeking to doubt the Universities commitment to this aim, as it has been secured via the Masterplan. A condition requiring submission and approval of these details would, however, allow the applicant the opportunity to investigate this matter in more detail.

**6.0 RECOMMENDATION:** Approve

1 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following plans:-

TV(PL)A001.C; TV(PL)A002.c, TV(PL)A003.C, TV(PL)A004, TV(PL)A005, TV(PL)A006, TV(PL)A007, TV(PL)A008, TV(PL)A009A, TV(PL)A010.A, TV(PL)11.A, TV(PL)12, TV(PL)13, TV(PL)14

or any plans or details subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority as amendment to the approved plans.

Reason- For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

2 Within three months of commencement of development a detailed landscaping scheme shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include ground levels, planting, swales and shall illustrate the number, species, height and position of trees and shrubs. This scheme shall be implemented within a period of six months of the completion of the development. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion 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 - In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied the variety, suitability and disposition of species within the site.

3 Within 6 months of the commencement of development, details of the design, external appearance and materials to be used in the construction of the chiller unit; sub station and staff cycle store shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The erection of these building shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

Reason - No details have been included within the application.

4 Within 1 month of the commencement of development, details of foul and surface water drainage works (including transitional arrangements) have been

submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and carried out in accordance with these approved details. The final rate of discharge shall not exceed 1.4litres/sec/ha

Reason - In the interests of the drainage of the site.

5 Details of soil and vent stacks, heating and air conditioning plant etc, including fume extraction and odour control equipment, with details of any external ducting, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority within one month of the commencement of development.

Reason- In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the amenities of occupants of adjoining properties.

6 Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority , within 3 months of commencement of development, the developer shall submit in writing and be approved by the local planning authority a formal BREEAM assessment for the design and procurement stages of the development. It shall be followed by a further BREEAM assessment to be submitted after construction at a time to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Both assessments shall confirm the minimum 'Very Good' rating anticipated in the preliminary BREEAM assessment submitted with the application

7 Prior to the commencement of development full details of a renewable energy strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall include (i) the buildings proposed renewable energy generation, which shall be at least 10% of total energy generation (ii) measures to reduce energy demand for the TFTV buildings (iii) measures to reduce CO2 emissions to a level lower than required under Building Regulations Part L.

8 Prior to the development first being brought into use, the pedestrian and cycle route currently known in part as the Pedestrian Ribbon and linking the development with Heslington Village at Field Lane via the Movement Spine shall be provided and made available for use. Details of the route shall be submitted to the local planning authority and agreed in writing. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted details.

Reason- To promote sustainable transport

9 Prior to the development first being brought into use, a scheme shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority which shows how the UTS will be implemented. Details should include a schedule for implementation and the route. Details agreed under this condition shall therefore be implemented in accordance with the agreed scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason- In order to provide a range of sustainable movement options for visitors wishing to use the facility.

10 Notwithstanding any proposed materials specified on the approved drawings

or in the application form submitted with the application, samples of the external materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out using the approved materials.

Reason- So as to achieve a visually cohesive appearance.

**7.0 INFORMATIVES:  
Notes to Applicant**

1. REASON FOR APPROVAL

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to policies CYGP1, CYGP4A, CYGP9, CYGP15A, CYNE7, CTED9, CYT4 and CDED9 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

**Contact details:**

**Author:** John Howlett Development Control Officer  
**Tel No:** 01904 552830