
MEETING	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK WORKING GROUP
DATE	4 AUGUST 2008
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS STEVE GALLOWAY (CHAIR), POTTER (VICE-CHAIR), AYRE, MERRETT, MOORE, REID, SIMPSON-LAING, R WATSON, WATT AND TAYLOR (SUBSTITUTE)
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR D'AGORNE

10. 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. No interests were declared.

11. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Local Development Framework Working Group held on 15 July 2008 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

12. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been one registration to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Mark Waters addressed the meeting, on behalf of the Friends of Osbaldwick Meadows. He expressed the view that the Derwenthorpe development had caused a massive shortfall in green open space in the urban east side of York, particularly in Osbaldwick Ward, and asked what the Council proposed to do to alleviate this shortfall.

13. OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION STUDY

Members considered a report which sought approval to publish the full 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study' as part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) evidence base. The Study had been made available to view on-line and printed copies, including large scale maps, had been circulated to Members.

The Study, produced in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance note 17 (PPG 17) and its companion guide, assessed open spaces of public value which offered important opportunities for sport and recreation. A previous version had been considered by the LDF Working Group on 8 January

2008, when a decision had been deferred pending further work to analyse area boundaries and consult on potential additional sites for inclusion in the Study. This work had now been concluded and 68 additional sites had been included in the revised Study, together with a reconsideration of the standards. . The revised version also addressed concerns raised by Members on 8 January with regard to 'Accessible Countryside', green corridors and setting local quantity standards.

Three options were presented for Members' consideration:

Option 1 – recommend approval of the Study for publication as part of the LDF evidence base;

Option 2- seek amendments to the Study prior to publication;

Option 3- request further work from Officers.

Members also received a presentation from PMP, the consultants who had produced the Study, reminding them of the purpose of PPG17 and outlining the methodology following during the assessment and the key findings resulting from this process.

Following questions and a full debate, the following recommendations and comments were agreed (by reference to the headings in the Executive Summary of the Study document and to the document appendices):

- a) **Current position** (p.ii):
 - should take into account the low satisfaction levels expressed by residents in some areas regarding the quantity of local parks;
 - needs to clarify that the standards do not preclude additional provision in the future in areas where further development occurs;
 - should consider whether all of the areas classified as 'amenity green spaces' are in fact usable as such - Officers should review previous Member comments and, in some cases, review sites.
- b) **Access** (p.vi):
 - should take account of the fact that sites within the City Centre sites are accessible to those working as well as residing there.
 - the issue of 'financial accessibility' - not just distance - when setting local standards was noted;
 - the word 'areas' should be removed from the 3rd bullet point.
- c) **Quantity** (p.vi, 1st bullet point):
 - amend to reflect the actual levels of satisfaction with parks expressed by residents, as previously highlighted (see 'a' above).
- d) **Parks and gardens** (p.viii, 6th bullet point):
 - query whether the upgrading of amenity green spaces would meet the need for parks in urban areas as suggested (the issue of size was highlighted), and what is meant by the 'Acomb and Woodthorpe area' – i.e. does it refer to wards or another type of geographical area?
- e) **Amenity green space** (p.ix):
 - re-phrase 2nd bullet point to remove the inference that additional green space provision in the City Centre will not be considered;

- re-phrase 5th bullet point to remove the inference that green space provision will only be protected in certain areas.
 - recommendation AGS3 (page 89) should refer to Heworth Without, given the reference in Figure 6.5.
- f) **Provision for children** (p.x):
- should take account of the need for 'buffer' zones of amenity space between play facilities and residential areas;
 - re the 3rd bullet point, any decision to remove play facilities should be taken by the local community, not imposed from above.
 - the reference to Dringhouses being an area where rationalisation should be appropriate was questioned;
 - re the 5th bullet point, terraced urban areas such as South Bank should also be considered for the provision of new facilities.
- g) **Provision for teenagers** (p.x):
- re bullet point 3, smaller local parks may be unsuitable for such provision, due to the risk of major 'neighbour' issues;
 - future implementation of this study should involve teenagers in identifying 'need' and appropriate facilities and locations.
- h) **Outdoor sports facilities** (p.xi):
- should reflect both the club-based analysis and the spatial analysis carried out by PMP - some club based needs have not been picked up, e.g. some clubs having to travel far to access pitches;
 - 2nd bullet point should include Holgate and other urban areas where demand for pitches has been expressed;
 - Officers to check whether a survey has been carried out to determine the needs of schools without sports pitches, and if necessary produce a further report for the LDG WG in due course;
 - the recommended standard should be amended to reflect Members' view that the standard for accessing synthetic pitches should be based on travel by public transport, cycling and walking.
- i) **Allotments** (p.xi) (3rd bullet point)
- query re the inclusion of Wheldrake, due to additional facilities already being provided.
- j) **Green corridors** (p.xii):
- the timescales for the green infrastructure work were highlighted and it was clarified that this work would go beyond the planning remit.
- k) **Appendix D** – there are a number of errors in the table including open space being labelled in the wrong wards. The table needs to be recirculated and sorted alphabetically by ward.
- l) **Appendix K**- the population figures for Heworth/Heworth Without appear the same; this needs to be amended.
- m) **Public participation** - with regard to the comments made under Public Participation, it was noted that the standards applied to the Derwenthorpe development were higher than those contained in the Local Plan, resulting in a significant contribution to open space needs in that part of York, and the Council's approach had been praised by the Planning Inspector.

n) **General:**

- where names are used for areas it must be clear whether they refer to wards or neighbourhoods.
- the boundaries of open spaces need to be checked e.g. Rawcliffe/Cliton Ings
- a clear definition of the typologies is needed, specifically the difference between 'natural/semi natural' and 'accessible countryside'.

RESOLVED: (i) That Officers prepare a revised version of Annex D (the site assessment scores), incorporating the amendments highlighted at this meeting and the meeting in January, and circulate it to Members by e-mail for them to raise any further comments, in writing, within the next two weeks.¹

REASON: To enable any further errors to be corrected prior to approval of the final Study document.

(ii) That, in accordance with Option 2, the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study be recommended for publication as part of the LDF evidence base, subject to Resolution (i) and subject to the recommendations and comments of the Working Group, as set out above.²

REASON: So that the Study can be used as part of the LDF evidence base and to avoid further delays to the production of the Core Strategy.

(iii) That authority be delegated to the Director of City Strategy, in consultation with the Executive Member and Shadow Executive Member for City Strategy, to make any incidental changes to the Study arising from the recommendations of the Working Group, prior to its publication.³

REASON: So that the recommended changes can be incorporated.

(iv) That Consultants and Officers be thanked for the hard work they have put into producing the Study document.

Action Required

1. Prepare and circulate amended site assessment scores. JB
3. Make changes as agreed. JB

Cllr S F Galloway, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 6.15 pm].