

City Boundary GMS Constraints: York City Boundary 0001

DC Area Teams GMS Constraints: East Area (1) 0003

2.2 Policies:

CYED6

University of York Heslington Campus

CYNE1

Trees, woodlands, hedgerows

CYGP1

Design

CYGP4A

Sustainability

CYGP4B

Air Quality

3.0 CONSULTATIONS

3.1 INTERNAL.

3.2 Highway Network Management.

Note the proposal involves an increase of 123 parking spaces. The development of an expanded car park facility in this location is in line with the University's sustainable travel plan which seeks to locate parking in the future on the periphery of both campuses. This strategy is designed to direct permit holders to use the peripheral car park closest to their home address, so as to minimise car journeys through the heart of the University grounds.

New barrier equipment is to be erected as part of the scheme to improve management of the spaces and enable enforcement of the relevant restrictions and charges. Cyclists will be able to bypass this equipment by means of a new cycle lane to be constructed alongside.

The University has stated that parking spaces elsewhere on the Campus are to be decommissioned to compensate for the new spaces, thereby ensuring that the total does not exceed the agreed maximum of 1520 spaces for Heslington West. Recommend that this be conditioned as part of any approval.

Note that the applicant's supporting information makes reference to the fact that the UTS will run along Goodricke Way, passing the entrance to this car park before turning in front of the Physics building. Officers look forward to the early implementation of this facility.

There are no highway objections to the application subject to conditions referring to the car parking cap and details of the barrier equipment to be installed.

3.3 Environmental Protection Unit.

The increase falls within the increased parking threshold as stated in Policy GP4b and in the Council's air quality guidance and as a result there are no air quality issues that need to be considered.

In terms of the development itself the only issues of concern relate to construction of the car park itself, and the potential for noise, dust etc during the construction phase, and potential loss of amenity due to artificial lighting for the car park itself. Recommend conditions be placed to control the above.

3.4 Landscape Architect.

Objected to the original plans submitted due to the extent of the proposed new parking and its dominance on the views within the campus and general green infrastructure which has diminished across the campus over the years. Also objected to the loss of 5 mature trees which is considered will have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity and views across the car park and campus. Noted that the loss of these trees is not for arboricultural reasons and they have full, attractive crowns and are within the public domain of the campus and therefore could be worthy of protection. Considered the extent of parking in the north east corner of the site would be detrimental to key views and approaches to the core of the university and would result in the loss of valuable trees. This is a main arrival area and entrance to the university campus; therefore considered that the design should be revisited to reduce the number of additional spaces in order to respect the importance of the landscape setting of the campus.

Revised proposals were submitted in response to these concerns and the following comments were offered:

Revisions represent an improvement on the previous scheme.

The Colvin and Moggridge 'Strategic Review of the Landscape' of the university of York (Sep 1992) identifies this area as a suitable location for a car park. Nonetheless the same document identifies the landscape structure to the east of the car park as a component of the proposed framework tree canopy to be protected from all intrusion of buildings and vehicles; furthermore, the route is identified as a future main path. With the removal of four drop off spaces for the nursery, this important corridor is kept free of vehicular intrusion in keeping with the above document.

A further four spaces have been removed to allow the parking in the north east corner to be pulled away from the northern footpath; thus creating a more attractive route and reducing the visual dominance of parked cars within the eastwards view along this

path towards the structural tree canopy as one heads towards the southern end of the open space relating to the lake.

There are no arboricultural reasons to remove the three Limes that are associated with the eastern landscape corridor. Indeed they are stated as being of mostly good quality and condition. Given the availability of public access through the university campus and the size of resident population, employees and visitors, I consider these to be of significant benefit to the public amenity since they can be clearly viewed across the car park from Goodricke Way and from the surrounding footpaths. To this end they are worthy of a TPO, but have no protection upon them at the moment. However, given the generous extent of new tree planting proposed within this development (78no. new trees to replace 6no.) I think the proposals are acceptable. Some of the trees are located within the new car park, thus breaking up its mass. Others will line the path across the north of the site, and more will supplement the leafy corridor along the east. The majority of trees will be placed along Goodricke Way, which is the main route into the campus and one that has been identified as part of the framework of trees in both the Strategic review document and the Council's development brief for campus 1. Given this,

3.4 Structures and Drainage.
Comments awaited.

EXTERNAL

3.5 Parish Council.
No comments received.

3.6 Police Architectural Liaison Officer.
Have previously assessed this site and was made aware that the University intended to apply for the Parkmark safer parking award for this particular car park. The proposed design and layout will meet the criteria for the scheme. No further comments to make.

3.7 Neighbours and Third parties.
5 letters received objecting to the development making the following observations:

- i) Concerned about the new storage bays adjacent to Walnut Close. In particular have concerns about the security of the boundaries with residential properties, the visual impact of the storage bays, the condition of the land on the university side of the boundary and the effect of water runoff from the rock salt storage bays. The fence on the University side is in poor condition and does no screening job. Leylandii hedge planted by the objector has died on the University side.
- ii) Concerned about the height of the storage bays and that these will be visible from rear garden areas. These details are not provided. The ground level on the University side is higher than on the garden side of 4 The Orchard so impact is unknown.
- iii) Concerned also over how well the maintenance area is looked after and that it is basically rubbish tip.
- iv) Concerned about light spill into adjacent residential properties.

- v) Important to maintain as large a buffer as possible between the increased size of the car park and the houses on Walnut Close. Concerned that new proposed trees will overhang neighbours gardens.
- vi) Car park will give reduced security to the rear of 1 Barn Grove.
- vii) Concerned that the recent removal of a shed from the maintenance area has exposed the rear of 1 Barn Grove and some privacy has been lost. Ask whether this will be restored.
- viii) The materials storage area will compromise security to the rear of properties, in particular people being able to climb on the storage areas close to these boundaries. Also concerned about newly planted trees overhanging neighbours gardens.
- ix) Request that there be a greater area between the materials compound and 2 Barn Grove.

4.0 APPRAISAL

4.1 KEY ISSUES.

- i) Loss of trees and impact on the landscape setting of the campus.
- ii) Campus car park cap.
- iii) Impact of the materials compound on the amenity of neighbours.
- iv) Sustainability.

4.2 This proposal has been assessed against the Heslington Campus Development Brief for future expansion which was approved in August 1999. This establishes a framework within which development on the campus must comply and introduces several criteria that are relevant to this application, including the cap on car parking spaces within the campus, landscaping details and the total built footprint limit on the campus of 20%.

4.3 Policy ED6 (University of York Heslington Campus) of the draft City of York Local Plan is also considered relevant and the application has been assessed against the criteria contained within. These are assessed in detail below. Other applicable policies include NE1 (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows), GP1 (Design), GP4A (Sustainability) and GP4B (Air Quality). Policy NE1 requires all proposals to remove trees and hedgerows to include a survey assessing the merits of individual specimens and where trees are to be lost, appropriate replacement planting be provided. GP1 is a general policy considering design and general loss of amenity and of particular relevance to this application is the criteria that seeks to ensure that residents living nearby are not unduly affected by the development and that the proposal is compatible with established spaces and the character of the area.

4.4 Policy ED6 is the main policy pertaining to the existing campus and is the main policy against which this application should be assessed. It allows for further development on the existing Heslington West campus providing it is in accordance with one of three criteria:

- i) small scale extensions to existing buildings
- ii) redevelopment of existing buildings
- iii) development on specific sites highlighted in the development brief

This type of development falls within the 3rd category of development as listed above.

It then goes on to say that development will only be permitted providing 8 criteria are met. The criteria relevant to this application are listed and discussed below.

4.5 'i) The development will not adversely affect the campus' landscape framework or the setting of Heslington Village.'

The comments of the Council's Landscape Architect are relevant to this issue and their detailed comments at para. 3.4 above should be referred to on this issue. Following initial concerns and objections about the loss of trees and the further erosion of part of the green infrastructure of the campus, amended plans have been submitted and these objections have now been withdrawn. The development does result in the loss of 5 mature trees, all of which have quite a strong amenity value. However a total of 78 replacement new trees will be planted, a ratio of approx. 13 new trees to every one lost. Some further new planting on the northern boundary of the site has been introduced following on from officer's objections and this is welcomed. Officers consider the extent of the new tree planting to be a positive element of the proposal and over time will help offset the loss of the existing trees and ultimately preserve the important and historic landscape setting of the campus.

4.6 One key component of the site area at present is the attractive landscaped area on the eastern edge of the site, which currently separates the car park from the rear of the properties on Walnut Close. This is made up of banked shrubbery with a grass strip behind it. Some of this banking will be lost to make way for a new line of parking spaces but a significant proportion of the landscaping here will remain. The grass strip and mature hedge that forms the boundary with Walnut Close will be unaffected by the proposal and therefore from the rear of these properties, this part of the site will appear little changed. Overall therefore, whilst some of the existing green spaces will be lost and elements of this turned over to car parking, officers do not consider that, given the extent of the landscaping proposed, the development will adversely affect the campus' landscape framework. The slight widening of Goodricke Way is not expected to harm the setting of the campus at this entrance point and the proposed barriers will not materially harm the general openness which is a feature of the campus here. A condition is recommended to agree the details of these barriers. The development is contained within the main campus and will not affect the setting of Heslington village.

4.6 'ii) The proposal is not sited on any of the campus' important open spaces.'

The development brief identifies key areas of open spaces within the campus upon which no development should take place. This application site area does not fall within any of these identified important spaces.

4.7 'iii) Total developed footprint on the campus (including the proposal) will at no time exceed 20% of the campus' site area.'

Para. 6.3 of the development brief states that the total footprint of all development, (this includes all buildings and car parks) on the campus will be restricted to 20% of the campus area. The total developed area is currently slightly below this 20% cap.

4.8 'iv) The height of any new buildings will be appropriate to the location in terms of distance to, and height of, surrounding buildings and a high standard of design appropriate to the setting of the University is proposed.'

The development does not propose any new buildings. The 5no. storage bays proposed in the maintenance yard in the south eastern corner of the site are likely to be simple walled in storage bays which are very modest in size and which will be appropriate in appearance to their intended use. This will be largely unseen and therefore will have no impact on the appearance of the campus.

4.9 'vi) There will be no overall net increase in car parking spaces on the campus as a result of the proposal.'

The development brief states that the maximum no. of car parking spaces across the campus should be no more than 1520. A recent survey carried out at the university showed the total car parking provision on the Heslington West Campus as of May 2009 to be 1480 spaces. The inclusion of the additional spaces proposed here would increase the provision to 1,603 parking spaces. However the decommissioning of other spaces within the campus will result in the loss of 79 spaces which would result in 1524 space being provided on Heslington West overall. Prior to the proposed car park here becoming fully operational the University will remove 4 spaces from minor car parks in the Campus to ensure the cap of 1520 is not exceeded. A condition is recommended to ensure this happens.

4.10 The other criteria set out in ED6 are not considered relevant to this application and therefore officers consider that the proposal is in accordance with both the development brief and the requirements of Policy ED6.

IMPACT OF THE MATERIALS COMPOUND ON THE AMENITY OF NEIGHBOURS

4.11 The five letters of objection received all refer to concerns over the materials compound in the south eastern corner of the application site. This area is currently a maintenance compound and materials and other items are currently stored here in a somewhat ad hoc basis and the area is not particularly well maintained and appears to be a bit of a dumping ground. The University are taking this opportunity to improve this area and the adjacent residents, which share a boundary with this compound, have expressed some concern at this. The size and purpose of this area will remain the same as existing although 5 new purpose built storage bays are shown to be provided in the south east corner of this yard. 5 properties share a boundary with this yard although the gardens of 11 and 15 Walnut Close and 4 The Orchard are the only properties next to the proposed bays.

4.12. The boundary with Walnut Close is defined by a leylandii hedge (apparently planted by the home owner) and a wooden fence 2 metres high on the University side. The hedge is approximately 300mm higher than the fence but appears to have died on the University side. The fence is in a very poor state and should be replaced. The concerns of the neighbours are acknowledged and the lack of detail supplied as to the size and appearance of these bays has added to their concerns in terms of the visual impact. Officers have requested some further information on this and this is awaited.

However, in planning terms given that the area is already used as a materials compound the key issue here is not one of use but one of the appearance of the proposed storage bays and the impact these will have on the amenity of these neighbours. They are shown on the amended plans to be set 3 metres in from the boundary with Walnut Close and some additional tree planting is proposed within this 3m strip. This separation distance is considered acceptable and whilst the tree planting is welcomed, a thin species will be required in order to ensure there is no overhang into the neighbours' gardens. The feasibility of this is being considered by the Council's landscape architect.

4.13 The existing boundary treatment does offer a high degree of screening from Walnut Close although its relatively poor condition would need addressing. A condition is recommended to be attached requiring these details and implementation prior to the bays going in. As for the size and appearance of them, it is recommended that a condition be imposed that restricts their height and that of the stored material to no higher than the approved boundary treatment. This, together with the separation distance and possible proposed tree planting would ensure that these bays do not materially harm the visual amenity of the properties on Walnut Close or The Orchard. Any further details received of this arrangement will be referred to members at the Committee meeting. It is not considered that no's 1 and 2 The Old Barn will be materially affected by the proposals particularly if the development is controlled as suggested above.

SUSTAINABILITY

4.14 Although the application is for an extension to an existing car park, the numbers across the campus are not rising above the cap limit agreed in the development brief. Therefore there is no increase in vehicle numbers or movements. Furthermore this and the proposed traffic barriers on Goodricke Way is part of the campus wide initiative to concentrate car parking into fewer key areas and control where people park within the campus in relation to their home. Having parked their car it is expected that permit holders will undertake the remainder of their journey by either walking, using public transport or by using the proposed University transit system, the commitment to which is again mentioned in the agent's supporting statement and which is welcomed by officers. Ultimately therefore the scheme should also assist in reducing vehicle movements around local roads. In sustainability terms therefore, the proposal does present some likely local benefits.

DRAINAGE

4.15 The comments of the Council's drainage officers are awaited with regard to any implications from additional surface water runoff from the site area. Any comments will be reported to members at the meeting.

5.0 CONCLUSION

5.1 The proposal is considered to be in accordance with relevant draft local plan policies. It is not expected to harm the landscape setting of the campus or the amenity of residents in Walnut Close and The Orchard, in particular from the area of the materials storage compound. However, conditions are recommended to ensure that this will be the case. Drainage comments are awaited and any comments received will be updated at the meeting if necessary. Subject to this and the imposition of conditions, officers raise no objections.

COMMITTEE TO VISIT

6.0 RECOMMENDATION: Approve

1 TIME2 Development start within three years

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

Drawing no's:

Figure 1 Rev. B

60095535-040-P-007

D015.P.004 Rev. F

D015.P.005 Rev.E

D015.L.003 Rev. N

D015.L.006 Rev. G

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.

3 Prior to the installation of any lighting on any part of the application site area a full Lighting Impact Assessment for car park lighting or within the proposed materials compound shall be undertaken by an independent assessor (not the applicant or the lighting provider). The details of this assessment shall provide the following:

- Description of the proposed lighting: number of lighting columns and their height, and proposed lighting units.
- Proposed level of lighting.
- Drawings showing the illuminance levels (separate drawings for each item listed):
 - Plan showing horizontal illuminance levels (E_h), showing all buildings within 100 metres of the site boundary
 - Plan showing vertical illuminance levels (E_v), showing all buildings within 100 metres of the site boundary.
 - Vertical cross-sections across the site showing lighting columns and vertical illuminance (2 to 50 lux lines), the heights of buildings within 100 metres of the edge of the site boundary and any existing/proposed screening. Two vertical cross-sections across the length and width of the site (perpendicular to each other)

should be provided.

- Specification of the Environmental Zone of the application site, as defined in The Institution of Lighting Engineers' Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution.
- A statement of the need for floodlighting.

E_v is the average vertical illuminance, which is a measurement of the quantity of light at height of 1.5 metres above the ground

E_h is the average horizontal illuminance, which is a measurement of the quantity of light falling on a horizontal plane

Reason: To protect the amenity of nearby residents from light intrusion and loss of amenity

4 Prior to the commencement of any works, details shall be agreed with the LPA of the barrier equipment to be installed at the entrance to the car park, together with the methods of managing and controlling access by students and staff.

Reason: in the interests of highway safety and to ensure effective management of parking demand within the University campus.

5 Prior to any works commencing on site, a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall identify the steps and procedures that will be implemented to minimise the creation and impact of noise, vibration and dust resulting from the site preparation, groundwork and construction phases of the development. Once approved, the CEMP shall be adhered to at all times, unless otherwise first agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the amenity of occupants of adjacent and adjoining properties during the development of the site.

6 At the time of opening of this car park to students and staff, the total number of car parking spaces within the Heslington West Campus shall not exceed 1520 spaces. (excluding disabled spaces).

Reason : To accord with previously agreed parking levels on this campus.

7 Details of all means of enclosure to the site boundaries between the existing maintenance yard and the properties on Walnut Close and The Orchard shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and subsequently provided before the development of the proposed new storage bays commences.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

8 Prior to the commencement of work on the proposed storage bays in the materials compound, details of their size, design and appearance shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The height of the bays or the materials stored within them shall not exceed the height of the adjacent forms of boundary enclosure with properties on Walnut Close and The Orchard.

Reason. In the interests of the visual amenities of the area and from neighbouring properties.

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 the impact on the principle of development within the existing campus, impact on the landscaped setting of the campus, loss of trees, design and appearance, sustainable development, drainage and impact on the amenity of neighbours. As such the proposal complies with the University Development Brief for the existing Heslington West campus and Policies GP1, ED6, GP4a, GP4b, NE1 and GP15a of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

Contact details:

Author: Matthew Parkinson Development Control Officer
Tel No: 01904 552405