
MEETING	PLANNING COMMITTEE
DATE	15 JUNE 2011
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS WILLIAMS (CHAIR), GALVIN (VICE-CHAIR), AYRE, BOYCE, CUNNINGHAM-CROSS, D'AGORNE, DOUGHTY, FIRTH, FUNNELL, KING, MCILVEEN, MERRETT, ORRELL (SUB FOR CLLR REID), SIMPSON-LAING, WATSON AND WATT
APOLOGIES	COUNCILLOR REID

1. INSPECTION OF SITE

Site	Reason for Visit	Members Attended
Holgate Villa, 22 Holgate Road, York YO24 4AB (11/00436/FULM)	To enable Members to view the site and adjacent properties following objections received.	Cllrs Boyce, King, Merrett and Watson.

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.

Councillor Boyce declared a personal prejudicial interest in relation to Plans item 4a (Holgate Villa, 22 Holgate Road, York YO24 4AB) as her employers occupied part of Holgate Villa and she withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Councillor D'Agorne declared a personal prejudicial interest in relation to Plans item 4a (Holgate Villa, 22 Holgate Road, York YO24 4AB) as the York Green Party Office occupied part of Holgate Villa and he withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.

Councillor Merrett declared a personal non prejudicial interest in relation to Plans item 4a (Holgate Villa, 22 Holgate Road, York YO24 4AB) and the reference to the adjacent cycle route as an Honorary Member of the CTC.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 24 March 2011 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak at the meeting under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

5. PLANS LIST

Members considered the report of the Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development) relating to the following planning application, outlining the proposals and relevant planning considerations and setting out the views of the consultees and officers.

5a Holgate Villa, 22 Holgate Road, York YO24 4AB (11/00436/FULM)

Members considered a major full application, received from The Villas Venture, for the erection of a part 3 and part 4 storey hotel with associated parking and landscaping following demolition of the existing office building.

Officers circulated an update at the meeting, which set out the following (the full update is attached to the agenda for this meeting):

- Confirmation that revised plans had been received which clarified material and delivery details and drawings showing that vehicles could turn and leave the site in a forward gear.
- Objections received from the Micklegate Planning Panel in respect of traffic management, building massing, community safety and lack of community involvement/consultation.

- Additional Conditions relating to construction of roads and footpaths, removal of redundant crossing, carriageway and footway widening and a method of works statement.
- Highways revised comments confirming that the hotel use would lead to a reduction in traffic generated by the site and that the hotel would not be eligible for on street parking permits. Also confirmation that Lowther Terrace would be widened to 4.1m (confirmed as 4.5m at the meeting) to accommodate two way traffic.
- Amendment to Condition 7 requesting large scale details and Condition 10 requiring coverage of the cycle store.
- Comments of the Environmental Protection Unit suggesting additional conditions regarding vehicle delivery hours, limiting noise levels in bedrooms and land contamination.
- Photomontages of the development as seen from Holgate Road/Lowther Terrace.
- Extract from the minutes of the Micklegate Ward Committee meeting held on 9 June 2011, when consideration had been given to the planning application.

Representations were received from the Chair of CAMLOW Residents' Association expressing concerns at possible traffic levels in relation to the proposed development. She pointed out that there would be an increase in vehicles accessing the site via Lowther Terrace and that the parking arrangements were inadequate resulting in pressure on residents parking in the vicinity. Concerns were also expressed regarding delivery vehicles and to the proposed increase in road width causing safety issues for children and vulnerable tenants.

A local resident went onto make representations at the lack of consultation in relation to the application. She also referred to safety concerns that arose from the proposal to amend traffic on Lowther Terrace to two way. Other concerns related to light pollution, problems arising from the demolition of the existing building and use of the hotel by racing clientele.

A further local resident confirmed that although their area had suffered from a number of problems the community had worked together to provide a safe environment for all residents. She pointed out that this proposal would be detrimental to the community in general and referred to existing drainage problems, which this development would exacerbate.

A representative of the North Yorkshire Committee of the national cyclists organisation CTC referred to the inclusion of Lowther Terrace as part of a quiet cycle route between the A59 corridor and the station, avoiding Blossom Street. He stated that, if approved, this application would generate as yet unquantified levels of additional vehicle journeys along Lowther Terrace. He stated that despite the proposal to increase the road width that this would still remain below the recommended standard in respect of cyclists being passed by wide bodied vehicles. He therefore requested the Committee to refuse the application on safety grounds.

Representations were received from a representative of the Micklegate Planning Panel, who also declared an interest as a tenant of Holgate Villas. He expressed concerns on behalf of residents at the lack of engagement with the local community, access to the site by large vehicles, community safety and the scale and massing of the building.

A representative of the Older People's Assembly also made representations as tenants of Holgate Villas. He confirmed that most points had already been covered but referred to the short period of notice for tenants and requested assurances that both the developer and the Council would endeavour to assist them in their relocation.

The developer assured members that neither his Architect nor himself had been invited to attend the Micklegate Ward Committee or any consultation meetings and he expressed surprise at the objections raised. He pointed out that the existing building was outdated and now let on short term lease but that this was unsustainable in the long term. Confirmation was received that no tenants would be required to leave until their lease expired and that they would try to assist with their relocation. He went onto describe the type of hotel and facilities proposed and landscaping plans for the site.

Members then questioned a number of aspects of the scheme including:

- Details of the cladding materials.
- Why the policy on community involvement did not appear to have been carried out in respect of this application.
- Further details of traffic movements, including coaches and service vehicles.

- Details of the cycle/pedestrian route through to the station and NCP car park. Confirmation that the developer had provided land to accommodate cycle track access to the station.
- Disposal of demolition materials. Confirmed that this would follow national guidelines, which included the recycling.
- Clarification on restaurant/bar usage and coaches using Lowther Terrace. Confirmation that the developers would accept a condition specifying that coach drop off and pick ups would take place at Queen Street/NCP car park and not in the vicinity of the hotel.
- Need for the provision of a hatched box restriction at the entrance to Lowther Terrace and accompanying waiting restrictions.

Members then questioned the possibility of delaying further consideration of the application to allow engagement with the community prior to the Committee making a decision. The applicant confirmed that, although he felt that there were no grounds on which the application could be refused, he was happy to defer further consideration pending further consultation.

Following discussion it was

RESOLVED: That consideration of this application be deferred to allow Officers to undertake further consultation. ¹

REASON: To allow full consultation to be undertaken on this application prior to a decision being made.

Action Required

1. Following further consultation bring back to Committee for decision.

JC

6. YORK CENTRAL HISTORIC CORE CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL: CONSULTATION DRAFT

Consideration was given to a report, which set out details of the York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal, which had been prepared by Alan Baxter Associates with joint funding from English Heritage and the City of York Council. An

Executive Summary of the draft appraisal had been attached to the report at Annex 1.

Officers pointed out that this was a large and complex Conservation Area and that completion of the comprehensive appraisal had been a significant undertaking. It was confirmed that the document had been designed to be accessible on the web with text being kept to a minimum. Details of the most significant recommendations and suggestions had been set out at paragraph 12 of the report.

Officers confirmed that the lack of an appraisal of the York Central Historic Core Conservation Area had been identified as a key weakness of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework. Members were informed that the draft document had received detailed input from a key stakeholder group and that it had now reached the public consultation stage.

Members referred to a number of points including:

- Consultation methodology - suggested use of social media such as Twitter, Face book and Focus Groups.
- Local consultation should be undertaken if there should be any support for Article 4 Directives.
- Need to engage the whole city including school children.
- The List of Consultees (Annex 2) required updating eg DPAG now known as Equality Advisory Group.
- The city needed to be inclusive and accessible and consider equality implications (EIA's)
- Document should include more interactive documents/maps

Members went onto express their appreciation and thanks to everyone involved in putting together this complex and comprehensive appraisal.

- RESOLVED:
- i) That the Draft York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal be approved for public consultation.¹
 - ii) That approval be given to the proposed consultation methods outlined in paragraphs 14 to 16 of the report subject to the addition of social media eg. Twitter and Facebook in an effort to engage with hard to reach groups.²

- iii) That the Chair, Vice Chair and Councillor Merrett be delegated authority to agree any outstanding changes to the Appraisal and oversee the final document.³

- REASON:
- i) The document has adopted a rigorous approach to the assessment of the York Central Historic Core Conservation Area, and is in accordance with relevant guidance documents;
 - ii) The boundary review has been carried out in accordance with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the latest guidance documents from English Heritage;
 - iii) The document has been subject to intensive peer review through the key stakeholder group;
 - iv) The proposed consultation process is based on previous best practice.

Action Required

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Commence public consultation. | BS |
| 2. Include social media in consultation methods. | BS |
| 3. Chair, Vice Chair and Councillor Merrett to agree any changes. | BS |

7. UPDATED COMMUTED SUM PAYMENTS FOR OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Members considered a report which sought their approval to update and republish the commuted sum payments contained within Guidance Note 'Commuted Sum Payments for Open Space in New Developments – A Guide for Developers'.

Officers stated that in order to provide a consistent and transparent approach towards these payments it was intended to use the RICS base line figures in the approved Guidance Note which would reflect the reduction in building costs arising from the recession.

Consideration was then given to the following options:

Option 1: Approve the updated set of commuted sum payment figures to be incorporated in the approved Guidance Note, together with automatic updating and clarified text;

Option 2: To instruct Officers to take an alternative approach.

- RESOLVED:
- i) That approval be given to the revised commuted sum payment figures set out in Table 1 of the report.
 - ii) That Officers be requested to update annually the commuted sum payment figures in the Guidance Note, in line with the RICS 'Building Costs Information Service all in Tender Price Index'.¹

- REASON:
- i) To update the open space commuted sum payments in line with current market conditions.
 - ii) To ensure that the commuted sum payment figures are updated regularly in line with current market conditions.

Action Required

1. Republish Guidance Note with new payment figures and update annually.

JR

CLLR D WILLIAMS, Chair

[The meeting started at 4.30 pm and finished at 5.55 pm].