

York – British Sugar – Presentation to Community Forum No 2 – 14 July 2014 6.30pm

Note of Meeting

Present

Chair:

John Hocking – Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JH)

Forum members:

Cllr Tracey Simpson-Laing – Acomb Ward Councillor (TSL) [Part]

Cllr David Horton – Acomb ward Councillor (DH)

Cllr Joseph Riches – Holgate Ward Councillor (JR) - **Apologies**

Rev Tony Hand – resident representative (TH)

Allan Deller – resident representative (AD)

Peter Powell – resident representative (PP) [Part]

Edie Jones – resident representative (EJ) [Part]

Neal Clarke – resident representative (NC)

Alex Rogers – Sovereign Park Residents Association (AR)

Rina Rogers – Sovereign Park Residents Association (RR)

Ann Ward (in place of Derek Gauld) – CYC (AW)

Michael Slater – CYC (MS)

Neil Jones – Rapleys (NJ)

Robert Clarke – Rapleys (RC)

Richard Green – AECOM (RG)

Simon Pratt – AECOM (SP)

David Townley – ABF (DT)

Derek Gauld – CYC - **Apologies**

Cllr Ian Gilles – Rural West Ward Councillor – **Apologies**

Observing:

Emily Pattinson – Beattie Communications

Place of meeting

Former Manor School site

**1. Introduction**

1.1 JH introduced the meeting and made apologies for those unable to attend.

1.2 MS provided an update on the Draft Local Plan which is out to consultation until 16.07.14. He confirmed that CYC aim to submit a final plan for examination by the end of the year. He explained that nothing has changed in terms of policy and the Council's aspirations and that brownfield sites are still the priority.

1.3 DH stated that he would not be contributing to the meeting, but as Chair of the Planning Committee he is in attendance to observe and to take comments into consideration.

## **2. Update on ABF's position**

2.1 NJ explained the purpose of the meeting and outlined the contents of the presentation which was to update the forum on the consultation feedback, amendments to the masterplan as a result, to show the preferred masterplan and confirm timescales.

2.2 NJ explained that the vision remains the same, to bring the site back into use, providing key family housing that is a benefit to the area. DT added that ABF is committed to working with the local community. ABF will make investment and seeks to exit sites cleanly, bringing land back into use for the benefit of the local community. The masterplan is integrated with the draft Local Plan and goes a long way to address the housing shortage. DT confirmed that ABF is the landowner, not a developer.

2.3 NJ explained the development model and confirmed that ABF would submit an outline planning application for the masterplan and a detailed planning application for the technical side such as engineering works etc.

## **3. Update on constraints and opportunities**

3.1 RG updated the group on progress and confirmed that a full EIA has been undertaken which considers all of the issues that would be impacted by the development and informs the design.

3.2 RG stated that a lot of work has been done with the highways team regarding access, egress and movement through the development. The team is taking a holistic approach and undertaking technical studies to ensure that the submission is robust.

## **4. Consultation update**

4.1 NJ ran through the consultation in November 2013 and explained that 260 people attended the exhibition and 278 feedback forms were received.

4.2 TH asked where people lived that provided feedback and said that it would be good if it was possible what types of comments came from those living in the immediate vicinity and those that live further away. NJ confirmed that although this information is not presented at the forum, it is available. RC added that an overview of consultation is being discussed at the forum and a more detailed breakdown of the consultation would be provided as part of the planning application.

4.3 RG provided an update on the three options that were shown at the public consultation in November 2013 and explained which aspects of each option were fixed and which gave scope for change – Option 1 included the extension of Craven Sports Ground, Option 2 distributed the open space across the development and Option 3 focussed the open space and community facilities together. RG confirmed that all options have the same amount of open space.

4.4 NJ then ran through the six key messages that came from the consultation:

- Option 2 & 3 were the preferred options with large centred green space with the opportunity to provide smaller areas across the development too.

- Natural and semi-natural green spaces – children’s play spaces, informal leisure and outdoor sports
- Community facilities should be accessible to existing and new communities with sports hall, education and health facilities.
- Pedestrian and cycle routes through the site and access to public transport is important.
- There should be a mix of housing types and styles with family housing being preferred. People said that housing styles should be in keeping with surrounding. NJ confirmed that ABF don’t have control over the architectural styles of the housing.
- Sustainability and environmental aspects of the development.

4.5 NJ ran through the amendments made to the masterplan:

- Location of open space
- Green infrastructure
- Location of community facilities
- Pedestrian and cycle routes
- Mix of housing
- Environmental impact/consideration

4.6 AD questioned the location of the green infrastructure and asked whether ABF had made representations to the Local Plan that the former Manor School playing field is strategic green space. RG explained that the former Manor School playing field was outside of the application boundary and not included within the green space allocation on the masterplan.

4.7 There was some discussion around the deadline for comments on the Local Plan in terms of the allocation of the Manor School playing field and strategic green space. MS confirmed that the allocation does not prevent the provision of the link road across the Former Manor School site. MS confirmed that residents need to make comment on the allocation as part of the consultation.

4.8 EJ asked whether there was a handout of the presentation and it was agreed that a copy of the presentation would be issued following the meeting.

## 5. **Access & Movement**

5.1 RG explained that there would be three principle access points to provide as much access as possible but to prevent the site becoming a through route. The access points would be off Millfield Lane, Plantation Drive and Boroughbridge Road. It was explained that access would be restricted from Plantation Drive (around 10% of trips), Millfield Lane would have around 40% and Boroughbridge Road would have 50% of traffic.

5.2 PP stated that there are current problems with traffic on Millfield Lane at present. He suggested removing the barrier on Lower Poppleton Road and the level crossing which cause issues.

5.3 EJ stated that most roundabouts have evenly spread exits and the Poppleton Business Park roundabout only has exits on half. Children need to be brought to school by car and

there are many problems now. EJ continued to say that there are big parking issues at the industrial estate and cars park on surrounding streets.

- 5.4 TH added that Boroughbridge Road is as bad and no one knows if the new roundabout will help the situation yet. He said that in reality traffic has to go somewhere and would rather the traffic be distributed evenly.
- 5.5 AR added that more than 10% of trips should be from Plantation Drive as it serves quite a large area.
- 5.6 RC confirmed that ABF were mindful of transport issues which need to be addressed properly. PP asked for assurance that the potential development of 360 new homes on Millfield Lane has been taken into account. SP explained that ABF's transport assessment cannot take this into account as it is not yet a commitment but CYC will have assessed overall impacts as part of the Local Plan evidence based.
- 5.7 SP then went on to explain that the original plan only had two accesses however another was added to distribute traffic more evenly. As part of the work, link capacities and junction capacities have been assessed and junction capacities are the issue. Mitigation measures have been identified which would be delivered working with CYC to contribute either through a planning conditions or s106 agreement. SP continued to explain that ABF is in discussions with Network Rail regarding the level crossing. SP added that the park & ride works are still ongoing but indications show that the new roundabout is working and people are still getting used to the new layout, but traffic flow will improve and it will be more efficient.
- 5.8 EJ commented that once the restrictions are lifted, the roundabout will be 60mph and exiting the business park will be difficult. SP responded that everything is taken into account including the speed and gaps in the traffic. He confirmed that there is traffic capacity to take the development. MS added that the Council is taking them all into account across the area in the Local Plan. EJ said that she counted 47 cars going through the traffic lights and called for a rethink on the speed limits. SP confirmed there would be a detailed traffic impact assessment submitted as part of the planning application. AW confirmed that she would pass on the forum's comments onto the highways engineers.
- 5.9 TH added that we must accept that traffic is bad at the moment and if the development could ensure that the situation would not be worse than it is now, then the local community would be happy. SP confirmed that traffic counts are not held in the summer as they do not produce true results of traffic volume and reassured the group that, should there be a worsening of the traffic, then mitigation measures would be implemented.
- 6. Community facilities and open space**
- 6.1 RG then went on to show the community facilities and open space plan and explained that certain parts of the site have been allocated for community areas, located on the key gateway from Boroughbridge Road into the site which could serve existing and new residents.

- 6.2 RG then explains that over 30% of the site will be green open space and ABF is working with CYC to determine the detailed typologies of this space. The space is concentrated in the middle of the development as well as additional smaller areas across the site. RG confirmed that an arboriculture survey has been undertaken and trees that were identified as significant will be retained wherever possible. SUDS will be integrated and could be attenuation ponds, rills and SUD systems which would create habitat on site too. AR offered that Sovereign Park found that noise was an issue for houses overlooking large areas of flat green space which lead to anti-social behaviour. Some discussion was then had around the dilemma of natural surveillance of open green spaces and noise disturbance for residents. RG confirmed that the aim would be for the open space to have different levels and allocated activity areas to break up the space.
- 6.3 TSL asked for clarification as to whether the trees at Langholme Drive would be retained. RG confirmed they would in part and that where removed the boundary treatment at this location would provide private garden spaces backing onto the rear of the existing properties on Langholme Drive, in line with best practice design guidance and ensuring a secure environment.
- 6.4 Some discussion was then had around the height of the development. PP stated that the development of York Business Park had height restrictions so that views of the Minster were not obscured. PP mentioned that the height guide was the Millfield Hotel and asked that building heights on the development would not exceed that. RG confirmed that the scale of development is in keeping with the surrounding heights and that it would be beneficial to maintain views of the Minster. MS added that conditions would probably be added to the planning consent to control the development height. RG added that sections of the site would be created to show the heights of key parts of the development.
- 6.5 RG said that the scheme has been designed around family housing and no flats are proposed. Larger properties would be to the north and smaller to the south. Longer gardens backing onto gardens on Langholme Drive would give a greater distance between existing and new development and provide more of a sense of security. RC added that ABF is trying to be inclusive in the design and the latest masterplan has only recently been shared with CYC.

## **7. Community facilities**

- 7.1 AD asked where the school and retail provision would be located as this had been mentioned in the ES scoping document. NJ confirmed that the community area on the latest masterplan has been allocated for community facilities such as a new school. However, NJ confirmed that it was unviable to provide retail provision on the site due to lack of footfall and prominence. There was then some discussion around the viability of retail. EJ commented that there are already facilities in the area that are oversubscribed and more houses would increase the need for these facilities. RC confirmed that the team were in discussions with officers to ensure the right provision in education was proposed. However, RC added that, whilst ABF is not adverse to providing retail on site, research shows that it wouldn't be viable or sustainable at this time.
- 7.2 TH questioned whether it would be better to improve access to existing facilities if retail wasn't going to be provided on site. MS said that CYC could see if they could support

existing facilities. RC added that as an applicant, ABF is bound by legislation as to what it can offer and that mitigation needs to be relative to the development.

## **8. Timescales**

8.1 NJ explained that ABF would like to move forward with a planning application as soon possible and that the delay has been due to discussions with statutory consultees around site remediation. The target timeline was confirmed as:

- Presentation to Planning Committee members – 24 July
- Feedback to respondents of the consultation – August/September
- Submission September closely followed by the next Community Forum meeting
- Determination February 2015
- Engineering and enabling works commence – summer 2015

8.2 TH asked if the presentation to Planning Committee is open to the public and the details were confirmed that the meeting was to be held at the West Office at 3.45pm (24.07.14).

## **9. AOB**

9.1 JH asked if anyone had any other points to add.

9.2 AD asked whether the SSSI had been considered. NJ confirmed that he would double check.

9.3 AD then asked if traffic from the new school had been considered. SP explained that the traffic figures for the housing development had been overestimated by around 300 homes, to take into account any traffic generated by the new school so that the figures are robust.

9.4 It was confirmed that copies of the meeting minutes and presentation would be emailed to members of the forum following the meeting.

9.5 EJ added that residents had supported this in the Local Plan and that they want it to be a community saying that people needed to feel part of a community and have ownership.

**Close**