

**York – British Sugar – Presentation to Community Forum No 3
18 February 2015. 6.30pm**

MEETING NOTES

Present:

Chair:

John Hocking – Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JH)

Forum members:

Rev Tony Hand – resident representative (TH)

Alan Deller – resident representative (AD)

David Nunns – resident representative (DN)

Peter Powell – resident representative (PP)

Edie Jones – resident representative (EJ)

Neal Clarke – resident representative (NC)

Alex Rogers – Sovereign Park Residents Association (AR)

Cllr Chris Steward Rural West Ward Councillor in place of Cllr Gillies

Derek Gauld – CYC (DG)

Neil Jones – Rapleys (NJ)

Robert Clarke – Rapleys (RC)

Richard Green – AECOM (RG)

David Townley – ABF (DT)

Simon Pratt – AECOM (SP)

David Mills – (ABF)

David Horton – Acomb ward Councillor (DH)

Ann Ward – CYC (AW)

Michael Slater – CYC (MS) – Apologies

Richard Bogg – CYC (RB) - Apologies

Gareth Arnold (GA) - Apologies

Cllr Ian Gilles – Rural West Ward Councillor – Apologies

Cllr Tracey Simpson-Laing – Acomb Ward Councillor - Apologies

Observing:

Deborah Hastie – Beattie Communications

Jonathan Kenyon - City of York Council.

Stuart Barnes – prospective Labour Councillor for Acomb Ward

Mrs Nunns – partner of Mr Nunns

Kristina Davey

Place of meeting:

All Saints Hall, Upper Poppleton

1. Introduction:

1.1 JH introduced the meeting and attendees introduced themselves (Apologies for those unable to attend were made later in the meeting).

1.2 The officers noted delays to the overall process of the local plan consultation in the autumn of 2014 so CYC officers could engage and respond to further reports. JH summarised and that as a result the consultation and the local plan had not been agreed to date.

2: Update since previous Community Forum meeting

NJ and RG began with a presentation regarding an update on the British Sugar site outlining the overall vision of the site and summarising the strategy of the outline and detailed applications for the site.

They touched on the site's opportunities and constraints and how British Sugar as owner not developer of the site was taking the opportunity to manage the site's development.

They also talked about the remedial work required on the site and how, over time, parcels of the site would be brought forward by developers. This was reflected in the outline masterplan application as well as the detailed application for remedial works.

They referred to slides showing the earlier site and how discussion with Council officers had been led by how the site connects with its surrounding neighbourhoods, communities and wider environment. The site and application had evolved to include transport, networks and other key elements.

NJ reiterated that as of the end of 2014, when the Planning Application was made, key amendments had been made to address feedback and comments from statutory stakeholders, officers and community members. These looked at, among other things, location of community facilities, mix and style of housing, retention of mature trees as well as cycle routes and transport issues.

The outline masterplan application submission in November 2014 set the parameters for:
Up to 1,100 homes, 8.77 ha of onsite green infrastructure and 1.54 ha of land for community use.

The detailed application enables the construction of development platforms, remediation and reclamation of the site and then development zones (parcels) to be released.

3: Consultation Feedback - Key Comments

As a result of the consultation process:

54 comments had been made – the majority were located close to the site.

The officers collated and summarised the key elements down to 11 points, some were requests for technical information, design details of the Main Street, others were about the relationship of the site with the imminent surroundings.

As a result of the feedback and key points, supplemental submissions were made and these are now out for consultation until March 6, 2015.

RG presented a supplementary parameter plan with development zones and land use and stated there was little change from the previous submission. They were looking to deliver a scheme that meets market demands and is deliverable.

Framework plan slide – little change again but British Sugar wanted to make sure they got a natural look where open spaces are overlooked for security and to make sure they are usable and feel safe. It also included minimum floor levels and maximum heights but this varied across the site. It was stated there were no apartments on this site.

Green Infrastructure Plan (GIP) – this had changed as they identified where on the plan they had to work with existing constraints such as HV cables and existing culverts. The GIP has evolved to now include "pocket parks", more pedestrian and cycle routes have been added and a potential Rail Halt identified as a possibility for the future by CYC.

Highways and details of Main Street – here the project looked again at the main street, barriers and crossing areas, island crossings and cycle routes, trying to identify potential pinch points. Essentially they were looking at a better experience for the pedestrian and cyclist first, not necessarily the road user.

Other updates they examined included: looking at sustainable drainage, what sports facilities could be onsite and car parking.

They were examining the relationship between new and existing properties, better security, longer gardens and trees to be retained where possible.

With regards to Ouse Acre, they looked at issues including the railway line, tree retention and the need for outward looking development; Millfield Lane regarding outward looking housing and the Main Street in relation to the issue of activity, pathways and cycle routes. Secondary roads were touched upon and the needs to create informal residential environments and central green spaces with sustainable elements such as “Swale” systems – an urban sustainable drainage system.

4: Questions to Key Consultation Comments

CLlr Horton at this stage said he was there purely as an observer and would not be making any comments – Noted.

CS asked for clarification on the shared space.

NJ responded and said it included a range of space across the site, close to and around the housing.

EJ stated that 1100 homes would mean another 1100 cars on the roads and CYC had to do something about the Ring Road as this was a critical issue.

RC stated that further engagement and comment would be taking place before March 15.

SP added that they had been looking at traffic modelling and it was felt the traffic could be accommodated on Millfield Lane but CYC was conducting more modelling work.

TH added that modelling is fine but who can say if those extra journeys could be soaked up and what would it be like in 10 years' time? – Noted.

SP added that in relation to roundabouts and pinch points that the developer would be making contributions related to the impacts of the proposals.

PP asked about the movement of traffic and was the Main Street going to be a through run and what could be done to prevent this becoming a rat run.

Response: The transport team had been using a system called SATURN where data was inputted and it pinpointed likely congestion points, routes and distribution of traffic.

DN asked if existing bus gate on Millfield Lane would be retained – yes

DN asked if there would be pedestrian access down Plantation Drive - yes

DN stated that he was disappointed with the hard landscaping and greenery and the open space overall. He expressed concerns that like the Terry's Factory site the masterplan bore no relation to what was being built. He was fearful a different development would be built – Noted by Forum.

NJ added that the green space was not just what you could see on the site but via S106 contributions, a new cricket pitch and new facilities at Manor School in Acomb are also being discussed with officers.

A debate followed regarding the allocation of S106 funding across the York and the potential injustice of one area taking a development but another area gaining from the funding.

RC made the point that overall 20% of the site was given to open space and they were talking to council officers regarding other provisions but there was certain criteria and rules to follow.

AW said that advice had been sought by Sports England on elements including the proposed cricket pitch and which sites it preferred. Discussions were on-going.

AD referred to the S106 heads of terms. RC clarified that this document, submitted with the Planning Application, is the basis for ongoing discussions with officers regarding necessary planning obligations.

It was noted that Sport England has objected to the British Sugar applications but representation were being made and the team were confident that solutions could be made and ultimately the objection would be withdrawn.

Various local areas were highlighted by members and observers, such as allocated community use and local tennis courts being lost – all noted.

EJ stated a key issue was parking and with an expectation of two cars per home would there be enough provision as well as a mix of houses and bungalows to meet the needs of not just families who work all day but retired residents who can be at home during to contribute to a community feel and security.

RG stated that there was a mix of 2-5 bed homes, detached, semi and terraced and some of these could be bungalows to appeal to an elderly market. He did however say it was a little premature to be this specific about the housing type allocation. He added that they were looking at a policy on parking, visitor parking and road designed where parking can also be achieved.

A question was raised about the retaining of the Mound. Answered collectively by the development team, it was being looked at but the mound would have to be altered due to the remedial work that has to take place. Security of open spaces was also an issue that has to be addressed by responsible planning. However, any perceived loss of amenity would be looked at and where possible trees would be retained or replanted after remedial the work. They would encouraging developers to plants trees and had designed in longer gardens.

It was noted that the site had to be left for 12 months after remedial works had taken place so re-planting could not take place immediately.

NC asked if the issue of upgrading the level crossing had been addressed and recommended re-checking of the standards required. Response was that the team had been in discussions with Network Rail about the level crossing and they were going to respond shortly.

DN asked if Millfield Lane was going to be the primary site for construction traffic on to the site and EJ asked if the issues of school buses at the new Manor School would be addressed as it currently resembled a car park at school pick up time with around 15 buses and many car parked on the roadside.

RG said that a detailed document and agreement would be drawn up to specify construction access and delivery times to make it safe with minimal noise pollution etc.

PP asked if a Strategic Environmental Assessment had been drawn up for the site.

NJ said a full environmental assessment has been conducted but an SEA was not required in support of the applications.

TH commented that care needed to be taken that people were not left to look after open spaces if they did not want to. Noted and RC added that ultimately they needed to create plans that would have market appeal.

Final questions:

Was there still a provision for a Primary School? – (RC) Yes, on the footprint of the community hub allocation. It would be phased in at an appropriate time when there were residents' on site, and the demand was there. Members said that the developers needed to be mindful of when it was brought on to the site. Noted.

Asked if there was provision for local training and employment – (AW) yes, skills and training were included in the S106 requests

EJ made a final statement that this brownfield site should be developed as a priority over any green belt land and asked for assurance from CYC that it was supportive of this. Noted.

5: Timescales and Next Steps

It was noted that:

Further consultation on supplementary submission – 13 Feb – March 6, 2015.

Application Presentation to Planning Committee March 19th, 2015. (Target date)

Granting of planning permission (following completion of s106) May 2015.

Discharge of pre commencement conditions – May-Sept 2015

Commence land formed & reclamation works – October 2015.

First homes ready – target April 2019.

6: Future Forum Meetings

Communications: That the presentation be circulated to Forum Members via email.

JH noted that more notice is required for future meetings and a minimum of four weeks should be allowed – other members agreed. Noted.

Larger venues should also be considered and KD offered to supply a list of suitable venues for future meeting. Noted.

7: AOB

None

Close