

From: Mark Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 March 2023 12:01
To: localplan@york.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Draft Local Plan MM Consultation
Attachments: CYC Main Mods March 23 Redrow ST8 response.docx

This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Local Plan team

Please find attached our response for Redrow largely in respect of Policy SS10/Site ST8

Regards

Mark
[REDACTED]

Mark Johnson
Managing Director

Johnson Mowat

Planning & Development Consultants

Coronet House, Queen Street, Leeds, LS1 2TW

T: 0113 887 0120 W: www.johnsonmowat.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email. This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and may contain privileged information intended solely for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please advise the sender immediately by return email, or contact our office on 0113 887 0120 and delete this message from your system. As this message has been transmitted over a public network Johnson Mowat cannot guarantee its accuracy or completeness. If you suspect that the message may have been intercepted or amended, please contact the sender.

Johnson Mowat, Coronet House, Queen Street, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS1 2TW

Registered in England Nos: 11141366

MAIN MODS RESPONSE



JohnsonMowat
Planning & Development Consultants

Examination of the City of York Local Plan

Phase 5 Main Modification Consultation

March 2023

CLIENT: REDROW HOMES

SITE ST8



CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 RESPONSE TO MAIN MODS



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This response has been prepared on behalf of Redrow Homes in relation to their land interests at Strategic Site ST8, Monks Cross north, York, which is a proposed allocation in the Publication Draft Local Plan.
- 1.2 In a separate parallel process, the ST8 site is now the subject of an Outline approval. See Secretary of State decision. Extracts below:



Department for Levelling Up,
Housing & Communities

Mark Johnson
Johnson Mowat
Coronet House
Queen Street
Leeds
LS1 2TW

Our ref: APP/C2741/W/21/3282969
Your ref: 18/00017/OUTM

14 December 2022

Dear Sir,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78
APPEAL MADE BY REDROW HOMES (YORKSHIRE) LIMITED
SITE TO THE WEST OF THE A1237 AND SOUTH OF NORTH LANE, HUNTINGTON,
YORK
APPLICATION REF: 18/00017/OUTM**

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State to say that consideration has been given to the report of David Prentis BA BPI MRTPI, who held a public local inquiry on 25-28 January 2022 into your client's appeal against the failure of the Council of the City of York to determine your client's application for outline planning permission for residential development of circa 970 dwellings with associated demolition, infrastructure works, open space, primary school, community facilities and convenience store (use class A1; not exceeding 200sqm floorspace) on land west of Monks Cross Link Road and a country park with drainage infrastructure east of Monks Cross Link Road, in accordance with application Ref. 18/00017/OUTM, dated 4 January 2018.
2. On 10 January 2022 this appeal was recovered for the Secretary of State's determination, in pursuance of section 79 of, and paragraph 3 of Schedule 6 to, the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Inspector's recommendation and summary of the decision

3. The Inspector recommended that the appeal be allowed, and planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.
4. For the reasons given below, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions, except where stated, and agrees with his recommendation. He has decided to allow the appeal and grant planning permission. A copy of the Inspector's report (IR) is enclosed. All references to paragraph numbers, unless otherwise stated, are to that report.

- 1.3 The approved Outline is for circa 970 dwellings, a planning condition in the Outline in fact restricts the quantum to 970 dwellings.



2.0 RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS

MAIN MODS RESPONSE

MM2.1: Housing Target

2.1 Comment:

To reduce the annual housing requirement from 867 dwellings to 822 dwellings is short-sighted and fails to reflect the growing need for affordable housing in York which impacts on its economic ability to grow.

The Council need 9,396 affordable dwellings up to 2033 but expect this modified Plan to now deliver only 3,265 dwellings up to 2033. This affordable housing shortfall is significant and could be resolved by allocating additional housing sites. This Plan is clearly failing a key housing objective.

MM3.1: POLICY SS1

2.2 Comment:

In amending and updating the text on the Plan Period 2017/2033 with only limited land allocations from 2033 to 2038 the Plan fails to recognise the need for a Review well before 2033.

The bulk of delivery in this Plan relates only to the period 2033 which is no more than 10 years. The extended Green Belt period from 2033 to 2038 contains very few development sites. From the Council's updated trajectory, it is clear a Review of this adopted Plan will need to commence within 5 years of adoption. This modified text fails to recognise the fragility of the Plan in its latter phases. The revised Trajectory at MM5.4 does not extend beyond 2033.

We request MM3.1 be additionally modified to make reference to a Plan Review commencing no later than 2025.

In addition, we raise concern over the Council's use of the word 'prioritise' for Previously Developed Land (PDL) which suggests that this would be prioritised before greenfield development. This Plan contains a balance of brownfield and greenfield sites with all other land largely in the Green Belt. As such, emphasis on prioritise is not necessary.

MM3.3: KEY DIAGRAM

2.3 Comment:

We object to the continued use of Green Belt strips to the west of ST8 – this land does not fit well the 5 main purposes of Green Belt.

MM3.5: SS1 Housing Growth text

2.4 Comment:



The revised text informs the Council will monitor the delivery of affordable housing through its annual updates but then provides no information on what measures it will take in the scenario where targets are not met. This text should be expanded to include reference of a Plan Review at 5 years.

RESPONSE TO MAIN MODIFICATIONS MM3.26 TO MM3.30

- 2.5 We acknowledge that the amendments outlined within the proposed modifications MM3.26 to MM3.30 largely mirror the Council's proposed amendments to Policy SS10 which were discussed in detail at the Phase 3 Hearing Sessions and formed the outcomes of the Outline decision notice.

MM3.26: Policy SS10 (Site ST8) – Boundary features

2.6 Comment:

This wording fails to recognise how the site will be laid out with sports pitches straddling the boundaries in the green wedge. This needs to end with ...

“where necessary or appropriate”.

Reason for addition, the Green Belt line cuts through an area proposed for sports provision on the masterplan, creating a defensible boundary to form the allocation would cut across the aims of the Masterplan.

MM3.27: Policy SS10 (ST8) – Green Wedge

2.7 Comment:

We continue our objection to the use of Green Belt in this area. The text makes reference to 'green wedge' west of the site south of Garth Road. It should also be noted that Garth Road at this point is a lane in private ownership and a link is not guaranteed. The word 'link' needs to be removed. The Green Wedge is achievable through the provision of public open space. We request the wording is amended to state:-

“Provide a new green wedge **containing public open space** to the west of the site south of the Garth Road **lane**....”

MM3.28: Policy SS10 (ST8) – Green Area OS8

2.8 Comment:

We support this change.

MM5.3 – MM 5.4 Housing Delivery

2.9 Comment:

There is no text on monitoring and what happens if the delivery begins to fail. At what point of failure is a Review triggered? There needs to be something added to end of Para 5.10 that



identifies through annual monitoring reports that any significant departure from the Revised Trajectory (2017-2033) that suggests delivery would be 10% less than that shown for the period 2023 to 2028 would trigger a Plan Review if that delivery cannot be rectified by actions.

MM5.9: Policy H3 – Accessibility Standards

2.10 Comment:

The policy lacks clarity over ‘**appropriate proportion**’. Clarity would be better if absolute targets were used. See local ‘Leeds 2019 Core Strategy’ example below.

Eg Leeds Council Policy

<p>POLICY H10: ACCESSIBLE HOUSING STANDARDS</p> <p>New build residential developments should include the following proportions of accessible dwellings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30% of dwellings meet the requirements of M4(2) ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’ of Part M Volume 1 of the Building Regulations. • 2% of dwellings meet the requirement of M4(3) ‘wheelchair user dwellings’ of Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations. Wheelchair user dwellings should meet the M4(3) wheelchair adaptable dwelling standard unless Leeds City Council is responsible for nominating a person to live in the dwelling. <p>Where the scale of development would generate more than one accessible dwelling, the mix of sizes, types and tenures of M4(2) and M4(3) dwellings should reflect the mix of sizes, types and tenures of the development as a whole as closely as possible (unless the applicant can demonstrate an evidenced need locally to provide accessible housing in dwellings of a particular size, type and / or tenure. Locally will normally mean the Designated Neighbourhood Area, or where this is not defined, will mean relevant settlement, or ward if the site lies within the main urban area).</p> <p>The required number, mix and location of accessible dwellings should be clearly illustrated on drawings and via planning condition.</p> <p>Departures from this policy should be justified by evidence of viability considerations.</p>

MM5.19: Policy H9 Older Persons Housing

2.11 Comment:

This policy lacks clarity over ‘an appropriate provision’. There is an overlap with Policy H3 on accessible housing and if targets are introduced into H3 as suggested above, then the need on Strategic Sites in Policy H9 to provide accessible housing for the elderly is removed.

MM9.6: Policy G12A – Strensall Common

2.12 Comment:

Part b)i) restricts development occupation until the whole greenspace is provided. This needs to be amended...

“to secure access to areas of suitable natural greenspace secured by way of **phased or whole** of the mitigation to any occupation...”

MM11.5: Policy CC2 Sustainable Design

2.13 Comment:

Suggest the final modification which starts “Pending anticipated changes....” Is removed as the following paragraph recognises such changes are brought about through Government



Building Regulation changes outside Planning Policy. As drafted, the MM adds nothing and may confuse.

MM11.8: Policy CC2 Sustainable Construction

2.14 Comment:

Taylor Wimpey object to the need for Strategic Sites to deliver a BREEAM Communities assessment. On the basis of following Part L changes, there is no case to switch to considering another regime under BREEAM.

MM11.11: Policy CC2 Text

2.15 Comment:

Taylor Wimpey requests the removal of para 11b the “% **targets**” as these have yet to be confirmed by Government in the Part L Future HHomes Revisions standards.

MM15.1:

2.16 Comment:

Taylor Wimpey objects to the revised wording. If a scheme is agreed to be unviable, simply re-phasing payments is unlikely to make much of a difference. We suggest the following:-

*“Where a scheme is demonstrably unviable, the Council will work with the developer to **modify the scale of contributions** as well as consider re-phasing of obligation payments.”*