



NOTES FROM COMMUNITY FORUM 22/12/2009 - St Chad's Church, Lady Chapel, 6-7pm

THESE NOTES ARE DELIBERATELY BRIEF AND ARE DESIGNED TO CAPTURE THE MAIN POINTS MADE AND THE SPIRIT OF THE MEETING RATHER THAN A LITERAL RECORD OF EVERYTHING DISCUSSED.

Present:

PAC	Peter Callaghan
LS	Luke Symonds
JH	Janet Hopton (Chair)
JG	Cllr Julie Gunnell
RB	Richard Beal
DM	Cllr Dave Merrett
AC	Andy Chase
KA	Katherine Atkinson
AS	Alison Sinclair
AL	Andrew Lindsey
CG	Christina Rivas Graver
BM	Brian Mellors
LH	Linda Hall
TL	Tony Lee
ACo	Ann Cox
SW	Steve Woods, Micklegate Planning Panel

1. Apologies for Absence

Eamonn Keogh, Steve Davis, Derek Gauld, Ian Stokes, Mike Slater, Glynn Drummond, Knavesmire School, Neil Hulse, Ann Grey

2. Comments on notes of the last Community Forum 24/09/09

DM made some observations regarding some of the wording used in the previous minutes;

- 2) Notes of 23/07/09 Minute 2, item 4c, the output from the SATURN calculations used in putting together the transport assessment for the development is considered by him to be misleading with regard to sustainability. the sustainable modes and trip allocation, and therefore in regard to traffic levels.
- 5) School Playing Area, 4th point. DM: There is a requirement for public open space on the scheme. How that is used is questionable open to question. A reduced size pitch could be appropriate for the school. Leisure Services have suggested a contribution towards the Knavesmire pitch off site, however this has additional staffing and facilities security and operation issues for the school, is seasonal, and is often waterlogged. Need to look for an imaginative, shared access solution.



These comments did not affect the overall intent of the previous discussions and nor were all the comments made accepted by all present.

3. Matters Arising

DM spoke on recent traffic counts at Station Business Park, recording a modal split of 7-8% cycle journeys, 22% walking journeys and +70% car journeys arriving at the site. This does not reflect the modal split projected in the MATT modelling tool for the Terry's site. The University is a large employer in the same MATT area, and their strict travel policy may have affected the MATT figures. Currently surveying two other office developments at out of town sites for comparison. The developer has done what CYC has asked of them, DM is challenging CYC's use of the MATT tool. Submitted this data to Howard Watson two months ago and await a response.

BM noted that Bishopthorpe Parish Council also conducted a traffic count along Church Lane. Its findings also contrasted with those of the City, and although our data was shown to relevant parties, it was essentially ignored. I am disappointed that with Traffic being such a major issue for this proposed development, we have not seen adequate representatives of Traffic and Transport from the Council present at these forums.

AC was in agreement with Cllr. Merrett on traffic issues. Also, the quantum of the development has seen little difference and more hotels are proposed.

PAC clarified that there are no more hotels, and that the commercial area of the site – the largest trip generator of proposed uses – has seen a decrease of 16% on the previous application.

JH agreed that Grantside have done all they can in reference to traffic and transport data. RB is due to meet with HW and officers in January to discuss these topics in full.

AL noted that Cllr. Merrett's traffic count has been carried out by a single person, to their own methodology. Furthermore, Station Business Park cannot be compared to the proposed development at the Terry's site in any way.

RB presented the additional information and revised plans that were submitted in December 2009.



4. Open Floor

a) Multi Storey Factory (MSF)

AS noted concern in the Conservation Area Advisory Panel regarding the rooftop extension to the MSF. The listing description for this building quite clearly states it is of interest for its architectural properties, with emphasis on the parapet wall to the South.

RB agreed to attend the January CAAP meeting and confirmed that English Heritage have verbally agreed revisions to the MSF, a written response is expected to follow. English Heritage's view is that there was always some scope to extend the rooftop. The proposed extension is set back from the parapet, and as such is partially obscured. There is a view that extensions to listed buildings are acceptable if done well.

DM Showed a photograph from a balcony at the racecourse of the Western elevation of the MSF, and voiced concerns that although set back, the extension was not proposed to be set back enough. Long distance views must also be considered.

PAC explained that they have submitted many visual impact assessments, undertaken by professional advisors and the relevant council officers have been consulted and are content. Parapet to North is approx 1.5m high in places and extension will be 3 to 3.5 m high. Extension is set back some 1.8 metres. Views over the parapet will be possible when stood up, but not sitting down. Raised decking for balcony area is proposed to allow views.

The approved extensions to the Time Office were subject to the same process.

b) Site Layout

PAC showed where the building impact on Bishopthorpe Road had been reduced and subsequently the amenity areas around the buildings had increased, and also where the links between the senior living buildings had been removed to form separate blocks and to open views up.

AS noted that the convenience store's revised position is better, and that the 2 storeys of apartments above seems rather bulky. PAC explained that this goes back to urban design principles, and the need to have a strong sense of arrival at the site entrances.

TL asked if there are any detailed plans for a through-route to the racecourse? PAC has some indicative designs, but details will be produced at the next stage.



c) **Quantum of Development**

Returning to the issue of quantum and traffic; PAC explained that the Transport Assessment contains inflated figures, based on what we considered the development could sustain. What we are applying for is lower than this. The TA presents a worst case scenario and was done to allow us to progress with certainty regarding the impact of the development on the highways network. **ACTION - PAC to circulate a table to show this comparative reduction.**

RB clarified that 'overdevelopment' is not a term that applies merely to quantum/ floor space – other factors such as layout and scale must also be borne in mind.

d) **Planning Controls**

AS asked how we will guarantee senior living is allocated to 'senior livers'? PAC explained that this is controlled by the Section 106 legal agreement. JH asked how can we be sure that the mixed use application will not result in something completely different being developed from what is set out, i.e. that one use will not dominate?

PAC explained that the parameters plan defines what may be developed on-site, and that a new application would have to be submitted to deviate from this. Alongside this is a table of development in the planning statement, which drives out quantum. We must also have listed building consent before we can progress

RB added that the planning conditions will include wording to allow the appropriate level of freedom to develop the building, but also control the uses.

PAC confirmed that there is not a contribution to shared community facilities, such as St Chad's.

PAC explained that there would be a contribution to off site cycle routes in the form of signs and lines, plus upgrade of the route down to the river. Grantside have been asked for an on road cycle lane along Knavesmire Road, however they have pointed out that the point to point it serves is no different to the existing route via Albermarle Road and that this will prevent coach parking. On reflection there are more negatives than positives for this to be introduced and so they have asked Highways to reconsider the request.



e) **Bus Service**

- AC asked what the situation is regarding buses and the Local Plan policy requiring proximity to a frequent bus service? PAC confirmed a 7am to 7pm service, with half hourly Park and Ride buses staggered with the No.11 bus which should provide a 15 minute service at the site. Grantside also propose to fund additional spaces at the Askham Bar Park & Ride site. The issue of cross ticketing is still unresolved due to the current service provider.

f) **Timescale and Process**

- Reconsulting on the revisions until 4 January 2010
- Planning Committee Report will be published approx. two weeks before Committee
- Planning Committee Site Visit 2 February 2010
- Planning Committee 3 February 2010 (with model)
- If approved, may have to refer to the Secretary of State as the car park is in the Green Belt (21 days), and then allow three months to ensure that there is no judicial review lodged. During this time Grantside will be able to prepare for demolition and infrastructure works. PAC's best guess would be 4-6 months before there is any activity on the site.

ACTION - KA to circulate Grantside's report to Members 10/12/09 setting out how the revised application addresses the reasons for refusal presented for the last application.

4. Date of the next meeting – to be confirmed.

5. A.O.B.

JH thanked everyone for their attendance, especially PAC, and called the meeting to a close

PAC expressed thanks to everyone for giving up their time for these forums and confirmed that the discussions had been extremely valuable in shaping the development proposals and were much appreciated.

BM noted that lots of useful dialogue had taken place and that he appreciated the openness of the process.