**HESLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF AN EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD IN THE MEETING ROOM  
ON TUESDAY 4 DECEMBER 2018 AT 7.30PM**

**Councillors Present:** David Blacketer (DB) Richard Bramley (RB) John Garner (JG) Rose Hilton (RH)

Lady Dot Lawton (DL) Zena Richards (ZR)

**In Attendance:** Janet O’Neill – Planning Consultant to University of York (UoY)

Liz Gatheral - Director of Estates Development UoY

Julie White – Indigo Planning on behalf of Graham Construction

Adrian McCormick – Civitas Graham Construction

Joe Spavin – Civitas Graham Construction

**Public Present:** 2

This extraordinary Parish Council (PC) meeting was called because the planning application

18/01416/REMM, Land to the South of Field Lane, by the University of York had not followed due

process in that the PC had not been informed of the application. The PC has until 6 December to

respond

1. **To accept apologies for absence:**

Parish Councillor Pauline Bramley (PB)

Parish Councillor Peter Hall (PH)

CYC Ward Cllr Keith Aspden (KA)

Fiona Hill Clerk to the Parish

1. **To record declarations of interest in items on the agenda:**

None

1. **To report and make relevant recommendations on new planning applications**

18/01416/REMM – Land to the South of Field Lane

Julie White gave a short presentation outlining the progress of this planned development for two residential buildings – the North College and the South College - in the area designated as Cluster 4 which stands to the west of other developments on Heslington East. The original plan received a number of objections mainly based on the proximity of the planned development to the lake and subsequently revised the plan, removing the two blocks nearest to the lake and adding two blocks in the central area between the North College and the South College. The revised planned development lies 18 metres away from the lake. Under the plan Lakeside Way will also be realigned. The reason given for the siting of these buildings is that the students want to be nearer to Heslington West and the UoY want to unify facilities. The new colleges are about ‘place making’ i.e. making Heslington East a place to be.

There followed a lively debate between the Councillors, the public and the visitors about the probable impact of this planned development on the residents of Heslington. For example, why not build nearer to where the new retail and social facilities are on Heslington East? Why were Heslington residents not consulted about the plans? If the University Masterplan does not specify that Cluster 4 is for residential development why not put academic buildings there, thus protecting Heslington Village residents from increased antisocial behaviour and loss of amenity. The visitors were not aware that anti-social behaviour by students, both day and night, was a current issue which has been repeatedly raised with the University. It was confirmed that HPC has representation at both Good Neighbours and Community fora. JO'N suggested that anti-social behaviour by students was not a planning matter directly. RH quoted from the CYC's report for the Planning Committee 15/11/18 3.21 “noise from student activity” under “unaddressed matters”, clearly indicating that this is a planning matter. Councillors asked what increased security and personnel to manage student behaviour will be put in place for the additional 1480 undergraduates including pre-course students as young as 16 whom it was planned to place in North and South Colleges. Councillors queried how college buildings sited on land adjacent to the Lake would fare better than the road which was planned to be moved to higher ground reportedly to make its structure more stable.

Mitigation of environmental impacts was discussed. Nesting grassland for skylarks will be re-provided elsewhere on the site. Reedbeds for pochards will be planted. Trees of varying heights but unspecified maturity will be planted. The planners were not aware of the site being an important breeding ground for hares.

Visitors were asked what the financial model was and who controlled the rent. We were informed that the financial model was set up between the construction company and the University. It was not a PFI arrangement but was a similar model.

Joe Spavin from Graham Construction gave another short presentation about the construction plans, should the development receive planning permission from CYC. Construction traffic would come in from the Sport Village side of Heslington East via a specially constructed temporary road. Lakeside Way would be closed during construction. Buses from Heslington East would all be routed down Field Lane. The work, including deliveries, will be done during normal working hours. There will be a one way system on the site. Ground work is due to start in February with the main construction work to start in April, if approved. Time scale is two years.

It was suggested that, if construction goes ahead, a weekly or fortnightly newsletter would be helpful and that there could be a special forum set up, including Badger Hill residents who are going to be equally affected.

Action To add to agenda for next HPC how to set up a meeting point for effective communication with all affected residents in addition to existing representatives fora (Good Neighbours, Community Forum Heslington East, HeslingtonVillage Trust, Heslington Parish Council). FH to add to agenda

DB then raised the issue of parking and traffic considerations not well covered in the planning application. The last annual traffic survey available carried out in 2017 identified a number of breaches which have not been mitigated.

1. Visitors were thanked for attending the meeting, and they then left. Members of the public were informed that councillors would now be formulating a response to the planning application 18/01416/REMM. They were welcome to stay and observe. Members of the public left the meeting. DB reported that he had drafted a response to planning application 18/02493/CLU. He requested that council submit comments for the advertised deadline of 6th December in order that it receive due consideration by CYC. It was noted by RH that unlike planning application 18/01416/REMM, the HPC had been properly informed, but it was unclear, at this point, whether or not an extension for comments would be granted. It was agreed to consider DB's draft response.

Letter A: We support the application

Letter B: We have no objections

Letter C: We do not object but wish to make comments or seek safeguards as set out overleaf

Letter D: We object on the planning grounds set out below

**18/01416/REMM**

D We object on planning grounds

We object to the siting of the accommodation. The plan involves building an area wholly for undergraduate student accommodation, at the nearest point to existing residents of Heslington Village. It is only some 150 meters away and, moreover, across a body of open water amplifying noise nuisance and with no attempt to create a sound barrier.

This scheme will cause Heslington residents to suffer a loss of their right to enjoyment of their property and loss of amenity due to additional noise, day and night, litter and minor vandalism.

Mitigation of traffic congestion and parking nuisance has not been addressed in the application. Existing breaches of on-street parking and consent limits is already problematic. If the planning application is granted, Heslington Parish Council would request that a requirement obliging York University to continue conducting annual parking surveys across all affected areas be continued for the duration of the outline planning consent i.e. 2027.

**18/02493/CLU**

22 The Crescent**,** Certificate of lawfulness for use as a House in Multiple Occupation for up to 5no. occupants within Use Class C4. Application by the Administrators of the Estate of Maria Raimonda Usai Deceased

D We object on planning grounds

The Parish Council cannot support an application that appears to be based on prior illegal, unlicensed use as an HMO. There is no reference to how this dwelling now complies with current HMO requirements relating to fire, health and safety standards, minimum room sizing, parking arrangements and control of refuse. The Parish Council therefore objects on the grounds that existence as an unlicensed and unregulated HMO is not grounds for granting a lawful licence.

Additionally, the Parish Council would expect full compliance with any prior Planning Consent conditions.