

---

## **Note of Meeting**

Project: British Sugar - York

Purpose of meeting: First Community Forum meeting – summary of work completed so far and preview of the exhibition materials ahead of public events.  
Applicant is Associated British Foods (ABF).

Present: Chair:  
Jacquie Dale (JD)

Forum members:

Derek Gauld (DG) – City of York Council (CYC)

David Cragg (DC) - URS

Michael Slater (MS) – CYC

Neil Jones (NJ) – Rapleys

Robert Clarke (RC) – Rapleys

Richard Green (RG) – AECOM

Simon Pratt (SP) – AECOM

Andrew Beresford (AB) - ABF

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

Cllr Ian Gillies (IG) – Rural West Ward Councillor

Cllr Joseph Riches (JR) – Holgate Ward Councillor

Rev Tony Hand (TH) – resident representative

Allan Deller (AD) - resident representative

Peter Powell (PP) - resident representative

Edie Jones (EJ) - resident representative

Neal Clarke (NC) – resident representative ***Apologies sent***

Alex Rogers (AR) – Sovereign Park Residents Association ***Apologies sent***

Observing:

Ann Ward (AW) - CYC

Anthony Dean (ADe) - CYC

Siobhan McGrogan (SM) - Beattie

Jayshree Patel (JP) - ATLAS

Place of meeting: Former Manor School Site

Date: 11<sup>th</sup> November 2013

### **1. Introduction**

1.1 JD introduced the meeting and made apologies for two resident representatives that were unable to attend. It was agreed that a full Forum membership list would be circulated along with initial meeting minutes for reference and name places would be used for the next forum.

1.2 Attendees agreed the proposed Terms of Reference for the Forum

### **2. CYC Policy Context Summary**

2.1 DG gave attendees a summary of work and consultation carried out so far on the site, as part of the Draft Local Plan, and referenced other recent projects and investments regarding the regeneration of sites throughout York. He stated that

the next stage of the process for the former British Sugar site is to present the masterplan options to the public, ahead of a planning submission in spring next year. CYC will review feedback from the consultation regarding the preferred masterplan options which should be reflected in the final submission where appropriate

2.2 A question was raised regarding the timeframes for the process, which were confirmed as the exhibitions being held at the end of November, ahead of data and feedback being collated and fed into the submission of an outline planning application in April/May 2014.

2.3 TH asked what work had already been carried out to ensure the successful integration of the new British Sugar site community with existing ones nearby. DG responded to say that an audit of existing facilities had been undertaken and is reflected in the planning document and policy requirements. EJ referenced the Old Civil Service site and raised concerns about roadworks/traffic volume if both sites are developed at a similar time. MS discussed the Local Plan consultation which received 14000 different responses, some of which were in reference to this issue, and acknowledged the need to look at the bigger picture to ensure that sites in all parts of the city are joined up. MS also stated that the Local Plan can dovetail sites/allocations and it is important to gather views on elements of proposals for sites to help ensure this happens. TSL and JD agreed a 'whole city' approach was required.

2.4 RC added that ABF is keen to engage the local community at this early stage of the process as they want to come forward with a successful and sustainable community that is fully integrated with its surroundings.

### **3. Associated British Foods Position**

3.1 AB summarised his company's history at the site, from 1926 – 2007 when ABF decided to close the factory leaving the site in a condition suitable for being delivered back into the community. He used a similar ABF regeneration site in Peterborough as an example of how this has been achieved before.

### **4. Summary of progress since the Sounding Board Meeting**

4.1 RG presented information slides (hand outs circulated at the end of the meeting). At this stage of the meeting Jayshree Patel from ATLAS was also invited to explain her role in the project – offering impartial advice on large developments to help facilitate discussions between the applicant and local authority. ATLAS has been involved in this project for the past three years.

4.2 RG described some of the background studies that had informed the approach for the site looking at factors including sustainability, facilities, environmental impact and open space – results of which will be included in the outline planning application. He stressed the importance of creating a space that would reinvigorate this former industrial brownfield site.

4.3 RG spoke about access and the need to consider the best ways to connect with existing destinations and communities – access needs to be considered broadly, not just in terms of vehicular access but also cycling and walking routes.

4.4 RG also mentioned the possibility of a raised edge around the site, to preserve existing wildlife and reduce noise/visual impact

4.5 RG informed the Forum what the agreed principles/fixed elements for the site were as per page 9 of his presentation.

## 5. Public consultation

5.1 NJ explained that the upcoming public exhibitions need to focus on the draft masterplan options requiring specific feedback. Stakeholder previews will also be held on 28<sup>th</sup> November ahead of the first event. Site tours will be available on 30<sup>th</sup> November. The website for the site is now live at [www.sugarredevelopmentyork.co.uk](http://www.sugarredevelopmentyork.co.uk). Feedback gathered at these events will be included in the Statement of Community Involvement as part of the planning application.

5.2 NJ stated that feedback from the events and how this informs the final masterplan should be discussed and reviewed at the next Forum in January. In response to a question from TH on how this feedback is processed, NJ confirmed that the applicant will co-ordinate the review of all feedback. RC said that the applicant is keen to be open and transparent about this information as they want to understand local views and engage with residents.

5.3 In reference to slide 11, TSL requested further questions should be put to residents during consultation regarding creative design, eco home provision, housing type. EJ added that infrastructure needed to be included due to the high density population the site falls within – referenced Ebenezer Howard's work on the design of cities. EJ also stated the importance of a good mix of housing and environmental enhancements. IG added that education provision should also be included due to lack of capacity in surrounding schools.

5.4 NJ confirmed that the draft masterplan options current include over 30% of the site as public open space and that the applicant wished to leave a positive legacy.

5.5 RC reminded the Forum that, as the application would be in outline form, this would deal with broad scales in terms of building height etc but couldn't offer more detail on building design at this early stage of development. This element would be overseen by the house builder subject to approval. The Forum would be consulted on design principles in future meetings.

5.6 Concerns were raised regarding existing traffic on the bypass and knock on effect on Millfield Lane. The traffic coming out of Poppleton was also a concern. JD stated that traffic/transport will be under extreme scrutiny as part of the consultation.

5.7 TSL stated that a key challenge to be mindful of would be residents' understanding of planning law and the restrictions placed on the council under this. JD said that feedback on this detail should be clearly set within the planning framework.

5.8 AD raised concerns about the potential number of developers for the site. Referred to the situation at Sovereign Park. NJ reminded the Forum of ABF's position as the landowner, not as developer. With a development of this scale, it is likely there will be more than one developer. However, they have a responsibility to make sure the site is brought back into positive use. The outline planning submission will set the parameters of development – the density will be family housing with 30-40 dwellings per hectare (providing for around 1000 houses). Details of the individual development plots will be submitted by the

relevant housebuilder / developer at the appropriate time following the grant of outline permission, with all details being subject to the Council's review and approval.

5.9 JD asked if design guide material will be brought to the forum – this was confirmed by the applicant. RC stated that the parameters of development would be controlled whilst maintaining an element of flexibility to meet policy and market considerations. Any changes from the outline parameters must be approved by council officers.

5.10 Certainty/control of future reserved matters was discussed further by the group as this was an issue on Sovereign Park – AD said it was important to secure community confidence and avoid cul de sac style development. JD said thorough pre application consultation work carried out would help achieve this. RG added that this style of development is not the intention in this case.

## **6. Transport/access**

6.1 SP said that primary access would be from Boroughbridge Road and acknowledged that traffic using Plantation Drive will be controlled and therefore limited. Modelling software is currently being used to assess this more precisely and mitigation measures are being considered for the local road network to help alleviate development traffic. Likely trips at peak hours are also being considered as part of this to offer real context along with sources of traffic and the distribution of traffic from the site. JD requested a plan showing traffic movements for the next meeting which was agreed.

## **7. Feedback on draft consultation materials**

7.1 RG advised that boards would be presented in A0 size. TH requested a definition of sustainability which was discussed. RC added that the meaning today is 'meeting today's needs without prejudice against future populations.'

7.2 EJ raised concerns that the site may lie on a potential floodplain. RG responded to say that the existing embankment could be reinforced/ raised area of the site perimeter – this would protect site from railway noise and mitigate any drainage issues.

7.3 AD asked about affordable housing allocation on-site. TSL and RC said this allocation would be in accordance with CYC policy (currently 20%) and the requirement at the time, however, a reserved matters application would need to be submitted before this allocation is agreed. It was anticipated this would be raised at events and RC confirmed that the project team would be in a position to advise/answer questions on this.

7.4 AD raised concerns about the impact on Plantation Drive if multiple developers are involved – RC responded to say CYC would have a number of controls over this.

7.5 PP enquired about transport – RC stated that consulting at this early stage will enable the team to make informed considerations about this element.

7.6 RG said the team would be looking to residents to inform the final masterplan based on feedback from the events. The main point of difference between the options is the location of the public open space provision. Identified restraints and

opportunities affects where other certain elements can go. Similarly, elements like open space may affect what type of facilities are included in the plan.

7.7 TH enquired whether Tangerine had been consulted – NJ confirmed that it had.

7.8 MS advised that the council owned land is currently undergoing consultation as part of the Draft Local Plan.

7.9 PP and EJ raised the matter of the rail halt as a key piece of infrastructure, RC confirmed space could be provided on-site for this however it is not in ABF's remit to deliver.

7.10 TH requested a simpler/clearer indication of scale – RG agreed to implement.

7.11 A feedback form will be available for exhibition attendees to fill in at the event or online.

## 8. **Close**

8.1 Siobhan McGrogan will be the key point of contact for communication between forum members. She is available on 08448 425 285 or at [sugarredevelopmentyork@onlybeattie.com](mailto:sugarredevelopmentyork@onlybeattie.com)

8.2 Resident representatives encouraged to spread the message about the public exhibitions and drive attendance.

8.3 Next forum meeting date proposed for January 2014 to discuss exhibition feedback and how this can be implemented into the plan.