

Germany Beck Community Forum
Wednesday 10th October 2012, 5.30pm
St Oswald's Church Hall

NOTES OF MEETING – DRAFT 12/10/12

1. Welcome & Apologies

In attendance (13):

Chair: Cllr K Aspden, Fulford Ward Councillor (CllrA)

Alan Smith, Resident Fordlands Road (AS)

Graham Cheyne, Selby Road (GC)

Karin deVries, Resident School Lane (KdV)

Verna Campbell, Fulford In Bloom/ Fulford VDS (VC)

Robin McGinn, Persimmon Homes (RM)

Stuart Carver, Hogg The Builder (SC)

Mary Urmston, Fulford Parish Council (MU)

Julian Young, Fulford Parish Council (JY)

Vivienne Clare, Fulford Parish Council (VCI)

Mike Slater, City of York Council (MS)

Hannah Blackburn, City of York Council (HB)

Katherine Atkinson, City of York Council (KA)

Apologies (6):

Derek Gauld, City of York Council (DG)

Steve Smith, Fulford School (SS)

Sue Keeble, Fulford School (SKe)

Val Ingleton, Chair of Governors St Oswald's Primary School/ Resident Heslington Lane (VI)

Sally Cawthorn, City of York Council (SAC)

Rupert Griffiths, St Oswald's Primary School (RG)

Chris Marshall has stood down as Fulford Parish Council rep, replaced by Vivienne Clare.
Patricia Hickson has stood down as Fulfordgate rep, replacement unconfirmed. CllrA requested that reps not attending should be contacted, and those without reps reappointed. **Action KA.**

2. Notes of the last meeting 11th April 2012 and Matters Arising

The notes of 11th April 2012 were approved with matters arising being dealt with on this agenda.

3. Updates

Hannah Blackburn tabled a handout to update on the Extension of Time application and Battlefield update.

Extension of Time Application

The principle of Extension of Time applications is greater flexibility for planning permissions. The paper summarised responses received to date.

Battlefield Designation

The matter is still with English Heritage. There is no indication of timescale within which a decision about designation will be reached.

MU: Fulford Parish Council urge CYC not to determine the application before English Heritage announce their decision on the battlefield. The Chief Executive has stated that this will be within a few weeks. HB: English Heritage have said CYC can proceed to determine the application. Committee will not take place for a few weeks and therefore a response may have been received.

MU: In what order will the applications be determined? HB: Could both be at the same Planning Committee meeting if they are both ready to be referred, but the dates have not been determined yet. KdV: Difficult to make community representations if they both go to the same meeting.

Flooding

KdV: Environmental statement paragraph 8.6 states "The current data now provides modelled flood data for the site and the 100 year climate change event level is shown to be 10.06m AOD. 2006 data was 9.63m, this is a 43cm difference. Will the junction level still be above this height? **RM: Will find out and distribute to Forum.**

KdV: Fulford historic flood level data is not available. MS: Environment Agency hold this data.

MU: Fulford Parish Council objects that there is no up to date flood risk assessment despite new flood maps being available, part of the site is in flood zones 2&3. No update on additional flood defences. HB: Environment Agency have been consulted. RM: The resubmission includes an update on flood risk. Engineering and attenuation works, including a nature park on the southern edge, balancing ponds and Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) will deal with the issue. Water will be held on the site and discharged via a controlled flow. Detailed engineering drawings come at a later stage.

JY: Will the access road act as a dam? RM: The river floods and the beck then backs up. Capacities have been modelled based on Environment Agency figures, plus an additional 20% over and above those capacities, plus a SUDS system. Run off water from the Germany Beck development will be held in the nature park area which will act as a large holding area.

VCI: Residents are very unhappy and laugh at the prospect of development. They want to see a detailed flood prevention scheme to understand what will happen to the water.

AS: Engineering works associated with the new development focus on the A19, but do CYC intend to do anything to prevent Fordlands Road from being cut off and inconvenienced during times of flood? Will the flood water that currently blocks the A19 divert to make Fordlands Road situation worse?

GC: Selby Road has experienced 1:100yr floods three times in the past twelve years. Will the banking/ barrier push water in a new direction and up Selby Road? RM: Flood waters will not be higher as a result of the Germany Beck development. The 1:100 statistic does not mean once in 100 years, but a 1:100 chance that it might happen in a given year.

MU: Public and consultees need an up to date comprehensive flood risk assessment before the application can be determined, not by condition later. The EIA calculations of 2004 are out of date (9.63m has increased to 10.06m).

CllrA: Need details of Section 106 costings, A19 defences and more at a special meeting prior to determination of this application. MS: Understand the uncertainty, however, the flooding and drainage details being asked for will be produced as part of the discharge of conditions should the reserved matters application be approved. The Environmental Statement outlines the principle measures, which is what is required at this reserved matters stage. **RM/CYC to assess available flooding/ drainage material and either circulate to Forum or arrange a meeting at a point when this information becomes available.**

KdV: Need all detail for Extension of Time application as this is a material change.

MU: Spoken to officer at Environment Agency who wasn't aware of A19 works and was surprised by community concern. **HB: Will have further dialogue with the Environment Agency.**

Consultation

MU: Publicity has not been sufficient given the extent of the changes. Should be a fresh application not an amendment. CllrA: Subject header code in emails is not sufficient. Should have covered whole parish, or neighbours at very least. 4 consultation letters have

gone out, people loose interest in responding. Submitted a 500 signature petition to full council calling for more consultation. HB: Statutory consultees and those who have expressed an interest in the reserved matters application have been contacted. This is in line with procedure for revised plans. Can put site notices up. MS: Have to balance cost of notification verses value/ responses. RM: In addition it is the role of Forum members to help cascade information out to the community that they represent. **CYC to consider further measures.**

4. Revisions to the reserved matters application

RM presented the revised scheme.

Original application was submitted in February 2012. Officers felt that the vision and principles set out in the Urban Design Principles Report (UDPR) had not been translated sufficiently into the scheme. The design was re-audited against the UDPR, Conservation Area Appraisal and Village Design Statement as well as urban design good practice. The layout and type and design of properties proposed were revisited, within the fixed parameters (e.g. open spaces, road network). The spine road has changed to reduce the number of vehicular access's (roads, private driveways and access to rear parking courts) to be more reminiscent of Main Street Fulford, and areas behind the spine road have been reworked to create homezones and squares, as suggested by the UDPR. More localised green spaces have been introduced to further support softening and character within the scheme. Reduced the number of private drives to provide softer frontages and improve the interface between buildings and open spaces. The flats in the central core have a more contemporary design.

Further work to develop a stronger sense of character and identity within individual development areas has led to an increased number of building styles across the site. A Design and Character Statement has been produced to explain the design process. Four housing ranges are proposed:

- Heritage, reflecting Main Street
- Rural, fronting green areas and the rural fringe
- Contemporary, adjacent to central core flats, away from Conservation Area
- Classic range.

School Lane footpath area has widened from 3m to 8.5/11.0m within the site, in addition to the path and other side which are not in their ownership.

KdV: Very narrow green corridor does not meet the aspirations of the outline planning application, nor the Inspectors prescribed distances. Properties currently side on to the footpath, can this be remedied? RM: Have sought to produce a scheme within the spirit of Pauline Randall's proof of evidence, e.g. aspiration for footpaths in greenways, whilst meeting the densities and stand off distances prescribed elsewhere. Pauline Randall report was an evidence report, and does not form part of the planning permission. MU: Believe Persimmon cannot deliver what Pauline Randall envisaged. These densities cannot be met without compromise.

KdV: Phase 1. GB5 Heritage range on plot 41/42 does not create an attractive view from approach road. Queried differences between house type ranges, and how the heritage range reflects the local vernacular. RM: GB5 is a bungalow design and therefore the opportunities to elevate features to reflect Main Street are limited. Fulford Main Street's appeal is in its proportions, materials and detailing, therefore the designs use materials, window and door detailing to create the desired character. Properties should not be judged in isolation, nor solely by the house type or elevation, but within the context of other heritage properties, their arrangement and landscape setting. The ranges are distinct, but also contain principles to tie the properties together as one development. The Design and Character Statement explains the broad parameters. Heritage is near the Conservation Area boundary.

KdV: Plots 45/46 within homezone look out onto the rear of other properties and therefore will see fencing and garages, this could be landscaped. Properties along open space look isolated. Springfield House is overlooked by lots of 2 storey dwellings. Plot 42, existing leylandii take up over half of the garden. RM: Had to either front onto the homezone or open land. Urban Design Principles Report (UDPR) says properties should face open spaces. Ideas for improvements are welcome. Landscaping is illustrative on this plan.

MU: Existing hedge in phase 1 has been left in isolation, were assured it would be retained.

RM: Hedges are retained wherever they can be, and it is of worthy condition.

MU: Germany Lane is an ancient heritage route and has been completely ruined by roads, paving and removal of hedges.

GC: Concerned about school drop-off congestion along the narrowed access road to rear of school/ the only access to the community sports hall. A turning point is required. Could be more traffic there than along the spine road. CllrA: School has no budget to provide turning circle for community access to the sports hall. AS/GC: Concerned that access to sports facilities is no clearer 6 months since it was raised. HB: Developer is required to take the road to the boundary. **MS to discuss with Kevin Hall.**

JY: Seem to be more concentrations of parking areas. RM: Aim is to keep cars off frontages. MU: How many parking spaces per property, have CYC standards have changed since 2006, is this causing space difficulties? KdV: Plots 27/28/29 only have one parking space for a two bed house. RM: Difficulty is that squares and homezones require more space and therefore the land use is less efficient. **RM to circulate parking provision figures, including visitor parking and car club numbers.**

Number of units has reduced from 677 to 657. AS: Will the percentage of affordable housing units be the same? RM: The percentage provision will remain, but the physical number of units will decrease proportionally.

VC: Difficult to make comments now, can Forum meet again to respond? KA: Role of the Forum is to share and disseminate information and enable dialogue between the community, developer and council. A collective response would not be appropriate, but individual responses are encouraged to be made into the Development Management consultation.

MU: P Randall described the dyke as a significant landscape feature. Disappointed that this has largely been culverted and the hedge removed.

KdV: Would have liked an area of housing with a modern interpretation of the local vernacular, rather than Derwenthorpe. RM: The modern designs use the vertical emphasis of windows and design detailing from properties in Fulford.

MU: The central flats are too high and alien to Fulford. RM: The principle of contemporary design was encouraged by the councils Design, Conservation & Sustainable Development team.

CLlA: Relationship between the community play area, visitor parking, shops and spine road is a key safety concern. How will the crossing points work? Pedestrians should have priority to create a safe space. GC: Has this happened elsewhere? RM: A shared space with no obvious priority was encouraged by the highways authority, there will be a clear change in material to differentiate the space.

To the east, concerns were expressed regarding boundary treatments and narrow pathway at Millenium Way. Desire line for path should meet Mitchells Lane further north, as the lower part is not lit.

5. Any Other Business

MU: Impact on extended Conservation Area should be assessed now not later.

VC: Will CYC undertake further publicity for the revisions? MS: Practice on revisions to major applications has been followed but further measures will be investigated.

GC: How can the application be viewed? MU: Website is confusing. Are the revised landscape plans online?

Responses to the Development Management consultation were encouraged as soon as possible.

6. Date of next meeting.

It is difficult to anticipate future dates for Forum meetings as it depends on progression within the planning system. No date was scheduled.