

York Labour Party (YLP) Phase 4 MIQ Response

Matter 4 – Placemaking, Design, Heritage, and Culture

Inspector's Question	Our response	References
<p>4.1 Is Policy D1 soundly based as a general approach?</p>	<p>No. There are a number of key issues that are not properly addressed in the policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy makes no reference to access to amenities including shops and open space. Good quality placemaking should respond to the needs of the area and if key amenities like this are not already present in the area then the development should respond to this. The policy should require applicants of larger developments to provide supporting evidence in their planning application reviewing local amenities within 15 minutes and how their proposals will respond to any shortfalls. The RIBA have published a report on Placemaking and the provision of nearby amenities and infrastructure is a major part of point 1 'The right place for the right housing' (see link) which shows why having the right amenities within a short distance is so important. <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p><u>Ten Characteristics of Places Where People Want to Live</u></p> <p>'Ten Characteristics of Places where People want to Live' provides valuable evidence demonstrating the relationship between design quality and the of supply in the delivery of much needed affordable homes.</p> <p>www.architecture.com</p> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy only references sustainability by stating developments should 'maximise sustainability potential'. This is extremely vague and not even clear in what type of sustainability they mean. Economic, biodiversity, carbon? This 	<p>https://www.architecture.com/knowledge-and-resources/resources/landing-page/ten-characteristics-of-places-where-people-want-to-live</p>

	<p>correlates to points raised in our response to the climate change policies that there is a lack of clear guidance on what sustainable design looks like. Other council's provide much clearer guidance on this as we state, including solar orientation, embodied carbon and a hierarchy of energy reduction. The policy should at least specify what good sustainability requires - this would be a very useful policy for tackling poorly designed, unsustainable developments going forward if clear. This mirrors our comments on DP2 and DP3 which are equally woolly on what is a sustainable development. Section v) should specifically flag the need to be moving to net zero building design and construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density: The policy is vague on density and only encourages density to be in keeping with the local area. There are many areas of the suburbs where density is very low and to maximise sustainable brownfield development should be much higher for new developments. High density of streets should be welcomed including more terraced housing which is thermally and spatially much more efficient. Density should also only account for areas of road, housing and garden, with a separate calculation for communal open space ideally. <p>We would ask that policy DP1 is further amended to cover these other issues.</p>	
<p>4.2 Is the approach to landscape and setting in Policy D2 soundly based?</p>		
<p>4.3 Does Policy D3 offer sufficient encouragement for new cultural facilities and protection for existing ones?</p>		

4.4 Is the way in which Policy D4 treats conservation areas and their settings, well founded?		
4.5 Is the manner that listed buildings and their settings are treated in Policy D5 sound?		
4.6 Does Policy D6 deal with archaeology in a way that offers sufficient protection?		
4.7 Is the approach of Policy D7 to non-designated heritage assets reasonable in the light of national policy?		
4.8 Are Historic Parks and Gardens properly dealt with by Policy D8?		
4.9 What is the basis for Policy D9?		

<p>4.10 Will Policy D10 offer appropriate protection for the City Walls and St Mary's Abbey Walls (York Walls) and their settings?</p>		
<p>4.11 Is the approach to the alteration and/or extension of existing buildings in Policy D11 soundly based?</p>	<p>No. It does not recognise the climate change emergency imperative. The policy should be amended to cross reference to the requirements of policy CC2 (as to be amended) to indicate that extensions should aim to meet the new standards and be compatible with the likely retrofitting of the main property that will be required.</p> <p>For major building alterations and extensions over a certain size a carbon impact assessment (including both embodied carbon in the materials to be used and in the demolition and construction processes should be required, demonstrating that carbon is being minimised.</p>	
<p>4.12 Will Policy D12 effectively protect existing shop-fronts and secure acceptable new one?</p>	<p>No. It does not recognise the climate change emergency imperative. The policy should be amended to cross reference to the requirements of policy CC2 (as to be amended) and ensure an open door arrangement that leads to major heat loss in cold weather, or heat ingress in very hot weather is avoided as far as practically possible.</p>	
<p>4.13 Is Policy D13 an acceptable approach to advertisements?</p>		

4.14 Is Policy D14 an acceptable approach to security shutters?		
---	--	--