

Plans Panel (City Centre)

Wednesday, 12th January, 2011

PRESENT: Councillor B Selby in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,
G Driver, M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty,
J Monaghan, E Nash, N Taggart and
P Wadsworth

65 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair wished everyone a Happy New Year, welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

66 Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared

67 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 9th December 2010 be approved

68 Chief Planning Officer

The Head of Planning Services informed Members that Phil Crabtree was soon expected to be discharged from hospital. He was appreciative of the best wishes he had received since his admission into hospital in early December. In terms of his return to work, Members were informed that this may be April at the earliest

69 Application 10/03179/EXT - Extension of time for planning application 07/04987/FU Multi level development up to 13 storeys comprising 147 flats and gym with surface and covered car parking at Former Bellows Engineering Site East Street LS9

Further to minute 61 of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 11th October 2007 where Panel approved in principle a residential development with gym and car parking on the former Bellows Engineering site, East Street LS9, Panel considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer on an application seeking an extension of time for the development

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report and informed Members that as the principle of development had been agreed in 2007, this application was being considered

against any changes of policy which had occurred since the original planning permission had been granted

Officers referred to concerns raised by local residents in respect of security; landscaping and car parking and that the developer had been in discussions with residents to try to address their concerns

It had been recognised that there were parking problems in the area and Members were informed that these would be addressed in the S106 Agreement

Members were informed that the developer was seeking a 5 year permission instead of the usual 3 years, in view of the current economic situation

Officers were of the view that the application complied with current policies and were recommending approval of the application

The Panel heard representations from the developer's agent and an objector who attended the meeting. The developer who was in attendance was asked by the Chair to respond to matters of fact raised by the Panel

Members discussed the following matters:

- that details of the travel plan were needed
- the proposed car parking arrangements and whether this could worsen the current parking situation
- that the site which was currently blocked off with hoardings was unattractive and the intention for it to remain in a poor state for up to 4-5 years was unacceptable, particularly from a major developer
- that the introduction of planting and a recent coat of paint to the hoardings was not sufficient and no controls existed to secure the on-going maintenance of this screening
- that there was a pragmatic denial of greenspace for residents of the developments which had been completed
- that an extra condition could be included requiring improvements to the site if a 5 year permission was sought
- that the site should be opened up; an appropriate see-through fence erected for safety and the area should be grassed over
- that the footpath by St Saviour's Church should be opened up
- clarification on what issues Panel could consider in view of the application being for an extension of time of a previous planning permission

Officers provided the following responses

- that a revised travel plan had been submitted and that an evaluation and monitoring fee would be required. The travel plan covered the existing conditions on site and objectives for a range of travel methods and car club usage. It identified a travel plan co-ordinator and targets to identify more sustainable forms of transport. There would be a requirement for the travel plan co-ordinator to be appointed before the flats were marketed to enable prospective residents to be provided with information at an early stage and to enable travel patterns to be monitored
In terms of targets, the national statistics would be applied, these being 36% car drivers in the morning peak; 36% pedestrians; 20% public transport with cycling and taxis making up the rest
- in terms of car parking, the Panel's Highways representative stated that an acceptable level of car parking was being provided in this

development. Whilst noting local residents' concerns on this matter, it was felt that some of the problems stemmed from residents in Echo City 1 not taking up the option of car parking spaces. Members noted the information provided by the objector on this matter that parking spaces were additional to the cost of a flat within the development.

The Central Area Planning Manager stated that parking pressures arose from various sources; that the maximum number of spaces which could be provided for the development was 147 which was only 27 more than proposed and that even at the maximum UDP level of 1 space per unit, this would not solve the on-street parking problems which occurred in this area. Officers accepted that the development would have an impact but that on-street parking issues could be better addressed by introducing TROs in the area

Members were informed the TRO controls were to be funded by the Echo City development; the sports hall development at nearby Mount St Mary's RC High School and through a contribution of just over £23,000 related to the development of the application site. The TRO controls would include permit parking for businesses in the area, short stay parking during the day with general parking overnight and an extension of double yellow lines on nearby streets. It was considered that the proposed TRO measures would help to resolve the on-street parking issues

- in relation to issues the Panel could consider, the Head of Planning Services stated that the concerns about height raised by the objector could be given little weight as there had been no material change to this since the last approval. Concerning the car parking, in the intervening period issues relating to parking had arisen and these could be considered. If minded to approve the application, an extra condition was proposed requiring the submission and approval of a car parking management plan

Members considered how to proceed. In view of the points raised and the need for further discussions between the residents/developer and possibly Ward Members, a proposal was made to defer determination of the application for one cycle; this was not supported

RESOLVED - That subject to further discussions and satisfactory resolution of the following matters

- a temporary landscape solution to be put in place
- more appropriate see-through fencing to be erected on the site and the land to be grassed over
- the opening up of the footpath by St Saviour's Church
- timescales for this work to be set out as part of an approval

to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer for a 5 year permission and subject to the specified conditions, including the submission and approval of a car park management plan and agreed timescales for improvement works to the site, as set out above (and any others which he might consider appropriate); the submission of an acceptable revised Travel Plan and following completion of a Deed

of Variation of the original Section 106 Agreement to cover the following additional matters:

Original 2005 Section 106 – Affordable housing provision, provision of public space, contribution towards off site highways works including realignment of pedestrian crossings

2007 Deed of Variation – Affordable housing provision

Current Deed of Variation – a public transport infrastructure improvements contribution of £13,661; a Green Travel Plan monitoring and evaluation fee of £2735; a Traffic Regulation Order sum of £23,240 and a car club trial contribution of £3200

In the circumstances where the Deed of Variation of the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

In the event that the matters outlined above for discussion cannot be satisfactorily resolved that the matter be brought back to Panel for determination

(During consideration of this matter, Councillors M Hamilton and Taggart joined the meeting)

70 Application 10/04813/FU - Alterations and fourth and fifth floor extension to offices - 21 Queen Street LS1

Plans, photographs, graphics and drawings were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which some Members had attended

Officers presented the report and showed previous proposals for the site which was situated in close proximity to the city centre conservation area and for other sites in the immediate vicinity. These included a scheme which had been granted on appeal further to the south and the most recent, unimplemented permission for the site which would have seen the demolition of the existing building

The current proposals saw the retention of the existing offices which were built in 1983 with the provision of two extra floors of accommodation in a modern design which would be constructed in metal and glazing with curved ends providing a lozenge form; a glazed vertical panel would extend from the ground floor to the new fifth floor. A condition requiring a large sample panel of facing and surfacing materials was to be included

Car parking for 16 cars, including one disabled parking space would be provided together with motorbike and cycle parking. An electric car charging point would also be provided

An area of land to the side of the building which was currently unkempt and littered would be replaced by high quality landscaping and the provision of new trees

Members commented on the following matters:

- that the proposals did not relate to any buildings in the area and that the architectural thinking behind the scheme could not be understood
- that the proposals were overdominant; the design was inappropriate and too brutal in this location
- that the design of the extension improved the building and created a sense of moving forward historically

- concerns about the overhang of the extension on one side of the building and that the ends of the extension were curved
- the possibility of viewing any of the other solutions considered by Officers
- the number of 'To Let' boards which dominated that area; that these masked many of the interesting buildings and that A3 boards sited flush to the building should be considered as this approach had worked in Headingley. The Chair asked that this be referred to the appropriate officers within the Council for consideration

Officers provided the following responses:

- that there had always been an intention for two additional storeys on the building and that pre-application discussions had taken place on the form these should take. A hand-out showing a range of options considered at the pre-application stage was circulated for Members' information
- the Council's Architect and Urban Designer, Mr Varley, accepted that the design of the extension was eccentric but that it would not work if the ends were squared off and were aligned with the edge of the building

Panel considered how to proceed. The Head of Planning Services referred to the previous scheme which had been accepted on this site, noting that this had been for a larger scheme and the previous appeal allowed for a modern intervention on Queen Street and asked Members to have regard to these matters when reaching a decision

RESOLVED – To agree the application in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to include the following obligations:

- travel plan and monitoring fee £3120
- management and accessibility to public areas
- employment and training initiatives and
- management fee

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

71 Date and time of next meeting

Thursday 10th February 2011 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall Leeds