

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 27TH SEPTEMBER, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors S Hamilton, G Latty, T Leadley,  
J McKenna, E Nash, N Walshaw, J Hardy,  
T Murray, Campbell and Procter

### 1 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed those in attendance to the inaugural meeting of City Plans Panel and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves.

In particular he also welcomed Councillors J Hardy, T Leadley and T Murray to the meeting, together with Councillors C Campbell and J Procter who were attending as substitutes.

### 2 Late Item

There were no formal late items of business to consider, however the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information:-

- Addendum to Agenda Item 9 – Report in response to the comments of the Council's Conservation Officer - Digital Media Screen to the Trinity West Shopping Centre at Albion Street, Leeds 1 (Minute 8 refers)

The document was not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but made available to the public on the Council's website.

### 3 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

There were no disclosable pecuniary and other interests declared at the meeting.

### 4 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors D Blackburn, P Gruen, M Hamilton and R Procter.

Notification had been received for Councillor C Campbell to substitute for Councillor M Hamilton and for Councillor J Procter to substitute for Councillor R Procter.

### 5 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

**RESOLVED** – That, subject to the following amendments, the minutes of the former Plans Panel (City Centre) meeting held on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2012 be noted and that this Panel notes the intention that they would be submitted to the Chair of that meeting for approval and signature:-

Minute 35 Pre- Application – PreApp/12/00278 – 223 Bedroom Student Accommodation Development at Woodhouse Square, Woodhouse, Leeds 3

To delete the resolution and replace with the following wording:-

- 'a) That the report and pre-application presentation be noted.
- b) That there were serious concerns as to whether a high density student accommodation scheme was appropriate in this sensitive heritage setting in close proximity to a number of listed buildings. If the scheme was to be progressed then the design quality would need to be significantly improved with a greater sensitivity to context and scale which also addressed issues raised about the relationship to existing housing to the north on Back Claremont Grove.
- c) That Member concerns about the lack of car parking in the scheme and the impact of on street parking in the wider area be examined in detail if the proposal was progressed'.

Minute 36 Pre-Application – PreApp/12/00631 – Proposed Data Centre, Black Bull Street, South Bank, Leeds

To delete resolution c) i.e. 'That prior to considering a full planning application at the October meeting, the Chief Planning Officer be requested to convene a Plans Panel Workshop to discuss the design of the building, travel implications, elevations and materials'

**6 Application 12/03002/OT - An Outline Planning Application for the Variation of Condition 3 of Planning Permission 11/01000/OT to allow for a leisure use (D2 Use Class) and Casino use (Sui Generis) as Part of a Retail-Led Mixed Use Development and Non Material Amendment 12/9/00098/MOD to Amend the Development Description to include Leisure use (D2 Use Class) and Casino use (Sui Generis) at Eastgate Quarters, Leeds - Land bound by New York Road (Inner Ring Road A64) to the North, Bridge Street and Milgarth Street to the East, George Street and Dyer Street to the South and Vicar Lane and Harewood Street to the West, Leeds 2**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an outline planning application for the variation of Condition 3 of Planning Permission 11/01000/OT to allow for a leisure use (D2 Use Class) and Casino use (Sui Generis) as Part of a Retail-Led Mixed Use Development and Non Material Amendment 12/9/00098/MOD to Amend the Development Description to include Leisure use (D2 Use Class) and Casino use (Sui Generis) at Eastgate Quarters, Leeds on land bound by New York Road (Inner Ring Road A64) to the North, Bridge Street and Milgarth Street to the East, George Street and Dyer Street to the South and Vicar Lane and Harewood Street to the West, Leeds 2.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- Floor Space Comparison Tables: 12/03002/OT (Appendix 1 refers)
- Planning Policies and Guidance: 12/03002/OT (Appendix 2 refers)
- Non Standard Conditions: 12/03002/OT (Appendix 3 refers)

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the site.

Sarah Mc Mahon, Senior Planner briefly outlined the proposals contained in the submitted report.

The Chair informed the meeting that there were two speakers against the recommendation in attendance, namely Sam Parker (CAMRA) and Stuart Long (Save The Templar Campaign).

Mr S Parker requested the Panel to protect the running of Templar Hotel public house in view of its long standing heritage and thriving spirit in the area. Reference was also made to the receipt of 1,200 signatures in support for the retention of the public house and of the backing of local MP's.

Mr S Long stated that he was against any proposal to move the public house which was considered to be a national monument. He also requested that the inside be retained as it was and that there had been no problems with the police in relation to the running of the premises.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the comments made.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Clarification of the police's involvement at the public house
- Clarification of the current ownership of the public house
- Clarification if there had been any internal changes made to the public house over the last forty years

The Chair informed the meeting that there was one speaker in attendance in support of the application, namely Chris Jones, a planning consultant on behalf of CRBE, the applicant.

In summary, Mr C Jones made reference to the following specific issues:-

- That the development would be retail led
- That there was a continuing dialogue on the proposals with planning officers with good progress made
- That the proposals did not affect Templar Hotel public house
- That excellent progress was being made with the East Quarter development

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the comments made.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Clarification if the internal workings of Templar Hotel public house would be altered  
*(Mr Jones responded and confirmed that any alterations would be brought back under reserved matters)*
- The concerns expressed that the application did not give any reassurances of the retention of the public house in view of the importance of the buildings heritage within the city  
*(Mr Jones responded and agreed to feed back these comments to the applicant)*
- Clarification of the retail element of the application and whether or not a Casino operator had been chosen

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members to the Senior Planning Officer as part of her presentation of the outline planning application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Clarification of the percentage and mix of the site  
*(The Senior Planning Officer responded and outlined the land use and floor space as referred to in Appendix 1 of the report)*
- Clarification that the scale and parameters of the outline planning application would not be altered  
*(This was confirmed by officers)*
- The need for a condition to be imposed retaining the Templar Hotel public house and its internal fixtures in view of it's rich history  
*(Officers explained that the proposal was for a variation of a condition only to the outline consent and that the details of the proposals to the Templar Hotel pub could be controlled at the reserved matters stage)*

Prior to determining the application, the Chair then invited comments from Members on the proposals.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- That the scheme appeared to be reasonable and an excellent addition for the city
- That the scheme provided the developer with a degree of flexibility
- That the Templar Hotel public house should be free standing and retain it's identity

In concluding discussions, the Panel were of the opinion that the Templar Hotel public house should be retained and that it was noted that this issue would come back to a future meeting under reserved matters.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to grant Outline Planning Permission, subject to the specified conditions (and any others which might be considered appropriate) and following completing of a Section 106 Agreement Deed of Variation to bind the previous application (11/01000/OT) and the current application.
- b) That 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.

**7 Application 12/03419/FU - Alterations to form Digital Media Advertising Display and Application 12/03420/ADV One Illuminated Digital Media Advertising Display at 59-61 Albion Street, Leeds 1**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented alterations to form Digital Media Advertising Display and for one Illuminated Digital Media Advertising Display at 59-61 Albion Street, Leeds 1.

Prior to considering the report (and Agenda Item 9) (Minute 8 refers), the Chief Planning Officer also submitted a Digital Media Overarching report for the information of the meeting.

Members were shown the locations of the two sites for digital advertising.

Daljit Singh, Deputy Area Planning Manager briefly outlined the most relevant planning policies and guidance contained in the overarching report.

He drew Members specific attention to policies BD8 and N19 of the Leeds UDPR , together with the CABE/English Heritage guidance ‘ Large Digital Screen in Public Places’.

He informed the meeting that each application for digital advertising should be considered on its merits. The purpose of the Panel reports was not to compare the two proposals but to determine them individually having regard to their impact on visual amenity and public safety

Members were then shown detailed plans and photographs of the site at 59-61 Albion Street and had previously visited the site prior to the meeting

The Deputy Area Planning Manager also referred to the receipt of a letter from the applicant (Moorfields Group Ltd.) which he addressed at the meeting. He only commented on those matters raised in the letter which did not seek to compare the two applications for digital advertising screens. Firstly it was considered by officers that due to its nature the proposed screen would cut across the horizontal banding of the car park decks and was considered an additional feature to the car park elevation and not integral to its design. Secondly officers are of the view that even at distance due to its size and location at the head of Albion Place the proposed screen would be clearly visible and would not be a recessive element within the relatively restrained context of Albion Place.

The Chair informed the meeting that there was a speaker against the recommendation in attendance, namely Philip Allard on behalf of Wildstone.

Mr P Allard addressed the meeting and, in summary, he informed the meeting that a digital media advertising display at West Yorkshire House would add vitality to the area and would be commercially viable to the advertising media.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the comments made.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Clarification of what value this proposal would bring to the area
- Clarification of how a digital media advertising display would enhance the Conservation Area and how it would add vitality  
*(Mr Allard responded and informed the meeting that a digital media advertising display would attract shoppers to the city centre and create opportunities to local businesses)*
- Concern that the digital media advertising display was very visible in a Conservation Area

The Chair invited questions from Members to officers on the specific proposals of the application and no issues were raised.

Prior to determining the application, the Chair then invited comments from Members on the proposals.

- The concern expressed that the design was not suitable for the area
- The need for officers to draw up a policy on digital advertising
- The view expressed that that the overall impact of the proposal was not acceptable and that there was no need to draw people's attention to the building and car park through this type of media advertising
- The need for the Panel to follow the Council's planning policies and the guidance from English Heritage in this regard

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of both reports be noted.
- b) That the applications be refused for the following reasons:

#### Application 12/03419/FU

The proposed digital media screen would be visible from along the length of Albion Place and as far as Kirkgate Market. The digital screen would be seen as a backdrop to several listed buildings and would be seen in the context of the City Centre Conservation Area. The screen would appear in contrast to the horizontal emphasis of the car park elevations and result in this currently background facade appearing prominent from within the conservation area therefore the siting of a digital media screen in this location would harmfully and significantly affect the setting of both the conservation area and listed buildings and in doing so would be contrary to Unitary

Development Plan Review policies N19, CC5, BD8 and BD12 and guidance contained within CABE and English Heritage 'Large Digital Screens In Public Spaces' (2009).

Application 12/03420/ADV

The proposed digital media screen would be visible from along the length of Albion Place and as far as Kirkgate Market. The digital screen would be seen as a backdrop to several listed buildings and would be seen in the context of the City Centre Conservation Area. The screen would appear in contrast to the horizontal emphasis of the car park elevations and result in this currently background facade appearing prominent from within the conservation area therefore the siting of outdoor advertising in this location would harmfully and significantly affect the setting of both the conservation area and listed buildings and in doing so would be contrary to the Council's adopted SPD "Advertising Design Guide" and Unitary Development Plan Review policies BD8 and BD12 and guidance contained within CABE and English Heritage 'Large Digital Screens In Public Spaces' (2009).

c) That the Chief Planning Officer be requested to look into developing a policy on digital advertising and that a report on this issue be submitted to the Development Plan Panel at the earliest opportunity.

**8 Application 12/03408/ADV - Digital Media Screen to Shopping Centre and 12/03409/FU - Variation of Condition 45 of Application Ref No 11/03290/FU (Change of Use from Retail (A1) to Food and Drink, Health Clinic and Leisure Uses (A3, A4,D1/D2) and Ancillary Mall Space; Associated Public Realm Works, External Alterations including Improved Entrance to Existing Shopping Centre and Associated Works as a Revision to Planning Application Ref No P/09/01742/FU) for a Minor Material Amendment to Modify the Alignment of the Bond Street/Albion Street Corner at First and Second Floor Levels to Accommodate a Digital Media Screen at Trinity West Shopping Centre, Albion Street, Leeds 1**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented alterations to form Digital Media Advertising Display and for one Illuminated Digital Media Advertising Display at 59-61 Albion Street, Leeds 1.

Appended to the report was a copy of conditions to be attached to Application 12/03409/FU/C for the information/comment of the meeting.

In addition to the above documents, an addendum report referring to comments from the Council's Conservation Officer was circulated for consideration as part of the application.

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the site and had previously visited the site prior to the meeting.

Daljit Singh, Deputy Area Planning Manager briefly outlined the proposals contained in the submitted report.

The Chair then invited questions from Members on the specific proposals of the application and no issues were raised.

Prior to determining the application, the Chair then invited comments from Members on the proposals.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The concern expressed that the site was very prominent and was on the edge of the Conservation area
- The view expressed that the digital media screen complimented the building and area
- The concern expressed that the digital media screen did not look right as the building was very dominant and the screen would be very intrusive
- The need to have a city centre digital advertising policy in place before considering applications of this nature and to adhere to English Heritage's National Policy guidelines on digital advertising

In relation to a request for a city centre advertising policy, the Chief Planning Officer responded and confirmed that officers would address this issue. He referred to the Trinity West scheme and reminded the meeting that there was previous support of Members towards a proposal for a digital screen.

Prior to making a decision on this application, Councillor E Nash put forward the following amendment to the recommendation in the report which was seconded by Councillor C Campbell:-

'That this application be deferred until such time that the Council had a policy on digital advertising in place'

The amendment was voted upon and lost.

## **RESOLVED –**

### (i) Application 12/03408/ADV

a) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the City Council's use of the screen for the advertising of public events and community related issues and information:

1. The screen hereby approved shall only be used for the display of commercial advertising and shall at no time be used for the display of sporting or entertainment events.

R. The Local Planning Authority is mindful of the fact that the screen faces out in to a busy cross roads and that the gathering of a crowd in this area may hinder the free flow of pedestrians on the public highway.

2. For the avoidance of doubt, there will be no playing of music or speech or other amplified sound in connection with the screen whatsoever.

R. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity.



3. The brightness of the screen shall be no greater than 6,000 candela per sq metre unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

R. In the interests of visual amenity.

(ii) Application 12/03409/FU

b) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions attached to previous permission 11/03290/FU contained in Appendix 1 of the report, the expiration of the public notice period and following completion of a Deed of Variation of the existing Section 106 attached to previous permission 11/03290/FU which ensures the obligations attached to that permission are brought forward and applied to this.

(Councillor Leadley and Councillor Campbell wished it to be recorded that they voted against the recommendation and that Councillor Nash abstained from voting)

**9 Position Statement - Application 12/02668/FU - Energy Recovery Facility (with Mechanical Pre-treatment) for the Incineration of Residual Municipal Solid Waste and Commercial and Industrial Waste, and Associated Infrastructure to Former Wholesale Market Site, Newmarket Approach, Cross Green Industrial Estate, Leeds 9**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a position statement in relation to a Energy Recovery Facility (with Mechanical Pre-treatment) for the Incineration of Residual Municipal Solid Waste and Commercial and Industrial Waste, and Associated Infrastructure to Former Wholesale Market Site, Newmarket Approach, Cross Green Industrial Estate, Leeds 9.

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme and had previously visited the site prior to the meeting.

Bob Prichard, Section Head, Development, Legal Services reminded the meeting that this was position statement only and for Members to note the content of the report and to provide feedback on the questions outlined in section 13.0 of the report.

Prior to discussing the application, Councillor E Nash raised her concerns that the Panel were being asked to consider this application when it was public knowledge that the contract on the incinerator had already been signed.

The Section Head, Development, Legal Services responded and confirmed that when the application was brought to Panel for determination the report would deal with matters that could properly be taken into account in making a decision and that Members concerns conveyed at this meeting would be addressed within the final report.

Max Rathmell, Mineral Waste and Contaminated Land Manager briefly outlined the proposals contained in the submitted report.

Also in attendance was Gillian Macleod, Transport Development Services Manager who responded to Members' queries and comments.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The need for a possible roundabout in relation to lorries coming from the East on the New Link Road  
*(Mrs G Macleod responded and informed the meeting that it was a low traffic generator and that East Leeds Extension had been designed to accommodate access traffic in this way)*
- The need to encourage lorry drivers not to drive on the 'A' roads
- The view expressed that it was not suitable for laying tarmac on concrete and that arising from the site visit a right hand turn was favourable for this location
- The need for more information on the tracking of major articulated vehicles was required
- Clarification of the route for vehicles entering, discharging and leaving the site
- Clarification of emission issues affecting Temple Newsam residents  
*(Mr M Rathmell responded and informed the meeting that the Environment Agency would advise on this issue. Although studies had shown that the emissions levels were low, it was suggested to invite representatives from the agency to address the Panel at a future meeting when this final application would be considered)*
- The need for tests to be undertaken on the ambient air before the application was determined and the concerns that the treatment of bottom ash off site generated unnecessary traffic  
*(Mr M Rathmell responded and informed the meeting that the authority already had ambient air quality measurements in the baseline section of the Environmental Impact Assessment and that regarding the suggestion that bottom ash be treated on site, there was insufficient tonnage for a viable operation, as it was land hungry and could generate dust)*
- Clarification if the height of the chimney was in accordance with agreed procedures in view of the close proximity of Neville Close
- The need for the Panel to visit a plant in Sheffield
- Clarification as to why the plant was so large in size
- Clarification of the future plans in relation to combined heat and power for the surrounding areas  
*(The Chief Planning Officer responded and informed the meeting that officers were undertaking some work on European funding and the department were in agreement of the fundamental principle of doing this work)*
- The need to acknowledge that this application had been previously debated in detail at Plans Panel East
- The need to address the hours of use, in particular operating on a Sunday and the period before and after a Bank Holiday Monday

In concluding discussions, the Chair put forward the following specific matters for Members consideration:-

- Whether an assisted visit with officers to Veolia's existing Energy Recovery Facility in Sheffield would be useful for Members of the City Plans Panel and the Members of the affected Wards prior to the decision-making stage;
- Any further detail or clarification they may require on the potential content of a legal agreement;
- Whether a discussion session with the Environment Agency in relation to the Environmental Permitting process would be desirable at the decision-making stage;
- Any further detail or clarification required in relation to air quality and health;
- Any transportation matters relating to the proposals;
- The layout and design of the facility, together with the materials and colour scheme of the buildings / chimney; and,
- Landscape and visual impact from the proposed development.

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the contents of the report be noted.
- b) That the Chief Planning Officer be requested to arrange a visit with officers to Veolia's existing Energy Recovery Facility in Sheffield and to invite Councillor C Campbell and Garforth Ward Members.
- c) That in relation to the potential content of a legal agreement, further detail be submitted in relation to potential routings, employment (local) and on highway implications.
- d) That the Chief Planning Officer be requested to invite representatives from the Environment Agency to discuss emission issues when the final application was determined at a future Panel meeting.
- e) That this Panel agrees with the layout and design of the facility, together with the materials and colour scheme of the buildings/ chimney.
- f) That in relation to landscape and visual impact from the proposed development, this Panel agrees that the long views and landscape proposals were acceptable.

(The meeting was adjourned at 4.05pm at the conclusion of this item and reconvened at 4.25pm prior to considering the pre-application for the laying out of access and erection of circa 1150 houses at Thorp Arch Estate, Wetherby, Leeds 22)

**10 Pre - Application - Preapp/11/00459 - Pre Application Presentation for the Laying Out of Access and Erection of Circa 1150 Houses at Thorp Arch Estate, Wetherby, Leeds 22**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to the laying out of access and erection of circa 1150 houses at Thorp Arch Estate, Wetherby, Leeds 22.

The following representatives attended and addressed the meeting:-

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 25th October, 2012

- Sue Ansbro – WYG Panning Consultants (Applicants Representative)
- Colin Pool – Clerk to Walton and Thorp Arch Parish Council's

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme and had previously visited the site prior to the meeting.

The applicants representative addressed the meeting and highlighted the following issues:-

- The proposed application is a Policy Compliant scheme
- The application supports Thorp Arch as an employment area
- The sustainability of the Thorp Arch Trading Estate was a key issue for the developers
- A previous Planning Inspector's report concluded that there were no employment land supply issues
- Thorp Arch was the only major brown field site in East Leeds
- A substantial amount of public consultation had already been carried out (i.e. meetings with Ward Councillors, Local Parish Council's, the leafleting of properties in the Thorp Arch, Walton and Boston Spa areas and a dedicated website)
- Affordable housing 35%
- Introduce alternative highway arrangements
- Proposed new public transport arrangements
- Proposed new community facilities (New school)
- New cycleway and pedestrian routes
- Sustainability proposals
- The undertaking of an environmental impact assessment

In conclusion Ms Ansbro suggested that if the application was to be approved it would create employment opportunities in the area, deliver housing growth and lead to sustainable development

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Had meaningful consultation taken place with the neighbouring Parish Council's and local residents?
- The intention of the developers to "press ahead" with a full application without addressing concerns raised by the public
- A suggestion that family housing (2,3 & 4 bedroom properties) be included within the housing proposals
- The integration of the neighbouring villages; Walton and Thorp Arch into the proposal was an important factor
- Seek to deliver the aspirations of Walton Parish Council in linking the proposals to the village
- Proposed community facilities

- Not convinced about the sustainability of the development, in particular the existing retail park required substantial investment
- Concerns about transport network, in view of the amount of proposed new housing
- Proposals around public transport
- The suggestion that the application was being pushed through prior to the implementation of the Localism Bill

The Chair then invited Mr Colin Pool Clerk to Walton and Thorp Arch Parish Council's to comment on the proposals and highlighted the following issues:-

- The Thorp Arch site was requisitioned by the military in 1942 to build a munitions factory. The site was chosen because it was in an isolated area, the road network was poor, all movements to and from the site were by rail
- To this day the road network remains poor
- The proposal to build a substantial number of houses in the area would create havoc on the local road network
- Local Parish Council's were made aware of the proposals in May 2012, they were not consulted, "they were told what was going to happen"
- Developers appeared to be confident that the application would be granted on appeal
- Concerns about the sustainability of the site
- Proper highway solutions required
- The proposed development appears to have not being properly thought through (Disjointed)
- Concerns that failure to address major issues would have adverse implications for the two neighbouring communities
- Not opposed to development in the area but major issues require addressing

At this point in the meeting the Chair, Councillor Taggart left the meeting, Councillor J McKenna assumed the Chair.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific issues raised by Mr Pool.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Parish Council's not opposed to development but concerns around infrastructure and sustainability of the site
- No meaningful consultation carried out
- Original housing proposal was 250 houses now 1100
- Neighbourhood Plan suggest development but highlights major concerns of the highway network

In concluding discussions, the Chair put forward the following specific matters for Members consideration:-

- Do Members have any comments to make about the principle and scale of residential development in this location?

No objections were raised to the principle of residential development so long as it was supported with the appropriate infrastructure to serve the needs of its residents and offset the impact of the development on the local communities. The nature of the development appeared disjointed and concerns were raised in respect of residential development on the 'Wighill Lane' site as this was not well related to the rest of the proposed development or Walton village

- What are Members thoughts on the approach to the indicative masterplan for the site?

Require a comprehensive plan for the whole of the site that sets out the vision for the development of the Trading Estate as a whole. Further details required around a numbers of matters including proposed public transport, possible Primary School and Community Centre and investment in the industrial estate

- What are Members views on the nature, mix and type of housing provision (including affordable housing) on this site?

It would be premature to comment in any detail at this stage. However, the mix and type of housing was too vague and required local housing needs assessment. Affordable housing should be 35%

- Do Members have any particular concerns, beyond those identified in the report, around the issue of sustainability, traffic impact and accessibility?

Yes. Concerns were raised that the site was not sustainable and that significant measures should be proposed to make the development so. These included appropriate highway and public transport provision, environmental measures and appropriate facilities for the residents of the proposed development and details of what measures that would be put in place to help integrate this development with existing communities

- What are Members thoughts on the nature and location of greenspaces on site and how these link into the wider strategic green areas?

Premature at this stage in the absence of the information requested above

- In the context set by the appropriate planning regulations do Members consider that the proposed heads of terms cover the appropriate obligations?

Premature to consider at this stage in light of previous comments made

- Are there any other issues Members would like to raise?

That proper and meaningful public consultation should take place, including a Consultation Committee to be established

**RESOLVED** – That the report and pre- application presentation be noted.

**11 Pre - Application - Preapp/11/01185 - Proposed Undergraduate Library Building at the University of Leeds Car Park adjacent to Emmanuel Church, Hillary Place, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to a proposed undergraduate Library Building at the University of Leeds car park adjacent to Emmanuel Church, Hillary Place, Leeds.

The following representatives attended and addressed the meeting:-

- Steve Gilley – Applicant – University of Leeds
- Joe Morgan – ADP Architecture

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme and had previously visited the site prior to the meeting.

The presentation highlighted the following key areas:-

- The height, Form and Massing of the building
- The relationship to neighbouring buildings
- Appearance on the street scene and skyline
- The design and appearance of the proposed new building
- The proposals for landscaping and tree loss
- The car parking implications

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Concerns there was a huge massing to the rear of the building “looks blocky, boxy”
- Missing an opportunity, does not make best use of the site
- Suggestion that the building be more refined, more delicate
- Rear and front of the building need to be of equal strength, require quality on a small site
- Welcome proposal for use of Portland stone
- Pleased with BREEAM status

- Concerns at the loss of 2 trees in a Conservation area

In concluding discussions, the Chair put forward the following specific matters for Members consideration:-

- Are the height, form and massing of the building acceptable?

Look again at the issues around massing, suggestion that the building be made taller and slimmer onto Hillary Place

- Does the scheme respond well to the historical context (particularly in respect of neighbouring listed buildings and the conservation area) and campus context?

Further consideration of the design and appearance of the building was required

- Are the design and appearance principles of the scheme acceptable?

Further consideration of the design and appearance of the building was required as above

- Was the removal of the unlisted former bank building acceptable?

Yes

- Are the landscaping scheme proposals appropriate and acceptable?

There was a need to address the loss of the existing trees with appropriate replacement planting

- Was the loss of car parking on site and the proposed mitigation for this acceptable?

More information was required on what happens to the displaced car parking

**RESOLVED** – That the report and pre- application presentation be noted.

**12 Pre - Application - Preapp/12/00421 - Proposed Redevelopment to Form 9-17 Storey Student Accommodation Building, with Ground Floor Cafe and A3 use at the Junction of Cropper Gate, Westgate and Wellington Street, Leeds 1**

(This item was withdrawn from the agenda)

**13 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

To note that the date and time of next meeting was Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 25th October, 2012



(The meeting concluded at 6.40pm)