

## **CITY PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER, 2012**

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

Councillors P Gruen, R Procter,  
M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty,  
T Leadley, J McKenna, E Nash,  
N Walshaw, J Hardy and M Coulson

### **26 Opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. The Chief Planning Officer informed the Panel that agreement had been reached with John Lewis about the lease for their anchor store in the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter and that a presentation on the progressing scheme would be made on behalf of the applicants at the December meeting of City Plans Panel

### **27 Late Items**

Although there were no formal late items, the Panel was in receipt of the following additional supplementary information which had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

Application 12/03975/FU – 6 storey data centre Black Bull Street, LS10 - coloured plans and an additional, short report (minute 31 refers)

Application 12/04018/FU – office building – land off Sovereign Street, LS1 – coloured plans and an additional, short report (minute 32 refers)

Application 12/04017/1a – greenspace – land off Sovereign Street, LS1 coloured plans and an additional, short report (minute 33 refers)

Application 11/03705/FU – Energy from Waste Facility, site of former Skelton Grange Power Station Stourton LS10 – coloured charts and maps (minute 36 refers)

### **28 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

No disclosable pecuniary or other interests were declared at this time, although a disclosable pecuniary interest was declared later in the meeting (minute 38 refers)

### **29 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Murray who was substituted for by Councillor Coulson. Apologies for absence were also received from Councillor D Blackburn

## 30 Minutes

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012 be approved

## 31 Application 12/03975/FU - 6 storey data centre - land formerly Yorkshire Chemicals site - Black Bull Street Hunslet LS10

Further to minute 20 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on the proposals, Panel considered the formal application. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Plans, graphics and sample materials were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a 6 storey data centre on part of the former Yorkshire Chemicals site. Members also had regard to a supplementary report which set out the emerging strategic planning context in relation to the Leeds Core Strategy and provided details on the non-standard conditions being recommended for the application

With reference to the detailed discussions which had taken place at the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, Officers addressed the issues raised by Members at that meeting and provided the following information:

- that in respect of sustainability, a BREEAM 'Very Good' rating was being sought for the building; that there would be green roofs to the generator houses and that the building would achieve the Council's standard on 20% CO2 reduction and 10% renewable energy generation, with this being controlled by condition
- a wind assessment had been undertaken and independently assessed on behalf of the Council, with no significant concerns being raised from this survey
- that the concerns raised by Carlsberg to the proposals had been considered and it was felt that the height of the building was comparable to those in close proximity to it and in terms of the impact on daylight, a study had been submitted which showed that the building would create less shadow at different times of the day than the previously approved scheme. The issue of noise had been considered by the Council's Environmental Protection Team which were satisfied with the proposals, subject to conditions and air quality was considered to be acceptable. Concerning pedestrian connections in this area, the development would be providing pedestrian access through the site but not enhanced road crossings due to the low level of occupancy. However it was anticipated that further phases of development in the area would contribute more to connectivity, including new pedestrian road crossings

Members were informed that the Environment Agency (EA) had no

objections to the principle of the scheme, subject to conditions in respect of remediation strategies and flood risk

A late comment from Leeds Civic Trust was reported which whilst supporting the scheme expressed disappointment at the lack of highway works to Black Bull Street

The current position on the issue of the contribution towards public realm was provided, with Members being informed that the proposal had been amended and that the applicant now wished to provide the improvements within their own site, rather than providing some temporary landscaping beyond the red line boundary. As this would fall short of the 20% greenspace requirement, an off-site commuted sum of £56,000 would be provided to be used for the city centre park

Members commented on the following matters:

- the northern footway, who would maintain this and when it would be fully provided. Members were informed that the footways and landscaping would be maintained by the site operator and owner and the maintenance of these would form part of the S106 agreement. That the full extent of the northern footway would be provided once further developments came on board but that this scheme would provide a 6-8 metre pathway
- the importance of reducing Black Bull Street from three lanes of traffic to two to provide traffic calming measures on a stretch of road where speed was an issue and for this to be done as soon as possible

The Chief Planning Officer stated that Highways Section were looking strategically at the entire city centre; that there was an aspiration to narrow Black Bull Street and this could be supported but that the application being considered could not provide for this

Members also discussed the colour for the proposed cladding with the view being expressed that grey cladding should be used on the scheme

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the provision and maintenance of publicly accessible landscaped areas as identified on plan 1209 -(P)- 002E, a greenspace contribution by way of a commuted sum of £56,000, public transport contribution in accordance with SPD5 Public Transport Improvements and developer contributions of £11290, cooperation with local jobs and skills training initiatives and a Section 106 management fee of £750 and subject to the conditions set out in the submitted reports

### **32 Application 12/04018/FU - Four storey office development with basement car parking and landscaping - land off Sovereign Street LS1**

Further to minute 21 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for a major office development in the city centre, Members considered the formal application. Members were also in receipt of a supplementary report which set out the emerging strategic planning context in relation to the Core

Strategy, an amendment to condition no.12 and clarification of the number of trees being removed at the site

Plans, graphics and a sample panel showing the opacity level of the glazing in a key location of the building were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and following the detailed discussions held at the meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, provided further information on the issues which had been raised by Members

In terms of the roof top plant, revisions had been made and these had been modelled from a range of key locations. The amount of green roof space had been reduced and an area of screened plant would be provided

Regarding the glazing manifestation, Members' comments had been considered but the applicant had indicated they wished to retain the film to this area. Whilst a sample panel showing opacity at a level of 20% had been provided to Panel, Members were informed that the actual material would be glass so would be more reflective than the sample being shown and that a BREAM 'Excellent' rating was being sought for the building

York stone paving would be provided and one tree was proposed although no further planting was to be provided

In respect of the S106 Agreement, the total contribution would be £232,633 which would comprise public transport contribution; travel plan monitoring fee; greenspace contribution as well as a requirement to work with Jobs and Skills

Officers recommended the scheme for approval and stated this was likely to contribute towards the first phase of the regeneration of this site

Members commented on the following matters:

- the glazing manifestation; that as stated previously, technologically there were ways to provide the commercial confidentiality which the applicant sought without adversely affecting the appearance of the building
- the need for sensitive uses to be located at this part of the building and whether these could be located elsewhere
- the cost of an electronic system which could be switched on only when needed

Officers responded to the points raised and stated that the applicant had been pressed on this point in view of Members' comments on this issue. The proposed material would not fully obscure the area; it would allow movement to be seen but faces and information would remain obscured, with the alternative option being clear glass and blinds, however this would result in the blinds always being closed which would detract from the overall visual appearance of the building. Further information was provided on the particular uses for these rooms to enable the Panel to better understand the rationale for siting these uses at this point of the building

Members continued to discuss the glazing treatment and were informed that there was no information available on the cost of a more sophisticated electronic system of automatic glazing and that it would not be possible to condition the use of blinds

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions specified in the submitted reports and an amendment to condition 12 in

respect of the agreed off-site highways works to Pitt Row and the basement car park

**33 Application 12/04017/LA -Change of Use from car park to public realm and amenity space, to include paving, water feature, drainage, exterior lighting and associated soft landscaping works - land off Sovereign Street LS1**

Further to minute 22 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for an area of greenspace in the city centre, Members considered the formal report. A supplementary report was also provided for Members' consideration which set out the emerging strategic planning context in relation to the Leeds Core Strategy and provided clarification of the number of trees being removed and provided in the planning application

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and following the detailed discussions held at the meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, provided further information on the issues which had been raised by Members

The Panel was informed that plot C had not been properly drawn on the plan before Members at the October meeting and that this was now correctly plotted, so moving it eastward, with the size of the greenspace area now comparable to Park Square. Furthermore, Executive Board had recently considered the potential disposal of plot B, which had set the parameters for that plot

In response to Members' comments about the balance of hard and soft landscaping within the scheme, this had now been amended with now 67% of the area being greenspace provision. Further amendments included more seating areas in a greater variety of styles and materials; an increased number of trees; a larger grassed area to Sovereign Square; re-alignment of the rill and the footpaths reduced in width

The level changes between the grassed areas were now very discrete; the whole area was now accessible to people with disabilities and the steps within the scheme would meet the requirements of the Access Officer

The importance of addressing Members' concerns about the possible build up of litter within the scheme was highlighted

A late representation from Leeds Civic Trust was reported which strongly supported the scheme but requested additional play areas, improved seating and improvements to Pitt Row

Members welcomed the revisions to the scheme and commented on the following matters:

- lighting within the scheme; the need to ensure it did not cause light pollution and the possibility of including coloured lighting at ground level to add further interest
- the need to ensure that the grass cutting machinery could reach the raised grassed areas
- that the enlarged greenspace area was welcomed
- the depth of the water; the need for this to be safe and for the water features to be regularly maintained

- the support for the proposals by Leeds Civic Trust in view of their earlier comments on the scheme
- the potential attraction of the area to skateboarders and whether this had been considered and addressed
- concerns about extensive use of the proposed tree species Sugar Gum which grew to 30m high
- the need for winter flowering cherry to be included in the planting scheme to provide some winter colour

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the depth of the water would be variable, with this being from 120mm to 40mm. Concerns were raised by some Members that this was too deep
- that the water feature would be maintained with an agreement being drawn up for a maintenance plan for a 15 year period
- that the issue of skateboarders using the space had been considered and that a range of measures would be included to prevent this from occurring

Members acknowledged the importance of this area of greenspace to the city and the role of the Plans Panel in securing a better scheme than had been originally proposed

**RESOLVED -**

a) To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the expiry of Notice No.1 on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2012 and subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any other which may be considered appropriate)

b) That Councillor Nash be consulted on the lighting within the scheme and the proposed tree species

**34 Application 12/04154/FU - Change of Use of offices to form student accommodation involving alterations and addition of roof top extension - Pennine House Russell Street LS1**

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

The Head of Planning Services stated that a further representation had been received and that the Panel might wish to hear the speakers for and against the application, discuss the proposals and then defer determination of the application to enable proper consideration by Officers of the information which had been submitted, with the Panel agreeing to this course of action

Officers presented the report which sought a change of use of a vacant office building located in the Prime Office Quarter, to student accommodation. Members were informed that the UDPR (2006) supported the principle of office use in the area but accepted other uses which added variety and vitality so long as they did not prejudice the functioning of the principal use

The 1960s building had been reclad in the 1990s and the proposal was to strip the building back to its original structure and to provide a simpler, more unified approach, with the main material being artificial stone. A new pavilion would be located at the top of the building with the overall height of

the building matching nearby Aquis House and the adjacent multi-storey car park

The Panel then heard representations from the applicant and an objector who attended the meeting

Members commented on the following matters:

- the levels of rent being charged for this type of accommodation in Bristol and that the intended market for the scheme was wealthy students
- the management for this type of accommodation
- the need to consider the medium/long-term sustainability of the building and the need for further information on the amount of residential accommodation in the area and the amount of vacant office space in the vicinity
- if approved, the possibility of converting at some future point, student accommodation into residential accommodation for details to be provided about the differences there would be between these two uses in terms of the S106 Agreement
- that whilst the proposal would result in the conversion of an unattractive building, that there were grave misgivings about introducing students into the heart of the business area, with concerns that if approved, a precedent could be set
- the importance of not losing low cost office space in the city centre
- the rapid advancements in technology and IT requirements which meant that relatively modern offices needed to be refurbished to meet modern demands
- that alternative uses, e.g. a hotel might be more acceptable in this area rather than student accommodation
- that the site was in a highly sustainable area for students
- the need to provide details of the proposals affecting Henry's Bar and the roof, together with information on the treatment to the lean-to

The Chief Planning Officer stated that there was a need to look at the supply of student accommodation in the city in view of declining student numbers and that the investment in the regeneration of Bond Court would also need to be considered when introducing a new use to this area

**RESOLVED** – To note the report and the comments made and in light of the late representation which had been received, to defer determination of the application to a future meeting to enable a further report to be submitted which also addressed the issues raised by Panel and the Chief Planning Officer

**35 Application 12/04240/EXT - Extension of time for planning application 08/06944/FU for two storey extension to main airport terminal building to provide improved internal facilities and associated landscaping works to the terminal building forecourt - Leeds and Bradford Airport Whitehouse Lane Yeadon LS19**

Plans, drawings, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

The Head of Planning Services presented the report which sought an extension of time for additions and improvements to the main terminal building at Leeds Bradford Airport and explained that for such applications, the chief issue was whether there had been any material changes, including changes to policy since the original grant of permission, with the Panel being informed that there had been no real changes

Members were informed that an extension of time for a further three years, could only be applied for once. The original application had been considered by Plans West who were supportive of the proposals and the emerging Core Strategy supported the airport's growth

The application had been advertised and had attracted representations from local Councillors but no objections to the proposals had been received

One element of betterment arising from this application was the intention to bring forward at an earlier date the Transport Steering Group, which was a technical group which considered traffic data which was then reported to Members

Members discussed the application and in response to a question regarding the free drop-off and pick up-point which was to commence from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2012, the Head of Planning Services stated there was no reason why this should not commence on that date

If minded to approve the application, Members were asked that condition no. 14 which related to the Forecourt Management Plan, should be dealt with in the S106 Agreement

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the completion of a deed of variation to the original Section 106 agreement agreed as part of planning approval 08/06944/FU to tie the approved obligations to the extension of time approval and updated regarding relevant dates and with the following amended obligation:

- To bring forward the setting up of a transport steering group (to include Leeds, Bradford and York City Council's Metro and LBIA) so that it is not linked to commencement of development but with the granting of this permission i.e. within 6 months of the date of the decision. The group will hold six monthly meetings and will review the airport's vehicular impact on the local road network, progress towards modal shift targets and the most effective use of existing and future funds for public transport

and the additional obligation relating to the Forecourt Management Plan – to be in accordance with approved details as agreed by Panel but with new access to free 1 hour pick-up and drop-off area from Whitehouse Lane completed by the end of May 2013

and subject to the conditions in the submitted report, with the deletion of condition no 14 relating to the Forecourt Management Plan



**36 Application 11/03705/FU - Energy Recovery Facility (incineration of waste and energy generation), associated infrastructure and improvements to access and bridge on site of former Skelton Grange Power Station, Skelton Grange Road Stourton LS10 - Position Statement**

Plans, photographs including historical images and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented a position statement on proposals for an Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) on the site of the former Skelton Grange Power Station at Stourton. The former Plans Panel East had previously received pre-application presentations and position statements on the proposals and minutes from these meetings were included in the report before Panel, to provide further background information. In view of two applications for ERFs in the city being received, a visit by Panel, relevant Ward Members and Officers to two such facilities in Sheffield and Mansfield would take place on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2012

With reference to the detailed report before Panel, Members were informed that the proposals were for an ERF which could accept up to 300,000 tonnes per annum of non-hazardous commercial and industrial waste and that if planning permission was granted, there was the potential to ensure that landfill ceased at the Skelton Grange landfill site which was operated by Biffa, the applicants for the ERF

The facility would result in 40 jobs at the site with approximately 300 jobs during the construction phase

Currently the site was derelict concrete and rubble which was now evolving into scrub land. Some poplar trees on the site would need to be removed but the area around the building would be landscaped and improved

In terms of the size of the building, this was largely dictated by the scale of the plant within it although design principles had been set at an early stage, with some modifications being made to the design in view of comments made by Plans Panel East. The proposed scheme provided additional detailing at the end of the building's elevations, with the office element now being raised higher and having a more refined facing to it. Good quality landscaping was proposed which would set the benchmark for future developments. As part of the scheme the Trans-Pennine trail would be re-engineered, giving improved pedestrian and cycle access

One matter which was considered by Plans Panel East at the meeting in August 2012 was vehicular access and the single carriageway solution which was proposed. Plans Panel East was of the view that there was a need for two way access and for sufficient access to be provided to open up the site to a wider area of the city to maximise its potential

Members were informed that this had been considered but that the applicant had agreed to carry out full strengthening works to the bridge which would allow the full width of the bridge to be provided as other developments came along

The Panel then received a presentation from Tim Shaw, a representative of the Environment Agency (EA), who outlined the EA permitting process and provided the following information:

- that applications for ERFs were assessed to ensure they were designed to the highest standards
- that the EA had a role as a consultee in the planning application process as well as a permitting role once an application for an environmental permit was received
- that a permit could be issued before planning permission was granted but that currently no permit had been applied for on this site
- that an environmental permit contained strict conditions to ensure the environment and people's health were protected and only when the applicant had demonstrated that the ERF would operate in line with UK and European laws and using best available technology, would a permit be issued
- that for older plants, the EA could require these to be retro-fitted to meet best available technology
- that once the permit application was received and checked that all the necessary information had been submitted, it would be advertised and a period of public consultation would commence which would also include other agencies, e.g. Natural England and PCTs. The EA had an obligation to take into account all comments which were received and once the application had been assessed, a draft decision was produced with further consultation on this being held and then a final decision was taken
- once a permit was issued the EA then assumed a regulatory role which required audits and inspections; continuous monitoring of emissions and periodic sampling. Emission reports would be reviewed and published
- management and operating procedures would also be monitored but the EA's role did not cover issues relating to traffic movements; visual impact of the development; operating hours or light pollution
- the enforcement action could be taken if this was necessary with a range of sanctions being available to the EA including suspension/prohibition notices being issued and prosecution for non-compliance

Members discussed the report and the presentation by the EA and commented on the following matters:

- concerns that the applicant had not yet applied for an environmental permit and that they should be encouraged to do so. The Chair advised that this was a matter for the applicant
- the transportation of waste from the applicant's materials recovery facility (MRF) on Gelderd Road and that it would be more efficient to sort the waste on the same site as it was being incinerated
- the fact there was another application for an ERF in close proximity and whether in the EA's evaluation, these were considered separately or collectively

- whether there was sufficient waste in the city to fully utilise both of the proposed facilities
- the topography of the area where the ERFs were proposed with concerns that due to the shallow valley these were sited in, the dispersion of emissions could be slow
- whether any similar scheme to that proposed had been refused an environmental permit
- the possibility of utilising the waterways to transport waste
- the possibility of both facilities being located on this site
- for residential properties which were sited close to an ERF, whether a higher standard for emissions or vibrations was required
- whether permits were time limited or had to be renewed

The following responses were provided:

- regarding the movement of materials from the MRF on Gelderd Road, whilst planning permission for the Gelderd Road site had been granted, it had not yet been implemented. In theory it would be more efficient to sort and incinerate waste on the same site, that proposal had not been put forward and it would only be residual waste which was transported from the MRF, which equated to around 9-10 vehicles per day
- that when determining the environmental permit for this site, the fact there was another facility proposed in close proximity would be taken into account and the EA would only grant the permit if it was satisfied it was safe to do so. When considering a permit for this site, the assumption would be made that the operators of the other site – which had applied for an environmental permit – would be operating at full capacity, so these emissions would be added to the background emissions and then those produced by this site would be added for the EA's consideration. If it was felt that the air quality standard was at risk through the level of emissions, it would be possible to refuse the permit or require additional technology to be provided to mitigate against this
- that in terms of waste arisings, the RSS set out the amount of waste the region produced and then further detailed information had been obtained in the research for the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (NRWDPD) which indicated that between 350,000 and 500,000 tonnes of commercial and industrial waste per annum had to be catered for, which included recycling materials but not municipal waste which was in addition to that figure
- that some applications for ERFs had been withdrawn, rather than refused an environmental permit
- that the NRWDPD was supportive of transporting goods by water but that this was a difficult site to achieve this at as transport stations would be required along the route
- that the standards applied to emissions and vibrations were the same regardless of location but that all complaints would be

investigated and where there were problems, the EA could require the operator to put in further measures

- that environmental permits were not time limited and would remain in force until either the EA revoked them or the operator sought to surrender the permit, although the permits were reviewed regularly

The views of Members were sought on the bridge and whether this should be two way either now or in the future

The Panel's Highways representative stated that an assessment had been carried out and that the proposed one-way signalled controlled operation of the bridge would be sufficient for the proposed development but that there were concerns for the future development of the site and that a two way bridge would be needed when all the land was developed. Members noted that the footpath and cycleway would be cantilevered at the side and separated from vehicular traffic which would provide a safer environment

Panel discussed the proposals and that if a two way route could not be provided by this development, that details were needed about the trigger point to achieve this, for further consideration

**RESOLVED** - To note the report, the presentation and the comments now made

During consideration of this matter, Councillor Coulson left the meeting and Councillor Gruen also withdrew from the meeting for a short while

**37 Application 12/03459/FU -Multi-level development up to 17 storeys with 625 residential apartments, commercial units (class A1 to A5, B1, D1 and D2), car parking, associated access, engineering works, landscape and public amenity space - land at Whitehall Road and Globe Road LS12 - Position statement**

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

Officers presented the report which provided the current position on proposals for a major mixed-use development close to the city centre. Panel noted that a pre-application presentation of the proposals had been made to Plans Panel City Centre on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2012 (minute 78 refers)

Members were informed that a mix of apartments across 7 units, were proposed which would include some 3 bedroom apartments and duplex units

The main public open space would be in the centre of the site, although this was less than 10% of the site area and Officers were considering whether a lower level of POS could be accepted in return for the provision of a footbridge over the canal

The main material proposed for the six lower buildings would be red brick which would provide a reference to the former industrial uses of this area. The tall building set apart from the rest of the blocks would be in a black brick with some relief being provided through the inclusion of gold-coloured detailing on the balconies of this block

To prevent graffiti on the elevation to the railway, green climbing plants were proposed which would also add interest and soften this area

Details of the vehicular access arrangements were provided and Members were informed that a cycle lane would be introduced into the scheme

A wind assessment had been submitted and this was currently being considered. A viability statement had also been received which was being examined

Members commented on the following matters:

- the need to see a sample of the gold-coloured cladding and to ensure that its appearance did not deteriorate over time. Members were informed that sample materials would be provided and the materials would be conditioned
- that the POS had to cater for families living on the site and from the image shown to Panel it appeared there was a road running through it
- whether houses should be considered for the site as opposed to flats
- the change of colour for the tall building and the reasons for this
- the need for the colour of the red brick to resemble that used on the developments at Granary Wharf, rather than that on the Courts
- the need for a more balanced housing structure in the city centre and the need for more family accommodation, e.g. houses/town houses in a traditional street pattern
- concerns about the density of the proposals
- the design of the buildings with a mix of views on this
- that the provision of the bridge would be beneficial if it could be achieved and would provide a link to Granary Wharf and the southern entrance of the railway station
- the importance of the views of the city to visitors arriving by train and the need for an image showing this development when entering Leeds station by rail
- the likelihood that conventional housing on this site would not be viable

The Head of Planning Services stated that in terms of viability the site was a marginal one. Regarding the design of the scheme, the comments from the pre-application presentation had indicated the buildings at that time were too 'blocky' and the amendments made were in response to those comments. In relation to the tall building, it was felt that elements of the nearby No.1 Whitehall were picked up in that block and that it was possible that the images provided did not fully indicate this

On the quantum of development, it was important to ensure this was correct

In response to the specific points raised in the report for Members' comments, the following responses were provided:

- that there were mixed views on the design approach adopted for the development and that a 'wow factor' was needed
- that there was support to the approach to private and public outdoor amenity space but that if families were to be accommodated, more child-friendly play spaces were required

and there should be increased green areas and reduced hard landscaping

- that there was support for the proposed car parking in the scheme

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

At the end of consideration of this matter, Councillors R Procter, G Latty, M Hamilton and T Leadley left the meeting

**38 Application 12/03788/FU - Hybrid application for full permission for 11 storey office building and outline application for office/hotel building up to 8 storeys with ancillary ground floor, A1, A3, A4 uses at Wellington Street/Whitehall Road LS1 - Position statement**

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

The Deputy Area Planning Manager presented a report setting out the current position on proposals for an office and hotel development at Wellington Street/Whitehall Road, LS1 on the site of the former Lumiere development. Members noted that a pre-application presentation on the scheme had been considered by Plans Panel City Centre at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2012

Regarding the location of the site, this was close to the City Centre Conservation Area and there were a number of listed buildings in the vicinity, with a mixed architectural style of Victorian and modern buildings around the site

At this point, Councillor Nash having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest through being a Committee Member of the Leeds and Wakefield Area Co-operative Group which had a store in close proximity to the site, left the meeting

The following information was provided:

- that the proposals were for two buildings around a central space, with one application being for full planning permission whereas the other building was for outline permission only
- both the base of the outline building and the top of it would align with City Central
- a central open space of 35m x 25m would be provided and this would include an area of soft landscaping together with seating and public art
- the servicing arrangements would be provided by a new route for vehicular access off Whitehall Road to the basement car park
- the need to protect the amenity of residents from the possible intensive servicing use and that a wall to screen this from view would be provided
- for the building on the Whitehall Road frontage, the proposed materials would be masonry in a grid pattern, with a loggia feature at the top level

- a brown roof was proposed to the eastern wing which would constitute crushed aggregate, brick and concrete which would encourage biodiversity
- to address concerns about lighting and safety raised at the pre-application presentation about the pedestrian cut-through, this would be 8m wide with a fully glazed reception area sited along one elevation to improve natural surveillance
- that some columns in the centre would be needed for support but these would be slim and not obtrusive
- signing was proposed at the entrance to provide a feature and further illuminate this part of the building
- that construction would be phased including a phased provision of the basement car park
- a temporary fence line was being proposed to screen the part-built basement and temporary surface treatment would be provided to the Public Open Space until the outline proposal was implemented
- a lay-by area was being proposed for the proposed hotel use and there would be the opportunity for a new, upgraded bus stop to be provided on Wellington Street. The existing bus stops on Whitehall Road would be relocated and improved
- the existing pedestrian crossing on Wellington Street would need to be relocated
- a wind study for the site had been submitted and was being considered

Members commented on the proposals particularly the need to provide a lay-by to improve the flow of public transport along Wellington Street, and the pedestrian route in and how well-illuminated this would be

In response to the specific points raised in the report for Members' consideration, the following comments were made:

- that Members considered that the combination of the materials proposed and the elevational treatment to be acceptable
- that the concerns regarding the attractiveness of the pedestrian access on to Whitehall Road had been addressed
- that with the safeguards which were in place, in general, residential amenity had been protected both during the construction and operational phases of development but that there was a need to make the screen wall to the service area more interesting and attractive and that the flow of public transport along Wellington Street needed to be improved

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

### **39 Preapp 12/01085 - Proposed office building and creche at White Rose Office Park Millshaw Park Lane Beeston LS11 - Pre-application presentation**

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out proposals for another new office development in Leeds which was a further example of investor confidence in the city

Members were informed about the planning history of the site and that there were two permissions for additional office space which had commenced but had not been completed. The applicant had stated that if the proposed scheme was granted planning permission, the two extant permissions would be relinquished

Car parking was proposed at ground level with office accommodation above it. A crèche was proposed on an existing car park, with there being a net loss of approximately 190 spaces

Aspects of the design were still being discussed although the coloured cladding which had formed part of the earlier designs had now been deleted

The extant permissions were material planning considerations as was whether an out of centre use was acceptable in this location

It was reported that Councillor Congreve had raised the issue about the loss of car parking spaces and that this needed to be addressed to ensure there was no worsening of the car parking situation at the White Rose Centre (WRC)

If Members were broadly satisfied with the proposals, a request was made to defer and delegate determination of the planning application when it was submitted, to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to no major issues being raised

The Panel then received a presentation on behalf of the applicants who provided the following information:

- that the site was the home to a range of companies and was a large employer
- that the site could be regarded as being mid-town rather than an out of town location
- that a company had approached them for a new office building with crèche facility and that the consented scheme did not meet the demands of this tenant. If the scheme was approved, the building was hoped to be occupied by 2014 and with 700 employees
- that an area of land did exist where decked car parking could be provided if the loss of spaces was an issue
- that the applicants would work with the owners of the WRC to develop the link to the shopping centre
- that the consented schemes could be built without the need for planning contributions and that this should be taken into account when considering contributions on the proposed scheme

Members discussed the scheme and were content with the proposals as presented, to the extent that determination of the application could be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

The Chief Planning Officer welcomed this approach but advised that any approval would be subject to no new material considerations being raised and for the scheme to be policy compliant and for appropriate planning contributions to be made

**RESOLVED** – To note the report, the presentation and the comments now made and that consideration of the formal application be deferred and



delegated to the Chief Planning Officer but that in the event that issues arose which could not be resolved, that the application be submitted to Panel for determination

**40 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds