

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 30TH OCTOBER, 2014

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, R Procter,
D Blackburn, S Hamilton, T Leadley,
E Nash, N Walshaw, M Ingham, J Lewis,
C Campbell, C Gruen and J Procter

65 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

66 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED - That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as designated as follows:

The appendices to the main reports referred to in minutes 72 and 74 under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 and the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds they contain information relating to the financial or business of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). It is considered that if this information was in the public domain it would be likely to prejudice the affairs of the applicant. Whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, in all the circumstances of the case, maintaining the exemption is considered to outweigh the public interest in disclosing this information at this time

67 Late Items

There were no formal late items, however the Panel was in receipt of a supplementary report in relation to application 14/04641/FU – Sweet Street and Manor Road Holbeck LS11, which had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting (minute 74 refers)

68 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests, however Councillor Leadley brought to the Panel's attention in respect of application 14/03263/FU – land off west side of Kidacre Street Hunslet for temporary use as a travellers site – that he was the Chair of the Lee Fair Committee which

organised the country's oldest chartered fair and that he knew some of the residents at the site (minute 73 refers)

69 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor G Latty, with Councillor J Procter attending as a substitute

70 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 9th October 2014 be approved

71 Application 14/00315/OT - Outline application for residential development of up to 150 dwellings including means of access and associated public open space and landscaping - Land at Leeds Road Collingham Wetherby

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

The North and East Area Planning Manager presented a report on an outline application for the principle of development and access on 8.79 ha site, part of which was designated as Protected Area of Search (PAS) land and part being located in the Green Belt. Although the application suggested up to 150 dwellings on the site, a proposed layout plan showed around 110 – 120 dwellings

Members were informed that a key aspect of the development was flooding, with there being a history of flood events on the site. To mitigate against this, the developer was proposing to raise the levels of the central area of the site and provide a cellular storage system under the road which would release water at controlled rates into the nearby beck. It was also proposed to create flood storage areas adjacent to Collingham Beck to the south of the site and erect a flood wall opposite Crabtree Green. Following the site visit earlier in the day, the North and East Area Planning Manager had sought further information from the Environment Agency about the flood mitigation measures and highlighted to Panel that whilst the proposed measures would ease the situation for residents of Millbeck Green and Crabtree Green, it did not constitute a flood alleviation scheme

The report before Panel recommended the application be refused with seven reasons for refusal being suggested to Members. In terms of the interim PAS policy, the site did not fulfil the criteria for early release of the site

The receipt of two further representations was reported. A detailed letter from the applicant was summarised to the Panel and concerns raised by Councillor Castle were outlined for Members' information

If minded to accept the reasons for refusal, an amendment to reason 1 was proposed, to remove 'and scale' from the sixth line down. Also on

reason 4, to correct a typing error to remove 'access point' from the fourth line down and replace with 'development'

The Transport Development Services Manager referred to the recent submission by the applicant of a more detailed plan of the access arrangements, which subject to further work, might be supported by Officers in principle. Further discussions would also be required in respect of the junction at Harewood Road, which experienced queuing traffic. The applicant had submitted a proposal to signalise the junction of School Lane/Mill Lane and the A58, and that discussions on this would be required.

Notwithstanding the recent revisions to the highways proposals the reason for refusal set out in the submitted report remained valid at this time

Members discussed the proposals, with the main issues being:

- the guidance set out in the NPPF which encouraged a plan-led system and the need to have regard to the Core Strategy and Site Allocations process
- that the Council was committed to building homes in the correct location and this site was not suitable
- the need for issues relating to education provision and health provision to be included in the reasons for refusal
- the scale of the proposed development which at 2.5 and 3 storey dwellings was not in keeping with the existing properties in Collingham
- concerns that the flood mitigation measures were inadequate
- concerns about highways measures; that additional proposals had come forward which were not in the public domain and that local residents and Ward Members had not had the opportunity to consider and comment on them. Concerns were also raised that continuing discussions on these issues could undermine the highways reason for refusal in the event an appeal was lodged, if the application was refused

The Panel considered how to proceed. The Head of Planning Services outlined the revisions to the proposed reasons for refusal and on the issue of public notification of revisions to applications, stated the importance of local people and Ward Members being made aware of any alterations to proposals

RESOLVED - That the application be refused for the following reasons:

1 The LPA considers that the release of the site for housing development would be premature, being contrary to policy N34 of the adopted UDP Review (2006) and contrary to Paragraph 85, bullet point 4 of the NPPF. The suitability of the site for housing purposes as part of the future expansion of Collingham needs to be comprehensively reviewed as part of the preparation of the ongoing Site Allocations Plan and Neighbourhood Plan. The location of the site in relation to the village of Collingham means that the proposal does not fulfil the criteria set out in the interim housing delivery policy approved by Leeds City Council's Executive Board on 13th March 2013 to justify early release ahead of the comprehensive assessment of safeguarded land being undertaken in the Site Allocations Plan. It is anticipated that the Site Allocations Plan work will identify which sites will be brought forward for development in the life the Plan together with the infrastructure which will be needed to support sustainable growth, including additional schools provision

and where that would best be located. It is considered that releasing this site in advance of that work would not be justified and would prejudice the comprehensive planning of future growth and infrastructure of the village in a plan-led way

2 The proposal is contrary to the Core Strategy which seeks to concentrate the majority of new development within and adjacent to the main urban area and major settlements. The Site Allocations Plan is the right vehicle to consider the scale and location of new development and supporting infrastructure which should take place in Collingham which is consistent with the size, function and sustainability credentials of a smaller settlement. Furthermore, the Core Strategy states that the 'priority for identifying land for development will be previously developed land, other infill and key locations identified as sustainable extensions' which have not yet been established through the Site Allocations Plan, and the Core Strategy recognises the key role of new and existing infrastructure in delivering future development which has not yet been established through the Site Allocations Plan, e.g. educational and health infrastructure, roads and public transport improvements. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy SP1 of the Core Strategy and SP3 of the UDP Review. In advance of the Site Allocations Plan the proposal represents such a substantial expansion of the existing smaller settlement that it is likely to adversely impact on the sustainability and on character and identity of Collingham, contrary to Policy SP1 of the Core Strategy, SP3 of the UDP Review and guidance on the core planning principles underpinning the planning system as set out in the NPPF

3 The development of this substantial site for residential purposes has poor sustainability credentials and does not meet the minimum accessibility standards as set out in the Core Strategy in terms of the frequency of bus services to give access to employment, secondary education and town/city centres. In the absence of any planned or proposed improvements it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy T2 of the Core Strategy, Policy T2 of the adopted UDP Review (2006) and to the sustainable transport guidance contained in the NPPF and the 12 core planning principles which requires that growth be actively managed to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable

4 The Local Planning Authority considers that the applicant has so far failed to demonstrate that the local highway infrastructure, including the wider network which will be affected by additional traffic as a result of this development, is capable of safely accommodating the proposed development and absorbing pressures placed on it by the increase in traffic, cycle and pedestrian movements which will be brought about by the proposed development. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy T2 of the Core Strategy, Policies GPT5, T2, T2B and T5 of the adopted UDP Review and the sustainable transport guidance contained in the NPPF which combined requires development not to create or materially add to problems of safety on the highway network

5 The Local Planning Authority considers that the development of this site for up to 150 dwellings in the manner proposed as set out within the indicative site layout, would be harmful to and out of character with the adjacent spatial pattern of existing residential development within this part of Collingham, which would result in an overly intensive form of development that would fail to take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. The application also fails to provide information relating to levels and sections and would locate an area of Greenspace within the Green Belt, all of which could be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the design and materials of the proposed bridge over Collingham Beck are not considered to be sympathetic to the rural character of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy P10 of the Core Strategy, Policy N12 of the UDP Review (2006), the guidance contained within the SPG 'Neighbourhoods for Living' and the guidance within the NPPF

6 In the absence of a detailed tree survey and further habitat and ecology surveys, it has not been possible for the LPA to properly consider and assess the effect of the proposed development on existing trees within and adjacent to the site and the potential ecological implications. In the absence of this information it is considered that the proposed development will be harmful to the rural character of the area, contrary to Policy P12 of the Core Strategy, Policies N49 and N51 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and the guidance within the NPPF

7 In the absence of a signed Section 106 agreement the proposed development so far fails to provide necessary contributions for the provision of affordable housing, education, greenspace, public transport, travel planning and off site highway, drainage and flood alleviation works contrary to the requirements of Policies H11, H12, H13 N2, N4, T2, GP5 and GP7 of the adopted UDP Review and related Supplementary Planning Documents and contrary to Policies H5, H8, P7, P9, T2, G4 and ID2 of the Leeds Core Strategy and guidance in the NPPF. The Council anticipates that a Section 106 agreement covering these matters could be provided in the event of an appeal but at present reserves the right to contest these matters should the Section 106 agreement not be completed or cover all the requirements satisfactorily

72 Application 13/03051/OT - Outline application for residential development of up to 325 dwellings, access and associated works including open space and landscaping - land at Spofforth Hill Wetherby

Further to minute 48 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 18th September 2014, where Panel supported in principle an application for residential development of up to 325 dwellings, access and associated works including open space; structural landscaping and the addition of a pelican crossing to Spofforth Hill, subject to further consideration of matters raised at the meeting, the Panel considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer. An exempt appendix which contained financial information was

appended to the main report and a copy of the report which was considered by Panel on 18th September 2014 was also included in the information before Members

Plans were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and outlined the information which had been received in respect of:

- guarantees regarding off-site commuted sum and phasing
- commitment to delivery of the balance of the EASEL 7 site
- affordable housing provision
- proposed changes deleting the right hand turn access to the site
- pepper potting of affordable housing throughout the site
- further discussions with Harrogate Borough Council in respect of an access on land within the Harrogate District to serve the development

Receipt of a further representation was reported which supported the deletion of the right hand turn lane. The Transport Development Services Manager advised that road safety audits had raised the fact there was the potential for accidents without the right turn and having considered this, Highways considered that the right turn lane was desirable but not essential. Members were also informed that if the right hand turn lane was deleted, the Heads of Terms should include setting aside of costs for the provision of the right hand turn lane for up to 3 years post completion, in the event this was required

At this point, having previously resolved to exclude the public, the Panel considered the financial information contained in the exempt appendix in private. To respond to questions and comments from Members, a representative of the District Valuer (DV) was in attendance

The Panel considered the financial viability information, with the main areas of discussion being:

- the delivery of EASEL 7 and the conflicting information which existed about the developer's willingness to commence on the completion of this stalled site
- the viability and profit levels for the EASEL 7 site with and without the cross subsidy from the site at Spofforth Hill
- the legal agreement tying Bellway into the delivery of 83 houses on the EASEL 7 site and the strength of this
- the build out rates for the Spofforth Hill site

Following these discussions the public were readmitted and Members considered the other elements of the report, which included:

- that the scheme could not be supported by Local Members; that this was likely to be a minority view of the Panel and therefore the best outcome for local residents had to be sought
- the extent of tree loss and possible numbers of trees at risk due to the proposals to accommodate a wider footway and whether this was necessary
- the need for clarity from Highways about the deletion of the right hand turn lane. In response to a question from the Panel, the

Transport Development Services Manager stated that a right turn lane was preferred

- the delivery of the greenspace within the S106 agreement. The Chair recommended that a meeting be arranged with relevant parties and Ward Members to discuss this matter
- payments and phasing; the likely build out rates on the Spofforth Hill site and the length of time the local community would need to wait until the planning contributions flowing from the scheme were delivered. The Chair invited a representative from Bellway Homes – the applicant – to advise on build out rates, with Members being informed that the build out rate would be 50 dwellings per annum, with an anticipated start in October 2015. On whether this build out rate applied to the whole city, the applicant's representative stated that in Seacroft, the build out rate would be 40 dwellings per annum, whereas in Wetherby which was a higher value area, the higher build out rate of 50 dwellings per annum would apply
- that the application was premature; concerns about the sustainability of the site and the impact on Wetherby; the car borne nature of the development and the lack of cohesiveness of the scheme, with large, luxury homes being provided on part of the site and lesser homes on the other part
- that the approach taken in this case to the application could not be commended as a way to deal with an application for planning permission
- the length of time the proposals, including the cross subsidy had been discussed; the need for new homes in Leeds and the need to consider the case on its planning merits

The Panel considered how to proceed

Councillor J Procter paid tribute to Adrian Hodgson, Principal Highways Engineer who had given so much of his time to explaining the highway proposals to local residents

In view of concerns about the differences in the DV assessment of viability and that of Bellway Homes, an amendment to the recommendation was made to defer determination of the application until the final agreed position in respect of viability was known. Members voted on this amendment but it did not receive majority support

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate); the width of the footpath to be 1.7m; discussions with Ward Members about the greenspace provision and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to cover the following:

- affordable housing at 15% (49 dwellings – phased delivery) on site, to be pepper-potted around the site in 5 clusters of between 8 and 10 properties and a commuted sum in lieu of the remaining 20% (around £8.5m in current values but to be index linked)
- commitment to deliver EASEL 7 (83 dwellings) – 20 units delivered at EASEL for every 50 delivered at Spofforth Hill)

- public transport contribution at £1,226 per dwelling and index linked
- off-site highways mitigation contribution of £1,226 per dwelling and index linked
- provision of a right turn lane (with the land safeguarded), in the event that it is needed
- education contribution of £2,972 per dwelling and index linked
- greenspace contribution (the current layout results in an indicative contribution of £324,876.82 and index linked)
- travel plan measures and monitoring fee of £5,125 and index linked
- bus stop and metro card provision
- car club contribution
- local employment and training initiatives during the construction of the development
- public access to public open space

In the circumstances where the Section 106 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

73 Application 14/03263/FU - Retrospective application for a temporary use as residential site for gypsies and travellers with 10 pitches for 12 months - Land off West Side of Kidacre Street Hunslet LS10

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

Officers presented the report which sought retrospective approval for the use of land at Kidacre Street as a residential site for gypsies and travellers, comprising 10 pitches for temporary use for a period of 12 months

Members discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- the level of facilities on site and that even on a temporary site, better facilities should be provided. The Deputy Area Planning Manager advised that the level of investment provided had to be balanced against the length of stay on the site
- the proximity of the gasworks to the pitches. Members were informed that the proposals were acceptable to the Health and Safety Executive and that the pitches were located in the middle zone of the site
- the complaints received from a nearby business and the management of the site

At this point, Councillor P Gruen brought to the Panel's attention that as Executive Board Member for Neighbourhoods, Planning and Personnel, he was aware of the issues involved in the provision of suitable sites

- the need to make provision for gypsies and travellers; the time spent on finding a suitable site and the reassurances which

have been built into the proposals in respect of a behaviour policy and rigorous management

- the length of time taken for this site to come forward
- the possibility of extending the timescale for the permission. The Chief Planning Officer stated that a longer period of time for the grant of the application would provide a justification for improving the ablution facilities on the site and although there would be a need to look at wider transport considerations in respect of HS2 and HS3, it was unlikely that a new railway would be delivered before 2030. Members were informed that if Panel was minded to support the application and extend the timescale, there would be a need to reconsult on the proposals
- that the site fully complied with policy H7 and was small in size at 10 pitches
- the need to look again at sites which could be available for gypsy and traveller site use
- the need for additional screening to the site and in the event the timescale for use was extended, that consideration should be given to extending the rent-free period for the School of Motoring
- that suitable small sites were preferable to larger encampments
- the need to reinforce the agreement in respect of behaviour and for residents to understand the consequences of any breach of the behaviour agreement
- the need for twice weekly visits to the site by Gypsy and Traveller Services LCC to continue even if a permission was extended

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate approval for a period of 3 years to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and an improvement to the ablution facilities to be provided . To note Members' comments about the enforcement of the behaviour agreement and management of the site and in the event of new issues being raised in the further consultation, that the application be returned to Panel for determination

74 Application 14/04641/FU - Mixed use multi level development comprising the erection of 4 new buildings with 744 residential apartments, 713 sqm of flexible commercial floorspace (A1-A5, B1, D1, D2 use classes) car parking, landscaping and public amenity space - Sweet Street and Manor Road Holbeck LS11 - Position Statement

Further to minute 198 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 5th June 2014, where Panel considered pre-application proposals for a residential-led mixed use development at Sweet Street, to consider a further report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the current position in respect of the proposals. An exempt supplementary report which provided financial viability information had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting

Plans, drawings, photographs, graphics and sample materials were displayed at the meeting. It was noted that following the pre-application

presentation in June 2014, Members had visited two residential schemes built by the applicant in Salford and Manchester

Officers presented the report and informed Members that revisions to the scheme had been made, with the 13 storey building being reduced to 11 storeys in height and the 12 storey block now being proposed to be sited opposite The Mint building. The lower buildings would be sited to the south of the public realm to maximise sunlight in these areas, with the taller blocks around the other edges of the public space

In terms of unit sizes, Members were informed these were as had been viewed in Manchester and Salford; the number of studios within the scheme had been reduced and the amount of 3 bed units had been increased from 5 to 10

The proposed materials would be brickwork, concrete, acid-etched screening and bronzed balcony railings

At this point, having previously resolved to exempt the public the Panel considered the financial information contained in the exempt supplementary report, in private. A representative of the District Valuer was in attendance to respond to Members' queries and comments

The main issues discussed in respect of the exempt information included:

- the reasons why the development was unviable
- the nature of the development, in that following construction it would be sold to a single investor and the units subsequently leased, so generating profit
- that details of who purchased the land should be provided
- the approach taken by the DV to financial viability assessments, and concerns that this varied across the 3 plans panels. The Chief Planning Officer stated that training by the DV would be arranged for Members of Plans Panels
- that developing the site for residential use would ease pressure on greenfield sites
- the differences between developing to level 3 or level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and the need for better explanations to be provided in reports. However, Level 4 should be the objective in accordance with the Leeds Standard
- that the proposals would not ease the pressure on accommodation for existing residents within the City and Hunslet Ward
- the need for high quality to be provided on a scheme in this location which would ensure the desirability of the units, but not at a cost to the Council in terms of reduced S106 contributions
- the extent of what could be taken into account when considering financial viability
- the need for figures to be provided on the value of the development when built and when fully let

Following consideration of the exempt information, the public were

readmitted to the meeting, with Panel proceeding to discuss other elements of the scheme, which included:

- the level of car parking being proposed and the need to demonstrate that sufficient car parking was being provided
- cycle parking and the need for secure cycle spaces to be provided
- whether a wind analysis had been undertaken. Members were informed that a wind study had been submitted which had been independently assessed and declared sound
- the design of the balconies and that glass balconies as seen in Manchester should be provided
- the need for improvements to the public amenity space and for the balconies to be of sufficient proportions to ensure they could be well used. The possibility of incorporating sliding panels was suggested which could help in increasing the usability of the balconies
- concern about the use of concrete and that the finish of the scheme was ordinary and uninspired
- the need for electric vehicle charging points to be included
- the need for the liveability of the scheme to be considered; the increase in renting rather than home ownership and that facilities were required to support this, in terms of provision of recreation and education facilities in the City Centre

In response to the specific questions raised in the report, the following responses were provided:

- agreement that the proposed predominantly residential scheme was appropriate for this City Centre brownfield site
- regarding the proposed mix of flat units, to note the mixed views on this, although the majority view was the mix and size are appropriate
- that further work was required on the general siting of the buildings, provision of landscaping and public realm and provision of active street frontages
- in respect of the revised height of the buildings and revised distribution of building heights around the scheme, in general this was considered to be acceptable but there were concerns about the lower blocks in the middle of the site; the amount of amenity space which would be available and the extent of shadowing to the POS, as seen on the sun path diagram displayed at the meeting
- that the proposed design and architectural treatment and materials were not acceptable
- that further information was required to convince Members that the proposal would give appropriate space between buildings and not have significantly adverse effects on the amenities of neighbouring properties
- that Members were unsure on the information provided that the development would provide accommodation of an appropriate size, outlook and sufficient natural light

- that further information was needed on the financial viability appraisal
- that further details were required about parking to justify the low level of car parking proposed in the scheme

The Chief Planning Officer accepted the amount of work required to bring this scheme forward but stated that if the applicant worked with the Council, a successful scheme on the site could be envisaged

RESOLVED – To note the report and the comments now made

During consideration of this matter, Councillor R Procter and Councillor D Blackburn left the meeting

75 Pre-app/14/00731 - Pre-application presentation of proposals for 26 Clear Channel 6 sheet advertisement units - Various sites across the City Centre

Prior to consideration of this matter, Councillor J Procter left the meeting

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit to some of the proposed locations around the City Centre had taken place earlier in the day

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on the emerging proposals for the development of a Leeds City Council Advertisement Portfolio in partnership with Clear Channel UK Ltd and received a presentation from a representative of the company

Members were informed that originally 40 sites around the City Centre had been proposed for the location of the advertisements, with this being scaled down to 26. These would be digital displays

Clear Channel UK Ltd was an experienced national company with a presence in Leeds since the late 1960s. The contract between the company and the Council was based on providing revenue to the Council

A design engineer had been employed, who had successfully produced the wayfinding scheme around the City Centre

The siting of the units had been considered carefully with regard being given to highways safety and pedestrian flows as well as the location of the displays in relation to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. To avoid impacting on pedestrian flow, where possible, the units would be sited in line with existing street furniture

Images of each site with an indicated siting of the display unit were shown to the Panel

Members discussed the proposal and commented on the following matters:

- the size of the units, whether these could be varied and their proximity to existing street furniture which increased the cluttered effect already seen on some City Centre streets
- the need to understand the benefits of the scheme to the Council
- the need for photomontages of each site showing the display unit in situ, to enable the Panel to better understand the proposals

- the length of time the units would remain part of the street scene, with the Clear Channel representative stating that 10 years was the standard length of time for such an investment, although 15 – 20 years was not uncommon
- the content of the advertisements, particularly in the context of Leeds being a child-friendly city. The Chief Planning Officer stated that in planning terms it was not possible to influence the content of images; that would be a matter to be dealt with in the contract. Members were informed that advertisements would be sold in packages across the country, so the same advertisement would not appear on each site. Furthermore there was the opportunity to use the displays to provide public information/emergency information, with details of a missing child being displayed on such units recently in Edinburgh
- concerns about specific locations which were proposed, including outside Dyson's Chambers; Sovereign Street and along The Headrow, where several units would be visible together and the need for each site to be evaluated

In response to the specific questions raised in the report, the Panel provided the following responses:

- that Members required further information on the proposals before they could be satisfied they were acceptable and appropriate for these locations, with concerns being raised that 26 displays around the City Centre were too many
- that further work was required in respect of the impact of the units on highways safety
- that any subsequent planning applications for the advertisement units should be brought to Panel for determination together with the additional information requested

76 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday 20th November 2014 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds