

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 22ND JANUARY, 2015

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

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

102 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first City Plans Panel of 2015 and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

The Chair introduced Tim Hill, the new Chief Planning Officer who would take over following Phil Crabtree's imminent retirement

103 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED - That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following part 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 appendix to the main report referred to in minute 111 under Schedule 12 Local Government Act 1972 and the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs 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

104 Late Items

Although there were no formal late items, the Panel was in receipt of supplementary information on the position statement concerning proposed advertising sites around the city (minute 113 refers). The information had been circulated to Panel prior to the meeting and published on the Council's website

Concerns were raised about the level of additional information provided to Members directly from applicants, with a legal view on this being requested

The Head of Development and Regulatory stated that it was not good practice for developers and third parties to contact the Panel and that as the

additional information sent directly by applicants and developers had not been considered by Officers, Members were advised to disregard that information

105 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest, however Councillor Leadley brought to the Panel's attention in respect of application 12/02470/OT – Land between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue and Nepshaw Lane North – that he was the Chair of Morley Town Council Planning Committee which had commented on this and all previous applications on the site (minute 108 refers)

106 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 11th December 2014 be approved

107 S106 Agreements

The Chief Planning Officer advised that a number of the reports being considered at the meeting referred to S106 Agreements and their completion within 3 months. As Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) came into effect on 6th April 2015, the timetable for dealing with outstanding S106 Agreements needed to be revised, with the wording to be 'completed by 2nd April 2015'

108 Application 12/02470/OT - Outline application for proposed employment development for use classes B1 (B) Research and Development (B1(C), Light Industrial uses B2, General Industrial uses and B8 Storage and Distribution uses - Land between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue and Nepshaw Lane North Gildersome

Further to minute 95 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 11th December 2014, where Panel deferred determination of an outline application for proposed employment development on a site designated for employment use by the UDP Inspector, for additional information, the Panel considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer. Appended to the report was a copy of the report presented in December 2014. It was noted that Members had visited the site prior to their consideration of the application on 11th December 2014

Plans, graphics and photographs were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which responded to the issues raised by Panel at its previous meeting and outlined the conditions which were proposed to address matters such as phasing, quantum of development and the access arrangements

Additional landscaping was now proposed to the residential dwellings at Belle Vue Terrace, together with the provision of an acoustic fence.

Minutes approved at the meeting
held on 12th February 2015

Planting details were also outlined for Nepshaw Lane North, with the minimum height of the proposed planting to be 10m. Members were informed that an 8m wide verge was proposed which could accommodate additional planting, with this being considered at Reserved Matters stage

In terms of the impact of the proposals on residents at Belle Vue Terrace, together with the additional planting proposed and the repositioning of the units as shown on the illustrative Master Plan, the adjoining unit would be restricted to B1 use only, with Officers of the view the proposals now represented an improvement in respect of the residents' amenity

Concerning the access arrangements and the view that this should be from Nepshaw Lane, whilst this suggestion had been put forward, the applicant required the access arrangements to be considered as set out in the application. An additional highways condition had been included which related to the level of passenger car units for the different industrial uses proposed, with this providing flexibility of use whilst at the same time capping what could be built

Reference was made to discussions by Development Plan Panel in respect of site allocations, at the meeting held on 13th January 2015, where it was noted that some Members wished to see housing on all or part of the site. Members were informed that employment use for the site was proposed but subject to the developer proceeding with this application and that in the event the scheme did not proceed, further consideration be given to the proposed allocation of this site

The receipt of additional representations was reported, with one further objection from Morley Town Council being read out and nine further representations being referred to

One issue which had arisen was in relation to a Right of Way (ROW), with representations being made that the proposed buffer at Belle Vue Terrace would encroach on this. Members were advised that Officers considered the ROW did not encroach on the application site but that if evidence was provided to contradict that view, the scheme could be reworked at RM stage to preserve the buffer

The Panel heard representations from a Gildersome Parish Councillor who outlined concerns about the proposals which included:

- impact of the proposals on Gildersome
- access arrangements and concerns about the safety of the proposed access from Asquith Avenue
- the need for the site to be developed for employment use in view of other empty brownfield sites in the area
- impact on the geography of the area
- effectiveness of the proposed landscape mitigation measures
- accuracy of the travel figures presented
- issues of sustainability

Prior to hearing from the applicant's representative, the Chair advised that the additional information which had been sent directly to Panel Members from the applicant would be disregarded in light of advice given by Legal Services at the start of the meeting (minute 104 refers)

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel and provided information which included:

- the conditions which were proposed would control the amount of development and the traffic generation from the proposals
- the revisions proposed regarding improved landscaping and an extended buffer to the nearby residential dwellings
- the importance of the site as an employment site in the Site Allocations Process
- the job creation the scheme would provide

The Panel discussed the application, with the main issues relating to:

- the impact of the scheme on the residents at Belle Vue Terrace
- the sum proposed for flood alleviation works and that this should be index-linked

The Chief Planning Officer advised that condition no. 4 should refer specifically to the masterplan; that service access to Unit 5 needed to be secured so that it was not directly next to the residential properties; that the distance of the 15m buffer should be increased and that the resulting amendments to the submitted plan should be conditioned

The Panel continued to discuss the application with concerns being raised that the applicant should be asked to evidence the financial issues in respect of providing the access from Nepshaw Lane over third party land

The Panel considered how to proceed

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, with an amendment to condition no 4 to specify 'in accordance with the masterplan' (and any other conditions which he might consider appropriate); the submission of a revised plan for an improved relationship to the properties at Belle Vue Terrace and the units to the south east of the dwellings and the completion of a S106 agreement to cover the following:

- travel plan – including monitoring fee
- highway and transport mitigation measures – to include:

Weight limit restrictions through Gildersome, including Branch End, Town Street, College Road and Street Lane to be in place before first occupation of the development

Improvements to the junction of Victoria Road/Asquith Avenue/Bruntcliffe Lane/Brunswick Street to be completed before first occupation of the development

Traffic management works on Asquith Avenue from Victoria Road to the M621 motorway bridge

Neptshaw Lane North resurfacing (c£20,000)

£60,000 towards improvement of two existing bus shelters on Asquith Avenue and one shelter on Gelderd Road

- woodland management plan – for woodland management within the applicant's ownership
- public transport contribution also required to comply with up-to-date SPD guidance. The sum is under negotiation but is calculated at £316,000 (£20,000 of this to provide enhanced bus stop facilities)

- drainage - £300,000 (index-linked) contribution towards off site flood alleviation works and drainage works to Gildersome tunnel. The £300,000 includes £50,000 towards a study of possible schemes in Farnley Wood Beck/Dean Beck, plus £250,000 towards a major scheme to address flooding in the catchment as follows, as required by the study:

Flood doors at Old Close (£70k); maintenance of the channels and grilles downstream of the Treefield site to just below Old Close, Churwell (£1k/ annum - £30k) and storage of storm flows in 2 potential locations (£75k each – total £150k)

- provision for local training and employment initiatives

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed before 2nd April 2015, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

Following this resolution, a further discussion took place regarding S106 agreements and the introduction of CIL, with Members being informed that if a S106 was not signed by 2nd April 2015, from 6th April 2015 the application would become CIL liable, with some of the contributions falling away to CIL. The Head of Planning Services suggested that this matter be considered in greater detail at the next Joint Plans Panel

109 Application 14/04340/OT - Outline application for residential development including means of access - Field at Ridge Meadows, Northgate Lane/Tibgarth Linton Wetherby LS22

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

Officers presented the report which related to an outline application for residential development on a Protected Area of Search (PAS) site in Linton

Members were informed that the masterplan which accompanied the application indicated ten large houses in large plots. It was noted that Linton was a relatively unsustainable village with few facilities and limited linkages to the nearest centre - Wetherby

The proposals would see the loss of some trees and vegetation and Officers had concerns about the heavily engineered access into the site due to the topography of the land

Having considered the application, Officers were of the view that it should be refused, with the main issues being outlined to Panel, as set out in the suggested reasons for refusal within the submitted report

The receipt of an additional letter of representation was reported

Members discussed the application, with the main issues raised relating to:

- the topography of the site
- the need to consider protecting the trees on and around the site through TPOs

- that the application was not policy compliant and was premature

RESOLVED – That the Chief Planning Officer be asked to pursue TPO applications on the trees on and around the site and that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1 The Local Planning Authority considers that the release of the site for housing development would be premature, being contrary to saved policy N34 of the UDP 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 Linton needs to be comprehensively reviewed as part of the preparation of the ongoing Site Allocations Plan and Neighbourhood Plan. The location and scale of the site in relation to the village of Linton 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 of 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 Linton which is consistent with the size, function and sustainability credentials of a village. 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. In advance of the Site Allocations Plan, the proposal represents such an expansion of the village that it is likely to adversely impact on the sustainability of Linton, contrary to Policy SP1 of the Core Strategy and guidance on the core planning principles underpinning the planning system as set out in the NPPF

- 3 The development of this site for residential purposes has poor sustainability credentials, represents an inefficient use of land and does not meet the minimum accessibility standards 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. As such it is contrary to Policy H3 of the Core Strategy. Also, in the absence of any planned or proposed improvements it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy T2 of the Core Strategy and to the sustainable transport guidance contained in the NPPF and the 12 core planning principles which require 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 sensitive
- 4 The Local Planning Authority considers that the development of this site for up to 10 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 Linton, that would result in overly dispersed form of development that fails to take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. The application also fails to provide an appropriate Design Code which would ensure that the development had an coherent character which responded well to its immediate context and the wider character of Linton Village and the adjacent conservation area. The Local Planning Authority also considers that, in the absence of an agreed design for the access road, the development would be contrary to the landscaped character of the wider area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies P10, P11 and P12 of the Core Strategy, the guidance contained within the SPG 'Neighbourhoods for Living' and the guidance within the NPPF
- 5 In the absence of a detailed topographical survey, levels information, arboricultural impact assessment and further habitat and ecology surveys, it had not been possible for the Local Planning Authority 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 would cause harm to protected species and the arboricultural and ecological amenities of the site, as well as the wider landscape character, contrary to Policy G8 and P12 of the Core Strategy and the guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework
- 6 In the absence of a signed Section 106 agreement, the proposed development so far fails to provide necessary on-site affordable housing, Greenspace and the offered public transport

(Metro Cards), contrary to the requirements of Policies H5, 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

110 Applications 14/05481/OT/14/05483/FU and 14/05484/COND - Land between Barrowby Lane and Manston Lane Thorpe Park LS15

Further to minute 86 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 20th November 2014, where Panel received a position statement on proposals for a residential and mixed use development at Thorpe Park, the Panel considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer on the formal applications. It was noted that application 14/05481/OT was for determination and not for consideration as a position statement as set out in error on the report before Panel. Members were also informed that application 14/05484/COND had been withdrawn as this was not now required as the matter would be addressed by a specific condition linking the two applications

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Reference was made to the Members site visit to a residential development in York which had taken place in late December, which had proved useful, with both positive and negative aspects of that scheme being noted

Details of the revised S106 agreement were outlined, to reflect the housing element of the scheme now being proposed

An omission at paragraph 2.4 of the submitted report was corrected, with Members being informed that a transport assessment had been submitted and assessed. On condition no. 5, the application reference should read 14/05483/FU and if minded to approve the proposals, an additional condition was proposed on the outline application to cover details of the drainage pond and provision of updated surveys

The Panel heard representations on behalf of an objector who outlined concerns which included:

- the timescale for the necessary works, particularly in view of the application needing to be referred to the Secretary of State as a departure from the Development Plan
- the proposed housing on the site
- the trigger mechanisms
- the existence of coal on the site; the possible extraction of this and the lack of consultation with the local community on this and that the application was ultra vires and could prompt a judicial review
- the drainage ponds and the depths of these leading to safety concerns

- the part of the site allocated for a supermarket, with concerns that due to the changing nature of this retail sector, further housing could be introduced into the scheme

The Panel then heard representations on behalf of the applicant, with information provided about the proposals, which included:

- the procedure needing to be followed as the application was a departure from the Development Plan
- the bridge agreement with Network Rail and that the applicant was close to securing an agreement which would provide an additional 3 years for this work to be undertaken
- that information had been provided about the ponds and how they would be managed
- the introduction of housing into the site and the delivery of the MLLR
- that a sign off of 2017 was still being worked towards and that consideration could be given to including a timetable for the works in the S106 agreement, subject to further discussions with Officers and Legal representatives, in order ease local concerns about the development

The Panel discussed the applications and commented on the following matters:

- an issue raised by the objector regarding the legality of the application. The Panel's legal representative stated this related to the extraction of coal and that the application was considered to be lawful
- the lessons learned from the site visit to the Derwenthorpe development in York. Members were informed that the design of the scheme at Thorpe Park was of a better quality and that the Leeds Standard would be used to set the minimum standards and guide the process. It was also stated that the residential element of the scheme would not be the usual volume house builders development
- the delivery of the MLLR and the need for a fixed date for this to be provided
- education provision and the need for reports to make reference to school provision where this was an issue. The Chief Planning Officer advised that the long-term position in respect of education provision was being protected through the site allocations process and that in the short-term, there was scope for temporary expansion
- detailed design issues of the layout, with Members being informed these matters would be dealt with as part of the Reserved Matters application
- the need for sufficient parking to be provided to avoid on-street parking
- an acceptance that a large scale office park on the site in the current market would not be feasible and that the proposed mixed use, including housing was a sensible use of the site and

the inclusion of an additional condition linking the two applications

The Panel considered how to proceed

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate approve to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to referral of the two planning applications to the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government as departures from the Statutory Development Plan, and for consultation under the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009, and in respect of 14/05481/OT, subject to conditions to cover those matters outlined in the submitted report, additional conditions in respect of the drainage ponds and provision of updated surveys (and any other conditions which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a S106 agreement to cover the matters set out in the submitted report (and consequential variations of the existing S106 agreement in respect of application 12/03886/OT, to reflect the introduction of housing, amended MLLR layout and amended trigger points) To also delegate to the Chief Planning Officer any changes required to conditions of application 14/05483/FU to bring it in to line with the current proposal and circumstances and referral of application 14/05483/FU to the Secretary of State as a departure

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed before 2nd April 2015, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

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

Prior to considering this matter, Councillor Lewis left the meeting

Further to minute 74 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 30th October 2014, where Panel considered a position statement on an application for a residential-led mixed use development at Sweet Street/Manor Road Holbeck, the Panel considered a further report setting out the formal application

Accompanying the report was an appendix which contained exempt information and which was considered in private

Plans, photographs, graphics, a model of the proposed development and sample materials were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report which sought the redevelopment of a large brownfield site at the edge of Holbeck Urban Village

Details of the buildings; the landscaping; public and private amenity areas and proposed materials were outlined to Panel. A sun path diagram of the public space at different times of the day and year was shown, with Members being informed that most of the public realm would be in sun at lunchtime

Minutes approved at the meeting
held on 12th February 2015

The apartment sizes of the 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings were broadly in line with the Leeds Standard, although the studios were smaller, at approximately 29 sqm in gross internal area

The Panel heard representations from a representative of adjacent residents who attended the meeting and outlined concerns, which included:

- the level of car parking proposed – 263 parking spaces for 744 apartments
- the proximity of the Manor Road frontage to the neighbouring building
- that detailed design issues needed further consideration
- that low cost housing should be provided

The Panel then heard from the applicant's agent. Prior to her submission to Panel, the Chair reminded her that in line with the legal advice provided on additional information sent directly to Panel Members, (minute 104 refers) the additional information which had been sent in respect of this application would be disregarded

The applicant's agent addressed the Panel and provided information which included:

- the scheme was an improvement on the previously consented scheme for the site
- that it complied with policy
- that high quality accommodation in a variety of apartment sizes would be provided
- that additional family accommodation had now been included
- the site was in a highly sustainable location, well served by public transport and that the parking levels reflected this fact
- that key worker units would be provided through the scheme, either on or off-site

The Chair then asked the public who were in attendance to withdraw from the meeting to enable the Panel to consider information of a commercially sensitive nature

Councillor R Procter left the meeting at this point

A representative of the District Valuer was in attendance and explained the financial viability assessment he had carried out on the scheme and responded to questions and comments from the Panel. It was noted that the model proposed was for the development to be sold to a single investor on completion and the units then leased

Concerns were expressed that the development would only meet level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, when the Council's policy was for level 4 to be met, with mixed views on this as a determining factor in granting planning permission when considered against specific energy/heat and sound performance matters

In view of the time limited nature of the information in the viability assessment (due to potential changes in economic and market conditions), if minded to approve the application, the Deputy Area Planning Manager proposed a shorter timescale for the grant of planning permission than the normal 3 years. Members were informed that the applicant had requested a

period of 18 months, however it was the view of Panel that a 12 month planning consent was appropriate in this case

Following consideration of the exempt information, the public were readmitted to the meeting, with the Panel proceeding to discuss the scheme, with the key issues relating to:

- viability issues
- detailed design issues, the extent of exposed concrete; how the concrete would weather; the balcony treatment and that the intended railings were reminiscent of 1960s Local Authority flats; the size of the balconies, with concerns these were not large enough to make use of; the uninspiring design overall and that the City Centre should benefit from the best treatments and standards in terms of development.
- the need for the deletion of exposed concrete from the scheme; that a more sculptural form be considered for the buildings and that a more interesting and natural palette of materials be pursued
- the possibility of Housing Leeds managing the units which were available for low cost rent. The Chair allowed the applicant's agent to respond to this point, with Members being informed that all of the units would be managed by the same organisation but that Housing Leeds could nominate people for the low cost flat units
- concerns about the level of the S106 contributions being offered in terms of affordable housing provision
- proposed parking levels. The Transport Development Services Manager informed Members that the general parking policy for the City Centre was to try to reduce car ownership and that having considered the census data in the City and Hunslet Ward, this showed car ownership of 40%, with the level of parking proposed being just under that figure. The site was located in a controlled parking area; was in a highly sustainable location and there were measures and funding to work with the Travel Plan Co-ordinator
- the view that the building as proposed was not acceptable; was in the wrong location and had insufficient parking

The Panel considered how to proceed

RESOLVED - To defer determination of the application for one cycle to enable further negotiations between Officers and the applicant in terms of design; the viability issues and the low cost market flats offer within the S106 agreement

Following consideration of this matter, Councillor C Gruen and Councillor P Gruen left the meeting

112 Application 14/06534/OT - Outline application for mixed use redevelopment including A1, A3 and A5 uses , offices B1, residential C3, medical centre D1, college D1, student residential accommodation, multi

Minutes approved at the meeting
held on 12th February 2015

storey car park, basement parking, access and open space - Land at Quarry Hill St Peters Street LS2 - Position Statement

Plans, photographs, including a historic image of Quarry Hill Flats, and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the current position in respect of a major mixed use development at Quarry Hill which comprised 6 buildings around a centralised pedestrian route. It was noted that a previous outline application for the central part of the Quarry Hill site was approved in principle by City Plans Panel in 2005 but as the S106 agreement was not signed, the application was never approved

Details of the mix of uses were provided. Members were informed that a flexible approach was being sought in terms of two of the buildings for office use/education use/student accommodation, depending upon the market conditions prevailing at the time of construction

Matters of scale, layout and public realm were also outlined to Panel

Members discussed the proposals, with the main issues raised being:

- the importance of understanding the surrounding context including extant planning permissions and for the development to link into Victoria Gate at the bottom of Eastgate
- the courtyards and the amount of sunlight these would receive and that rooftop gardens might be more appropriate in this location
- the possibility of a fully accessible, ramped route being incorporated into the main pedestrian east-west route proposed through the site
- the need for good design in terms of the pedestrian access arrangements and for improved linkages to the rest of the City Centre
- to bear in mind the proximity of the District Heating system and that it could be linked to the proposed development
- car parking arrangements and the need to ensure sufficient car parking remains on site through the construction process, to serve the West Yorkshire Playhouse

In respect of the specific point raised in the report, the following comments were provided by Members

- that Members were happy with the approach being adopted in relation to determining the mix and size of residential flats at reserved matters stage and that the housing need would be assessed closer to the point of likely construction
- on student housing provision, concerns were raised that the site was some distance from the main higher education establishments, although it was accepted that the College of Music was close by. Some concerns were raised about the mix of student accommodation and residential on the same site, with the Deputy Area Planning Manager suggesting any concerns about this be addressed by not siting these two types of accommodation in the same building

- that the range of city centre uses proposed were acceptable on the site, including the proposed flexible uses for two of the buildings
- that the footprints of the buildings, including the readjustment to the building corners at the western end of the site were acceptable
- that the heights of the buildings proposed were acceptable to a point, although there were concerns about the impact of high buildings on the amount of shadowing this would cause in the courtyards
- that the amount of open space on the site was acceptable
- that as development commences, there was a need for a strategy for the phasing and layout of open space and routes to ensure the site could be properly accessed as the development progresses. On this matter, the Panel insisted that the car parking which would be lost to the development would be re-provided before the development commenced

RESOLVED - To note the report and the comments now made

During consideration of this matter, Councillor Hamilton left the meeting

113 Various locations across the City Centre - J C Decaux UK Ltd - Position Statement

Prior to consideration of this matter, Councillor Latty left the meeting

Further to minute 25 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 17th July 2014, where Panel considered a pre-application presentation on proposals for advertisement consent for 11 applications, 10 of which were large scale illuminated advertisement hoardings and 1 digital advertisement unit at sites located within or close to the City Centre boundary, mainly along the main arterial routes in and out of the city, Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on the current position in respect of these proposals. A supplementary report providing updated information on the individual applications which had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting was also considered

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

The Deputy Area Planning Manager presented the proposals and informed the Panel that the Council had entered into a contract with JC Decaux to evolve the Council's existing advertising portfolio. The proposals would see 22 existing hoardings at 10 sites being removed and 11 new advertisement units being provided

The Panel considered and commented on each application

To assist Members in understanding the background to the proposals, the Chief Planning Officer stated that the income generated from the proposals would help fund other Council services and that as a planning authority, issues relating to public safety and visual amenity needed to be considered

Although a number of the proposals were considered to be acceptable in principle, concerns were raised in respect of some sites, which included siting; highways concerns, particularly in relation to servicing; possible distraction to drivers due to the size of the units and their location

It was noted that Highways Officers had concerns about some of the applications and that further information was required on several of the sites

In respect of the specific matters raised in the report, the following comments were provided:

- that Members were satisfied that the visual impact from the proposals were acceptable for several of the locations, but concerns remained about particular sites
- that in light of concerns raised by Highways Officers that further detail on road safety measures and servicing assessments were required to support the applications

In particular, Members had concerns with the following sites:

- 14/06617/ADV – adjacent to the Woodhouse Lane multi-storey car park – the display was considered too dominant in its impact and would create a traffic hazard. This was not supported
- 14/06618/ADV – Sheepscar Junction – the sign was too dominant and would add to the street clutter and there was a need to address these concerns and to resolve highway concerns
- 14/06621/ADV – Crown Point Road – there was a need to reconsider the design and exact location and that siting this to the east would be an improvement
- 14/06626/ADV – Kirkstall Road – concern this could impact on drivers exiting the West Street car park and could conflict with highway signs. It was recommended that the sign be relocated further to the right when viewed from the west

RESOLVED - To note the report, the supplementary information, the Officer presentation and comments and views of Panel and that the following applications be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for determination, subject to resolving detailed highway safety matters:

14/06627/ADV – Victoria Road
14/06625/ADV – Claypit Lane bridge
14/06624/ADV – Meadow Lane
14/06623/ADV – Inner Ring Road/Woodhouse Lane
14/06622/ADV – Hunslet Road
14/06620/ADV – near Domestic Road
14/06619/ADV – Wellington Road

and that the following site proposals be brought back to Panel for determination:

14/06617/ADV; 14/06618/ADV; 14/06621/ADV and 14/06626/ADV

During consideration of this matter, Councillor Ingham and Councillor Leadley left the meeting

Minutes approved at the meeting
held on 12th February 2015

114 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday 29th January 2015 at 1.00pm