CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 21ST JANUARY, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, R Procter,
D Blackburn, S Hamilton, G Latty,
T Leadley, M Ingham, A Khan, K Ritchie,
E Taylor, B Selby and B Cleasby

86 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

87 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

88 Late Items

There was one late item submitted to the agenda for consideration. Agenda Item 8 "Position Statement for residential development of 503 houses, conversion of a former hospital administration block, demolition of the former Villa building, associated infrastructure, including two new vehicle access points to A64, public open space and retention of Clock Tower(APP. REF. 15/07300/FU)" Minute No. 94 refers.

89 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

No declarations were made.

90 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Campbell (Cllr Cleasby in attendance as substitute) and Councillor Walshaw (Cllr Selby in attendance as substitute).

91 Minutes - 17th December 2015

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 17th December 2015 be approved as a correct record subject to the amendment to below:

Minute 82 "Application 15/06583/OT Land between Barrowby Lane and Manston Lane, Thorpe Park, LS15"

To insert: "The outstanding sequential / impact assessment information had been provided and assessed and was considered acceptable"

To remove from Resolution (1): "Satisfactory outcome regarding consideration of the additional sequential/impact assessment information."

92 Matters Arising From the Minutes

Minute No. 81 Matters Arising From The Minutes

The Head of Planning Services reported to the Panel that a response from Miller Homes had been received following the Council's approach to work constructively with them. The letter of 23rd December 2015 highlighted that Miller Homes were not willing to withdraw their appeals but wanted to work co-operatively with the Council. The Panel confirmed that the Council would defend its position.

RESOLVED – That all Plans Panel Members receive a copy of the letter from Miller Homes.

Minute No. 84 PREAPP/1500757 Central Arcade LS1

Members wished to make it known to the developer that they felt the entrance to the Central Arcade would benefit from alterations and improvements to its appearance.

RESOLVED – That officers make contact with the developer to convey the Panel's views about the appearance of the entrance to the Central Arcade.

93 OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR MIXED USE REDEVELOPMENT INCLUDING A1,A3, A4 and A5 USES, OFFICES (B1), RESIDENTIAL (C3), MEDICAL CENTRE (D1), COLLEGE (D1), STUDENT RESIDENTIAL ACCOMODATION, MULTI-STOREY CAR PARK, BASEMENT CAR PARKING, ACCESS AND OPEN SPACE ON LAND AT QUARRY HILL (APP. REF. 14/06534/OT)

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out an application for mixed use redevelopment including A1, A3, A4 and A5 Uses, Offices (B1), Residential (C3), Medical Centre (D1), College (D1), Student Residential Accommodation, multi-storey car park, basement car parking, access and open space on land at Quarry Hill.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

Representatives from Caddick addressed the Panel in relation to the application and highlighted the following issues:

- That Caddick have been responsible for many high quality developments that have been completed in other cities across the UK and that the company intended to create something special at Quarry Hill;
- The importance of getting a planning consent in order to progress the scheme;
- That the development was large scale and would take place over 6 phases, the phasing plan yet to be confirmed. It was noted that this plan was flexible;

- The central pedestrianized route would be maintained and be a feature of the development;
- The car parking provision for each of the buildings was explained to Members and it was confirmed that underground parking would form part of the development. There would also be a maximisation of surface parking on the site;
- There was an agreement in place with Caddick and Leeds City Council for a multi storey car park to be built. However this would not be built unless it was established that it was viable to do so;
- Contact had been made with educational establishments about possibly using part of the development. Furthermore discussions had also taken place with a student housing operator for one of the plots; and
- That Caddick were committed to deliver this project and that the development would be a positive one for the City.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following was discussed:

- Details of how the viability would be assessed for the construction of the multi-storey car park and the likelihood of finding an operator to run it;
- The options for what could be developed if it was found that there was no demand to build a multi-storey carpark. It was confirmed that Planning Permission would have to sought for any development should the multi-storey car park not be built. However it was expected that there would be sufficient demand for parking to build the multi-storey car park;
- The parking provision for residential parts of the development. It was confirmed that there would be parking provision in place but that not all residential units would be allocated a space. Parking spaces would be optional to either buy or rent.
- The importance of bringing forward the site in a coherent and timely manner following the strategic master plan that had been presented;
- The A64 footbridge and the possibility of improving it to allow for good pedestrian and cycle access. It was confirmed to Members that Caddick were under obligation to provide finance for these improvements;
- Water discharge from the site, and whether, following the site's construction, it would contribute to the flooding problems Leeds had recently experienced was considered in detail. Officers assured Members that adequate drainage provision would be secured as part of the development through appropriate planning conditions and that any change in policy at the time of implementation would be complied with by the developer. It was confirmed that this site was not in a high risk flood zone;

- In discussion it was confirmed to the Panel that once construction begins there would be provision made for people to be dropped off outside the West Yorkshire Play House;
- The relationship of the large DSS building and its visual effect against the new development and surrounding area was discussed. It was confirmed that from certain angles the view of the DSS building would be restricted.

Members were keen for this development to progress quickly and were pleased with both the design and layout presented.

RESOLVED –

That the application be approved in principle and that the final decision be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to specified conditions outlined in the appendix at the end of the submitted report (and such other conditions as he may consider appropriate) and following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following:

(a) Requirement for public access to and maintenance of all routes through the scheme and public spaces;
(b) The provision of on-site Affordable Housing (5% of the total number of units to be provided on site, 40% of these to meet the needs of households on the lower quartile of earnings and 60% of these to meet the needs of households on the lower decile of earnings)
(c) Travel Plan initiatives:

i) £34,000 for free trial car club membership package for residents and staff
ii) Provision of 3no. car club parking spaces
iii) £10,210 Travel Plan Review fee

(d) Up-grading of bus stop on York Rd to include real time display (£20,000)
(e) Money for off-site highway works £213,765 – for improvements to junctions and crossings;
(f) Management and pricing strategy for Multi Storey Car Park;
(g) Safety improvement works to the footbridge over the A64(M) (£50,000); and
(h) Local Employment Initiatives together with such ancillary clauses as the Chief Legal Officer shall consider appropriate.

94 Position Statement for residential development of 503 houses, conversion of a former hospital administration block, demolition of the former Villa building, associated infrastructure,including two new vehicle access points to A64, public open space and retention of Clock Tower(APP. REF. 15/07300/FU)

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which provided a position statement with regards to Planning Application 15/07300/FU for a residential

development of 503 houses, conversion of a former hospital administration block, demolition of the former Villa building, associated infrastructure including two new vehicle access points to A64, public open space and retention of Clock Tower on land at Seacroft Hospital, York Road, Leeds, LS14 6UH.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- That the site was allocated for housing it being part green field and part brown field;
- The site would have two entrances which would be linked by a central spine road;
- The Clock Tower which formed part of the original hospital buildings on the site would be retained as would some of the existing trees, alongside planting of new trees. There was also provision for public space within the development, although slightly less than normal due to the site abutting a park;
- Confirmation that there would be 905 allocated parking spaces for residents and 101 visitor spaces;
- Flooding issues were addressed and plans to alleviate the possibility of flooding were explained to Members, with the possibility that water storage could be included to allow for slower run -off;
- That the site had been designed so that a secondary school could be built to the eastern side of the development; and
- It was confirmed that 15% of the total proposed residential units would be affordable housing and that a contribution of £964k would be made to the CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy).

The Head of Planning Services commented that highways and air quality issues were key considerations that needed to be addressed together for this site and would need to be progressed once formal comments from consultees were received.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following was discussed:

- In relation to parking provision Members sought clarification that planning permission would be required should any residents wish to convert the garages into habitable rooms in the future;
- Consideration was given to the clock tower including its possible community use and the likely costs of maintaining it;
- The mix of housing was discussed. Members felt that more two bedroomed properties should be included within the development.

Extra housing for the elderly was also considered essential. The Panel also questioned the standard that the homes would be built to and considered it important that they matched the “Leeds Standard”;

- In relation to the proposed 15% affordable housing, Members asked that it be considered that coal seams exist in the area and as such the costs relating to any necessary ground stability works could possibly affect the viability of the level of affordable housing being proposed;
- Members felt that they would expect assurance from the developers that they had conducted all enquiries with respect to highways, public transport and air quality. Currently Members felt that they were not in a position to pass comment;
- Members considered that the designs presented for the houses and the apartment buildings needed further improvements. The Head of Planning Services considered that the apartment block replacing the “arts and crafts” building did not look right proportionally in terms of the relationship between the window sizes and solid elevations and further work was needed to improve this design;
- Members requested that consideration be given to keeping the “arts and crafts” building;
- The Panel discussed the possibility of a school being built on the land to the east of the development. Members established the access arrangements for the school and the route buses would be likely to take should it be built; and
- Members noted that it was likely to take up to five years to develop this site and that thought would need to be given to the traffic on the busy road running past the site and how this would affect local residents.

The Chief Planning Officer commented that the development of the site in relation to secondary school provision faced two uncertainties these being the East Leeds Extension and if the school was to be built who would pay for it.

The architect for the site addressed the Panel commenting that the demolition of the “arts and crafts” building currently on the site was an essential part of the development due to it responding negatively to the public realm area which looked over the clock tower.

Members responded to the questions featured at paragraph 11.1 of the submitted report as follows:

1. The design of the accommodation required further work. The separate blocks appeared disjointed and disparate when viewed in relation to each other and the illustrations did not demonstrate the possible quality of the accommodation;

2&3. The approach to greenspace provision was supported;

4. The housing needed to meet the quality and mix promoted by the Leeds Standard and the Council’s adopted policy on housing mix. Homes for the elderly should also be considered;

5. More information required on the potential highway impact including the conclusions of the Council's Highway Services and the potential cumulative impact of this and other development in the area on the highway network;

6. Potential drainage impact and flood risk mitigation needed to be addressed by the proposals, particularly for communities further downstream;

7.More certainty is required in relation to the proposed school provision on the site and Children Services should attend Panel when the proposal is next brought to Members;

RESOLVED – That the contents of the report be noted.

95 Date and Time of Next Meeting

1.30pm, Thursday 11th February 2016.