

## **CITY PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 12TH MAY, 2016**

**PRESENT:** Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, R Procter,  
D Blackburn, S Hamilton, G Latty,  
T Leadley, C Campbell, A Khan, K Ritchie,  
E Taylor, S McKenna and B Selby

**Apologies** N Walshaw

### **131 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

### **132 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public**

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### **133 Late Items**

There were no late items submitted for consideration.

### **134 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

No declarations were made.

### **135 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Walshaw. Councillor Selby was in attendance as substitute.

### **136 Minutes - 24th March 2016**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on the 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016 be approved as a correct record. Subject to the following amendments:

From.

**Minute No 125. “Application Number 15/04151/FU, Residential development of 270 houses with associated roads and infrastructure at Tyersall.**

**RESOLVED** – The Panel resolved to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning officer subject to the conditions and obligations in the section 106 agreement being finalised as set out in the submitted report and asked that

the commuted sum to Bradford Council regarding highway works and the bridge be tracked and that the timing of the works be considered.”

To.

**Minute No 125. “Application Number 15/04151/FU, Residential development of 270 houses with associated roads and infrastructure at Tyersall Lane, Tyersal.**

**RESOLVED** – The Panel resolved to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning officer subject to the conditions and obligations in the section 106 agreement being finalised as set out in the submitted report and asked that the commuted sum to Bradford Council regarding highway works and the bridge be tracked and that the timing of the works be considered. Furthermore that the viability to be reviewed at the provision of the 90<sup>th</sup>, 180<sup>th</sup> and 270<sup>th</sup> houses.”

From

**Minute No 128. “16/00176/ADV - One illuminated rooftop sign, 16/00173/ADV – Eight illuminated signs, 16/00177/ADV - One illuminated projecting blade sign.”**

To

**“16/00176/ADV - One illuminated rooftop sign, 16/00173/ADV - Eight illuminated signs, 16/00177/ADV - One illuminated projecting blade sign.**

**AT: John Lewis, Unit 45 Victoria gate, Harewood Street Leeds LS2 7AR”**

## **137 Matters Arising**

### Housing and Planning Bill

The Head of Planning Services updated the Panel on the latest developments of the Housing and Planning Bill. The Court of Appeal confirmed that small house builders constructing 10 or less houses would not be obliged to provide affordable housing.

### NGT

The Chair informed the Panel that following an inquiry the Secretary of State had decided that the NGT scheme would not be pursued. However, it was likely that the money allocated to the scheme would be earmarked for transport infrastructure works in Leeds.

## Hilton Hotel, First Direct Arena

Councillor P Gruen raised concerns about the continued halt in construction at the “arena hotel”, it now being more than 12 months since construction ceased. Also highlighted was that pedestrians and vehicles are still being inconvenienced by the barriers placed around the site. Cllr Gruen asked what the latest position was and that a strong message be sent to the bank responsible for the site.

The City Centre Team Leader updated the panel, informing them that the bank was working on getting a new contractor to complete the building. It was noted that the Leeds City Region Enterprise Partnership were also involved in negotiations.

**RESOLVED** – That the Panel write to The Director of City Development highlighting the concerns raised about the “arena hotel” and requesting that a report on the latest position on efforts to resolve the situation is brought to the next Plans Panel.

**138 Planning Application 15/07300/FU for a residential development of 503 houses, conversion of former hospital administration block, demolition of 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**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed an application for a residential development of 503 houses, conversion of former hospital administration block, demolition of 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.

Officers highlighted the design changes that were proposed following the comments of Plans Panel on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

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

- Design workshops had been held with the applicants, the outcome of which was to re-appraise the approach to some of the design detail;
- The Manston Block had been revised to incorporate fenestration detailing and string courses that were more reminiscent of the retained Administration Block. In order to provide symmetry to the building, a further two units had been added which can be accommodated without any adverse impact to the retained trees or the remainder of the layout;
- The dwellings to the south of the Grade II Listed clock tower are now proposed to be faced with an ochre render and a stone finish, rather than white render and red brick;

- The design of the house types has been reviewed, with the introduction of more vertical emphasis to the front elevations, incorporating front projections with doors and windows, pitched roofs over dormers and the introduction of decorative chimneys to some of the buildings at key moments in the street scenes;
- Amendment to the design of the apartment building (Block 01) by omitting the turret feature to the corner and replacing it with a finally expressed gable form; and. Further consideration had been given to the use of materials given Members' previous concerns - render around the base of buildings and excessive use of buff brick, when red brick is more characteristic of the locality. The render is to be removed around the base of buildings, including Block 01 and is to be replaced with brick. Whilst details of exact materials are yet to be agreed, the applicants are willing to move towards red brick as the dominant material. Design analysis has been undertaken of the forms of buildings across the development in order to inform how materials should be used.

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

- Clarification that the number of houses to be built would be 503 due to the increased size of the Manston Block. Previously 501 dwellings had been planned;
- The difference between the new designs for the Manston Block and the previously submitted designs;
- The dimensions of the balconies and garages were considered; and
- That the possibility of a school being built on land next to the development was still subject to on going discussion with the relevant parties.

The Head of Planning Services addressed the Panel commenting that the size of the garages on the development would be adequate to park a car in. He also confirmed that regular dialogue would continue with Ward Members noting that it is highly likely that there would be changes as the development went along and that this site was a key part of the Council's housing land supply.

In general Members felt that the changes made to the design of the development were good and an improvement on previous submissions.

**RESOLVED** – To approve the application in principle and defer and delegate the final decision to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions and finalising the Section 106 agreement with the obligations outlined in the report and the appendix of the report (and such other conditions as he may consider appropriate).

**139 PREAPP/15/00867 Proposal for the demolition of a two storey building and a garage block and the creation of an innovation and enterprise centre building, set in a landscaped area within the University Of Leeds campus, Orange Zone Car Park, Off Woodhouse Lane, Leeds, LS2 9JT.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed a pre-application proposal for the demolition of a two storey building and a garage block and the creation of an innovation and enterprise centre building, set in a landscaped area within the University Of Leeds campus, Orange Zone Car Park, Off Woodhouse Lane, Leeds, LS2 9JT.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item.

The Panel heard from the City Centre Team Leader and a representative of Associated Architects LLP who highlighted the following aspects of the proposals:

- The development would provide office, research and leisure space for start-up businesses. The layout of the building was explained in detail;
- Efforts had been made to reduce the visual impact from the conservation area to the north and east of the proposed development;
- The building would comprise a limited palette of materials which were described to Members; and
- That the existing trees on site would need to be removed but that their loss would be mitigated by the planting of some replacement trees on other areas of the University Campus and biodiversity enhancements to landscaped areas. .

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

- Which land and buildings were owned by the University in the vicinity of the proposed development;
- The disappointment at the loss of the existing trees and the expectation that there would be replacement in line with adopted Council policy ;
- The loss of existing car parking spaces and the suitability of the alternative provision for car parking ;
- The masterplan for the University and the likelihood of further buildings being built to the front and side of the proposed development, leading Members to consider what green space would remain within the setting of the development in the future and the request that green space needs to be maximised;
- The usage of the proposed building;
- The materials pallet, and that materials should be carefully chosen so that they retain the same look after construction and do not deteriorate over time;
- That public art should be a feature of the development.

- The impact on views from the Woodhouse Lane-University Precinct Conservation area;
- The impact on the existing cycling route adjacent to the north side of the inner ring road;
- The need to ensure that the design of the landscaped areas avoided potential conflict between disabled and pedestrian users and deliveries around Fenton Street; and
- The need to improve the appearance of the rear of properties located along Woodhouse Lane

Generally Members felt the proposed building design would be a positive addition to the University's buildings.

Members responded to the questions featured at paragraph 8 of the submitted report as follows:

1. Members felt that the proposed demolitions were appropriate;
2. Members felt that the emerging scale and massing of the proposals were appropriate;
3. Members felt that they needed more information on the emerging landscape proposals and approach to dealing with the loss and replacement of trees. Members noted the intention to use the DEFREA approach to retaining biodiversity value which was supported but in addition required that the Council's policy relating to the loss of trees should also be met d;
4. Members felt that the designs for the proposed development were good in general but that materials need to be carefully considered.
5. The proposal needed to be presented in the context of the future nearby building plots in order to assess the potential impact of the development and the quality of greenspace to be provided.

**RESOLVED** - The Panel resolved to note the contents of the report.

#### **140 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

1.30pm Thursday 9<sup>th</sup> June 2016.