

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 9TH JUNE, 2016

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

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn, G Latty,  
T Leadley, A Khan, J Heselwood, B Selby,  
C Macniven, S McKenna and J Procter

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

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

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

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### 3 **Late Items**

There were no late items submitted for consideration. However supplementary information had been circulated with regards to Minute No.137 of the City Plans Panel meeting on 12/5/2016

### 4 **Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

No declarations were made.

### 5 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Campbell, Garthwaite, Walshaw and R Procter. Councillor S McKenna was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Garthwaite. Councillor J Procter was in attendance as substitute for Councillor R Procter.

### 6 **Minutes - 12th May 2016**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016 be approved as a correct record.

### 7 **Matters Arising**

Minute No 137. Matters Arising – Hilton Hotel First Direct Arena

Councillor Gruen noted the letter that had been sent from the Chair of City Plans Panel to the Director of City Development on 18th May 2016 with regards to the stalled hotel development at Portland Crescent. Councillor Gruen asked whether there was any further information with regards to the development. The City Centre Team Leader confirmed that a report would be brought to the City Plans Panel at the earliest opportunity, and that discussions were still on-going between the bank, the administrator and other interested parties.

**RESOLVED** - The Panel resolved to:

Minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 7th July, 2016

- (a) Receive a report in one month's time with regards to the stalled hotel development at Portland Crescent; and
- (b) Request that the report also be presented to the Licensing Committee for consideration.

### Leeds 5 Year Land Supply

Members expressed disappointment at the recent decision by the Secretary of State which concluded that Leeds did not have a 5 year land supply. Members were concerned that this could lead to the release of greenfield land for housing development prematurely.

It was confirmed that the Council were considering options and taking legal advice as to whether there were grounds to challenge the Secretary of State's decision to allow the appeal at Grove Road Boston Spa..

**8 Planning Application 16/01115/FU - for a mixed use development across three buildings, comprising residential apartments (use class C3), flexible office (use class B1) or food and drink (use class A3), D1 (Clinics and health centres), undercroft parking and associated landscaping, at Granary Wharf Car Park, Wharf Approach, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 5PY.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed an application for a mixed use development across three buildings, comprising residential apartments (use class C3), flexible office (use class B1) or food and drink (use class A3), D1 (Clinics and health centres), undercroft parking and associated landscaping, at Granary Wharf Car Park, Wharf Approach, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 5PY.

Plans and 3-D visuals of the proposals were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item.

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

- There would be a total of 250 apartments of which 13 would be affordable homes. Included in this would be 34 car parking spaces and 291 cycle spaces;
- Provision for trees on the site were yet to be finalised;
- A speed table would be introduced on the road that accessed the site;
- Detailed information was provided on the pallet of materials that were to be used on site; and
- The buildings had been designed to give a contextual approach to the areas heritage.
- The need for an additional planning condition to require surface improvements to the canal towpath adjoining the site, in order to tie in with the proposed public routes through the site and the proposals on the adjacent Tower Works site.

The Panel heard from Mr Considine a resident of the nearby Candle House. He highlighted the reasons for a number of residents objecting to the development which included:

- The historic nature of the site and its importance to the development of Leeds through the industrial revolution;
- P11 of the Core Strategy states that historical environments should be preserved and enhanced; and
- That the buildings proposed were too big.

The Panel heard from Jon Peak of Fazenda restaurant. Mr Peak raised concerns about the loss of parking which would result from the development of the site, which would affect his business, owing to many customers travelling from outside Leeds to visit the restaurant. He also highlighted that the loss of the car park would create more traffic and parking problems in this part of the city.

David Topham representing the applicant addressed the Panel stating that the scheme had been worked on and refined over a long period of time. He commented that he felt that this was a sustainable location and that the developer was committed to deliver the development later in the year.

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

- The amount of consultation that had taken place with local residents and the importance of continuing to consult and engage with local residents;
- The number of parking spaces in the area around the development; and
- The reasons why no wind study had been commissioned to date and a request that a condition be inserted to have a wind impact study carried out.

The Transport Development Services Manager advised Members on the available parking provision in the vicinity of the area.

The Head of Development Management recommended the report be deferred and delegated with two additional conditions. Those being; improvement works related to the tow path surface of the canal; and the requirement for a wind impact study to be carried out.

**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. Additional conditions agreed during discussion on the item included:

- Improvement works related to the tow path surface of the canal; and
- that the requirement to undertake a wind impact study by the developer.

**9 Planning application - 16/02175/FU : Demolition of existing building and erection of part 6, part 8 storey student accommodation building comprising 96 studio apartments, ancillary student amenity areas and two commercial units in A1, A2 or A3 use, 67-83 Cookridge Street, Leeds 2**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed a planning application – Demolition of existing building and erection of part 6, part 8 storey student accommodation building comprising 96 studio apartments, ancillary student amenity areas and two commercial units in A1, A2 or A3 use, 67-83 Cookridge Street, Leeds 2.

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.

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

- The importance of the development relating to the historic buildings in the area;
- That the area proposed for development was sensitive; and
- That the stone to be used was good quality sandstone.

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

- The layout of the apartments and how to best use the space available;
- The level of demand for student accommodation in the city centre, considering the number of recent developments and the need for careful consideration for how much student accommodation Leeds required;
- The report agreed by Executive Board on 4<sup>th</sup> September 2013 in relation to purpose built student housing provision in the city centre and the requirement for a needs based criteria to be included in the application of policy H6B of the Core Strategy;
- That the design looked very “busy” and that the visual impact of this was not particularly appealing;
- The amount of green space that would be available to residents and the public; and
- That the building be designed so that it could be easily converted to standard flats for the open market.

Simon Grundy of Indigo, representing the applicant, addressed the Panel commenting that within the last two years there had been an increase in

demand for purpose built student housing especially for self-contained studios.

The City Centre Team Leader commented that the September 2013 Executive Board position to apply a test of need for student housing was considered at the public examination of the Core Strategy and not supported. Policy H6B of the Core Strategy was subsequently adopted in November 2014 without the requirement for a needs based assessment and that the development proposal should be tested against the adopted policy.

The City Centre Team Leader clarified that the only external space to be delivered would be private courtyard areas at first floor level for the occupiers of the flats.

The Head of Development Management addressed the Panel commenting that the detailed design of the front elevation could be addressed through consideration of the details to be submitted pursuant to Condition 16 at Appendix 1 of the submitted report.

## **RESOLVED**

To approve the application in principle and defer and delegate the final decision to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out at Appendix 1 of the submitted report and finalising the Section 106 agreement with the obligations outlined in the report. Additional conditions agreed during discussion on the item included:

- The design of the front elevation to be re-considered by the developer pursuant to Condition 16 detailed within Appendix 1 of the submitted report.

**10 Planning Application 12/02571/OT – Outline application for means of access and erection of residential development (circa 2000 dwellings), retail, health centre, community centre and primary school development, with associated drainage and landscaping on land between Wetherby Road, Skeltons Lane and York Road, Leeds,LS14.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted an update report for information relating to an outline application for means of access and erection of residential development (circa 2000 dwellings), retail, health centre, community centre and primary school development, with associated drainage and landscaping on land between Wetherby Road, Skeltons Lane and York Road, Leeds, LS14.

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

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

- Agreement had been reached in relation to the amount of affordable housing to be built and the Section 106 contribution to be made by the developer; and
- Information in relation to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

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

- Members raised concerns that there had been major changes to the development;
- What was considered “affordable” in terms of the cost of a property. A request was made for information to be circulated to Members which determined what is affordable housing;
- The reason behind the ten year limit for commencement;
- The need for a sequential plan to development which would include the policy of building away from the existing properties;
- The need for clarification as to what would be funded through the CIL, which would be determined by the Executive Board. Importance was placed on local residents receiving the compensatory effects of contributions made to the CIL from this development; and
- Members considered whether it would be possible to deliver an off-site primary school through Section 106.

The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that there was provision for an on-site primary school in the Section 106 but that a financial contribution for off-site works could not be secured in the absence of an identified improvement proposal.

The Panel’s legal advisor confirmed that at City Plans Panel on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2015 authority was delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the issue of affordable housing provision being resolved, which it now was. Therefore the applicant could place reliance on the resolution made on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

The CIL was a separate statutory regime enacted by the Government and adopted by the Council. The CIL money does come to the Council excepting the proportion to neighbourhood and parish Councils. The Executive Board would determine how the CIL money was spent.

In summary Members requested that Ward Members to continue to work with the developers and that before any final decision is taken a meeting should take place between Ward Members, the relevant Executive Board Member and the Leader of Council to discuss issues around the CIL.

**RESOLVED** – The Panel resolved to:

- (a) Note the contents of the report;

Minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 7th July, 2016

- (b) Request information be circulated defining what affordable housing was and what was classified as “affordable”; and
- (c) That that before any final decision is taken a meeting should take place between Ward Members, the relevant Executive Board Member and the Leader of Council to discuss issues around the CIL.

**11 PRE-APPLICATION PRESENTATION (PREAPP/16/00210) - THE PROPOSED ERECTION OF A 7 STOREY OFFICE BUILDING AT LEEDS CITY OFFICE PARK, MEADOW LANE, LEEDS 11**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed a pre application presentation - for the proposed erection of a 7 storey office building at Leeds City Office Park, Meadow Lane, Leeds.

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.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the consultation that had taken place with HS2 Limited with regards to the proposed route to be taken into the City.

The Panel heard from John Brooks the planning consultant for the applicant and Patrick Ven Den Bergh the applicant’s architect, who informed members that the building had been reduced from 11 stories to 7 stories. The height of the building was still to be determined. That the car park had originally been planned as a basement car park but that this was unlikely to be constructed and alternatives were being looked into.

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

- The timescales for development, which was linked to the decision on HS2;
- The importance of applying the latest parking standards when considering parking provision; and
- That the new building should not have an impact on the existing green space and every attempt should be made to blend the building in with other existing buildings.

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

- 1) Members supported the development in principle;
- 2) In terms of the scale of the development and emerging design proposals being appropriate for this location Members felt that improvements could be made. The scale was deemed acceptable but further work was requested to be completed on the design. Members considered it acceptable for the building to be up to 8 stories high;
- 3) Members considered the proposed approach to highways and transportation to be acceptable at this moment in time; and

- 4) In terms of supporting the approach to public open space provision on site Members felt that connectivity to Crown Point should be a condition and that connectivity could be enhanced through landscaping.

**12 RESOLVED – The Panel resolved to note the contents of the report.  
Preapplication PREAPP/16/00017- for part demolition and construction of an eleven storey residential building (with the retention of the main building of No.17 Wellington Street) 17 Wellington Street, Leeds, LS1 4DL**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed a pre application presentation - for part demolition and construction of an eleven storey residential building (with the retention of the main building of No.17 Wellington Street) 17 Wellington Street, Leeds, LS1 4DL

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 Simon Smithson, the architect and Ian Baraclough representing the applicant who presented information which included:

- The history of the building including the lack of anything of historical interest within the building;
- The viable use for the building following consideration of all options, which was considered by the developer to be an apartment block; and
- The intention to retain the building on Wellington Street and add an 11 storey tower to the rear of the site.

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

- The possibility of conducting a wind survey;
- The approximate size and type of flats that would be built;
- What would be the parking and servicing provision for the flats. Members were informed there would be no parking provision for the flats but servicing bays would be available for deliveries on Aire Street;
- What the views of the tower would be like and confirmation that the tower would not be able to be seen from Wellington Street;
- The importance of demonstrating that the building would provide a quality enhancement to the area bearing in mind the proposal to remove part of a listed building;

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

- 1) Members considered the uses to be appropriate;
- 2) In terms of the proposed demolition Members considered they were yet to be convinced;
- 3) Members views on the emerging scale, massing and design of the proposals were that the scale and massing were acceptable but more work needed to be done on the design of the building; and
- 4) Members considered the emerging scheme provided an acceptable mix and standard of residential accommodation.

**13 RESOLVED** – The Panel resolved to note the contents of the report.  
**PREAPP/16/00067 - Pre-application presentation for the first phase residential building pursuant to outline permission (14/05976/OT – mixed use offices and residential/hotel building) at the eastern end of the site bounded by Wellington St and Wellington Bridge St (formerly Yorkshire Post).**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed a pre application presentation - for the first phase residential building pursuant to outline permission for mixed use offices and residential/hotel building at the eastern end of the site bounded by Wellington St and Wellington Bridge Street formerly Yorkshire Post.

Site 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 representatives of Grainger PLC who were the prospective owners of the residential development. Information presented included:

- The history of Grainger PLC and their current projects and work;
- A detailed explanation of the layout of the site including all the public realm space;
- That the scheme would contribute to housing delivery in Leeds;
- The possibilities for affordable housing provision either on the site or delivery through an off-site contribution; and
- The emphasis on large amounts of communal space for residents including a gym, lounge and outdoor terraces.

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

- The policy requirement for affordable housing was only 5% in this case;
- That the size of the flats were too small;
- The need to provide for three bedroomed flats in the City Centre;

- That further work was required in relation to the parameters of the building which were considered to appear a bit overbearing and could possibly be improved; and
- Timescales for bringing the future phase of buildings on the site forward were discussed with Members seeking temporary landscaping treatment of the areas yet to be developed.

The Chief Planning Officer sought clarification from the developers' representatives about the approach to affordable housing.

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

- 1) Members supported the emerging design for the residential block but considered that work could be done to "lighten" the upper storeys;
- 2) In terms of views on the provision of one and two bedroom unit only Members requested more information on this issue and justification why there should be no 3 bed provision;
- 3) Members felt that the size of the units appeared to be small; and
- 4) With regards to the provision of affordable housing Members wished to have further discussions with the applicant and the mechanisms for delivery.

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

**14 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

1.30pm Thursday 7th July 2016.