

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 6TH APRIL, 2017

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

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

A Member site visit was held in the morning in connection with the following proposals: PREAPP 16/00567 – 16 -18 Manor Road, Holbeck, Application No. 16/04778/FU – Temporary car park at Woodhouse Square and PREAPP 16/00303 – Manston Business Centre, Melbourne Street and was attended by the following Councillors: J McKenna, A Garthwaite, C Campbell C Macniven, D Blackburn, S McKenna, P Gruen, A Khan and T Leadley.

### **148 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations.

### **149 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor N Walshaw.

Councillor S McKenna was in attendance as substitute.

### **150 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2017 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **151 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 report of the Chief Planning Officer presented 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 Care), undercroft parking and associated landscaping at Granary Wharf Car Park, Wharf Approach, Holbeck, Leeds, LS 11 5PY.

The application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the Panel for further clarification as to how the commuted sum is calculated, further information on why on-site affordable housing provision was not possible in

this case and if it would be feasible / acceptable for Housing Leeds to take on the management of the on- site affordable housing units.

Further issues highlighted included the following:

- The commuted sum had been based on the buy to rent value of the properties.
- Reasons why it was not possible to deliver affordable housing on site as outlined in the report.
- Reasons why it was not possible for Housing Leeds or another social landlord to take on management of affordable housing units as outlined in the report.
- Reference was made to the recent Executive Board approval which enabled consideration of the reinvestment of commuted sums in such cases.

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

- Concern regards the applicant's comments in the report which referred to points of uncertainty caused by Brexit. The applicant's representative reported that this was not aimed directly to affordable housing but to the overall viability as there had been an impact on values since Brexit.
- The need to see more affordable housing in the city centre and where could this be delivered in inner city areas.
- The need for clarity on when, where and how commuted sums were spent. It was suggested that this could possibly be reported to Joint Plans Panel.
- Concerns that commuted sums would not provide the equivalent of on-site affordable housing and also that the buy to rent model did not meet affordable housing requirements. Reference was also made to the lack of a management structure for on-site affordable housing and whether Leeds City Council could set up its own management group to deal with this. It was also requested that information be provided on the effectiveness of contributions to car clubs. It was suggested that these issues could be considered at Joints Plan Panel or at a workshop for Plans Panel Members.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions (and any others which he might consider appropriate), and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following additional matters:

- To accept a commuted sum of £755,996.87 towards off site affordable housing provision in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision to be paid on occupation of the first residential unit. The retention of the building as a Private Rented Scheme (Build to Rent) for a minimum period of 10 years from first occupation. To secure payment of an

additional sum of £757,867.13 on the sale of the first of any unit to be sold within 10 years of the occupation of the building.

- Publicly accessible areas
- Employment and Training for Local People
- A contribution of £3,567 towards monitoring and evaluation of a Travel Plan
- A contribution of £17,500 for provision of a Car Club provider free trial membership package of 2 year membership with drive time and contribution of £42,650 for provision of a Sustainable Travel Fund for sustainable travel incentives to encourage the use of public transport and other sustainable travel modes.
- A Traffic Regulations Order contribution of £15,000 is required, for changes to waiting restrictions and park and display bays in the vicinity
- A contribution of up to a maximum of £34,015 towards the planting of trees within the wider Holbeck area with a potential planting in an area of public realm to be created in front of Temple Works
- To use reasonable endeavours to agree the re-surfacing of the canal towpath

In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement 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.

Following the discussion and decision on this item and in response to issues raised, the Chief Planning Officer informed the Panel that a workshop would be arranged as part of the development program for Plans Panel Members. This would give an opportunity to look at the broader issues surrounding affordable housing.

**152 Planning Application 16/04778/FU - Proposal for Student Residential Accommodation Building Comprising 117 Studio Flats, including Ancillary Communal Facilities and Associated Landscaping at Woodhouse Square, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for student residential accommodation comprising of 117 studio flats including ancillary communal facilities and associated landscaping at Woodhouse Square, Leeds.

Members attended a site visit prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

Further issues highlighted in relation the application included the following:

- The site was to the north west of the City Centre and was the site of the former St Anne's School.
- Original buildings at the site had been demolished and the site was now in use as a temporary car park.

- The proposal was for student residential accommodation of 117 studio flats and the design of the building would reflect the character of the area.
- The building would be aligned with existing buildings to face Woodhouse Square.
- There would be communal facilities at ground floor level which would include common rooms, study areas and a gym.
- The size of the studios would range from 22 to 31 square metres.
- There would be angled windows to the northern walls facing existing residential properties to protect privacy.
- The existing boundary wall to the site to Brandon Road would be repaired and retained.
- Floor plans were shown. Studio sizes were smaller than national standards but due to the regular shapes of the rooms it was demonstrated that they were adequate for everyday living needs. In addition to this there was also significant ancillary/communal provision within the development.
- The style of the building would reflect the character of the existing buildings in the area.
- There would be no on-site parking provided. The development was close to the Universities, City Centre and services. The developer would provide some on street disabled parking and some on street parking opposite the development.
- Additional letters of objection had been received following the publication of the report. New issues included concern regarding lack of consultation, issues relating to the right of light and the loss of a silver birch tree. In response to this it was reported that the application had been advertised within the usual procedures, right of light was not a planning matter and there had been an amendment to the plans to retain the silver birch tree.

A local resident addressed the Panel with concerns and objections to the application. These included the following:

- The Little Woodhouse Neighbourhood Planning Forums aim was for the area to remain a balanced and sustainable community.
- The proposals would mean an excessive student population which was contrary to policy as it would undermine the balance of the local community.
- Reference was made to the density of the student population in this and surrounding areas.
- Loss of opportunity for family housing.
- The proposed building would overshadow and overlook properties on Back Claremont Grove.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. Issues highlighted included the following:

- The applicant had provided student accommodation in various locations across Britain and had been well received in other areas.
- There had been extensive work with planning officers in developing the proposals.
- The development would enhance this part of Woodhouse Square and the conservation area.
- It was recognised that there was a level of angst regarding proposals for student accommodation.
- The area had an eclectic mix of housing and was not just student accommodation.
- More purpose built student accommodation could potentially release HMOs for family housing.
- The plans had been significantly reduced from an initial proposal for 152 studio flats.
- The applicant was willing to work with local residents and community associations to address any concerns.
- In response to questions from the Panel, the following was discussed:
  - Room sizes were larger than what was typical for student accommodation. There was a range of different sizes to suit market needs.
  - It was felt that shared communal areas would be sufficient in size.
  - With regards to concern that the building could cause a wind tunnelling effect it was reported that it had not been felt necessary to carry out a wind assessment.
  - A report had been submitted regarding the operation of student arrivals.
  - With regard to concerns of overshadowing/overlooking properties on Back Claremont Grove, it was reported that the distances involved would exceed minimum space standards. The building would also be at a lower level.
  - In response to concerns regarding disturbance from students, it was reported that managed student accommodation would not present the problems that unmanaged student housing could. Students had to sign a tenancy agreement which made reference to expected behaviour.
  - The unadopted road to the rear was not in the applicant's ownership.
  - Lease length for the studios would be for a period of 51 weeks. These would be more suited to postgraduate students.
  - There would be one 8 person capacity lift within the building and entrances would be wheelchair accessible.
  - There would be internal and external CCTV for the security of the building. This would not overlook other residential properties.
  - There would be planning conditions controlling the facing materials to be used for the construction of the building.
  - There would be hard landscaping for pedestrianized areas and the courtyard and towards the boundaries some planting, shrubbery and lawn areas.

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

- There would be potential for disabled residents to have off site permit parking during their tenancy.
- The amount of communal space required had been assessed on its likely use by future residents.
- There was a clear aspiration from the universities deliver purpose built student accommodation that was both close to the learning facilities and the city centre.
- It was felt that the impact on established communities in the area would be minimal as the general flow of the student occupiers would be in the other direction towards the universities and the city centre.
- A previous scheme had been recommended for approval 9 years ago but this had been refused by the Panel at the time.
- There was a view that the communal space was sufficient. This was not based on a calculated formula but on experience of other similar schemes.
- Concern that not all upstairs areas could be accessed by lift.
- Concern that the rooms and communal areas were not big enough.
- With regard to use of national space standards, the Panel was advised that only limited weight could be given to this as Leeds did not yet have a local policy in relation to this. It was also mentioned that a student scheme with similar sized studios had been approved by the Panel at its last meeting.
- Further to concerns regarding detail and design it was reported that Members could be consulted at the condition discharge stage for the proposed materials.
- Size and massing of the building – the relationship of the proposed building to those already in the area was discussed. There was a view that a building of the proposed size was needed to fit with existing buildings.
- Concern that Little Woodhouse would be the next area to have a high concentration of student accommodation.
- A gable ended roof would be preferable to the proposed hipped design.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the specified conditions set out below and any others which he might consider appropriate, and also the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- Use of residential accommodation only by students in full-time higher education;
- Restrictions on student car ownership and use through lease agreements
- Cooperation with local employment and training initiatives
- £10,000 for the delivery of the revised Traffic Regulation Order required for the proposed off-site highway works
- Section 106 management fee (£750)

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.

Members to be consulted at the condition discharge stage regarding use of materials.

**153 PREAPP/16/00567 Pre-application presentation for proposed residential development on land at 16-18 Manor Road, Holbeck, Leeds LS11 9AH**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed the Panel of a pre-application presentation for a proposed residential development on land at 16-18 Manor Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS11 9AH.

Members attended the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the pre-application presentation and discussion.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The site was within the Holbeck Urban Village Area.
- There had previously been consent for a development of 57 apartments with mixed commercial and business uses.
- There was a mixed use of buildings in the area with commercial, business and residential uses.
- Improving links between Siddal Street and Manor Road.
- The site previously housed brick warehouses and steel fabricators. The design of the building would reflect the history of this with a metallic design. Members were shown examples of the materials to be used.
- Residential amenities included a lounge area, cinema and a gym.
- There would be a mix of studio; one, two and three bedroom apartments with a total of 101 units.
- In terms of scale and relation to other buildings in the area it was considered that a 10 storey building was of an appropriate size.
- Use of meshed steel window shutters.

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

- The angle of the walls would prevent overlooking of other properties. The meshed shutter would feature on all sides of the building.
- The height of the link through the building was felt to be sufficient and would allow the flow of natural light.
- Affordable housing – whilst the applicant would like to commit to on-site provision of affordable housing, experience on similar projects had shown this to be difficult due to the low number of units available and the difficulty in engaging a social landlord to manage these. It was

considered that a commuted sum may be the most appropriate route. It was further mentioned that there could be other options through buy to rent or sub market discounted housing.

- Footpaths around the site and relation to adjacent sites which would be subject of future development.
- The cladding would be a copper coloured aluminium and with correct maintenance would retain its quality of finish. There would not be an issue with reflections from car headlights as the lower part of the building would not have the cladding finish.
- Some concern regarding the lack of on-site affordable housing.

In response to questions outlined in the report, the following was discussed:

- Members supported the size and quality of residential dwellings proposed.
- Members agreed that the proposed building layout, height and emerging design was generally acceptable.
- With regard to the lack of on-site parking there was some concern that this could cause problems to neighbouring areas. Questions were asked whether basement parking could be provided. It was stated that basement parking would not be feasible due to space. It was considered that due to the location of the development that a no car scheme was potentially suitable. Further consideration to this matter would be given as part of the Transport Assessment at the next stage of the application.

**RESOLVED** - That the report, presentation and discussion be noted.

**154 PREAPP/16/00303 for the erection of 152 apartments in a single building between 5 and 9 storeys with ground floor car parking located between Melbourne St and Lower Brunswick St, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed the Panel of a pre-application presentation for erection of 152 apartments in a single building between 5 and 9 storeys with ground floor car parking located between Melbourne Street and Lower Brunswick Street, Leeds.

Members attended the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the pre-application presentation and discussion.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel. The following issues were highlighted:

- The site was currently home to the Marston Business Centre which was a two storey building.
- The site was in a sustainable city centre location with easy access to transport, leisure/retail facilities and employment opportunities.
- There would be 100% cycle storage provision and the site was close to the cycle super highway and proposed city centre cycle loop.



- There would be non-allocated parking on site for up to 18 vehicles and 2 spaces for city car club parking for which tenants would receive two years free membership. There would also be free metro bus provision.
- Pedestrian entrances to the site.
- Floor plans – these had been designed to minimise the number of north facing apartments. All apartments met national space standards.
- The proposed development would step down from 8 storeys to 6 storeys and the scale and massing reflected that of surrounding developments.
- In summary it was felt that the proposals provided much needed residential accommodation in a suitable and sustainable location and that the scale and design was suitable.
- With regard to affordable housing, the applicant was open minded to keeping this on-site.

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

- Footpaths around the site would be widened to 2 metres to create a safer environment for pedestrians. Concern was expressed regarding ground floor apartments and their relation to the footpaths. It was reported that there was no commercial viability for alternative uses for the ground floor.
- The size of the proposed building had been designed to fit in with the scale of buildings in the surrounding area. To reach viability there also had to be a certain amount of units in the development.
- It was not viable to convert the existing building to residential accommodation.
- Concern regarding the scale and massing of the proposed development.
- Concern regarding the lack of amenity space.
- Members accepted that the site needed to be re-developed but that the proposals at this stage were not suitable or acceptable and the proposed design did not contribute an improvement to the area.

In response to questions outlined in the report, the following was discussed:

- The site was suitable in principle for residential development.
- There were concerns regarding the emerging scale and design of the development.
- Concern that there was no amenity provision on site and the proposals did not respect the amenity of occupiers or surrounding properties. There was some concern regarding the size of studio apartments. It was felt that the proposed building was too large and did not enhance the surrounding area.
- The mix of units was considered to be acceptable.
- Car parking provision – there was some concern as to whether 15% was acceptable in this location. The level of parking required more justification

**RESOLVED** – That the report, presentation and discussion be noted.

**155 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday, 27 April 2017 at 1.30 p.m.