

Kirkgate Quarter Stakeholders meeting minutes October 2, 2014

Present: Cath Follin (CF), Service Areas, City Development, Leeds City Council
 Franklin Riley (FR), Regeneration, Leeds City Council
 Neall Bower (NB), THI Officer, Regeneration, Leeds City Council
 Mark Robinson (MB), City Connect, Leeds City Council
 Graham Stead (GS), agent - 96 Kirkgate
 Ann Clark (AC), Leeds Parish Church
 Paul Nathan Geary (PG), for City Fusion- owner- 83-89, 91 and 97
 Kirkgate and FWCH
 Kevin Grady (KG), Leeds Civic Trust
 Jeremy Thompson (JT), Leeds Civic Trust
 Peter Mason (PM), 92 Kirkgate
 Chris Ashby (CA), Asset Management, Leeds City Council
 Simon Smithson (SS), Think architecture and design

Apologies:

Item	Description	Action
1.0	Minutes of the last meeting	
1.1	PG: 2.5 Leisure use lettings are normally 10 – 15 years.	
2.0	Lower Kirkgate THI/ First White Cloth Hall	
2.1	<p><i>Lower Kirkgate</i></p> <p>NB: Things have started to move since the clawback activation point for rental agreements was set at over 10 years. There have been positive discussions with owners and hopefully there should be successful applications for grant too. Notwithstanding this the proposal for this activation point to be increased to 25 years is still with the HLF and we are awaiting a response. The consultation period on the Design Guide and Specification and Maintenance guide has ended and comments received were largely supportive of the providing such advice. There was one concern that the design guide set a principle for development in terms of vacant sites or scale of development. It was made clear that this was not the case and that it was purely a vehicle for displaying indicative approaches to detailed design.</p>	
2.2	<p><i>FWCH</i></p> <p>The license for access to the site has been signed by the owner all that is outstanding is the photographic schedule of condition. We have interviewed consultants to develop options for the site – a wider team is also being put together. By the end of January we should have completed the survey work and have developed a number of options. We then have two years to carry out necessary applications and decide whether to take the project forward.</p>	
3.0	Cycle City Connect	

3.1	MR: The scheme was awarded funding in March to create a cycle line between Bradford and Leeds. The first stage of consultation has been completed.	
3.2	Designs for Kirkgate were produced initially but this has run into a number of problems and things that can't be done. The city centre portion of the scheme has been lifted from the proposals to enable more time to be spent developing it. Funding still in place but this gives more time.	
3.3	Considered closing Lower Kirkgate but issue around Arriva Buses who are adamant they want to retain it as part of the route. Suggestion of a bus gate under viaduct, MR to look at and assess potential.	
3.4	JT – have other routes been considered – concerned about the ability to integrate a cycle path safely. Headrow seems a better route. MR – issues about steepness of route but agree it is less busy but would cyclists go the long way round? JT- city centre element of the scheme should have been included in consultation should have been included to make it worthwhile – should move to other route and consult again. MR – the route is still flexible and the funding wasn't secured on a firm route or proposal. Difficult to apply the standards used on other parts of the route due to space constraints. Still waiting to see if closing left under the viaduct can be restricted – ultimately need more time and to come back with future proposals.	
3.5	FR – No matter what is done with the route and Headrow it still makes sense to include Kirkgate as a cycle route but give more options. MR – that could be an option.	
3.6	CF – Quality Places and Spaces group have looked at the area and see some potential for small changes to bring large results such as reducing width of road etc.	
4.0	Licensing Cumulative Impact Zone	
4.1	FR: Background – problems of a concentration of licenced premises. Licensing department has developed a policy based on traffic light system. Kirkgate is in the red area which results in an automatic objection to an application. Next boundary review is in January. Licensing Services are consulting on the current boundary till the 10 th October. Councillors will make a decision as to whether to amend boundary.	
4.2	PNG – The red area is a presumption against new licenses – Kirkgate is faces this issues in future regeneration proposals. Food led uses stand a better chance and City Fusion are testing this with a proposal at Lamberts Yard. Ultimately if we are to attract responsible leisure uses and owners there needs to be more flexibility in the policy. Well maintained places and spaces shouldn't create a problem.	
4.3	KG – What is the regeneration departments feeling on this? FR – Feel that given the objective of the THI there is an argument for moving it out of the red zone.	
4.4	PNG – have police released the revised data yet? FR – Licensing will be getting the data on the 6 th October.	

4.5	CF – there appears to be advantages of taking Lower Kirkgate out of the red area, but green could provide too much flexibility to other than responsible operators. Is the view of the group that we respond to the consultation for Lower Kirkgate to be moved into the amber zone? All Agreed. NB to submit to the minutes of this meeting to the CIP consultation.	
5.0	Public Realm Improvements	
4.1	SS - QPS have been looking over the past few months at how Leeds could introduce shared spaces into city centre – decided to rename the approach calm spaces .	
4.2	The idea is to home in on a couple of areas. Upper Briggate and the area around the Corn Exchange. Both similar and suffer from the pedestrianising of the city centre. Problems are pushed out onto the edge of the city.	
4.3	Document has been sent to city centre bid team to try to get some finance into these areas. Idea is to turn current thinking on its head with space for pedestrians but accommodating cars. Poynton and Kensington High Street are good examples.	
4.4	CF – pedestrianisation on the whole has been successful but cannot extend it ever outwards. This is a better way of dealing with the problem at the edge. Need discussion with colleagues in councils where this principle has been adopted.	
4.5	AC – do disabled users find this approach difficult? CF – still possible to accommodate all users – it's about simple interventions in the first place.	
4.6	SS – example of this parking spaces and taxi ranks are separated but are used at different times – could they be joint uses to reduce space taken? CF – we will have a workshop to discuss the idea. San Francisco use an approach called Parklettes where you don't have to use the business to park in space around it.	
4.7	JT - Is it the councils policy to discourage parking close to shops? CF – No but potential to look at it and the issues around it – it's about finding a balance.	
5.0	Skills for the Future	
5.1	FR – 3 year project entitled Remaking Leeds. A number of paid bursary's looking to train people in traditional crafts. Paid for a year. 1 st years cohort are in place but after this looking to move to a rolling basis rather than the academic year. Also looking to develop live sites such as Temple Newsome – any ideas for sites please contact us.	
5.2	KG – how are standards maintained? FR – Supervisors are also being trained to ensure that they meet the required standards.	
7.0	Major Developments	
7.1	AC – Work may start in March on St. Peters Hall and Vergers house, leaving St. Peters house as offices. Developer sought demolition without Church backing but was refused anyway.	
7.2	CA – Progressing, have appointed main contractor. Due to start	

	on site early 2015 for 18 month contract. KG – heard there has been a 205 rent reduction across the board. CA- yes to indoor traders in recognition of the disruption.	
8.0	Forward Plan	
8.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QPS workshop • Cycle City Connect • Licensing 	
9.0	Any Other Business	
9.1	Discussion around 92 Kirkgate and proposed work.	
10.0	Date of next meeting	
10.1	A list of dates to be sent out.	