



## Report of the Chief Planning Officer

### *CITY PLANS PANEL*

Date: 5<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2015

**Subject: PLANNING APPLICATION REF. 14/04641/FU MIXED-USE, MULTI-LEVEL DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING THE ERECTION OF 4 NEW BUILDINGS, WITH 744 RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS, 713SQM OF FLEXIBLE COMMERCIAL FLOORSPACE (A1-A5, B1, D1, D2 USE CLASSES), CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND PUBLIC AMENITY SPACE AT SWEET STREET AND MANOR ROAD, HOLBECK, LEEDS LS11 9AY**

#### **APPLICANT**

Ingram Row Limited

#### **DATE VALID**

7 August 2014

#### **TARGET DATE**

31 March 2015  
(Extended)

#### **Electoral Wards Affected:**

**City and Hunslet**

Yes Ward Members consulted referred to in report)

#### **Specific Implications For:**

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Members are asked to note this update report on outstanding issues from when the application was last considered by City Plans Panel on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2015 and to Defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the specified conditions set out in Appendix 4 of the 22<sup>nd</sup> January report as updated and amended (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and following the completion of a Section 106 agreement to cover the following matters;

- Provision of 37 (5%) on-site low cost rental flats comprising a mix of studio, 1 bed and 2 bed flats in a similar proportion to the overall mix of the scheme available for those in full-time employment nominated by Leeds City Council
- £11,011 to be allocated to Holbeck Urban Village public realm or public transport
- Specific travel plan measures contributions – car club trial provision of £27,000
- Travel plan monitoring fee of £6,040
- Public access through the site

- Cooperation with local jobs and skills initiatives
- Management fee of £1,500

The intention is to complete the Section 106 and issue the decision before 6<sup>th</sup> April 2015 when CIL is introduced although the introduction of CIL does not substantially affect this development. In the circumstances where the Section 106 agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant permission the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Members last considered this application and a below the line report regarding viability on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2015. Members resolved to defer determination of the application for one cycle to enable further negotiations between officers and the applicant in terms of design (including the difference in design terms between achieving a Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 as proposed and a Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 as required by adopted planning guidance); the viability issues and low cost market flats offer within the Section 106 agreement and the proposed parking levels. In relation to design members were concerned that the design was uninspiring and relentless, and had detailed concerns about the use and extent of exposed concrete, and the balcony treatments.
- 1.2 This report will update members on progress made on these matters which will be augmented by a presentation at Plans Panel . The report to the 22<sup>nd</sup> January Panel is appended to this report for information and sets out a full description, policies and the appraisal of the scheme at that point. Members will recall that the confidential report at the last meeting and the summary given by the District Valuer was accepted by members as a robust examination of the viability of the scheme and what it was able to deliver.

## 2.0 DESIGN MATTERS

- 2.1 Following the Plans Panel in January the Chief Planning Officer involved John Thorp in reviewing the scheme and that has led to a productive dialogue with the scheme architects and the applicant. As a consequence a number of revisions and refinements have been made which respond positively to member comments made at Panel. These will be fully described and illustrated at the Panel meeting but can be summarised as follows;
  - On plan, Building A2 (north west block, part of the overall approach of 4 L-shaped blocks) has been inflected at its base by amending the ground floor terraces to reflect the alignment of Manor Mills and Ingram Row and respond better to the street frontage. The alignment of the superstructure remains unchanged.
  - The site plan now indicates the context and lines of pedestrian movement through the locality
  - Overall the form of each block has been subdivided on the vertical lines of each apartment to subtly break up the overall form
  - Brick components at the gables and the plinth have been revised to a light textured (soft brown colour) to complement context

- The framing product material (for balconies) has been changed to reconstructed Portland stone (it is proposed that sample panels and planning conditions will ensure a positive finish is achieved).
- The balcony depth has been widened to 1200mm (from c.1000mm previously)
- The panels to the rear wall have been revised from a mahogany tone to a light oak tone
- In each bay the balustrade and screens have been revised to provide a more integrated approach to balcony design. The balcony edge panels and screens are carefully placed and angled to create a sense of depth, and 3-dimensions to the bays - enhancing streetscene views
- Colour/form/detail has been used to differentiate between sections of the buildings, and provide a rhythm to the streetscene views

2.2 As a result of these changes considerable progress has been made in producing a scheme which sits well within its context and is of a high quality.

### 3.0 PARKING LEVELS

3.1 The site is in a sustainable location, the table below shows the walk distance and time to facilities.

FACILITY	DISTANCE	WALK TIME
Holbeck Urban Village, Café /Pubs /corner shops	450m	5.5mins
Bridgewater Place Tesco Extra	300m	3.5mins
Crown Point Retail	800m	10.0mins
College of Building / City College	1200m	15.0mins
Outbound bus stop	370m	4.5mins
Inbound bus stop	270m	3.2mins
Station S entrance	800m	10.0mins
Boar Lane / Trinity	950m	11.3mins

3.2 The Core Strategy requires that bus services should be within a 5 minute walk, rail services within a 10 minute walk and local facilities also within a 10 minute walk. Employment, leisure and retail should be within a 5 minute walk of a 15 minute frequency bus service. The site meets or exceeds the requirements and clearly has additional attractions close by. The buses that use adjacent stops to the site include several high frequency services and serve destinations such as; The City Centre, the White Rose Centre, Wakefield, Kirklees destinations, Lawnswood / Headingley / Roundhay and also provide a frequent link to the city centre.

3.3 Residents will benefit from the City Car Club, with vehicles in close proximity, a high level of cycle parking and access to a safe cycle route passing along Meadow Road along with the quieter streets through Holbeck.

3.4 The ability to park vehicles on the surrounding highway network is controlled through Traffic Regulation Orders, some pay and display spaces are available close to the development, however they are quite heavily used during the day, but would be available for overnight parking and visitors. The nearest streets without parking controls (measured from the centre of the site) are within Holbeck; Holbeck Moor Road 970m walk from the site and St Matthews Street 950m walk from the site are the nearest

points. The remoteness of this parking would make it unattractive for overnight or long term parking.

3.5 The 2011 census has been examined to compare car ownership in areas of the city where there are clusters of apartments. It seems that the development site straddles 3 output areas which range in car ownership from 34% to 85% averaging at 56%. The results show a correlation between the level of parking provision in the apartments and car ownership. This is illustrated by the adjacent census area that includes the Velocity development in City Walk having a high level of parking and only 28% of households not owning a car, whilst the similarly adjacent census area containing the Manor Mills development with low parking provision has 68% of households not owning a car. These two cases represent the extremes of non-car ownership, however most established apartment developments have approximately 50% of households not owning a car.

3.6 The proposal is for 263 spaces for approx. 744 flats which allows for 35% car ownership which is within but at the bottom end of the range of car ownership figures for the area. Clearly there would have to be harm shown to refuse an application on this basis. The area is widely controlled with paid on-street parking bays which operate during the day, allowing parking for visitors and residents. Hence from a highway safety / congestion perspective it is not anticipated that there would be any highway problems with allowing this level of car parking in this city centre parking policy area where there is very good access to city centre facilities and public transport.

3.7 The proposed car parking provision also reflects the level of parking at similar developments within Leeds City Centre and others, as illustrated below (information supplied by Dandara):

- West Street/ Kirkstall Road, Leeds – Mixed use development including 100 apartments, in addition to hotel, offices, A3/ A4 use, with 32 car parking spaces – c. 68% car free housing;
- Cambridge Street, Manchester City Centre – Development comprising 282 residential apartments and ground floor commercial uses, with 75 associated basement car parking spaces – c. 73% car free housing;
- Chapel Wharf, Salford - Another Dandara development comprising 995 new dwellings and ground floor commercial space with 375 car parking spaces - c. 63% car free housing.
- Liverpool: Manfred Street/ Erskine Street – 592 residential units with six car parking spaces provided in total – 99% car free housing. The development has good public transport provision and a car club operates in the area.

3.8 In summary, there is evidence that residential developments with low car parking provision is viable, practically the availability of public transport, car club schemes, cycle facilities and good walking routes, along with proximity to local facilities and the city centre means that it is perfectly viable to live in the location of the development site without a private car.

#### **4.0 AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION AND MIX**

4.1 The applicants have confirmed through their viability appraisals that they can not meet the Council's normal affordable housing requirements on this site. As an alternative they are prepared to offer 37 of the 744 units (5%) for low cost rent. The applicant has confirmed that they will accept nominations from Leeds City Council for all the low cost flats, for those in full-time employment where this is defined, by either a minimum salary or minimum number of 30 + hours a week. The low cost rental flats would be retained

in perpetuity and managed by the company for the development. The full details will be controlled by the S106 agreement.

4.2 In revising the design for the scheme there has been a slight change to the mix in that 744 units are still proposed but 43 of the one beds would become two beds. This can be accommodated within the layout without increasing the massing by the more efficient use of internal space and the loss of some additional corridors. The amended units are still considered to provide an acceptable level of internal amenity. The mix now proposed is therefore ;

81 studios (10.9%) at 29.1 sq m  
252 x 1 bed (33.9%) at 44.4 sq m  
401 x 2 bed (53.9%) at 59.7 sq m  
10 x 3 bed (1.3%) at 89.7 sq m

4.3 It is expected that the mix of the 37 low cost units will be studios, 1 and 2 bed flats in a similar proportion to the mix of the overall scheme.

## **5.0 Sustainability**

5.1 In order to be financially viable the scheme will achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3. To achieve Code 3 the approach follows the energy hierarchy with priority given to efficient design, before consideration of renewables. It is therefore proposed to adopt an energy efficient design focusing on high performance building fabric and control systems (walls, glazing, roof, flooring), passive design measures to reduce energy demand for heating, cooling, ventilation and lighting and electric space and hot water heating to reduce the risk of unwanted internal heat gains and overheating.

5.2 The materials pallet proposed are compared against the British Research Establishment's Green Guide Methodology, these materials will also look to be procured from sustainable suppliers. To manage water efficiency within each apartment, water efficient sanitary fittings will be selected resulting in a water consumption of 105l/person/day.

5.3 The scheme also addresses the sustainable approach to resident wellbeing; internally the scheme will address improved sound insulation values and externally the ecological biodiversity of the site will be significantly improved with native species planting. All residents will have access to private space, communal or private balcony that has been designed to promote natural surveillance. To mitigate any pollution contribution from the site, the drainage strategy responds to the flood risk in proposing sustainable urban drainage via attenuation tanks. In terms of global warming, low global warming potential insulants will be selected and the proposed space and water heating will emit no Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emissions.

5.4 If the scheme was progressed under Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 as recommended by local planning guidance, the only differences would be:

- Energy - A Combined Heat and Power (CHP) boiler would be installed to heat and distribute hot water. The CHP boiler provides the 25% improvement over 2010 building regulations and the 10% contribution towards low carbon energy required.
- Water - Water consumption per apartment would be reduced from 105 litres per day to 90 litres per day by use of water saving fittings;
- Materials - There would be an increase in the use of Green Guide compliant materials but there would be a slight reduction in the use of responsibly resourced materials;

- Pollution - By installing a CHP boiler, it would result in the scheme emitting Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) emissions.

## **6.0 CONCLUSION**

6.1 The above matters are considered to respond positively to and address the concerns raised by Plans Panel on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2015. On the basis of this and all other matters addressed by the appended 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2015 Panel report it is considered that on balance, the proposals are considered to comply with the Council's substantive adopted policies, and would constitute acceptable sustainable development. This proposal would lead to the early delivery of much needed new homes within an existing and proposed strategic housing allocation, and deliver the regeneration of a longstanding cleared brownfield site in the City Centre, close to public transport links, in a sustainable location. The scheme would also contribute towards meeting low cost housing need, support sustainable travel patterns, provide improved public realm and pedestrian connectivity, provide active employment uses in part of the ground floor, and further the regeneration of the Holbeck Urban Village area of Leeds South Bank.

### **Background Papers:**

Application file 14/04641/FU

### **Appendix:**

**22<sup>nd</sup> January 2015 City Plans Panel report and relevant Minutes**