

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 11TH JUNE, 2015

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, G Latty,
T Leadley, N Walshaw, M Ingham,
C Campbell, A Khan, K Ritchie, M Harland,
S McKenna and J Procter

1 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting, and asked Councillor Khan and Councillor Ritchie, who were new members of the Panel, to introduce themselves

2 Late Items

There were no formal late items, however the Panel was in receipt of supplementary information in respect of application 15/00415/FU – Low Fold, which had been circulated prior to the meeting and had been published on the Council's website (minute 6 refers)

3 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests

4 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence had been received from the following Members: Councillor P Gruen, Councillor E Taylor, Councillor R Procter and Councillor Hamilton, with Councillors Harland; S McKenna and J Procter substituting for their respective colleagues

5 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 14th May 2015 be approved

6 Application 15/00415/FU - 312 dwellings including new open space and associated works - Low Fold South Accommodation Road Hunslet LS10

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting to be held on Thursday 23rd July 2015

Further to minute 185 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 14th May 2015, where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for a major residential development on a brownfield site close to the City Centre, the Panel considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the formal application. A supplementary report which set out proposed conditions to be attached to an approval was considered alongside the main report

Plans, photographs, graphics, artist's impressions and precedent images were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had previously taken place and as part of the round of site visits earlier in the day, Members had driven past this site

The Deputy Area Planning Manager presented the report and outlined the scheme, highlighting detailed design elements of the proposed landscaping and elevations and referring to the generally supportive comments made by Panel about the proposals at the May meeting. Particular issues where concerns had been raised related to the level of affordable housing offer and the desire of the applicant to provide a bridge link in lieu of the required level of affordable housing; the durability of some of the proposed materials and the traffic implications arising from the absence of visitor parking within the scheme

Members were informed that the developer had agreed to increase the number of affordable housing units to 16, however these would not be a mix of houses and flats, but would be 1 and 2 bed flats. This would enable the developer to also provide the river bridge. Whilst the provision of this bridge was not necessary to make the development acceptable, in terms of the opportunities it would provide to link to sites in the wider area, it was seen as being of great importance

In terms of durability of the proposed cladding materials, details of these had been included in the submitted report

Concerning parking, no dedicated visitor parking would be provided on site, however the developer was of the view that based on previous experience, not all of the available parking for residents was likely to be taken up. Residents would have access to a Smart App to see where parking spaces were available so could inform their visitors where they could park. Additionally, as part of the S106 agreement, the developer would carry out a parking survey of the area from a walking distance of 800m from the site access road and resurvey this area after the development was complete. If parking problems arising from the development were evident, mitigation measures would be provided

Members were informed that the Environment Agency was now happy with the flood risk assessment and had withdrawn their objection, provided that the flood mitigation measures were carried out as proposed and were controlled by condition, which Officers were satisfied with

If minded to accept the Officer's recommendation, amendments to the Officer's recommendation would be required to clarify that the delivery of the bridge to be controlled by the S106 agreement should be for a pedestrian and cycle bridge, and that in the event the bridge was not delivered, the full level of affordable housing would be provided on site, along with additional necessary off site highway works. Also the S106 Heads of Terms would need to include the requirements for the carrying out of a parking survey pre

and post development and the provision of any off site mitigation measures, in accordance with the approach agreed with the developer

The Panel considered the application with the key areas of discussion relating to:

- the bridge link; the benefits it would bring to the local community and wider area and the importance of ensuring land was available for the bridge to land on the other side of the site. Members were informed that the proposed bridge landing could be provided on land owned by the Council, subject to detailed design
- the affordable housing and where this would be sited. Members were informed the exact location of these units would require discussion with the social landlord but that the intention was not to have them sited in one block
- the Community Interest Company; that this appeared to be a good model and would be of benefit when dealing with maintenance issues
- highways and parking issues, with concerns continuing to be raised at the absence of visitor parking spaces on the site and the possibility of this leading to parking problems occurring beyond the site. The Deputy Area Planning Manager outlined the proposed requirement for pre and post development traffic surveys and the provision of any necessary mitigation measures which would form part of the S106 agreement
- the durability of some of the materials and the need for prospective residents to understand that a level of maintenance of the exterior cladding would be required. Concerns were raised at the practicality of this, particularly for the highest blocks within the scheme
- the landscaping proposals and whether advice would be sought on what was being proposed. The Deputy Area Planning Manager advised that the landscaping was covered by conditions and that the Council's Landscape Officers would consider the proposals

The Panel considered how to proceed

RESOLVED – To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval in principle, subject to the specified conditions set out in the supplementary report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matters:

- affordable housing – the provision of 5% of the total units as affordable housing on site (16 units) plus the delivery of a publicly accessible pedestrian and cycle bridge across the River Aire. In the event the bridge did not proceed, the full 15% of affordable housing to be provided on site in accordance with adopted planning policy and the provision of the necessary additional highway improvement works
- travel plan monitoring fee £3650
- provision of two car club bays and £25,000 car club trial provision

- public access throughout the site
- co-operation with local jobs and skills initiatives
- management fee £750
- parking survey of an area 800m from the site access road prior to development and resurvey upon completion of development and provision of additional parking mitigation measures if required
-

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

7 Application 13/02771/OT - Outline planning application for the erection of residential development, landscaping, open space and incorporating associated new access (layout, appearance, landscaping and scale reserved) - Land off Great North Road Micklefield LS25

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented a report of the Chief Planning Officer on an outline application for residential development, landscaping, open space and new access, with all other matters reserved, on a greenfield site, allocated in the UDP Review for housing at Great North Road Micklefield. A position statement on the proposals had been considered by City Plans Panel on 21st November 2013

Details of the access arrangements; the existing boundary treatments of the site and the relationship of the site to the adjacent newly built dwellings were highlighted. Members were informed that the small area of Green Belt land sited between the housing allocation site and the A1(M) was being proposed by the applicant to be incorporated into the red line boundary to provide additional green space. As this was a departure from the Development Plan, the application would require re-advertisement

In terms of highways issues, the applicant had been asked to consider a solution which improved the existing junction at Barnsdale Road and Church Lane, with the proposals being put forward to widen Barnsdale Road and introduce a right hand turning lane into Church Lane. This was considered to be acceptable to Highway Officers

In terms of the Grade II Listed mile stone, Members were informed this was outside of the development area and would not be affected by the proposals although a condition to protect it during the works was proposed

The proposals would involve tree loss, with this being outlined in the submitted report. Members were informed that most of the trees to be removed were classed as category C, i.e. trees of low quality or young trees, although some category B trees, i.e. trees of moderate quality or value, would be affected. It was stated that this tree loss was unavoidable as the housing allocation had to be delivered

Objections had been received to the proposals, with particular concerns relating to the highways scheme. Although an alternative

roundabout solution had been proposed, this would also impact on trees. Receipt of two further representations was reported, these raising issues relating to highways and flooding. Members were informed that Highways Officers were satisfied with the Stage 1 Safety Audit which had been undertaken on the proposed highway works. In respect of flood risk management, mitigation measures could be installed, with these being dealt with at the detailed design stage

Details of the planning obligations were provided, which would include affordable housing at 15%

In view of the need to re-advertise the application, Members were informed of a revision to the wording of the recommendation to accommodate this

The Panel then heard representations from two objectors who, with agreement of the Chair were on this occasion, given two minutes each to address Members

The concerns relating to the proposals were outlined and included:

- drainage issues
- school provision, particularly in view of the lack of land to expand the local primary school
- highways safety and concerns with the proposed junction layout
- that the application should be deferred for consideration of alternative highways solutions

The Panel then heard from a representative of the developer who provided information on the highways issues, which included:

- the design of the highways proposals which had been approved and reviewed by the Council
- that an independent Stage 1 Safety Audit had been carried out and accepted by Highways Officers
- the proposals provided betterment to existing and future road users
- that Members had all the information they required to consider the proposals

In response to queries regarding education provision and drainage, the Chair invited the developer to respond. In terms of education provision, the developer informed Members he was unable to respond on this point. Concerning drainage and recent ponding which had occurred on part of the site, that this could be mitigated by installing an infiltration trench/land drainage system between the new development and the existing houses on Great North Road

The Panel discussed the application, with the main issues being raised relating to:

- highways. The Transport Development Services Manager advised that much work had been undertaken in considering the proposed solution. The solution was tight and some of the standards were minimum and whilst other solutions might be available, this was what had been submitted and was considered to be acceptable and safe, with an independent Stage 1 Safety Audit having been undertaken and deemed acceptable

- education provision and concerns about the feasibility of this if land for expansion was not available. Members were informed that regarding the expansion of the primary school, a financial contribution for this would normally have been required prior to the adoption of CIL but this type of infrastructure improvement would now be delivered through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). For clarity, the Chief Planning Officer stated that the need for the expansion of the local primary school related to the whole housing allocation site, with the extent of this being highlighted on the plan, for Members' information
- the green space being provided; the siting of the children's play area; (as indicated on the allocation wide masterplan), that providing green space within the Green Belt, might in this case be acceptable in view of the narrowness of the Green Belt at this point, however it was felt there was a need for justification of this course of action, to guard against similar proposals elsewhere
- the need to co-ordinate proposals across a wider area and that the application before Panel could be considered as premature

The Chief Planning Officer advised the Panel that in respect of the highways issues which had been raised, these had been addressed. On the issue of green space, there was a justification for the proposed incorporation of a narrow strip of Green Belt land and that a larger amount of green space was being provided which was acceptable. Finally on the primary school expansion, the financial contribution would be picked up by CIL and that future education provision would need to be picked up with other developers with sites near to the existing primary school. However, it was for Children's Services to advise what provision was needed and where this should be sited.

The Chief Planning Officer stated he did not consider the application to be premature

The Panel considered how to proceed

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the revised red line boundary and re-advertisement of the application as a Departure from the Development Plan; subject to no new, material planning considerations being raised as part of that re-advertisement process and subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report; an additional condition to cover the protection of the Listed mile stone on Barnsdale Road during the construction work (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:

- affordable housing – 15% (with a 60% social rent and 40% submarket split)
- public open space on site of the size and locations set out on the revised masterplan
- improvements to bus stop 24237 at a cost of £10,000
- travel plan, including a monitoring fee of £2,500 and £1,000 contribution for cycle/scooter storage at the primary school
- residential Metrocards (bus and rail) at a cost of £605.00 per dwelling
- employment and training initiatives (applies to the construction of the development)

In the circumstances where the S106 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

During consideration of this matter, Councillor J Procter took his seat in the meeting

8 Application 15/02023//RM - Reserved Matters application at Plot A2 of the wider Thorpe Park Masterplan - Thorpe Park Business Park Barrowby Lane/Manston Lane Leeds 15

Plans, graphics, drawings and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on a Reserved Matters application for a three storey office building with roof mounted plant housing and associated parking on Plot A2 at Thorpe Park

The design of the scheme was outlined and details of the proposed materials were provided. Members were informed what was proposed was a simple, high quality design which incorporated a range of sustainable elements, including provision on the roof for solar photovoltaics. No objections to the application had been raised and the scheme was policy compliant

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to addressing outstanding issues and the imposition of the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate)

9 Application 15/01615/FU - Four storey office building with associated parking - 3175 Century Way Thorpe Park LS15

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

The Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on an application for a four storey office building with associated parking on Plot 3175, sited off Century Way, west of the roundabout off Junction 46 of the M1

Members were informed that the Coal Board had removed their objection to the scheme

In view of the development being for office use, Officers recommended an alteration to the recommendation to include provision for an alteration of the S106 covering the original consent in terms of triggers for the provision of the Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR) which was linked to the amount of office accommodation on the site

RESOLVED - To defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to addressing outstanding issues; the imposition of the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and to include provision for any requisite variation of the S106 in terms of triggers for the provision of the MLLR

10 Preapp/15/00275 - Proposed redevelopment of Tower Works Globe Road comprising offices, residential, supporting A1, A3, A4 and D1 uses and public open space - Tower Works 2 - 10 Globe Road Holbeck LS11 - Pre-application presentation

Plans, photographs including a 1951 photograph of the site; an historic painting of Holbeck; graphics; precedent images and a fly-through were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

The Deputy Area Planning Manager introduced the proposals and referred to the number of proposed developments for Holbeck Urban Village including the Tower Works site which had been brought forward but had not progressed. Reference was also made to the Holbeck Urban Village Planning Framework, which set out the urban design framework and key principles for development within Holbeck Urban Village (HUV) and the number of historic buildings within the area, several of which were Listed

The Tower Works site was owned by the Homes and Communities Agency which had run a competition to develop the site, with Carillion Developments winning the competition and having now entered into pre-application discussions with Officers. The parameters for the competition had referenced the existing planning permission for the site and the adopted planning guidance for the area in relation to massing; scale; connectivity and preserving the setting of the Listed Buildings

Members were informed that an application proposal had also been received from the adjacent site owner, with pre-application discussions beginning to take place and that it was important that the developers of both sites worked collaboratively to ensure delivery of the planning objectives in the Holbeck Urban Village Planning Framework

The Panel then received a presentation from a representative of the developers of the Tower Works site, with Members being provided with information on the proposals which included:

- the mix of uses proposed, these being residential; flexible office space and a range of active uses, including shops, restaurants, cafes and bars, along with public open space
- that nine buildings were proposed to be arranged around the site
- the provision of a main square area which would include a water feature
- that 50% of the site would be Public Open Space and that the use of text within the floor plan would provide a history of the site to its visitors
- the use of greenery which would be used vertically and horizontally
- that to respect the Listed Buildings, the buildings on Globe Road would be kept to a lower level and that the original factory entrance would be used to access the site
- the treatment of Water Lane, with the historic factory wall being continued and new building being sited above it

- the residential accommodation and that this would be a mix of town houses and flats

In response to questions from Members, additional information was provided relating to:

- on-site parking. This would be at a low level as the site was in a highly sustainable location and was close to public transport links. Low level/minimal parking was specified in the HUV Planning Framework and to avoid vehicles coming into HUV, a multi-storey car park was proposed on the periphery of the village. The Listed Building posed limitations in terms of providing an underground car park, as did the risk of flooding. From agent feedback from the development at Granary Wharf, only 27% of residents had taken up the parking on this site, with the developers considering that people who would be interested in living on the site would be making a lifestyle choice not to have a car
- energy efficiency. That BREEAM 'excellent' was being aimed for and that in terms of the provision of solar panels, the number of these to be provided would be that required to meet this standard
- the relationship between blocks D and F and Verona Tower; that these buildings would step back to give the historic tower some breathing space and that a mini square would be created around Verona Tower, with building G benefitting from glazed walls to enjoy the views in this space
- the Engine House and future uses for this. It was noted this building was in Council ownership. The developer's representative stated that a number of uses were being considered for this building, including a micro-brewery and an art house cinema

Members discussed the proposals and commented on the following key issues:

- the attractiveness of much of the scheme, particularly at Globe Road and the use of the original entrance archway but concerns that the historic, listed towers were not being sufficiently respected within the scheme; that they were being crowded; that from some aspects, it would be difficult to glimpse views of them and from the canal view, any building on the adjacent site could obscure the towers entirely and that in previous discussions about the site, Members had stressed the importance of retaining views of the towers
- the Globe Quay building and that this would be dwarfed by the surrounding buildings and that a less dense development which provided more space around the Towers would be more appropriate
- the excellent use of brickwork in the scheme
- the green credentials being aimed for and the importance of buildings in this area meeting high BREEAM standards

- the use of green walls within the scheme which was welcomed as was the accommodation types, with some triplex units being provided
- that the considerable attention given to the Globe Road frontage had not been sustained in respect of buildings inside the site
- concerns about blocks G, J, K and L which were felt to create a closed in effect
- land ownership and commercial matters and how these could be affected if a less dense development was proposed
- that the low level of on site car parking provision must be justified, particularly for family sized units

The Panel considered the specific points Officers required Members' comments on, as set out in the submitted report. Prior to this, the Deputy Area Planning Manager highlighted that whilst ground floor active uses were generally supported by planning policy, the amount of A1 use was normally restricted. The developer's representative stated that the A1 use could be reduced to less than 372 sqm

In response to the questions posed in the report, the Panel made the following comments:

- that the mix of proposed uses were acceptable, in view of the comments made on behalf of the applicant about the extent of the A1 uses
- that the scale and arrangement of the buildings were not appropriate, especially with regard to the listed towers and buildings and that further consideration needed to be given to these matters, in light of the detailed comments by Members
- that Members were supportive of the emerging mix and standard of residential accommodation being proposed
- to note Members' concerns and views on the approach to car parking provision within the site and the need for accessibility improvements on Globe Road

The Deputy Area Planning Manager stressed the importance of the pedestrian access being as good as it could be to accommodate greater pedestrian trips generated by the proposals, with Officers being of the view that the width of the Globe Road footpath was not wide as was desired and that there were aspirations to better connect this site to the surrounding area to the south

RESOLVED - To note the report, the presentation and the comments now made

11 Preapp/15/00332 - Proposals for a roof top extension to the southern arcade block of the Victoria Gate development - land bounded by Eastgate, St Peters Street and George Street/Dyer Street - Pre-application presentation

Plans and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Members received a presentation from the developer's architect on proposals for a roof top extension to the southern arcade block of the Victoria Gate development

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting to be held on Thursday 23rd July 2015

The background to the project; the construction process and planning history were briefly outlined to the Panel. Members were reminded that the original approved scheme for the first phase of the development included a 3 storey block to the southern edge of the site. The developer then considered that not all 3 floors to this side of the Phase 1 site were required and submitted a variation application to remove the top floor of the southern block. In view of the level of demand for restaurant space within the scheme, the developer was now seeking to reintroduce a 3rd floor to the southern block

Due to the level of construction which had already been carried out, a lightweight solution to providing this additional accommodation was proposed, with corten steel and patinated brass being considered

The Panel also heard representations from an objector who expressed concern that the proposal would impact on the viability of the Templar Pub and other A3 and A4 uses in the immediate vicinity of the site and that Hammersons had appeared to have changed their views on what were appropriate uses in this area

The Panel discussed the proposals and sought reassurances about the access arrangements to the roof top restaurant by people with mobility issues. Members were reassured that as well as a spiral staircase, there was good lift provision

In response to the specific points raised in the report, the Panel provided the following comments:

- that the scale, massing and layout of the proposed extension were acceptable
- that the design and materials proposed were acceptable. The confidence Members had in the developer's architect, Mr Ludewig, was stressed
- that the proposal could be delegated to Officers for the determination of any subsequent planning application

12 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday 2nd July 2015 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds