

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 14TH DECEMBER, 2017

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

Councillors P Gruen, G Latty, T Leadley,  
N Walshaw, C Campbell, A Khan,  
A Garthwaite, B Selby, C Macniven,  
E Nash and B Anderson

Member's site visits were held in connection with the following proposals:  
PREAPP/17/00602 – City Reach, Kirkstall, Leeds1, PREAPP/17/00288 –  
Brunswick Point, Wade Lane, Leeds 2 and Application No.17/06605/FU –  
Symons House, Belgrave Street, Leeds 2 and was attended by the following  
Councillors: J McKenna, A Garthwaite, P Gruen, C Macniven, C Campbell, G  
Latty, B Anderson and T Leadley

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

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

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

There were no items identified where it was considered necessary to exclude  
the press or public from the meeting due to the nature of the business to be  
considered.

### **91 Late Items**

The Chair accepted the inclusion of an additional item onto the agenda as  
referred to in Minute No.97 – Application No. 17/03974/RM – Reserve Matters  
application for 292 dwellings on land south of railway line at Thorpe Park,  
Leeds, LS15 8ZB. Members were informed that the item was not available at  
the time of the agenda publication and it was in the best interests of the  
Council and other parties concerned that the matter be considered without  
delay.

### **92 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interests made at the  
meeting.

### **93 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: D Blackburn and R  
Procter.

Councillors: B Anderson was in attendance as a substitute.

## 94 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2017 were submitted for consideration and approval

Councillor Nash required an amendment to Minutes No. 81 to highlight that the Council should purchase Lazencroft Farm to compensate for the adverse impact of the new road.

The Chair clarified that Plans Panel could not instruct the purchase of property but that the minutes reflected Panel's view that compensation should be available to residents affected by the proposal.

It was agreed that Panel supported the provision of greater assurance to the resident of Lazencroft Farm that their outstanding issues would be satisfactorily addressed.

**RESOLVED** – That with the inclusion of the above the minutes of the previous meeting held on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2017 be accepted as a true and correct record

## 95 Matters Arising

Demand for Student Accommodation within the City Centre (Minute No. 84 refers) - Proposals to create a 15 storey and a 27 storey student accommodation building within the city centre - Councillor Gruen referred to the proliferation of student accommodation within the city centre and asked if his earlier request for a report on the demand for student accommodation including the views of developers and the impact of businesses within the city centre would be made available

In responding the Chief Planning Officer confirmed that research was currently being undertaken and would be the subject of a report back to Members in due course.

It was reported that at the last Joint Plans Panel meeting Councillor Leadley enquired about the planning position on the Majestics site, City Square.

The City Centre Team Leader confirmed that works had started on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2017 and that the temporary roof structure had been adapted to enable the permanent structure to be installed with completion of the works programmed for June 2019.

Councillor Leadley also sought confirmation of the planning position on the public access through Pennine House, Russell Street which had been blocked up.

The City Centre Team Leader reported that the access (which runs under Pennine House and was in private ownership) was blocked up by the adjacent restaurant use and is being used as a bin store and plant location. The access

was blocked up without planning permission and the owners disputed the need for planning permission for these works. Following negotiation with the applicant and representation from the neighbouring developers of the Dakota Hotel (who wanted the bin and plant stores to be screened) a pragmatic planning position was adopted to not pursue planning enforcement action against the closure of the access. This takes into account the provision of a new pedestrian route from Greek Street to Russell Street provided by the Dakota Hotel development and the provision of an off-site commuted sum by the site owners that were put towards public realm improvements to Russell Street

**96 Application No. 17/006605/FU - Proposed demolition of existing office building and construction of new, part 9, part 23 storey, student accommodation building at Symons House, Belgrave Street, Leeds 2**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application for the proposed demolition of existing office building and the construction of new, part 9, part 23 storey, student accommodation building at Symons House, Belgrave Street, Leeds 2

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

The Planning Case Officer addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- The proposal is to demolish the existing building and to construct a new building with a rectangular footprint, similar to that existing. The new building would have an “L shaped” form when viewed from the south. The taller element, approximately two thirds of the length of the building, would be 23 storeys (18 at pre-application), 66.4m in height. The lower eastern shoulder would be 9 storeys (10 at pre-application) 27.6m in height, a similar height to Fairfax House.
- Due to the changing ground levels the full extent of the lower ground floor of the building would be exposed on the southern elevation whereas fronting Belgrave Street the lower ground floor level would only be evident at the lower, eastern end of the building. The ground floor of the building fronting Belgrave Street would be set back approximately 2 metres from the building line above. The first floor soffit height would be a minimum of 3.5 metres above ground level. The lowest two levels of the buildings would be largely glazed and the upper levels faced in light-coloured brickwork.
- The lower ground floor of the building would contain plant, bin and cycle stores, a laundry, transformer room and the lower level of a gym, part of the dedicated facilities provided for the students. The ground floor, accessed from the north-west corner of the building onto Belgrave Street, would comprise the reception area, study areas, open

lounge space, a cinema room and the upper level of the gym. The dedicated space would total 748m<sup>2</sup>.

- The upper floors of the building would contain a mix of studios; one-bedroom apartments, and 2, 4 and 5 bedroom student clusters.

Studios 185

Apartments 10

2 bedroom cluster (10)

4 bedroom cluster (16)

5 bedroom cluster (14)

Total Bed spaces 349

- Other than for one, larger, accessible studio (44.2m<sup>2</sup>) the standard studio size would be 21.34m<sup>2</sup>. The one bedroom apartments would be 44.2m<sup>2</sup>. The 2 bedroom clusters would have 14.5m<sup>2</sup> study bedrooms with 21m<sup>2</sup> kitchen/living spaces; the 4 bedroom clusters would have 14.5m<sup>2</sup> study bedrooms and 43m<sup>2</sup> kitchen/living space; and the 5 bedroom clusters would have 14m<sup>2</sup> study bedrooms and 31m<sup>2</sup> kitchen/living areas. Each apartment will be fitted with bespoke bathroom and kitchen units, pre-fabricated off-site, prior to installation in the building. The apartments are designed to have distinct zones for washing / dressing, living / dining and sleep / studying.
- A student amenity room (44.2m<sup>2</sup>) is proposed at level 8 with access from this point onto an external amenity terrace (189.5m<sup>2</sup>) located on the roof of the lower shoulder of the building. The terrace would be sheltered and secured by raised planting and a balustrade.
- The building would be serviced from Belgrave Street making use of the existing layby across the street and from the parking court to the rear. The applicant and officers have discussed the desirability of making Belgrave Street more pedestrian friendly and to improving accessibility to the St Alban's Place green space.

In response to Members questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Why was the Section 106 legal agreement required to be completed within 3 months. Was this timescale normally achieved.
- Would there be night time lighting
- What is the relationship to nearby heritage buildings such as the Belgrave Music Hall
- Further information was required on the impact of student accommodation in the area
- The commuted sum of £200,000 for highway improvement works, what would it be used for
- How would student pick up and drop off be managed

- The building still appeared to be too chunky due to the strong horizontal lines, could these be softened. Concern was also raised about the solidity and appearance of the gable ends
- It was suggested the outside of the building may become discoloured due to the proximity of the Inner Ring Road and weathering

The Planning Case Officer together with the applicant's representative provided the following responses:

- The reference to the 3 month deadline for completing Section 106 agreements allows the Chief Planning Officer to refuse planning permission without coming back to Plans Panel if there is no progress being made on the Section 106 Heads of Terms as agreed at Plans Panel. For most applications successful progress is made although in many cases it takes longer than 3 months to complete the legalities of the documentation.
- Night time lighting would be provided and the details are to be controlled by planning condition.
- The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that the application before Members was in line with current adopted Council Policy. A report on the demand for student accommodation including the views of developers and Universities and the impact on residents and businesses within the city centre would be made available to Members in due course
- The commuted sum would not fund widening of the footways but would fund the refurbishment of footways and highway improvements to create a more friendly pedestrian area. It was noted that it was not possible to totally pedestrianise Brunswick Street due to the need to provide on-street car parking spaces and access the on-street loading bays
- There was no parking associated with this development so day to day pick up and drop off would rely on on-street parking but arrangements for the start and end of terms, in conjunction with nearby St Alban's Place development, would be agreed with the local highway authority
- In terms of the appearance of the building, there was a need to provide visual interest through the brick detailing of the building but it may be possible to make the horizontal grid lines less prominent in order to emphasise the vertical nature of the building and reduce its apparent "chunkiness"
- The building construction could be detailed to avoid staining of the brickwork.
- The gaps across Merrion Place and Merrion Street and the immediate context of more modern large scale buildings help to mitigate any unduly dominant impact on the setting of nearby heritage assets such as the Belgrave Music Hall

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- A New Policy for Student Accommodation in the city centre was required
- Brunswick Street should be pedestrianised and £200,000 is insufficient for this
- Some Members were of the view that the room size was too small and living conditions were unacceptable (Councillor Campbell and Councillor Mcniven) other Members considered the room size and amenities to be acceptable
- Although there was some discussion about the proposed brick colour and possible introduction of another material , overall it was considered that the design of the building was acceptable
- The suggestion to make the grid line less prominent was welcomed

In summing up the Chair thanked the Developers for their attendance commenting that the majority of Members appeared to be supportive of the proposals

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the resolution of detailed highway improvement and wind issues and the specified conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and also the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- Use of accommodation for use solely by students in full-time higher education;
- A travel plan monitoring fee of £3,765
- Implementation of travel plan
- Local employment and training initiatives;
- Section 106 management fee of £750.

In the event of the Section 106 having 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.

**97 17/03974/RM Reserved Matters application for 292 dwellings on land south of railway line at Thorpe Park, Leeds, LS15 8ZB**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a Reserved Matters application for 292 dwellings (currently revised upwards to 300) including layout, scale, appearance, landscape and access to northern development plots on land south of railway line at Thorpe Park, Leeds, LS15 8ZB

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

The Planning Case Officer addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- The application relates to the northern half of the employment allocation at Thorpe Park that totalled approximately 65 hectares. The site is located to the south of the Leeds- York railway line and Manston Lane, west of the M1 (junction 46), north of the A63 Selby Road and the existing Thorpe Park buildings. Austhorpe Lane is to the west. The site covers Zone B of the Thorpe Park masterplan but excludes what it termed 'Central Park', which is an important landscaping and open space feature running east to west across the site and which contains the SUDS attenuation/balancing ponds.
- The application seeks approval of the detailed reserved matters relating to layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and detailed access arrangements for this residential development. The main access from a signalised junction from the north south Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR) has already been approved at the outline stage.

In response to Members questions, the following issues were discussed:

- Could clarification be provided around the contribution to Green Park
- Was the affordable housing mix policy compliant and were lifts fitted within the flats designed for elderly occupants
- Could clarification be provided as to where the railway station would be located

In responding to the issues raised, the Planning Case Officer together with the applicant's representative provided the following responses:

- A contribution towards Green Park would be provided upon commencement of the residential development
- It was confirmed that the affordable housing mix was policy compliant and lifts designed for the elderly would be fitted within the flats
- The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that West Yorkshire Combined Authority were proposing a railway station to serve the area but the positioning of the platforms and station was still to be determined

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- This was a very much improved scheme since coming to Panel at a pre application stage
- This was a good demonstration of partnership working between the Council and the applicants
- Members expressed a wish to see more what was envisaged in terms of the railway station and park & ride provision

In summing up the Chair thanked the Developers for their attendance commenting that there had been some good partnership working and Members were supportive of the revised proposals

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval

**98 PREAPP/17/00288 - Pre Application Presentation for a stepped block of up to 18 storeys providing student accommodation comprising some 99 units with ground floor communal spaces and a landscape scheme around the building at land to the north of Brunswick Point/Q One, Wade Lane, Leeds, LS2 8DS.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of a pre-application proposal for a stepped block of up to 18 storey's providing student accommodation comprising 99 units with ground floor communal space and a landscaped scheme around the building at land to the north of Brunswick Point/Q One, Wade Lane, Leeds, LS2 8DS.

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

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- The site is 0.06 hectares in area and is currently in use as a car park for the adjacent Q One building. The adjacent Q One building is a seven storey building comprising 84 apartments that is also owned by the Developer and is managed on their behalf by YPP.
- The site is located in the north of the city centre and is accessible from the main arterial route of Wade Lane / Lovell Park Road. The site sits above Leeds Inner Ring Road (A64) in a prominent gateway location which is visible from the surrounding area when approaching the city centre. As well as hard standing for parking, the site also includes existing soft/green landscaping, including trees, along its perimeters, two of which are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Further trees in the grounds of the adjacent Q One are also subject to Tree Preservation Orders. A Public Right of Way runs along the eastern edge of the site, outside its boundary.
- The proposed development seeks to construct a part 11, 15 and 18 storey (with roof top plant) building of student accommodation. The scheme would comprise 99 studio dwellings, for occupation by students, ranging in internal floorspace from 23 sq. metres to 25 sq. metres. The proposal would include a range of high quality communal facilities within the ground floor level of the proposed building, comprising a lounge, reception area with TV, a breakfast room and study rooms/pods. Occupiers would also be able to make use of the lower ground floor of the existing Q One building, which will provide a



cinema room (c. 30 – 40sqm), a games room (c.80sqm), a storage area for students (c. 30-40sqm) and additional cycle stands.

Members raised the following questions:

- Were the developers confident that the construction of the foundations would not impact on the Inner Ring Road
- Would a wind survey be undertaken
- More information was required as to the design/ appearance of the building
- How would student drop off and pick up be managed

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representatives said:

- The developers confirmed that a structural engineer had been instructed and that they were confident that the foundations could be constructed without impacting on the Inner Ring Road
- The developer confirmed a wind impact assessment would be undertaken
- Referring to the design/ appearance of the building the applicant stated that the indicative proposals suggested a brick frame with vertical windows but other ideas were emerging
- Car parking spaces would still be available on site to manage drop off and pick up at the start and end of term.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- A number of trees would be lost which were covered by a Tree Preservation Orders but it was accepted that replacement planting would be carried out
- The majority of Members expressed the view that this was a small site and the proposal was too large for the site.
- The proposed development was too close to neighbouring properties, in some instances only 5m away
- Members emphasised the need to have further details about the design/ appearance of the building
- Turning within the site for cars would be tight
- The free gym membership was a positive

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion Members provided the following feedback;

- The majority of Members were supportive of the principle of the use (Councillors: Campbell and Leadley did not support the principle of the use)
- Subject to further details being provided, the majority of Members considered the internal amenity including communal space was likely to be acceptable for student accommodation (Councillor Campbell was

of the view that the internal amenity and communal space was inadequate)

- Members were not supportive of the emerging scale, massing and design proposals. The proposals represented overdevelopment of the site
- Members were supportive of the approach to tree planting including off-site mitigation
- Further information was required around the approach to transport and access including details on pick up and drop off arrangements and the available car queuing space within the site

In summing up the Chair said Members required further details about the design/ appearance of the building and that it was the view that too much was being put onto a small site.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation

**99 PREAPP/17/00602 - Pre-Application Presentation for outline proposal 'City Reach 2' - mixed use scheme comprising private sector residential and private rented sector (PRS) residential with ancillary ground floor 'active' uses, small scale retailing, café/restaurants, bars at site south of Kirkstall Road fronting the River Aire (former First Bus depot site) and proposed amendments to outline permission for neighbouring 'City Reach 1' site, approval ref. 15/06844/OT.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of a pre-application proposal for outline proposals for “City Reach 2” – mixed use scheme comprising private sector residential and private rented sector (PRS) residential with ancillary ground floor active uses, small scale retailing, café/restaurants, bars at site south of Kirkstall Road fronting the River Aire (Former First Bus Depot site) and proposed amendments to outline permission for neighbouring “City Reach 1” site, Approval Reference No. 15/06844/OT

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

The applicant’s representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- The proposals comprises of two applications across the City Reach 1 (CR1) and City Reach 2 (CR2) sites: 1. CR1 Reserved Matters Application (RMA), submitted pursuant to the extant outline planning permission reference 15/06844/OT; 2. CR2 Hybrid Application, comprising a detailed (full) application for a small area of landscaped

surface-level car parking, and an outline application for residential-led development on the remainder of the site.

- The resultant scheme includes 526 residential units and 309 student units split as follows:
  - Block A: 309 student units, to be provided as 93% cluster flats and 7% studios. The building would extend to 11 and 12 storeys in height.
  - Block B: 128 PRS units in a building extending to 7 and 9 storeys.
  - Block C: 111 PRS units in a building of 5 and 8 storeys.
  - Block D: 105 PFS units in a building extending to 5 and 9 storeys.
  - Block E: 182 PFS units in a building extending to 7 and 9 storeys.
- The proposals would be set around a landscaped public realm that maximises access to, and enjoyment of, the river frontage through the provision of considerable public open space and a river park. 210 car parking spaces would be provided within the site at street level.
- The CR2 site is seen as a continuation of CR1, and the design approach has addressed the two sites comprehensively as a result. A hybrid application is proposed to progress CR2 through the planning process. A small surface level car park in the north-east of the CR2 site and provides for 42 car parking spaces to meet the parking requirements of the CR1 development (and align with the above mentioned ratios). The area will be heavily landscape focussed, with an emphasis on the use of trees and softer materials to create shared spaces.
- An outline planning permission is sought for the remainder of the CR2 site to comprise a residential-led development of four blocks. The four buildings would sit two to the north and two to the south of the continuation of the east-west route from the CR1 site. These would then be separated by a northsouth oriented linear park that assumes central position within the site and provides a continuous and green pedestrian connection from Kirkstall Road through to the River Aire, mirroring that proposed within the CR1 site.
- The CR2 site would be served by 252 surface level car parking spaces ensuring a consistent parking ratio with CR1. Supporting commercial uses would be provided at ground floor to generate activity and interest. An appropriate quantum of cycle parking (both resident and visitor) will be provided and is subject to further discussions with officers.
- A single point of vehicular access/egress would be provided on Kirkstall Road to City Reach 2 meaning that in total there would be only two points of access from Kirkstall Rd to the combined City Reach 1 and 2 sites.

In response to Members questions, the following were raised:

- The layout of the development created an east/west spine, would there be wind implications as a consequence
- There appeared to be a large area for surface parking, could more basement parking be created
- What were the build out rates
- Had any of the businesses on site been given any assistance with relocating
- Were there any issues around contaminated land
- Would the proposed development lead to increased congestion on Kirkstall Road
- Was there adequate school provision in the area
- In terms of sustainability were green roofs and photovoltaic cells being considered
- How would the greenspace be maintained
- Was there a lighting scheme planned for the development
- Were the applicants aware of proposals for FAS 2 works (Flood Alleviation Scheme) along the north bank of the river Aire

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representatives said:

- The applicants confirmed that a wind survey would be undertaken as part of the detailed work
- It was reported that customer perception suggested that basement parking was a concern within a flood zone. It was also considered the surface parking allows the spaces to be "re-purposed" if they are not needed in the future
- City Reach 1 would be developed as a single phase with a completion date of summer 2020, City Reach 2 would then begin
- It was reported that the applicants were in dialogue with the existing tenants, all were located on the City Reach 2 site and therefore they have plenty of notice to relocate
- In terms of contaminated land, a ground survey was ongoing and remedial works would be undertaken if required
- Access arrangements onto Kirkstall Road were appropriate and included a second access point further along Kirkstall Road (Left turn). The applicant confirmed that they did not anticipate further congestion issues along Kirkstall Road
- In terms of school provision for the area, officers from the Children & Families Directorate suggested that evidence to date indicates that flatted development in the city centre generates less school aged children and therefore it is likely that the proposal would result in an off-site contribution to enable expansion of capacity in existing schools rather the need for an additional school on site. The details were being discussed with planning officers and the applicant.
- On the issue of sustainability the applicant confirmed that it was their intention that the development complies with Core Strategy policies

EN1 and EN2 and that green roofs and photovoltaic cells would be included within the scheme.

- It was confirmed the client would maintain and manage the site including the maintenance of the greenspace
- It was confirmed a lighting scheme would be included within the development
- The applicant reported that they had reduced the level of the ground within CR2 to enable parts of the river frontage open-space to flood

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- With respect to phase 1, could consideration be given to a slight repositioning of block D to provide a 20m flood zone
- Could consideration be given to the provision of segregated cycle-ways along Kirkstall Road

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion Members provided the following feedback;

- Members were supportive of the proposed uses on the site but a further understanding of school provision in the area was required
- Members were supportive of the emerging scale and design of development for City Reach 1 and 2
- Members were supportive of the emerging approach to public space and landscaping provision on the site but further information about the surface car parking provision was required

In summing up the Chair said Members appeared to be generally supportive of the development but further consideration was required on a number of issues

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation

#### **100 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> January 2018 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.