

## **CITY PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 8TH MARCH, 2018**

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

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn, G Latty,  
T Leadley, N Walshaw, C Campbell,  
A Khan, A Garthwaite, E Nash and  
M Coulson

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

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

### **124 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 confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

### **125 Late Items**

There were no late items of business to be considered.

### **126 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

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

### **127 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: C Macniven and B Selby.

Councillor M Coulson was in attendance as a substitute Member.

### **128 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2018 were submitted for consideration and approval.

**RESOLVED** – That the Minutes of the previous meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2018 be accepted as a true and correct record.

### **129 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

Proposed pedestrian improvements to be provided at the junction of Portland Crescent and Woodhouse Lane, Leeds 2 (Minute No. 120 referred) – With reference to the previous meeting when it was agreed that further details about the design/ appearance of the junction should come back to Panel in due course. Members sought an indication when that was likely to be.

In responding the City Centre Team Leader said it was intended that a report/ presentation would be brought back to the meeting in April.

**130 Application No. 17/07710/FU - external alterations including reinstatement of the west wing, new covered courtyard with atrium, new circulation core to rear, new shopfront and flexible use as A1 retail, A2 financial and professional services, A3 cafe, A4 bar and/or B1 offices and Listed Building Consent Application reference 17/07711/LI for internal and external alterations including reinstatement of the west wing, new covered courtyard with atrium, new circulation core to rear and new shopfront at the First White Cloth Hall, 98-100 Kirkgate, Leeds LS2 7DJ**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application for external alterations including re-instatement of the west wing, new covered courtyard with atrium, new circulation core to rear, new shopfront and flexible use as A1 retail, A2 bar and /or B1 office and Listed Building Consent, Application reference 17/07711/LI for internal and external alterations including re-instatement of the west wing, new covered courtyard with atrium, new circulation core to rear and new shopfront at the First White Cloth Hall, 98-100 Kirkgate, Leeds, LS2 7DJ.

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 proposal seeks to repair and restore the First White Cloth Hall and provide a viable space for a new shop, financial or professional service, café/restaurant, bar or office workspace (791 sqm).
- The main elements of the proposals are:
  - Carry out essential repairs
  - Restore the existing arcading to the East Wing inner courtyard
  - Mirror the restored east wing on the west wing, re-using salvaged fabric from the demolished west wing where possible
  - Repair of the Kirkgate frontages including new shopfronts
  - Introduce high quality modern design in the form of a glazed atrium
  - Introduction of a modern polycarbonate rainscreen and modern windows on the southern elevation
  - Reinstatement of the cupola

The Panel heard from Joanne Needham, the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) who spoke in opposition to the proposal.

Members were informed that the Society were keen to see a positive outcome but without spoiling the character of the building. The building was currently in a vulnerable state and a full structural report was necessary to understand the extent of the demolition required. What was being proposed was a highly risky restoration, the Society were of the view that further consideration should be given as to whether what was being proposed was the right solution.

It was reported that the Society had come forward with an alternative solution but details had only been received within the past few days.

The Legal Officer to the Panel advised Members that there was only one proposal before Members today and determination of the application should be based on that proposal alone.

Members raised the following questions:

- Who is this development for, who will receive the most benefit from its restoration
- The Society are suggesting an alternative solution but this was not put forward at the appropriate time
- It would appear that there is not a lot of the original building remaining so you are not going to get back and use those materials

In responding to the issues raised, the SPAB representative said:

- The restoration of the building would benefit the citizens of Leeds
- The Society would prefer to engage with the City Council to explore alternative options
- The proposals before Members would cause substantial harm to the building, the society wish to see the remaining building conserved

The Panel then heard from: Mark Finch, the applicant, Grant Prescott, Architect and Martin Hamilton from the Leeds Civic Trust who spoke in support of the application.

Members were informed that the First White Cloth Hall was a very important/significant historic building within the city centre and its restoration had been a challenge for many years. In total 14 options had been put forward, due consideration had been given to them all but only one solution could be taken forward. The views of SPAB were respected but there was a difference in conservation philosophy.

Martin Hamilton from Leeds Civic Trust said the trust welcomed the restoration scheme and the fact that the building would be brought back into use. The proposal that had been put forward appeared to strike the right balance between conservation and restoration.

Members raised the following questions:

- Was there enough sufficient historical interest being retained
- Who is this development for, who will receive the most benefit from its restoration
- Could more have been made of the South West face
- Could the cupola be retained
- What would be the timescale for the restoration works
- Were the Leeds Civic Trust content with the design of the shop fronts
- What materials would be used on the roof

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representative/ Leeds Civic Trust and council officers said:

- It was the view of the applicant that enough of the original building had been retained, all of the elements we wish to see had been included. If the building was left any longer there may be nothing to salvage
- A lot of groups would benefit from the restoration of the building; the Citizens of Leeds, the Leeds Civic Trust and other historical societies but this development would assist in the wider regeneration of the Kirkgate area.
- Due consideration was given to the design of the South West face but there was not enough documentary evidence remaining to assist with the reconstruction.
- It was confirmed that a cupola would be provided with details of the works to be controlled by condition
- Subject to receiving planning permission it was intended that work would begin on site summer 2018 with a 12 month build period
- The Leeds Civic Trust were "not delighted" with the design of the shop fronts and would prefer to see an alternative design but on balance were supportive of the application. The full details of the shopfronts would be controlled by condition
- It was confirmed that the materials to be used on the roof would be Westland Slate

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were of the view that restoration of the building was important and bringing the building back into use would be welcomed
- A number of Members expressed the view that the shopfronts need to be dealt with sympathetically
- One Member suggested to preserve what is best but include some modern/ contemporary elements  
Welcome the re-instatement of the cupola
- The view was expressed that a progress report needs to come back to Members in six months-time

In summing up the Chair thanked all parties from their attendance and contributions commenting that a useful discussion had taken place.

The Chair said Members appeared to be of the view that restoration of the building was important and bringing it back into use would be welcomed by all parties but there was some concern about the design of the shop fronts.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) That in respect of Application No.17/07710/FU, determination of the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate).
- (ii) That in respect of Application No. 17/07711/LI determination of the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to referral to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, and subject to the conditions specified at Appendix 2 of the submitted report (and any others which he might considered appropriate).
- (iii) That a progress report be brought back to Members in six months-time (September 2018)

**131 Application No. 17/07579/FU - Retrospective demolition of 101-104 Kirkgate, the demolition of 9-13 Crown Court, and the construction of new residential buildings with ground floor A1 retail, A3 café/restaurant uses and D1 leisure uses, basement car parking and associated public realm at 101-104 Kirkgate, 9-13 Crown Court and Crown Street Car Park, Leeds 2.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application which sought retrospective demolition of 101 - 104 Kirkgate, the demolition of 9 -13 Crown Court and the construction of new residential buildings with ground floor A1 retail, A3 café/restaurant uses and D1 leisure uses, basement car parking and associated public realm at 101 – 104 Kirkgate, 9 – 13 Crown Court and Crown Street Car Park, 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 application consists of two new buildings with associated public realm. At 101- 104 Kirkgate and 9-13 Crown Court (at the rear), a part 4, part 5 storey building in red-brick and vertical metal cladding is proposed, with A3 café/bar at basement level, A1 retail at ground floor,

with flats above. The application also proposes the demolition of the existing 9-13 Crown Court.

- The proposal also includes the re-development of the Crown Street car park, with a new red-brick part 4/5/6/7 storey residential building, with ground floor A3 café/restaurant units.
- The proposal is for Private Rented Sector (PRS) flats, across the two buildings. 80 flats are proposed in total, consisting of:
  - 33 one-bed flats
  - 42 two-bed flats
  - 6 three-bed flats
- The buildings would be constructed to exceed 2013 Building Regulations Part L by 20%. 10% on-site low carbon energy demand would be met by using air source heat pumps.
- 28 car parking spaces including 3 disabled bays are proposed at basement level below the Crown Street car park building. This basement would also include provision for 74 cycle parking spaces. The car park would be accessed via Pine Court (one-way in) and egressed via the Waterloo House access road. Bin storage would also be located inside the building, accessed from the Waterloo House access road. All refuse and recycling would be managed by private collection.

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

- The alleyways running through the site, were these public rights of way
- Would there be lighting in the alleyways
- The proposed choice of brick was a little disappointing
- Where were the dustbins located
- Why had the Private Rented Sector (PRS) flats model been selected by the developers
- Would the affordable housing provision be located within the development
- The public realm would include seating areas but who would be using these areas and how would they be managed
- There appeared to be a lack of co-ordination with the developers of the neighbouring First White Cloth Hall site which may have assisted in the digging out of a route through both sites

The Planning Officers together with the applicant's representatives provided the following responses:

- The City Centre Team Leader confirmed that it would be for the Public Rights of Way Team to include each of the alleyways on the definitive

map but late night closure of these alleyways was acceptable in planning terms to help prevent anti-social behaviour

- It was confirmed that lighting of the alleyways would be included as part of the landscaping controls and would be subject to condition
- The applicants representative reported that the final choice of brick had yet to be selected but generally the car park building would be constructed in a lighter material with the historic frontage being darker
- It was confirmed that there were several bin storage areas located throughout the site
- PRS flats had been chosen to allow one funding model for the whole of the scheme and the residential element would not be directly managed
- The City Centre Team Leader reported that the applicant intended to deliver affordable housing on site as a first option. The use of a commuted sum would only be pursued if on-site provision was not possible and would have to be agreed with the Council
- The public realm areas had been designed to create active use, security was important to residents and on-site management would control the access to the public realm areas
- The applicant's representative confirmed that discussions had taken place with Rushbond, the developers of the First White Cloth Hall site. Members were informed that any digging out would have created a 1.5m step resulting in the loss of the through route.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members would prefer the provision of on-site affordable housing
- It was the view of Members that once completed the scheme would deliver a very much improved Kirkgate façade

In summing up the Chair thanked the Developers for their attendance, suggesting 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 conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and following the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the subsequent obligations:

- 5% Affordable housing to be provided in accordance with details set out in section 10.6 of the submitted report
- Sustainable travel fund £14,803
- Car club contribution £10,000
- Travel plan monitoring fee £2500
- Cost of TRO work and compensation for loss of parking bay revenue of £25,215
- Public access to routes and spaces within the site: Crown Court, Crown Square and access road to Pine Court at all times, pedestrian route to the north of the building and the alleyways 8am-8pm 7 days a week

- Co-operation with local jobs and skills initiatives

In the event of the Section 106 Agreement 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.

**132 Application No.17/07963/OT - Outline Application for residential development and associated basement parking at Sweet Street, Holbeck, Leeds LS11 9AA**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an outline application for residential development and associated basement parking at Sweet Street, Holbeck, Leeds 11.

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 maximum height of the building would be 10 residential storeys, approximately 33m. The maximum footprint would be U-shaped, fronting onto Sweet Street and Siddall Street and the new pedestrian/cycle route to the north, forming a west facing courtyard amenity space. The indicative building footprint would be set back approximately 10.5m from the boundary to the north, which would allow the provision of a 2.5m wide public pedestrian/cycle route and not prejudice the development of the sites to the north. There would be a residents' gym and communal lounge at ground floor
- The proposal is for an indicative maximum of 215 flats in outline only, likely to be provided in the following combination and size:

No. Type Mix H4 target mix Size

33 Studio (included in one-bedroom target and size below)

103 1 bed 60% Min 0-Max 50% 35.58-43.5sqm

75 2 bed 35% Min 30-Max 50% 61.9-67sqm

10 3 bed 5% Min 20-Max 70% 85-90sqm

- A pedestrian route is proposed along the northern edge of the site, this would be a minimum of 2.5m wide and would feature tree planting. This route would be added to if neighbouring sites to the north and west were to come forward for redevelopment at any time in the future, in order to achieve the aspirations for enhanced connectivity within Holbeck from Siddall Street to Marshall Street.



- Basement car parking for the block would be accessed from Siddall Street. This would provide 68 car parking spaces to serve the development, including 2 disabled bays and 6 electric vehicle charging points. The basement would also provide secure cycle parking for 215 cycles, 16 motorcycle spaces and bin storage.
- A minimum of 10% energy generation would be developed through on site low carbon energy sources. The scheme would also deliver a reduction of at least 20% on building regulations carbon emissions. As this scheme is in outline only, further details will follow regarding how this might be achieved, however the applicant has indicated that this would include roof-top solar panels. The external appearance of the building would include material such as: brick, glazing, and metal cladding.

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

- Previously Members had suggested that the development of the adjacent Council owned site be explored in conjunction with this site, had such enquiries been made.
- There appeared to be a number of one bedroom studio apartments which were below the required space standards

The Planning Case Officer/ applicant representatives provided the following responses:

- It was reported that discussions had taken place with the Director of City Development who had confirmed the LCC site was not available at the current time but that both sites could be developed independently on the basis of the current proposals.
- It was confirmed there were likely to be 33 studio apartments which were just below the required space standards, but this detail would be fully considered at reserved matters stage.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- The Panel would be robust in seeking adequate affordable housing provision
- A number of Members expressed the view that the indicative design of the building was unimaginative
- The developers need to bring forward a “statement of quality” which would provide a legacy for the future
- The proposed use of red brick was dull and uninspiring
- It was suggested that inspiration be taken from the proposals planned for the South Bank
- Explore southern aspect for amenity space, space is required which is usable.
- The C Plan form does not appear to provide the quality of space required.

- The area needs to have a sustainable population, more larger family apartments are required
- There was concern that some of the studio apartments were below the required space standards

In summing up the Chair said although this was an outline application there was concern from a number of Members about the shape/ design and footprint of the development.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for further discussions around the shape/ design and footprint of the development

**133 PREAPP/17/00288 - Pre-Application Presentation for a stepped block of part 11 storeys, part 18 storeys (with roof top plant and lower ground floor) providing student accommodation comprising some 98 units with ground and lower 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 presentation for a stepped block of part 11 storeys, part 18 storeys (with roof top plant and lower ground floor) providing student accommodation comprising 98 units with ground and lower ground floor communal spaces and a landscape scheme around the building at land to the north of Brunswick Point/ Q One, Wade Lane, Leeds 2.

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 proposed scheme would comprise of 98 studio dwellings, for occupation by students, ranging in internal floorspace from 21 sq. metres to 31 sq. metres. These are currently proposed to be set out as follows:

- 10 studios of 21 sq metres
- 17 studios of 22 sq metres
- 37 studios of 23 sq metres
- 17 studios of 29 sq metres
- 17 studios of 31 sq metres

The proposal would include a range of high quality communal facilities within the ground and lower ground floor levels of the proposed building, comprising a lounge, reception area with TV, a breakfast room and study rooms/pods. The Developer advises that occupiers would also be able to make use of the lower ground floor of the existing Q One building, which would provide a cinema room (c. 30 – 40sqm), a games room (c.80sqm), a storage area for students (c. 30-40sqm) and additional cycle stands. In addition the Developer

also stated that student occupiers would be given free annual membership of the nearby Pure Gym at the Merrion Centre.

Members raised the following questions:

- The communal space would be located in two different buildings, had consideration been given to the provision of an extension to link the two buildings together.
- Could further details about the security of the building be provided

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

- It was proposed that the façade to the existing building would be redeveloped and new landscaping would be provided that would give the impression the two buildings were linked.
- Entrances to the building would be gated and there would be a managed reception at the main entrance

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- A number of Members expressed the view that the design / proposals was an improvement on the earlier scheme.
- A number of Members expressed concern about the size of some of the studio apartments.
- Had cluster apartments been considered
- Further details of the landscaping proposals were required
- There was concern that some of the communal facilities were to be located in the neighbouring property, could consideration be given to linking the two buildings

Responding to the comment as to whether cluster apartments had been considered, the Chief Planning Officer said Members needed to be mindful about the type of student accommodation that was being proposed, there were distinct markets for both studio flats and cluster flats.

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

- The majority of Members supported the revised scale, massing, layout and design of the proposals

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.5 Councillors: C Campbell required it to be recorded that he considered the living conditions within the student accommodation to be unacceptable)

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation.

**RESOLVED –**

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

**134 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 29<sup>th</sup> March 2018 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.