

## **Plans Panel (City Centre)**

**Thursday, 29th April, 2010**

**PRESENT:** Councillor M Hamilton in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, T Hanley, G Latty,  
J McKenna, J Monaghan and E Nash

### **84 Chair's opening remarks**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

### **85 Date and time of next meeting**

The Head of Planning Services referred to the next scheduled date for a meeting of Plans Panel City Centre, this being Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> May 2010. As this was the day before Annual Council, Members were asked to consider whether they wished to have the meeting on that day or postpone it to the following week

Members discussed this and there was some support for the proposal to move the meeting to the following week but it was decided not to make a decision until after the outcome of the local elections. It was agreed that the clerk would liaise with the Head of Planning Services on this and notify Members accordingly

### **86 Late Items**

There were no late items

### **87 Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purposes of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct

Application 09/03829/OT – 10-11 Sweet Street Holbeck – Councillors Hanley and Monaghan declared personal interests through being members of Leeds Civic Trust which had previously commented on the proposals (minute 90 refers)

### **88 Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence had been received

### **89 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** - That the minutes of the Plans Panel City Centre meetings held on 22<sup>nd</sup> March and 1<sup>st</sup> April 2010 be approved

**90 Application 09/03829/OT - Outline application to erect B1 offices in two blocks and a health and fitness centre and multi-storey car park at 10-11 Sweet Street Holbeck Leeds LS11**

Further to minute 43 of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2009 where Panel considered a position statement on proposals for a mixed-use, phased development at 10-11 Sweet Street Holbeck, Members considered a report seeking approval for an outline application

Plans, photographs and precedent images were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and stated that the outline application sought approval for the principle of development together with access, layout and scale with all other matters being reserved

Approximately 8000sqm of office space was proposed in two six storey buildings, with a multi-storey car park (MSCP) to the east of the site and a gym on the ground floor of the site

Leeds Civic Trust had previously expressed concerns at the proposed height of the blocks which had now been amended to 5 storeys and a plant room which Officers considered to be more acceptable

Landscaping would be provided as part of the scheme. Approximately half of the 1 hectare site would be undeveloped and much of that would be used as public open space

In the first phase of development the MSCP, gym, the north/south cycle route and some landscaping would be delivered, with the office blocks and other landscaping being developed in the second phase

In respect of the car park, 596 spaces would be provided, with 104 of these being allocated to the gym and offices and the remaining spaces being for short stay parking. Members were informed that a car parking management plan had been submitted which included details of cycle storage, tariffs and shared vehicle spaces

The short stay spaces would be for five hours or under, with the tariff being negotiated with the Council and then monitored in the future. If it was found that a high level of long stay parking was occurring, further controls could be imposed. It would also be possible to allocate some of the parking spaces to other users in the surrounding area, particularly Holbeck Urban Village (HUV)

Officers provided details of the S106 contributions and reported the receipt of a letter of objection from the Mosaic Church which had questioned the need for the site to be developed

Members commented on the following matters:

- whether enforcement action was being taken on the site for allowing unauthorised car parking and whether there were proposals for any other MSCPs in the area
- that car parking was taking place on the Sweet Street frontage of the site and that details of the level of this was requested
- the lack of a bus service in the area of Holbeck Urban Village which could lead to more people using cars to access the facilities on the site
- that delivery of the offices ahead of the MSCP was preferred
- design details of the office blocks with concerns being raised at the stepping down of the top storey adjacent to Marshall Street. This could be continued at the upper height to help screen views of the proposed MSCP beyond

Officers provided the following comments:

- that the site was not subject to unauthorised car parking; that the HUV Planning Framework referred to a MSCP to support development where no car parks existed and that whilst there had been some discussions in the past about a MSCP on Bath Road, this had not been forthcoming. In terms of the numbers of cars parking on the Sweet Street frontage, this was estimated to be in the region of 60 – 80 cars
- that in terms of provision of a bus service on Sweet Street, this was for an operator to agree to provide this
- regarding the phasing of the proposals, the applicant had submitted letters from businesses in the area, including The Mint, stating that the lack of car parking was having a detrimental effect in attracting people to the area. It was felt that there was some demand already for a visitor car park and that a robust car parking management plan had been submitted with the application to prevent general commuter car parking use
- that in respect of the top floor design if approved in principle, Officers could negotiate further on this aspect
- that some of the S106 money should be used to identify where bus stops in the area could be located

A detailed discussion took place on public transport contributions and how these were used, with the following comments being made by Members:

- concerns that money generated through developments was not being used for improvements in the areas where the schemes had taken place and that S106 contributions should not be put into a general fund, but should be aligned to the specific development
- whilst noting this view, that the amount of S106 contributions generated within the city centre would be disproportionate to other areas and these would lose out if this method was used
- that for many schemes to develop as planned and deliver the envisaged benefits, transport improvements were necessary
- that public transport contributions had been collected from major schemes but that little in the way of improvements had been seen
- that consideration should be given to refusing applications where transport links were not in place
- that Metro and bus operators should be asked to look at the demand and provision of services around the city
- that whilst some major public transport improvements would be needed, it was also possible for relatively small sums to make a difference and this should be considered
- concerns about the way the S106 contributions were collected; that some funds which had been agreed were delayed or had not been forthcoming and the importance of ensuring the legal agreements were worded in such a way to prevent this situation continuing

The Panel's Highways representative stated that a list of major public transport improvements was included in the SPD and that some of these were coming forward. Members were also informed that the current Local Transport Plan finished in 2011 and a new one would be written

The Chair agreed to write to Metro on the matters raised regarding bus services, with a copy being circulated to Panel Members for information

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate), further discussions regarding the design detail of the stepping of the office block and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement within 3 months from the date of resolution unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Chief Planning Officer, to include the following obligations:

- securing the Car Park Management Regime (CPMR)
- public transport contribution of £116,155
- travel plan with monitoring fee of £4,275
- public access through the site
- off site highway works
- commitment to use reasonable endeavours to cooperate with LCC Jobs and Skills Service
- £600 monitoring fee for each of the CPMR, public transport and off site highway works

#### **91 Trinity Quarter (West), Boar Lane LS1 - Changes required to existing bus services to facilitate the development of Boar Lane undercroft as part of the Trinity West scheme**

Plans of the proposals were displayed at the meeting

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer providing information on the strategy to relocate bus services currently located on Boar Lane in the undercroft of the Leeds Shopping Plaza – to be known as Trinity West to facilitate that development

Officers presented the report and stated that there were currently 8 bus stops but that it was felt that 5 stops would be sufficient to accommodate the buses as this would enable up to 20 buses per hour to stop in this location

Members had regard to a colour site plan which indicated the stops being considered for alteration and were informed that stop T3A would be removed for the NGT service and stop T4 would be relocated to accommodate the NGT service, this being resited on Duncan Street

A new stop would be provided on Infirmary Street and stop P5 in City Square would become a prestigious location for a prominent transport hub which would also include the NGT services. The articulated bus service, Route 4, would also stop at P5 and buses serving St James Hospital would be regrouped at this point

Three other stops, P6A, T2 and T3 would be enhanced with improved shelters and real time information

The proposals would continue to provide conveniently located stops and would create an improved route at the side of Holy Trinity Church

Members were informed that the proposals had the support of Metro, subject to the developer funding the improvements to the stops; contributing to the NGT interchange and the public information which would be needed on the relocation of the stops. The proposals would need to be ratified by the Metro Board

Members discussed the following matters:

- whether bus operators had been consulted on the proposals
- concerns at possible blockages on stands G and H sited on Infirmary Street as these were already busy with concerns that often the FTR bus had difficulties in exiting Infirmary Street

- the relocation of stop P8 to G; that this was congested; that the next stop at T4 was too far away and whether stop P6A would be at capacity
- that bus stops could be relocated if the proposals did not work, but that there was only one chance to improve this part of Boar Lane
- that stop P8 needed to be given further consideration
- that the changes to New Station Street with the introduction of buses stopping directly outside the railway station had not worked out as envisaged and had an adverse impact and concerns that the proposals being put forward could result in a similar situation

The Panel's Highways representative stated that bus operators had been involved in discussions on this and had signed up to the proposals. The scheme had been considered both with and without NGT and Officers were satisfied that the proposals would work. Members were informed that this particular part of the NGT proposals did have funding allocated to it

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made