

Plans Panel (City Centre)

Thursday, 1st July, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor B Selby in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,
G Driver, R Grahame, G Latty, J Matthews,
J Monaghan and E Nash

1 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the first Plans Panel City Centre meeting of the new municipal year and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves

2 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 08/05307/FU – 14 – 28 The Calls LS2:

Councillor Latty declared a personal interest as a British Waterways License Holder as British Waterways had commented on the proposals (minute 6 refers)

Councillor Monaghan declared a personal interest as a member of Leeds Civic Trust which had commented on the proposals (minute 6 refers)

Councillor Campbell declared a personal interest as Metro had commented on the proposals and at the time the comments were made he would have been a member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (minute 6 refers)

Application 09/03230/FU – St Peter's Church and House, Chantrell House Leeds Parish Church LS2:

Councillors Campbell, Nash and Selby declared personal interests through being members of English Heritage which had commented on the proposals (minute 7 refers). Councillor Nash stated that she wished to disassociate herself with the comments made by English Heritage

Councillor Monaghan declared a personal interest as a member of Leeds Civic Trust which had commented on the proposals (minute 7 refers)

Application 10/00923/OT – Land bounded by Sweet Street, Meadow Road, Jack Lane, Bowling Green Terrace and Trent Street LS11 – Position statement:

Councillor Campbell declared personal interests through being a member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority at the time Metro had commented on the proposals and as a member of Leeds Bradford Airport Consultative Committee has LBIA had commented on the proposals (minute 8 refers)

Councillor Monaghan declared a personal interest as a member of Leeds Civic Trust which had commented on the proposals (minute 8 refers)

3 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Hamilton who was substituted for by Councillor J Matthews; Councillor S Hamilton who was substituted for by Councillor R Grahame; Councillor G Harper and Councillor A Carter

4 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 26th May 2010 be approved

5 Matters arising

The Head of Planning Services stated that the two applications which were for determination at the meeting had been considered previously by Panel. Whilst there had been some changes in membership, this did not necessarily disbar new Members from taking a decision of these applications. The Panel's Legal adviser referred to paragraph 12.1 of the Council's Code of Practice for the Determination of Planning Matters which stated that it was for each Member to consider if they were fully appraised of all the facts and relevant information necessary to properly reach a decision. It was noted that site visits to the two sites had taken place prior to the meeting which had been attended by all of the Panel

6 Applications 08/05307/FU - Alterations and extension to form offices and A3/A4 bar restaurant development and erection of 5 storey office block with basement car parking and public landscaped area - 14-28 The Calls Leeds LS2 and 08/05309/CA - Conservation Area application for the demolition of the Mission Hut and 28 The Calls

Further to minute 52 of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 3rd December 2009 where Panel considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on a mixed use, riverside development at 14-28 The Calls, Members considered a revised application

Plans, photographs, graphics and a sample board were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which all Members had attended

Officers presented the report and stated that this brownfield site was the last major, undeveloped riverside site in the city centre and comprised buildings which were largely vacant and inefficiently used. It was noted that there was an extant permission on the site for a mixed-use residential, office and A3 development which had been granted in 2007

Details of the planning history of the site were provided as were details of the revisions which had been made to the scheme following Members' previous comments, these being:

- a further reduction in the projection of the Atkinson building
- alterations to the glazing and louvres on the elevation alongside 32 The Calls to create a more solid format with a design which echoed that of the Warehouse Hill building
- replacement of the blue brick with a rustic red/blue brick
- refinement of the fenestration on the Warehouse Hill building
- the introduction of railings along the river's edge

Members were informed of a factual error in the report which should

state the provision of 5, not 3, disabled parking spaces in the basement car park

In respect of a public transport contribution, Members were informed that a sum of £115,627 would be provided and that the S106 agreement was being drafted for this

Members were asked to approve application 08/05307/FU in principle; defer and delegate final approval to the Chief Planning Officer and to approve the Conservation Area application

Members commented on the following matters:

- the height of the buildings and concerns that the Warehouse Hill building was overdominant and did not refer to surrounding buildings
- whether the development was likely to proceed
- the need for further explanation for the condition in respect of a S106 agreement which had not been completed within 3 months of the grant of planning permission
- that this was an historic area and whether a museum would be included to display artefacts found in the area
- that the waterfront should be more widely used than a spill out area for bars and restaurants and that to maximise the number of people who would use the site, other recreational uses ie for boating, including mooring of boats, fishing and some water sports should be considered
- that the inclusion of railings along the riverside was welcomed in view of the recent tragedies which had occurred
- the need for increased soft landscaping which could include some treatment to the blank walls
- the need to include species of trees which were suitable in this location
- the need for further information on the pyramid area in the corner of the site
- concerns whether this would be an attractive, vibrant riverside space
- concerns that the verticality of the Warehouse Hill building did not provide references back to warehouse vernacular, despite the assertions in the report
- the weathering of the proposed copper elements and that this should be treated to prevent oxidisation
- the need for the site to be developed quickly to provide much needed employment opportunities
- the possibility of continuing the cobbled Crown Street behind the Corn Exchange across the Loop on The Calls, adjacent to the site access
- that the white-painted window frames of 24-26 The Calls should be painted in a dark colour
- concerns at the riverside glazed frontage of the Atkinson building which was redolent of a 1960s office block and the need for a more elegant approach rather than the proposed fenestration
- whether the appearance of the height of the Warehouse Hill building could be reduced to minimise its visual impact on the adjacent warehouse building and longer distance views
- the need for adequate signing for the proposed pedestrian crossing
- that a pedestrian crossing could spoil the outlook and whether an alternative option would be to reduce the speed limit to 20mph on this stretch of The Calls

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the Warehouse Hill building was located on the bend of the river and Officers felt that the height could be reinstated on this bend, however by looking at the detail of the roof and modifying the plinth, this could help to reduce the apparent scale of the building and produce a building more in character
- that the hope was by granting planning permission it would result in early construction as it would enable the applicant to market the site
- that the benefit of the condition relating to the completion of a S106 agreement within 3 months was to enable a decision to be made at the end of that time without it having to come back to Panel, so giving the LPA greater flexibility to move applications on at the end of a 3 month period
- that a condition had been included which required full archaeological recording of the site but that Officers would speak to the applicant about the possibility of incorporating a museum on the site
- that the public space which would be created would provide the opportunity for anyone to use this, not solely office workers, residents or patrons of the bars and restaurants
- that additional soft landscaping could be included although there could be some constraints especially the inclusion of trees, due to these being sited above car parking areas
- that the pyramid area was to be contemplative space
- that the copper cladding would be treated so as not to weather
- acceptance that the glazed frontage of the Atkinson Building should be reconsidered
- that further discussions would be undertaken with the applicant in respect of the highway crossing and the possibility of using granite blocks to take the load of the loop traffic. Whilst this would be more costly, it would be of a higher quality. The Panel's Highways representative stated this would also need to be considered by Highways Maintenance to check the appropriateness of using this sort of treatment across the Loop
- that a speed limit of 20mph on this part of The Calls was not possible as the phasing of traffic lights was based on a speed of 25mph

The Panel noted the recommendation contained in the submitted report and considered how to proceed

RESOLVED- To defer determination of the application until the August meeting and that the Chief Planning Officer be asked to submit a further report setting out additional information on the following matters only:

- landscaping provision
- highways issues in respect of the design and position of the pedestrian crossing
- the apparent height of the Warehouse Hill building
- the detailing of the base of the Warehouse Hill building
- the detailing of the frontage of the Atkinson building

7 Application 09/03230/FU - Change of use including refurbishment and extensions to two church buildings with two flats to form offices and 18 flats and erect part 3, part 4 storey block comprising office & 32 flats with car parking; Conservation Area consent to demolish office and Listed Building application for replacement gate in boundary wall - St Peter's Church and House, Chantrell House, Leeds Parish Church Kirkgate Leeds LS2

Further to minute 67 of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 4th March 2010 where Members considered a position statement for the redevelopment of St Peter's Hall and House and Chantrell House, Leeds Parish Church, Kirkgate, the Panel considered the formal applications

Plans, drawings, graphics, photographs and a model were displayed at the meeting. A site visit had taken place earlier in the day which all of the Panel Members had attended

Officers presented the report and highlighted the revisions made to the scheme in view of Members' comments on the position statement by showing comparative images

Members were informed of the following revisions:

- that the height of the proposals had been reduced
- that there would be one less flat within the scheme
- the roof design had been altered and now pitched roofs would be provided
- the previously glazed vertical slots indicating the locations of staircases would now be clad in stone
- realignment of the windows to provide a consistent approach across all three buildings and alterations to window treatments to create shadow and relief on the elevations

Members were informed that the scheme should provide affordable housing of 7 units but that a financial appraisal had been submitted requesting affordable housing to be restricted to 4 units in Chantrell House, with the income generated from the units in St Peter's Hall and House to be used to fund maintenance works to the adjacent Grade I listed Leeds Parish Church

Officers sought Panel's approval in principle to the scheme and requested final approval to be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement

Members commented on the following matters:

- the design details of the recesses and the absence of chimneys on Chantrell House
- the lack of windows on the gable wall of the extension of St Peter's Hall
- that some of the best features would be covered up on St Peter's Hall, which albeit some of the window frames were in poor condition, created an important view down The Calls
- that the extension to St Peter's Hall had tried, unsuccessfully, to imitate the adjacent Victorian building and that it was not of a high enough quality given its surroundings and proximity to a Grade I Listed church
- that as an entrance into a precinct it was unattractive
- that although improvements had been made to the scheme it was still not good enough, particularly the blocking off of the view of the Parish Church from Maud Street

- concerns about the design of Chantrell House; that the parapet should be in stone as opposed to stone and brick; that more glazing could be introduced on the elevations and concerns at the design of this building adjacent to the Parish Church
- that what was being shown was a comparison with an earlier scheme; that the current scheme should be considered in isolation and the view that this scheme was not good enough
- that if the intention was to create a cathedral close, the buildings faced the cathedral, whereas Chantrell House did not face the Parish Church
- that the applicant had taken on board Members' comments and responded but the scheme was not of sufficient quality to approve in this location
- Officers provided the following responses:
 - that the inclusion of chimneys on Chantrell House could be considered
 - the lack of windows on the St Peter's Hall extension could be due to the internal arrangements but that this could be discussed further with the applicant
 - that the length of engagement of this project had been ten years and had been one of the most difficult projects in the city
 - that Members' comments appeared to go further than those made on the position statement, with the concerns expressed likely to lead to a reduction in the amount of development on the site

Further discussion on the application ensued with particular concerns being raised that the proposals for St Peter's Hall were unacceptable; that the scheme would be improved without Chantrell House in its present form and that the proposals for St Peter's House might be acceptable subject to some further revisions. Members made it clear that the scheme in its current form would not be approved

The Head of Planning Services stated that Members' views had been noted and that the applicant had a choice to make, but that Officers would need to discuss these matters with the applicant and to submit a further report setting out the results of these negotiations. The Panel was advised that the quantum of development on the site was likely to be reduced and that the report would seek the Panel's views on where there was room for manoeuvre in the scheme

RESOLVED - That determination of the application be deferred to enable further discussions to be undertaken on the issues raised by Members and that a further report be submitted in due course

8 Application 10/00923/OT - Redevelopment of land at Meadow Road for uses within the following classes: B1, D2, C1, C3 (up to 296 residential units) and ancillary A1, A3, A4 and A5 uses including associated works for the formation of site access roads at land bounded by Meadow Road, Jack Lane, Bowling Green Terrace and Trent Street LS11

(Prior to considering this matter, Councillor Blackburn left the meeting)

Plans, photographs, drawings and precedent images were displayed at the meeting

Members considered a position statement by the Chief Planning Officer setting out the latest proposals for a major mixed-use development on the site known

as 'City One' at Sweet Street and Meadow Road. Members noted that the site had benefited from previous major outline consents in 2004 and 2006 so the principle of a major development on this site had been established

When the outline application was submitted, approval would be sought only for the principle of development and access

Details of the parameters for the site layout and building heights were provided with Members being informed that there was flexibility within the site as to where the different uses would be located

In respect of highways issues, the Panel's Highways representative stated that the scheme would contain a large amount of car parking and would generate a significant amount of movement, however the aim was to retain the central area free of vehicles by locating an area of public open space at the heart of the development and enabling pedestrian movement around the site

The intention was to create a few vehicular access points, including extending Bowling Green Terrace to Sweet Street

The site would provide 1500 car parking spaces, with 1100 in the proposed multi-storey car park and 400 basement parking spaces underneath the various blocks

It was felt that there were a number of choices of exit route which would help to spread the load on the highway network. Furthermore several improvements were proposed which would also assist in this, these being the widening of Meadow Road to provide 3 full width lanes of traffic; widening of the junction at Jack Lane and improvements to the slip road off the motorway, although traffic modelling was still being undertaken on these proposals

As the previous scheme had included a casino on the site which would have generated a greater amount of traffic later on in the day, the traffic generated by the proposed development would occur more at peak times and a strong travel plan would be required. Increased pedestrian connectivity would be provided. Improvements being considered included a zebra crossing at the mini roundabout on Sweet Street; possible improvements to the crossing at Manor Road and provision of two central refuges at Jack Lane

Increased cycling facilities were being considered as the applicant had offered to widen the footway along the Meadow Road frontage to provide a segregated cycle track and footway and to provide a Toucan crossing across the mouth of Jack Lane; also cycle routes would be developed into the site

Members were informed that a range of supporting plans and documents had been submitted; that there would be 8 different areas of green space on the site equating to 29.1% public open space and it was felt that the policy requirements would be met

The development would be phased with the influencing factor being future market forces, although with each building which was constructed an area of quality open space would be provided

Members commented on the following matters:

- the maximum and minimum distance and heights which had been shown and whether these would be tweaked to reach a totality
- that there was so much difference in the parameters that a clear picture could not be obtained
- the view that the offices would probably be built first which would create highways problems from day one

- the need to understand how people would travel to the site by car, public transport and walking. There was concern that people driving to the site would add to congestion generally of the roads into the city
- the likely number of people on the site; the targets to be achieved in the travel plan and whether penalties would be considered if targets were not met
- whether a shuttle bus would be provided from the city centre to the site
- that the area had been segregated from the city centre for some time and that this situation should be reversed but that the real opportunity to create an interaction between old and new did not appear to have been taken. An example of this was the proposed park; that it looked inwards and was geared towards the people living and working on the site rather than welcoming those from the nearby communities, with concerns at the emergence of two cities, with a rigid boundary at the M621 and that it was important to create opportunities and access rather than walls
- that the proposals were a positive attempt to address the needs of the area and links with the communities of Beeston and Holbeck were essential
- that larger and more open areas of green space, particularly at the front of the site should be considered through closer siting of the buildings
- that the badly designed pedestrian routes within City Walk should not be replicated on this site
- that the site being so close to the motorway was likely to increase the number of people using cars to access the site
- the level of consultation about the proposals which had been undertaken in the Beeston and Holbeck areas and whether groups representing people with disabilities had been consulted about their requirements for the site
- the need for the layout to be discussed with disabled groups and the need for changing places toilets to be provided
- the importance of approaching the Area Committees for comments on the proposals

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the quantum of development was depicted on the plans displayed at the meeting but that not all of the buildings would be built to the maximum or minimum levels
- that there could be around 4800 employees within the office buildings with the potential at peak hours of 1000 people walking to and from the city centre at peak times
- that the annual travel to work survey of participating businesses across Leeds of people arriving at work by various methods suggested that a target split of 32% arriving by car was reasonably achievable and that incentives for alternative transport methods would be provided eg metrocards and cycling provision
- in terms of penalties if the approved travel plan was not reaching its targets, a fund would be set aside to identify why people were not

changing their travel methods to the site with a pot of money being available to provide what was needed

- that a presentation of the proposals had taken place in the Civic Hall Ante Chamber; that letters had been sent to local businesses and that Officers had met with Leeds Civic Trust. In terms of local consultation Officers stated they were not aware of any having taken place
- that the Council's Access Officer had been consulted but that more detailed comments would be sought at the Reserved Matters stage

A summary of issues which required further information to be provided was made, these being:

- a need to understand the highways implications for the site
- the need for a green travel plan that Members could sign up to and which contained clear targets
- further information on the maximum and minimum figures and the need for a better understanding of this
- the need for a phasing plan to be provided
- further details on the public space to be provided and where this would be sited
- the need for more local consultation with surrounding communities to the site
- the need for the applicant to indicate how local people would be encouraged to find work both during the construction phase and beyond

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

(During consideration of this matter Councillors Grahame, Latty and Nash left the meeting)

9 Date and time of next meeting

Thursday 22nd July 2010 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds