

Plans Panel (City Centre)

Thursday, 14th October, 2010

PRESENT: Councillor B Selby in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,
M Coulson, G Driver, C Fox, R Grahame,
M Hamilton, J Monaghan and N Taggart

36 Chairs Opening Remarks

The Chair welcomed all present to the meeting and invited officers and Members of the Panel to briefly introduce themselves. Mr J Thorp, the Civic Architect for the City, attended the meeting and introduced colleagues from the Design Services Team.

37 Late Items

No formal late items of business were added to the agenda; however Members were in receipt of a copy of a late letter of representation from English Heritage relating to the St Peters Church applications. This had been submitted after the despatch of the agenda for the meeting. The Chair agreed that the representation would be taken into account during consideration of the applications (minute 43 refers)

38 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

Councillor B Selby – Applications 09/03230/FU; 09/03280/CA & 09/03397/LI St Peters Church – declared a personal interest as a member of English Heritage which had commented on the proposals (minute 43 refers)

Councillor Colin Campbell - Applications 09/03230/FU; 09/03280/CA & 09/03397/LI St Peters Church – declared a personal interest as a member of English Heritage which had commented on the proposals (minute 43 refers)

Councillor J Monaghan – Application 08/054440/FU Globe Road/ Water Lane and Applications 09/03230/FU; 09/03280/CA & 09/03397/LI St Peters Church – declared a personal interest in both items as a member of Leeds Civic Trust which had made comments on the proposals (minutes 42 and 43 refer respectively)

Councillor C Fox - Application 08/054440/FU Globe Road/ Water Lane – declared a personal interest as a local authority appointed member of West Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as METRO had commented on the proposals (minute 42 refers)

Councillor M Coulson - Application 08/054440/FU Globe Road/ Water Lane – declared a personal interest as a local authority appointed member of West

Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority as METRO had commented on the proposals although he stated he had not attended any meetings where the proposals had been discussed. (minute 42 refers)

39 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Hamilton, G Latty and Nash. The Chair welcomed Councillors Coulson, Fox and R Grahame respectively as substitute members for this meeting

40 Minutes

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 16th September 2010 be approved as a correct record

41 Matters Arising

White Cloth Hall (minute 31)

Mr J Thorp, Civic Architect for the City, provided an update on the current situation regarding the first White Cloth Hall, Kirkgate. Slides showing recent scale of the collapse and necessary demolition works were displayed along with a slide showing the painting of Kirkgate by L Grimshaw dated 1895 for context.

Mr Thorp explained the collapse had revealed the speculative aspects of the colonnade feature to White Cloth Hall, the Victorian cellars and views through to the Corn Exchange from Kirkgate. He reported that the site owner had agreed to remove the Victorian infill from the cellars in order for an archaeological dig to be undertaken to see if any remnants of the mediaeval Hospitium believed to have been on this site could be found. Furthermore the owner had confirmed a willingness to adopt a vehicle to progress the restoration of the White Cloth Hall in conjunction with guardians such as LCC or English Heritage and a working party had been established to progress restoration works and address comments of English Heritage. Mr Thorp reported that the Executive Member with responsibility for Development & Regeneration had visited the site and had been briefed. Councillor Nash as the Heritage Champion would be briefed shortly.

Members reiterated their previous request that a letter be sent to the Executive Member for Development & Regeneration setting out the Panel's earlier comments regarding the importance of the White Cloth Hall to the City and their discussions on the possibility of LCC purchasing the building and the whole row

Toronto Square

The Head of Planning Services presented information on the recent court ruling on the legal claim involving the "right to light" brought by M Heaney against Highgrove and their development of 2 floors of office accommodation to Toronto Square. The Court had ruled that one third of the new build required demolition. This ruling highlighted what rights were available under Common and Civil Law. It was noted that Highgrove had appealed the outcome, however if the judgement was upheld, Highgrove would need to

make a planning application for the demolition works which would require Panel approval.

Members discussed the implications for LCC as permission had been granted by Panel and works completed in 2009. Officers responded that LCC would strongly resist being implicated in any future action, as there was an acceptable distance of 22m between the new build and the affected property owned by M Heaney. However the case did serve as a warning to prospective developers to review any historical covenants attached to land they proposed to develop.

(Councillor Hamilton withdrew from the meeting for a short while prior to the consideration of the next item)

42 Application 08/054440/FU - Globe Road/Water Lane Holbeck LS11

Further to minute 14 of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held 22nd July 2010, when Members deferred determination of the application, the Chief Planning Officer submitted a report setting out the response from the applicant to the issues raised by the Panel.

Plans, architects drawings and photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting along with slides showing the earlier scheme for reference. Samples of the brick and zinc materials proposed for the scheme were also available for Members to view. Officers highlighted the revisions to the scheme including

- the relocation of the reception area/main entrance
- removal of the “active” element from the streetscene
- relocation of the solar panels
- the views from street level of the plant room were now obscured by parapets although the plant room may still be visible from further away
- removal of the copper elements from the scheme. Zinc or brick had replaced some of the features previously indicated as copper.
- a uniform window design had been introduced to the south elevations to provided a strong vertical feel with recessed windows

Officers reported that 75% of the ground floor elevation would be glazed to provide activity and interest at ground level. The simplicity of the elevations and the use of glazing/brick/stone would reflect the historic buildings in the locality. This development was intended to be a subtle addition to the streetscene in order to respect the prominence of the Italianate Towers on Tower Works.

Slides of 3D computer graphics showing the relationship of the new build adjacent to existing buildings were displayed with a slide showing the views retained to the Giotto Tower.

Officers highlighted the sustainability measures proposed with the application which would ensure the scheme met the BREEAM excellent standard. Officers also addressed parking issues as the developers had originally

intended to develop this plot (5) and Plot 4B adjacent simultaneously with parking for this site underneath Plot 4B. Plot 5 was now to be developed as a stand alone site with no car parking. However officers stated their belief that this site could be sustained without dedicated car parking due to its proximity to the city centre and various public transport links.

Members acknowledged this was an awkward site to develop and commented that the revisions to the scheme addressed the issues they had previously raised. The Panel briefly discussed:

- Ground floor lighting to enhance the building to be conditioned
- The criteria by which the service units and plant had been relocated to minimise impact and having regard to the English Heritage comments to retain the views to the Italianate Tower

RESOLVED – That the application be approved in principle and final approval be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the specified conditions contained within the report and following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matters:

- Public transport contribution of £119,276.
- Holbeck Urban Village (HUV) public realm contribution of £322,050.
- Travel Plan with monitoring fee of £2,500.
- 24 hour public access along the north-south pedestrian route and access between 0700-2300 hours along the Hol Beck walkway.
- Off site highway works (the closure of redundant vehicular access points, introduction of a service/drop off lay-by and Traffic Regulation Order (TRO contribution).
 - Restriction of period of stay in the hotel to be no more than 3 months and for the hotel to remain as one planning unit to ensure the hotel does not revert to a residential use that would be liable to affordable housing obligations.
 - Commitment to use reasonable endeavours to cooperate with LCC Jobs and Skills Service that seeks to employ local people in both pre and post construction phases.
 - £600 monitoring fee for each of the public transport and HUV contributions and off site highway works.

In the circumstances where the Section 106 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.

43 Applications 09/03230/FU/0903280/CA/0903397/LI - St Peter's Church and Church Buildings and Chantrell House Leeds Parish Church Kirkgate LS2

Further to minute 25 of the Panel meeting held on 19th August 2010 when Members received a position statement on the progress of the applications, the Chief Planning Officer submitted a further report on the proposed mixed use development at St Peter's Church and Church Buildings and Chantrell House.

Plans; architects drawings; elevations and photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting along with graphics showing 3D modelling of the

proposed development in situ. An historical photograph showing the former school building on the site was also displayed

The report set out the history of the applications and included an outline of the developers' response to the matters discussed by the Panel previously.

Officers highlighted the key matters to consider as

Views –

- Views through the site to St Peters Church had been retained through the redesign of the overall site layout

St Peters Hall –

- the dark brick banding now wrapped around the new build and included the gable end and copper cladding to the staircore
- this provided interest to the elevations and mirrored the brickwork pattern on the retained St Peters Hall
- the realigning of the new build now revealed and reinstated a window to the side elevation of the existing St Peters Hall
- The proposed new build would remove two “lean to” type extensions which would reveal more of the existing building. The old additions had masked some of the architectural features of St Peters Hall and had partially blocked the window to the side elevation.

St Peters House

- Incorporation of blank windows to the side/rear provided relief and interest to that elevation
- Officers updated the Panel on further discussions held with the developers on whether glazing could be introduced to this elevation
- There was a suggestion that, as the bathrooms were indicated on the internal plan in the middle of this elevation, obscure glazed windows could be introduced
- Officers also wished to consider further the merits of introducing small windows to the kitchen and/or living room areas to either side of the bathroom on this elevation. This would require further discussion and submission of details.

Chantrell House

- 5 storeys were now proposed although this new build had a smaller footprint than the original proposal and did not dogleg to the rear of the site
- This block included the affordable housing provision
- The design suggested a strong rhythm to the build with 2 gables to the Calls elevations, and 4 to each side elevation

Overall

- the reduction in the overall scale of the proposals has resulted in a total of 37 flats (down from 52 originally)
- the roof forms, gables and heights, tied in with the existing heights of buildings in the locality
- the massing of the development echoed the built form of the former historical warehousing use of the locality
- the materials proposed included copper and brick with stone sills/coping and slate for the roofs with the possibility of zinc for the roof on the new build element.

Officers reported receipt of two letters of representation received from Leeds Civic Trust and English Heritage. The letters were tabled at the meeting as their contents were received too late for inclusion within the report on the agenda.

Mr J Thorp, the Civic Architect for the City, addressed the comments objecting to the scheme made by English Heritage which he felt arose from the developers seeking to strike a balance between the comments made throughout the planning process by the Civic Trust, English Heritage and Members of Plans Panel City Centre. It was noted that English Heritage had previously supported the scheme. Mr Thorp suggested the English Heritage comments concentrated on architectural refinements which could be addressed through the remainder of the planning process through the submission of 1:20 plans, cross sections and profiling.

(Councillor D Blackburn withdrew from the meeting for a short while at this point)

Members discussed the following in detail:

- Clarified the date of the English Heritage letter
- How the development enhanced the views of the churchyard. Officers responded that St Peter's House now provided a splayed gable end which presented an "opening out" view of the churchyard and a better view of the church tower.

St Peters Hall –

- Members reiterated their previous concerns that details to the side elevation of St Peter's Hall would be lost. Officers responded the need for a certain quantum of development to provide for the upkeep of St Peters Church informed the design of the extension and overall development
- Members regarded the Hall as an asset to the street scene and sought assurance that the extension would relate to the Hall in sufficient detail.
- Some Members felt the details of the new build did not replicate the detail of the historic Hall. Officers responded that the "lean-to" buildings currently obscured the lower levels and half of the windows. Mr Thorp stated that the extension with the banding and gables would provide a link to; and engage with, the nineteenth century buildings on site but ultimately even with the extension, much more of the Hall was revealed

St Peter's House –

- concern that the side elevation would represent a blank façade without the window detail Officers responded that further investigation on any proposals for glazing for "return windows" for the sitting/living room area would be needed.
- It was felt the plinth was a more challenging feature, but more details of this were required

The Panel welcomed the revisions made to the scheme and made the following comments:

- expressed support for the proposals for Chantrell House
- remained concerned about the treatment of St Peter's Hall as Members felt they could not fully appreciate which features had been lost and which would be retained

- regarded the relationship of the buildings to St Peter's graveyard as being of utmost importance and that it would be beneficial to see how people currently used that space
- the visual display did not provide enough detail on which to make a decision today
- some Members wished to undertake a site visit to understand the proposals, particularly for St Peter's Hall

Members reiterated their view that St Peter's Hall and St Peter's House were important buildings within the streetscene and as such it was very important to better understand the impact of the proposed extensions on the existing buildings. Members noted that not all the detail had been submitted. The Panel further noted the officer recommendation to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to a Section 106, which could take some months to complete and would facilitate time for the details to be submitted and for a site visit to be undertaken.

RESOLVED -

a) That the applications be approved in principle, and be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions (and any others which he might consider appropriate), the completion of preliminary archaeological investigation works on site, and following completing of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matters:

- on site affordable housing provision
 - an agreement to undertake a list of repair and maintenance works to St Peter's (Leeds Parish Church) within an agreed period,
 - agreement to publicly accessible areas,
 - a contribution of £4100.00 to a car club,
 - employment and training opportunities for local people,
- and the provision of two replacement trees within the site or the churchyard.

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.

b) that a further report be brought to the next Panel meeting presenting the details on the following matters over which Members expressed some concern

- The proposed detailing to the St Peter's House western elevation
- Impact on the existing western gable and the detailing of the extension to St Peter's Hall

c) Members also requested a site visit be undertaken prior to the next Panel meeting to provide an explanation of the matters detailed in b) above

44 Any Other Business

a) Eastgate/Harewood Quarter

Members noted the request to provide the Area Planning Manager with dates in January 2011 when they would be available to attend a site visit to the development completed in Leicester by the same applicants

b) Unauthorised car parks

Members noted that a verbal update on unauthorised car parks within the city centre would be provided to the next Panel meeting

45 Date and time of next meeting

RESOLVED – To note the date and time of the next meeting as Friday 12th November 2010 at 1.30 pm