

## **Appendix 1**

# **Leeds City Council Local Development Framework City Centre Area Action Plan Preferred Options**

## **1.1 Introduction**

### **What is the City Centre Area Action Plan?**

1.1.1 The CCAAP is a “spatial plan” for the city centre forming part of the Leeds Local Development Framework. Its main purpose is to set out policies and proposals for the development of land to help decide planning applications and guide the future growth of the city centre.

### **Leeds city centre**

1.1.2 Leeds’ location in the middle of the country half way between London & Edinburgh and at the crossroads of north-south and east west motorways and railways has helped Leeds to flourish. At the centre of a network of roads and railway lines, Leeds has become a regional centre within a city region stretching from Hebden Bridge to York and Barnsley to Harrogate.

1.1.3 The growing success of Leeds can be seen in its city centre which is the financial & commercial centre and ‘shop-window’ for the rest of the city and region. The city centre provides 125,000 jobs with 50,000 sqm of new office space every year. It has over 1000 shops clustered around the shopping quarter, 130 pubs & bars, 80 restaurants, and over 3000 hotel bedrooms in more than 20 hotels. The city’s attractions include museums, theatres, cinemas, historic buildings and the waterways with improved riverside access.

1.1.4 The growth means that more people are travelling in to the city centre by car and public transport. The train station was recently refurbished with capacity improvements and the City Council is looking at alternatives to “Supertram”. Much of the shopping quarter is now pedestrianised.

1.1.5 Since the mid 1990s, one of the most dramatic changes to Leeds city centre has been the growth in residential accommodation with thousands of flats built and more planned. Historically, the city centre has been a commercial and cultural centre. This will continue to be its main role, but housing has an important complementary role to play in creating a diverse and cosmopolitan centre. A residential population means that new facilities such as convenience shops and outdoor recreation space need to be planned.

1.1.6 Growing environmental awareness means that Leeds city centre needs to be planned to provide the highest environmental quality and to combat global warming as effectively as possible.

### **Policy context**

1.1.7 In terms of national planning policy statements, PPS6 “Planning for Town Centres” is very important. PPS6 sees town centres as the

focus for activity – employment, shopping, services and entertainment – with good accessibility and interaction between uses helping to create healthy vibrant centres and reducing reliance on car use. Leeds city centre is not an archetypal town centre given its sheer scale, and consequently needs a more sophisticated approach to defining its role and function than envisaged for standard town centres by PPS3. For example, the city centre needs smaller area boundaries for particular town centre uses.

- 1.1.8 The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) sees Leeds as a Regional Centre with the role to be the prime focus for housing, jobs and services in the region. A key spatial priority is to spread the benefits of Leeds' economy to the city region and an economic aim is to strengthen the role of city and town centres as a key focus of commercial activity (Policy E2). In particular, Policy E5 expects LDFs to safeguard employment land where evidence shows that this is necessary. The city centre of Leeds is recognised as an area of concern where employment land is being lost to housing development. Regarding climate change, flood management is required (Policy ENV1) and targets for renewable energy are set for sizeable new development (ENV5). Also, the health of residents should be improved by provision of walking & cycling routes through the urban centre of Leeds (ENV11). The accessibility of Leeds city centre to the Leeds city region and adjoining city regions is also a priority for improved public transport investment (Policy T9, Table 16.24).

### **Other local strategy context**

- 1.1.9 **Vision for Leeds 2004-2020.** This is the local community strategy and has a number of objectives relevant to the city centre:
- to make Leeds more competitive and a contributor to the national economy
  - to extend the success of the city centre to inner-city areas
  - to develop a knowledge economy with increased involvement of Universities in business & the regional economy
  - to design buildings with minimal harm to the environment, improving energy efficiency and promoting quality
  - to promote conditions for good health
  - to improve access to greenspace
  - to celebrate cultural diversity

- 1.1.10 **City Centre Strategic Plan 2006-10.** This provides a shared vision of objectives and actions to improve the vibrancy, distinctiveness, sustainability and inclusiveness of the city centre. It provides a plan for the City Centre Partnership - a range of organisations and interests with an interest in the city centre – forming part of the Leeds Initiative, the City’s strategic partnership. Some of its objectives concern spatial planning and overlap with the CCAAP, whilst others extend beyond land use matters.
- 1.1.11 **Renaissance Leeds.** A project initially conceived to give effect to the Lord Rogers report “Towards an Urban Renaissance”. The project has identified particular characteristics of Leeds, to do with its context, history, geography, use, form and appearance as a basis for exploring future development opportunities and options to improve Leeds as a whole. A piece of implementation work is currently focussed on improving the inner city areas surrounding the city centre – an area termed “the rim” - including better integration with the city centre.
- 1.1.12 **City Centre Urban Design Strategy (CCUDs).** Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Unitary Development Plan, as an aid to quality design, this provides a comprehensive audit of the characteristics of the city centre around themes of use, movement, form & space identifying aspects of merit and areas for improvement.
- 1.1.13 **Holbeck Urban Village Planning Framework.** Supplementary Planning Guidance to the Unitary Development Plan advising upon the mix of uses and design of development in this southern sector of the city centre.
- 1.1.14 **Leeds Waterfront Strategy Partial Review (July 2006).** Covering a 6.5km stretch of the river and canal corridor running through the city centre and beyond, it establishes a strategic vision for enhancing an underused city centre resource, encouraging a co-ordinated approach to development and marketing of the waterway.
- 1.1.15 **Cultural Strategy 2002-7** Sets out a vision for the development of the cultural life of a prosperous, vibrant and attractive city. It embraces a wide range of issues, from widening peoples' access to cultural resources, to making Leeds a great cultural city. It is widely scoped, with six supporting strategies going into fuller detail for the arts & heritage sectors, sport, libraries and tourism.
- 1.1.16 **Tourism Strategy.** This provides a framework for the development of tourism in Leeds, an analysis by the industry of the strategic influences affecting the city and a suggested agenda for action including development of a conference centre and better coach parking.
- 1.1.17 **Arts & Heritage Strategy** To promote Leeds as an international centre for arts, culture & creativity, by building partnerships, harnessing educational resources, widening access, tapping into funding, better marketing, facilitating research, safeguarding heritage and securing

infrastructure to support the arts. It has a 5 year action plan.

1.1.18 **Draft Parks and Greenspace Strategy.** This has a specific objective to increase the availability and access of parks and green space within the city centre.

1.1.19 **Mabgate Framework:** This informal planning guidance sets out an appraisal of the Mabgate area with advice on the preferred type of development.

1.1.20 **Kirkstall Road Renaissance Area Planning Framework:** This informal planning guidance sets out an appraisal of the corridor of Kirksall Road with advice on the preferred type of development.

## **2 Spatial vision & objectives**

### **2.1 Aim and Objectives**

2.1.1 The starting point was to suggest carrying forward the aim and 7 objectives set out in the city centre chapter (Chapter 13) of the Unitary Development Plan. The aim and objectives were considered at the consultation workshops in September and revised into 1 aim and 10 objectives. These were then consulted upon in April 2006. The aim and objectives presented below take account of the consultation responses, but have been re-cast to better relate to the structure of the preferred options:

**Aim – support sustainable development for Leeds to maintain and enhance its role as the regional centre and a principal city of Europe**

**i) To plan to accommodate the employment, residential and higher educational functions of the city centre.**

**ii) To plan to accommodate support services and facilities for businesses, workers, visitors and residents.**

These mean intervening to sustain and accommodate the land use needs of all the functions so that they can all prosper.

**iii) To strengthen the vibrancy, appeal and accessibility of the city centre to all.** This means supporting a wide variety of attractions in terms of shopping, leisure, entertainment and culture, whilst ensuring that the city centre is physically and socially accessible and free of barriers and can support the development of a mixed residential community.

**iv) To promote and maintain a high quality safe environment.** This

means the natural environment as well as the built, health and protection against dangers such as pollution and flooding, respecting and enhancing heritage and reinforcing distinctive character. It means promoting provision of greenery. It means negotiating for better quality schemes and harnessing development to secure environmental improvements. Pollution includes air quality and consequently seeking to reduce traffic as it is the main source of air pollution.

**v) To promote good connections to other areas, and ease of movement within the city centre**

**vi) To extend the benefits of the city centre to neighbourhoods throughout the city**

These mean planning for movement of motor traffic, pedestrians and cycles, particularly linking the north and south sides of the city centre and connecting the city centre with adjoining neighbourhoods. It also involves strengthening the socio-economic connections in terms of employment opportunity and sharing of facilities.

## **2.2 Principal Use Quarters**

- 2.2.1 The Principal Use Quarters were a key aspect of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) approach to the city centre. The concept involved designation of a number of “use quarters” or zones where a principal use was expected to dominate, but not exclusively so.
- 2.2.2 Early consultation revealed little support for the concept of quarters per se; greater flexibility was considered necessary. Exceptions were the Prime Shopping Quarter - people appreciated the benefit of a compact shopping area - and clustering office uses in proximity to the train station. Consultation on the Alternative Options revealed little appetite for entertainment “focal points” or residential zones. Consultation with the NHS Trust and Universities revealed that these organisations are not wedded to the retention of the Hospital, Civic and Education Quarters. In fact, the LGI and LMU are looking to diversify and decentralise their operations.
- 2.2.3 Hence, the approach proposed for the CCAAP is to advance planning policy controls over spatial location of uses only where there is a clear spatial rationale for doing so.

## **3 Preferred Options**

### **3.1 Meeting the land use needs of the city and region**

- 3.1.1 Historically, the city centre has been commercial in nature, but it now includes a residential dimension. The challenge is to maintain the

centre of Leeds as a centre for business and visitor attraction whilst accommodating city centre living and the diversity and vitality it brings.

### **Size of the City Centre**

3.1.2 The Alternative Options consultation presented choices of expanding the city centre, keeping the existing Adopted UDP boundary or contracting it (GR04). The choice was informed by Option AS02 regarding consolidation of uses and Option GR03 concerning the purpose of having a city centre boundary.

3.1.3 The City Council's Preferred Option is:

**PO-01a i) To expand the UDP city centre boundary (see map) to accommodate:**

- a) the Kirkstall Road Renaissance Area**
- b) the Mabgate Renaissance Area, and**
- c) southern loop road proposals at Holbeck**

- ii) To promote main town centre uses in the city centre**
- iii) To encourage the development of vacant & under-utilised areas of the city centre**
- iv) To facilitate better integration of the city centre as a whole, and better connections to adjoining neighbourhoods**

### **Providing Employment**

3.1.4 Leeds city centre acts as an economic driver for city and region, so there is a need to safeguard opportunity for business & employment growth. This is a matter of helping to provide accessibility to jobs – both in terms of transport and skills – in the most environmentally sustainable way and for the long term. There are three means for ensuring that the city centre secures opportunities for office development – firstly ensuring that developments in areas of the best public transport accessibility incorporate some office space, secondly that developments on specified Proposals Areas (as set out toward the end of this document) incorporate appropriate office space and thirdly that office development be welcomed in most other parts of the city centre.

3.1.5 Alternative options considered whether major new development should be expected to incorporate minimum quantities of B1 office content either throughout the city centre, in defined zones or not at all (GR05) and what size should be regarded as “major” (GR06). The preferred option is to expect new developments within the core areas of the city centre to incorporate office space, but that this intention will be applied in aggregate, rather than a rigid figure for every scheme. Hence, some schemes will provide more office space whilst others less, whilst monitoring aggregate achievement over time.

**PO-02 To reinforce and promote the office function of core areas of the city centre (see map) by controlling the mix of uses in new developments**

**Having regard to:**

- **The need to maintain and promote a predominance of office use within a 5 min walk of the train station,**
- **The need to maintain a substantial component of office use within a 10 min walk of the train station,**
- **The need to promote retailing in the prime shopping quarter**
- **The need to reflect requirements of the Proposal Area Statements and Holbeck Urban Village policy.**
- **The need to ensure active street frontages to appropriate parts of the core office areas including office and other appropriate active uses**
- **where office accommodation capable of meeting modern business needs exists on site, there will be a presumption that existing office floorspace will be maintained in any new development**

**Ensuring through annual monitoring and review of practice that:**

- **for the 5 minute walk zone at least a 300% plot ratio of aggregate land area developed is office floorspace**
- **for the 10 minute walk zone at least 100% plot ratio of aggregate land area developed is office floorspace**

3.1.6 For clarity about the CCAAP's attitude to development in other parts of the city centre, a further preferred option is suggested:

**PO-03 To encourage office development throughout the city centre, providing it does not compromise the attraction and function of the Prime Shopping Quarter. Special guidance is given for the Kirkstall Road Renaissance Area (see Proposal Areas).**

3.1.7 Locational preference between city centre and other areas will be a question for the LDF Core Strategy, but within the scope of the City Centre Area Action Plan, the city centre is considered to be the preferred location in Leeds for major office development and it is



anticipated that office development outside of the city centre and town centres will be limited by application of principles from national and regional policy. As an expression “to encourage”, it will be impossible to monitor the effectiveness of this intention in dealing with planning applications. Hence, in the draft Plan to be published subsequently, the encouragement may need to be expressed as explanatory text rather than policy.

### **Universities, Hospitals and City Council**

- 3.1.8 Leeds Metropolitan University has plans for partial redevelopment of its central campus, with potential to introduce a mix of other uses, such as housing & offices, whilst moving teaching faculties to other parts of the city centre. The University of Leeds plans to stay in-situ within its large city centre campus and pursue a programme of improvements & some new development. The NHS Trust plans to decentralise many services currently provided at the LGI to the primary care level, such that many buildings will become available for re-use or redevelopment. The City Council has a number of office buildings around Millennium Sq and Woodhouse Lane.
- 3.1.9 As regards how clustered or concentrated these uses remain *within* the city centre, more dispersal of university teaching accommodation away from the north west corner to the rest of the city centre could have advantages in shifting the locus of accessible suburbs away from the A660 Headingley corridor. On the other hand, dispersal may hinder effective service provision and sharing of facilities which could be disadvantageous for both service providers and users.
- 3.1.10 As regards whether the totality of floorspace of these uses remains within the city centre or moves to other areas, this has serious implications for the effective spatial planning of Leeds as a whole. As significant employers and providers of services which generate a large amount of trips, activity and local expenditure, the future of the universities, hospitals and city council offices is very important to the city centre. In the context of a general reluctance to accept the exportation of floorspace to areas outside of the city centre, where this is necessary, replacement uses should offer a quantum of activity to compensate. Opportunities to introduce science related facilities which can help nurture innovative new businesses should also be explored. Advice on how this might be achieved is set out in Proposal Area Statements below.

### **Providing Housing**

- 3.1.11 The last 10 years has seen a dramatic growth in development of residential flats in the city centre. The city centre housing market is therefore becoming more established. Developments include conversions of upper floors of buildings as well as large scale developments, often mixed with other uses. Some have expressed

concern that the scale of residential development should not detract from established purposes of the city centre – mainly shopping, employment and entertainment. However, the residential mix is seen as adding a valuable relatively new dimension to the city centre, a ‘European’ flavour, and in practical terms can allow people to live within walking distance of city centre jobs and reduce the need for commuting. Up until now developments have been largely of 1 and 2 bedroomed flats appealing to single people or young childless couples. Any new residential developments need also to have adequate supporting services (convenience shops, doctors and dental surgeries etc). (See also Section 3.2 below). The increasing residential population in the City Centre means that there is a greater need for open space and greenery.

- 3.1.12 The City Centre contains areas which are in a High Flood Risk Zone. These areas are already developed and are now being redeveloped as part of wider renaissance proposals. Due to these circumstances it is not possible to find alternative sites in a lower flood risk category, although development here requires careful attention and a justification that overrides the intrinsic risk.

The alternative options stage asked whether residential development should be promoted or discouraged in the city centre, and if the former, where. The overwhelming response was that it should be encouraged anywhere within the city centre, and the conclusion is that it should be encouraged providing it does not prejudice main town centre uses, and is subject to flood risk considerations.

**PO-05 To encourage the development of new housing throughout the city centre providing:**  
**a) it does not prejudice the functioning of the city centre as a place for main town centre uses**  
**b) it has suitable mitigation and emergency planning in areas of high flood risk (see map) and satisfies the PPS25 Exceptions Test.**

- 3.1.13 The emerging residential markets of metropolitan city centres have been driven by appeal to childless households for reasons of lifestyle and proximity to work. Within Leeds city centre, as mentioned, residential development has been almost exclusively of 1 and 2 bedroom flats. Some see this limited mix of dwellings & population as a natural response to the nature of the locality – high densities, bustle and association with employment and entertainment. Others see it as a deficit in the balance of the population leading to high turnover and lack of community.

- 3.1.14 The Alternative Options posed questions whether the CCAAP should seek a greater population mix, particularly families, students and

elderly people (Options RS03, RS06 and AC07), with general response that it should. Planning Policy Statement (PPS)3 states that “the mix of housing should contribute to the creation of mixed communities” (paragraph 24).

3.1.15 The Preferred Option conclusion here is to encourage more of a mixed range of dwelling sizes throughout the city centre, to encourage both family housing and wider needs of those without families (eg 3 persons sharing a 3 bedroomed unit).

**PO-06 To require developments of 50 or more residential units to make at least 10% of the total number of residential units 3 or more bedroomed; this will be required up to a ceiling of 20 units although developers will be encouraged to provide more.**

**For developments on larger sites of 0.5ha or more, safe and secure amenity space such as courtyards, terraces, roof gardens and communal gardens must be provided (See PO-25).**

3.1.16 As regards housing for elderly people, most general housing will be equally suited to able bodied elderly people as younger people. Flats on the ground floor or served by lifts will be suited to people with less mobility. As regards sheltered housing and residential homes, the city centre is considered a suitable location (generally safe and well served by shops and other facilities), providing that appropriate amenity space is available nearby.

**PO-07 To require all new housing to be built to ‘Lifetime Home’ standards and ten per cent of new housing to be designed to be wheelchair accessible, or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users**

3.1.17 The whole of the city centre is considered to be a suitable location for purpose built student accommodation, however in areas of high flood risk this will have to satisfy the requirements of the Exceptions Test in PPS25. It is considered that the vibrancy of the core area would be appreciated by most students; the north-west fringe is next to the University campuses; even the other fringes are not too distant to walk, cycle or use public transport.

**PO-08 To encourage the development of purpose built student accommodation, providing there is suitable mitigation and emergency planning in areas of high flood risk (see map) and the proposal satisfies the PPS25 Exceptions Test.**

## **Affordable Housing**

3.1.18 The need for, and policy controlling delivery of, affordable housing is established Leeds-wide through Unitary Development Plan policy and supplementary planning guidance. This will be updated through the Local Development Framework.

## **3.2 Attractions and Services**

### **The shopping “offer”**

3.2.1 Leeds city centre has the benefit of a compact shopping area which acts as both an attraction for people to visit the city centre and a service for workers and residents. The area designated as the Prime Shopping Quarter (PSQ) in the Unitary Development Plan is proposed to be carried forward, with minor boundary changes, into the CCAAP. The City Council undertook an update of retail capacity in 2003 (Leeds City Council Retail Study November 2003) to provide information on the capacity for major retail development in the city. The study concluded that major new developments in out-of-centre locations would be likely to threaten new retail investment that had been sought and proposed in the city centre. The Alternative Options floated whether any new retail floorspace that might be required over the next 10-15 years should be expected to fit into the existing PSQ through consolidation and increased density or whether the boundary of the PSQ should be extended. There was a mixed response.

3.2.2 The City Council's preferred option is:

- PO-09**
- i) To reconfirm the definition of the Prime Shopping Quarter (PSQ) as the Regional Shopping Centre.**
  - ii) Minor boundary changes to the PSQ to incorporate “The Light” and changes to provide Harewood and Eastgate Quarter with a principal frontage to Eastgate at the eastern part of the PSQ (see map).**
  - iii) To reassess the need for additional retail development sites within the PSQ once Trinity Quarter and Harewood Quarter are well advanced.**

3.2.3 The Unitary Development Plan contains Shopping Frontage Policy for the PSQ which provides controls over the mix of retail and retail related uses desirable within defined shopping frontages. Generally, it seeks to maintain the primacy of shopping by ensuring sufficient concentration of retail uses (A1) and limited penetration of supporting uses such as estate agents, banks, cafes and restaurants. Recent changes to national policy have divided the types of shop related uses into four categories – financial & professional services (A2), cafes & restaurants (A3), pubs & bars (A4) and hot food take-aways (A5). The

recent developments of The Light and other changes warrants a minor updating of the current UDP Shopping Frontage Policy definitions. The development of Trinity Quarter and the Harewood and Eastgate scheme will require a comprehensive update to the existing frontage map & policy. The City Councils preferred option is:

- PO-10** i) **To carry forward the defined Shopping Frontages of the UDP with minor updating (e.g. The Light).**  
ii) **To carry out, at a later date, a comprehensive update of the Shopping Frontages by means of a Supplementary Planning Document.**

3.2.4 Part of the retail offer of Leeds city centre is large format retailing, which often cannot fit into the PSQ. The Unitary Development Plan designated two “Retail Warehouse” zones to accommodate such retailing. The locations proposed for *large format retailers* are to identify possibilities and offer an opportunity for further investigation. It is not envisaged that all three suggested locations will be necessary in the Draft CCAAP.

- PO-11** i) **To modify the Regent Street allocation boundary to include the existing frontage retail units on the eastern side of Regent Street (see map).**  
ii) **To make initial suggestions for locations of large format retailing at Marsh Lane Goods Yard, Kidacre Street and the Brewery Proposals Areas.**  
iii) **To consolidate the Crown Point retail park boundary (see map).**

### **The entertainment and cultural “offer”**

3.2.5 Entertainment uses include indoor leisure, public houses, bars, restaurants, cafes and nightlife whilst cultural uses include museums, theatres and galleries. The Alternative Options considered whether the CCAAP should promote clusters of entertainment uses into defined areas or “focal points”, but there was little support for the idea, particularly if it involved prescriptive designations and planning controls. Such provision is best left to the dynamism of the market and delivery of mixed use developments.

3.2.6 The city centre is the natural location for major leisure and entertainment venues such as arenas, concert halls, conference facilities and large/regional casinos, providing the most accessible location day and night by public transport and providing a good selection of supporting uses such as hotels, bars, restaurants and shops. As regards provision of a concert hall and arena, consultation option responses favoured a city centre location or edge of centre location, as opposed to out of centre.

3.2.7 Locational preference between city centre and other areas will be a question for the LDF Core Strategy, but within the scope of the City Centre Area Action Plan, the city centre is considered to be the preferred location in Leeds for major leisure and entertainment development. As an expression “to encourage”, it will be impossible to monitor the effectiveness of this intention in dealing with planning applications. Hence, in the draft Plan to be published subsequently, the encouragement may need to be expressed as explanatory text rather than policy:

**PO-12 i) To encourage provision of entertainment and cultural uses throughout the city centre, subject to PO-14 below  
ii) To encourage & promote provision of major entertainment and cultural attractions, including the making of land allocations & proposal area statements and the exercise of compulsory purchase powers as appropriate**

3.2.8 The consultation floated the idea of protecting theatres and museums from changes of use. This was largely supported although suggestions to protect public houses in historic buildings were put forward by respondents. In order to sustain the city centre’s cultural appeal, the City Council’s preferred option is as follows:

**PO-13 To protect cinemas, theatres and public houses in buildings designed for the purpose from changes to other uses**

3.2.9 The consultation revealed a depth of concern about the impact of pubs, bars and nightclubs on amenity and on the safety and security of the city centre. This is a prompt for a preferred option dealing specifically with these uses.

**PO-14 To expect all developments of bars and nightclubs in the city centre to incorporate suitable noise insulation measures and to be controlled by appropriate hours of opening and management arrangements to avoid unacceptable noise, nuisance and disturbance on the street and noise to adjoining buildings. Without sufficient mitigation, applications should be refused.**

3.2.10 Judgements on the level of acceptability will need to be sensitive to differences of location in the city centre, particularly whether the site is within one of the “cumulative impact” licensing zones where the Police have concerns about rowdy behaviour on streets linked to the number of pubs and bars or whether the site is in a predominantly residential part of the city centre.

3.2.11 Hotels (some with related conference facilities) play an important

supporting role for the city centre in terms of both the business and entertainment functions of Leeds. There has been a significant growth in hotel bed-spaces in Leeds over the last 5-10 years catering for a wide range of budgets. No issues were raised concerning development of hotels as part of the Alternative Options consultation. Some of the existing hoteliers feel that there are beginning to be too many hotels for the market. As far as spatial planning control goes the only real concern is a locational preference in favour of town centres, in accordance with national planning policy in Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6), while quantity of provision is a matter for the market.

- 3.2.12 Locational preference between city centre and other areas will be a question for the LDF Core Strategy, but within the scope of the City Centre Area Action Plan, the city centre is considered to be the preferred location in Leeds for major hotel development. Parts of the city centre are in a High Flood Risk Zone and these areas are already developed and are now being redeveloped as part of wider renaissance proposals. Due to these circumstances it may not be possible to find alternative sites in a lower flood risk category. Hotel use can help contribute to the renaissance of the waterfront. However, if hotel use is proposed in a High Flood Risk Zone it will require careful attention and a justification that overrides the intrinsic risk.
- 3.2.13 As an expression “to encourage”, it will be impossible to monitor the effectiveness of the intention to encourage hotels. Hence, in the draft Plan to be published subsequently, the encouragement may need to be expressed as explanatory text rather than policy. Nevertheless, hotel and conference facility development is recommended in a number of the Proposals Area Statements (see below).

**PO-15 To encourage the development of new hotels and hotel floorspace, including conference facilities, providing there is suitable mitigation and emergency planning in areas of high flood risk (see map) and the proposal satisfies the PPS25 Exceptions Test.**

### **Health related facilities**

- 3.2.14 The need for dentists and GP surgeries in the city centre as supporting facilities for the growing residential population was raised during early consultation as an issue. It is not necessarily the case that there is a shortage of suitable premises, but concern about funding and the cost of delivering facilities. Hence, the alternative option (RS05) probed whether new development should be expected to provide funding to help health facilities get established. Most respondents favoured seeking funding either generally, or specifically where a shortage of facilities is evident. However, the health authority is promoting two health care drop-in centres, one in The Light shopping/leisure centre and one connected to the Leeds General Infirmary. These, along with

existing GP surgeries just outside of the city centre boundary mean that most of the city centre will be within easy walking distance of primary health care facilities. Hence, a policy to require financial contributions from development toward health facilities is not considered necessary.

### **Schools & Nurseries**

3.2.15 The issue of provision of schools and nurseries for the growing residential population was raised as part of early consultation, but not specifically addressed in the Alternative Options. Primary schools exist in the adjoining established residential neighbourhoods within 800m walking distance of some fringe areas of the city centre. Private nurseries have been established within the city centre, which service the working population more than the residential population. At present, there are only a handful of children living in the city centre under the age of 16.

3.2.16 As regards planning policy, the Unitary Development Plan has a city-wide policy to seek contributions from major housing development toward improvements to school provision. This is amplified by supplementary planning guidance. It is considered sensible to continue with a comprehensive district-wide approach, updated as necessary through the Core strategy and future LDF documents.

### **Convenience shopping & other services**

3.2.17 The issue of an adequate provision of convenience shops and services for the growing residential population was raised as part of early consultation and options were floated in the Alternative Options consultation. The City Council's preferred approach is to continue to allow small scale (individual unit of 80 sqm or less) ancillary convenience goods retail outside the Prime Shopping Quarter to meet the immediate day to day needs of city centre residents and workers.

3.2.18 In order to meet the needs of city centre residents and workers requirements to access a wider range of products and services that are often needed on a day to day basis it is intended to locate Convenience Stores (defined as a mini supermarket no larger than 280 sq m net retail sales area) within 'service centres' along with a range of other convenience services (e.g. hairdresser, beauty salon, travel agent, ticket agency, laundrette, dry cleaners, betting office,).

3.2.19 'Service centres' will provide a level of retail service relevant to a small and immediate catchment area of offices and city centre housing. By grouping convenience shops and services together it is possible to provide and offer improved access to facilities in a sustainable pattern in defined locations within the city centre. 'Service centres' are not intended to accommodate those retail uses (comparison goods



retailing) that would be best located and concentrated within the Prime Shopping Quarter.

3.2.20 The following existing 'service centres' have been identified (see map):

- University
- Great George Street
- City Station

In addition the following are proposed and/or have potential to develop as 'service centres';

- Clarence Dock
- Sweet Street
- Wellington Street
- Wellington Plaza

3.2.21 The policy approach on 'service centres' and convenience shopping within the city centre is:

- PO-16**
- i) To maintain a policy approach that allows small scale ancillary retail provision outside the Prime Shopping Quarter to meet the needs of convenience goods (food).**
  - ii) To control development to support 'convenience services' to be located within 'service centres' (see map) rather than to be distributed across the city centre.**
  - iii) To control, by planning condition the use of 'convenience goods' in new ancillary shops located outside the PSQ and preclude, a shift to non-food or other 'A' category Use Classes.**
  - iv) To control, by planning condition the use of 'convenience services' in new shops located outside the PSQ but within a designated 'service centre' and preclude, a shift to non-food retail sales.**

### **3.3 An attractive, sustainable, safe and healthy city centre**

3.3.1 The consultation response on Option GR01 has given a clear steer that the success and growth of the city centre needs to be harnessed to help deliver improvements to the quality of the city centre. Hence, it is important that new development contributes to making the environment of the city centre visually attractive, sustainable and healthy.

#### **Design of new development**

3.3.2 The Alternative Options floated different approaches to the design of new developments, either prescriptive parameters or case by case judgement according to context (DC01), with a strong public preference for judgement sensitive to context. A number of other

Options considered other factors which should be addressed as part of the initial design concept, such as desire lines for new routes (DC07, OS09, MT10) and disabled access (AC10), waste collection storage (MR07), renewable energy (MR02), sustainable construction (MR03), flood risk mitigation (MR01) and car & cycle parking (MT02, MT03 and MT09).

3.3.3 The City Council's preferred option is:

**PO-17 A parent policy to expect design of new building to be attractive and sensitive to context, with decisions informed by supplementary townscape & conservation appraisal documents, currently the City Centre Urban Design Strategy or successor.**

**In addition to aesthetic design, it is essential that the following matters are considered from the outset of designing a scheme:**

- desire lines for new routes**
- disabled access**
- waste storage**
- renewable energy measures**
- sustainable construction**
- flood risk mitigation**
- car & cycle parking provision**

3.3.4 In consultation on Option DC08, there was strong public support for the CCAAP to deal with the process of achieving good design. Achieving good design requires more than satisfying a written policy. As such, the City Council's preferred option is as follows:

**PO-18 To expect developers of significant new buildings or re-modelling of existing to engage in pre-application discussion with planning staff about scheme design.**

**Discussions should be informed by appropriate explanatory material to illustrate the existing site context, highlighting the existence of listed buildings or plan designations that would be affected by the proposal.**

**The aim of the discussions should be to agree upon design concepts such as massing, spaces and styles, helping to frame a design statement for submission with a planning application.**

### **Character Areas**

3.3.5 The benefit of defining character areas was considered under Option AS03 with a public response strongly in favour of defining broad zones.

A piece of research is being commissioned to identify character areas, including re-designation of conservation areas. Character Areas & Conservation Areas (further to Option DC03) will be defined with detailed analysis of form, space, architecture, history, movement & character of use in supplementary material to be applied in consideration of Preferred Option 17 above.

### **Tall Buildings**

3.3.6 The consultation response points to the need for a policy which only accepts tall buildings in appropriate situations. A supplementary planning document about tall buildings is currently underway.

3.3.7 The City Council's preferred option is:

- PO-19 A parent policy to judge the acceptability of tall buildings against overall criteria, informed by more detailed supplementary advice. The factors to be considered are:**
- **would views of landmark buildings or valued street scenes be unacceptably impaired**
  - **would the amenity of neighbouring buildings & spaces be unacceptably reduced in terms of shading, sense of enclosure or climatic effect**
  - **would the proposed tall building aesthetically complement neighbouring tall buildings, existing or proposed**
  - **Nb spaces include waterways and the whole of the city centre is considered sufficiently accessible by public transport for tall buildings**

### **Disabled Access**

3.3.8 The level of provision to be made for disabled access was raised under Option AC10, with the result of strong backing for disabled access to be required in all new developments. Hence, the City Council's preferred option is

- PO-20 To expect all development to be accessible to all users in accordance with the latest national best practice guidance unless exceptional circumstances are present. Exceptional circumstances include the need to avoid damage to valued elements of historic buildings.**

### **Waste Storage**

3.3.9 Consultation responses to the option of waste storage in new development (MR07) was overwhelmingly in favour of provision in all new developments.

**PO-21 To require all new developments to provide suitable storage for waste and recycled materials to be collected**

**Renewable Energy**

3.3.10 Choices for ensuring that buildings make provision for on-site renewable energy generation were considered under Option MR02. The City Council's preferred option is to take note of recent government guidance to go beyond choice "d" of 10% onsite renewable energy generation. As energy conservation standards rise during revisions to the building regulations the impact of microgeneration may be diminished over time and therefore it is proposed to including a rising percentage. It is considered appropriate for the policy to specify a development size threshold at which the policy is triggered so that it only applies to developments of a commercial nature. Further guidance on the implementation of this policy can be found in the Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document:

**PO-22 All development (either new build or conversion) with a floor space of 500 square metres or three or more residential units will be required to incorporate renewable energy generation to provide at least 10% of the predicted energy requirements of developments approved prior to 2010. Developments approved after 2010 will be expected to provide at least 15% and those approved after 2015, at least 20%.**

**Sustainable materials & construction**

3.3.11 Options for securing use of sustainably sourced building materials were considered in Option MT03. However the consultation on the Issues and Options attracted a number of comments advocating that the Council should go further than this and require a BREEAM. The Sustainable Construction Supplementary Planning Document has researched this option and provides further guidance on its implementation. The City Council's preferred option is shown below and applies to all those uses for which a BREEAM or Code for Sustainable Homes rating system exists.

**PO-23 To require developments of 500 or more square metres or 3 or more dwellings to meet at least the "very good" standard set by BREEAM/ Code for Sustainable Homes. A post construction review certificate will also be required.**

**Flood risk mitigation**

3.3.12 Different choices for designing development to lessen flood risk and damage were considered under Option MR01. The City Centre contains areas which are in a High Flood Risk Zone. These areas are

already developed and are now being redeveloped as part of wider renaissance proposals. Due to these circumstances it is not possible to find alternative sites in a lower flood risk category, however, development here requires careful attention and a justification that overrides the intrinsic risk. The Council is following government advice contained within Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) and therefore uses that are inconsistent with the vulnerability classification in PPS25 will not be permitted unless they can demonstrate they comply with the PPS25 Exceptions Test. As all development can potentially add to flood risk, even if it is not itself within a high flood risk zone, it is suggested that there should be a requirement for all planning applications in the City Centre to provide a Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate that no further increase in flood risk will result from the development. The City Council's preferred option is:

**PO-24 All planning applications in the City Centre will be required to:**

- **Ensure no increase in surface water run off will result from the new development.**
- **Ensure no increase in flooding on-site and elsewhere will result from the new development. The implications of climate change must be taken into account (these are predicted in Table B.2 of PPS25).**
- **Provide developer contributions for flood defence and mitigation works.**

### **Open space & routes**

3.3.13 Early Regulation 25 consultation feedback emphasised the importance of making the city centre greener, with more grassed and landscaped public spaces. The Open Space Alternative Options paper explored options for obtaining provision of public open space or contributions towards such provision as part of new development; the types of use of public open space; ways of securing green networks and tree planting. There is some overlap with the Managing Resources Option MR06, Movement Options MT05, 09 and 10 and Design & Conservation Option DC07 concerning routes & connections within the city centre and to surrounding neighbourhoods.

3.3.14 It is considered essential to have a policy in the CCAAP to require provision of public open space or contributions toward provision of public open space. New development creates demand for space for public health and recreation, and this is more necessary to cater for the growing residential population of the city centre, who, unlike workers & visitors, will not have the benefit of public open space near to where they live outside of the city centre. Such a policy already exists in the UDP (CC10), which requires 20% of site area of developments on sites of 0.5ha or more to be laid out as public open space. The CCAAP needs to extend the requirement to development on smaller sites

which would be appropriate to make contributions, if not on-site provision, particularly tall buildings.

**PO-25 Public Open Space and Development:**

- i) To protect existing open space in the city centre (see map).**
- ii) To require public open space provision on-site from developments of 0.5ha or more and smaller sites that adjoin existing/potential public open space. A minimum of 20% of the total site area should be laid out as public open space. Public space excludes footpaths, roads & gaps between buildings which do not form genuine public open space. An additional 5% is required for safe and secure communal gardens to meet the needs of families occupying larger units (see PO-06).**
- iii) To require developer contributions from developments below 0.5ha for public open space provision off-site. This includes tall buildings on small footprints. A commuted sum proportionate in scale to floorspace will be required, to be used toward provision and better use of public open space.**
- iv) Developer contributions may be used for enhancement of spaces outside of the city centre, providing that they are reasonably accessible to city centre residents & within easy walking distance of the city centre boundary.**
- v) To seek contributions to cover the cost of 10 years of maintenance of public open spaces which are to be vested with the City Council. The policy will have to define what types of work are to be covered by maintenance, & differentiate between maintenance & public realm improvement.**

**Use of public open space**

3.3.15 As regards the use of public open space, the city centre environment places many demands, not just green areas for passive and active recreation, but hard surfaced areas for heavy pedestrian movement and staging of events. Areas for recreation can also be laid out for a variety of purposes ranging from sport to playgrounds. Early public consultation identified strong views that more greenery ought to be provided. Regarding consultation on the Alternative options, OS05 floated the choices of *how* to decide mix of green/hard surface, OS06 asked for preferences on what should be the purposes of public open space and OS10 considered public access and opening arrangements. The options are relevant to decisions to be made with developers about on-site public open space provision and decisions about how to use commuted sum contributions.

3.3.16 The City Council's preferred option is:

- PO-26 i) To decide the mix of green space and hard surfacing in new public open space in negotiation with the developer**

taking account of the nature of the development. Green space will be expected as the rule, but hard surfacing will be appropriate in the following circumstances:

- where the space is designed to host events (eg Millenium Sq)
- for pathways across green areas
- to provide a base for café seating
- covered areas

Outdoor hard surfaces must be porous for rainwater absorption.

ii) To determine the use of new public open space in negotiation with the developer taking account of the nature of the development. This will need to be informed by an appraisal of current available provision in the vicinity of the development, including public open space in adjoining neighbourhoods.

iii) to determine times of opening in negotiation with the developer taking account of site circumstances, although the underlying aim should be to maximise opening hours.

## **Public Realm and Environmental Improvements**

3.3.17 Policy CC1 of the UDP seeks contributions from development for environmental improvements in the city centre. This is distinct from asking for public open space provision or contributions toward public open space provision. Linked to Policy CC1, a Supplementary Planning Document is about to be adopted which sets a tariff for new development to make contributions for public realm improvements. These improvements include re-paving, street furniture etc. A replacement for Policy CC1 will be required which accords with the recent circular on planning obligations 5/05:

**PO-27 To seek a proportionate financial contribution through commuted sum payments to be used by the city council to secure environmental / nature conservation improvements on public realm.**

## **Safety and Security**

3.3.18 It is vitally important that the city centre is, and feels, safe for visitors, residents and workers alike at all hours of the day. In terms of how to plan for a safe and secure city centre, Option DC02 put forward choices of promoting safety through natural surveillance, through cordoning off and restricting access or through a combination of approaches.

**PO-28 To apply a presumption in favour of making public areas**

**permeable and accessible, but to accept restriction of access if considered necessary to avoid creating opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour according to site circumstances.**

## **Waterways**

3.3.19 Consultation on the Alternative Option OS12 produced overwhelming support for the idea of identifying and opening up hidden and culverted watercourses. However, there are a number of practical concerns with public safety and the need to avoid exacerbation of flood risk, which need to be built into the preferred option:

**PO-29 To identify the lines of all hidden and culverted watercourses in the city centre (see map), and to expect developments over hidden watercourses to explore opportunities to open up them up, in full or in part where it is practical to do so, taking into account depth below ground, flood risk, public safety, potential to create an open space feature, potential to introduce biodiversity and appropriateness in terms of proposed land uses. A flood risk assessment will be required for any such proposal.**

## **3.4 Sustainable transport**

3.4.1 The on-going development of the city centre presents challenges for the existing transport system and a strategic review is currently being undertaken to identify the transport requirements which will support the future sustainable development of the city. The review will take account of the consultation findings which have informed the development of the CCAAP to date. The options presented here will be further developed as part of the review and it is intended that the CCAAP will provide an indication of where there may be potential spatial implications resulting from future transport proposals. This paper sets out some of the key areas which will be further developed over the duration of the CCAAP.

### **Routes & Connections for Pedestrians & Cyclists**

3.4.2 Consultation explored the importance of routes & connections in a number of ways, including Design & Conservation option DC07 concerning design coherence of routes (DC07), Open Space option OS09 and Movement options MT05, 09 & 10 for linking the south side of the city centre to the north, and encouraging walking & cycling.

3.4.3 The City Council's preferred option is:



**PO-30 i) To explain the importance of better connections for pedestrians & cyclists for movement within the city centre as well as between the city centre and adjoining neighbourhoods.**

**ii) To expect the layout of new development to be designed to contribute to connections by opening up new routes, avoiding obstruction to existing routes, making existing routes more attractive and user friendly, incorporating appropriate greenery and landscaping features and supplying appropriate off site infrastructure such as footbridges and other crossings as informed by the map illustrating route desire lines and the need for infrastructure improvements.**

### **Bus Interchanges**

3.4.4 A series of strategically located bus interchange points on the edge of the city centre will be considered in order to improve accessibility to public transport and improve bus movement, capacity and circulation in the city centre, thus reducing the delay to buses and their passengers making cross city journeys. The existing bus station is not ideally located to serve the needs of the city centre and the introduction of interchange points at Infirmary Street and New Station Street has proved successful. Areas of search have been identified for potential new interchange sites which are well connected to the public transport box and the radial routes into the city; some services would terminate at these points enabling a smaller number of through services to move efficiently across the city. It is envisaged that the sites would be served by a high frequency free city centre orbital bus service, as is currently in operation around the city centre, to enable passengers with a city centre destination to complete their journeys with minimum delay. The introduction of new interchange points requires a thorough review of existing bus services in order to rationalise the number of services crossing the city and to demonstrate a clear benefit to passengers. The proposed areas of search are identified in the CCAAP to inform the location of new development.

**PO-31 To identify areas where bus interchanges could be developed to enhance and improve opportunities for service provision and interchange between routes and travel modes (see map).**

### **Public Transport Routes**

3.4.5 A Bus Rapid Transit scheme is being considered as a replacement to the former Leeds Supertram project. The scheme would follow a similar alignment in the city centre to the former Supertram routes and would be served by park and ride sites. The proposed routes will be

identified in the CCAAP to ensure that they are protected and that new development addresses the opportunities available to deliver the routes.

- 3.4.6 Opportunities for the introduction of tram-trains are being considered for certain heavy rail routes. The Leeds City Region Transport Vision identifies the Harrogate Rail Line as an option for the introduction of tram-train technology and other opportunities are being considered such as the Castleford Rail Line. Detailed study work is required and route alignments have not yet been determined, however outline route options will be identified in the CCAAP to highlight the opportunities which could be afforded by the implementation of a scheme.

**PO-32 To identify preferred routes for Bus Rapid Transit and for future tram-train schemes or heavy rail improvements (see map).**

### **Railway Stations**

- 3.4.7 Leeds city centre is currently served by one rail station. In the short term there are improvements proposed at the City Rail Station including the implementation of a southern access/egress point to improve access to/from the Station for passengers. In the longer term there are aspirations for additional rail stations in the East, and potentially West and South, of the city centre to serve new and existing development in these areas and to provide capacity improvements at the existing City Rail Station. It is likely that any new rail station in these areas would require a substantial financial contribution from the private sector in order to be implemented within the period of the CCAAP. Areas of search for potential new rail stations will be identified in the CCAAP to ensure that new development addresses any opportunities that exist to deliver new stations.

**PO-33 To identify potential locations for new rail stations (see map).**

### **Traffic Circulation**

- 3.4.8 The existing city centre highway network is close to capacity and improvements are required in order to effectively serve the city and support its future development. A detailed study will be carried out to determine the most suitable highway proposals which will improve connections with the south of the city, improve the flow of traffic on the existing network and address road safety and air quality concerns. Secondary loop roads could potentially be introduced in the south of the city centre to better serve the city, incorporating sophisticated traffic management schemes to reduce the impact of traffic on the city centre and improve the environment for pedestrians. There is an aspiration to direct particular attention to the needs of pedestrians in specific areas around City Square, the City Rail Station and the Parish Church. The CCAAP will identify outline route options for detailed analysis.

**PO-34 To designate schematic desire lines for new traffic circulation routes to the south of the city centre (see map).**

### **Car & Cycle Parking Provision**

3.4.9 The options for short stay and commuter car parking were considered in Movement Options MT02 and 03, and the need for improved cycle parking provision was considered in MT10. The consultation revealed support for maintaining or enhancing short stay provision for visitors and maintaining or reducing the level of car parking for commuters. Parking standards for developments in the city centre are currently applied according to the zone of the city within which the development is located. Different standards exist for different zones within the city centre, including the areas on the fringe of the city centre. A package of proposals has been prepared to influence the provision of parking for the duration of the CCAAP.

#### **PO-36 Car Parking Option**

**The preferred option for long stay commuter car parking consists of the following proposals (see map):**

- **applying stricter parking standards to sites within, and fronting on to, the public transport box (PTB)**
- **extending the coverage of the existing core car parking policy area, within which parking standards apply**
- **applying more stringent parking controls within the core car parking policy area when parking is made available through the construction of park and ride sites which will serve the city centre**
- **ensuring parking provision is made for people with a disability where development is of a certain floorspace**

**The table below provides details of the existing adopted UDP City Centre Commuter Parking guidelines together with the proposed amendments.**

<b>Area</b>	<b>Adopted UDP Guideline</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>
PTB Within & immediately adjoining the public transport box	Normally replacement parking only. However, in exceptional circumstances, especially on the edge of the Public Transport Box, more spaces may be permitted for particularly desirable prestigious developments.	To define the area as 'Within and fronting on to the public transport box'. To revise the standard to no car parking.
CCPPA (core car parking policy area)	1:175 SQ M	To extend the boundary to the city centre boundary and apply

		1:175 SQ M. When enhanced city centre accessibility is delivered through the development of park and ride the Council is considering reducing the standard to 1 space per 350 SQ M.
Fringe (fringe city centre commuter parking control area)	1:100 SQ M	The remaining fringe area will be covered in part by the development of separate parking policies in the Area Action Plans for Aire Valley Leeds, EASEL and West Leeds Gateway, and in part by the existing UDP fringe policy which will be saved.
PDA's (prestige development areas)	1:70 SQ M [except where it falls within CCPPA, in which case CCPPA guideline applies.]	N/A At present the concept of PDA's do not form part of the CCAAP.
Parking provision for people with a disability	Where a requirement of 10 spaces or more is indicated, 10% should be designed and reserved for disabled users, up to a total of 20 spaces (Schedule of General Parking Guidelines)	For developments within the PTB or CCPPA, of 1500 SQ M or above, apply the standard of 1 space per 1500 SQ M to a maximum of 20 spaces.

3.4.10 Adopted UDP Policy CCP3, covering Parking Permit Schemes within the fringe area, would be retained as a saved policy, however, the expansion of the CCPPA means that this will only apply outside the boundary of the CCAAP. It is therefore proposed that this policy should be included within the CCAAP, and applied to the whole area covered by the expanded CCPPA.

3.4.11 The preferred option for short stay visitor car parking would be to retain the existing short stay parking standards but to look to obtaining contributions from developers towards the provision of off-site shared car parking, managed by the City Council.

3.4.12 Stand alone short stay car parks (ie not associated with developments of town centre uses), will be positively considered throughout the city centre, especially around the main areas of attraction (ie the prime shopping quarter). In the future this may need to be balanced against park and ride provision and the wider transport and parking strategy. In the short term temporary short stay car parking will be welcomed to offset the loss of spaces as a result of redevelopments of surface level car parks.

## **PO-36 Cycle & Motorcycle Parking Options**

- 3.4.13 A review of the existing Cycle Parking Guidelines and Motorcycle Parking Guidelines will be undertaken.

### **3.5 Extend the success of the city centre to adjoining neighbourhoods**

- 3.5.1 Vision for Leeds II has objectives to expand the city centre (linking city centre to surrounding neighbourhoods, creating high quality spaces & developing new facilities – p.31) and to extend the success of the city centre to inner city areas (areas of urban renaissance, improving housing markets and higher standards of design – p.67).
- 3.5.2 Consultation on the CCAAP has sought to explore how best to extend the success of the city centre to adjoining areas. One issue was whether to extend the city centre boundary outwards (see PO-01 above). Here, it was considered that the urban renaissance process of transforming industrial landscape on the fringes of the city centre into 21<sup>st</sup> century landscape would not be helped or hindered by an administrative boundary, as the process is being driven by the residential market which would be supported inside and outside of the boundary. The only difference would be the development of “town centre uses” (offices, hotels, indoor leisure) which would be resisted outside of the city centre boundary. It is considered that it is important to keep town centre uses reasonably central, and that there would be little benefit to inner city communities allowing a greater dispersal. What is considered more important is improving the connections between city centre and adjoining neighbourhoods.
- 3.5.3 Improvement to the connections between city centre and adjoining neighbourhoods is addressed in PO-30. It is also suggested in PO-25 that money raised for public space provision may be used for the improvement of parks and other open spaces in inner city areas adjoining the city centre. There is also a need for the planned development of new convenience shopping and facilities, whilst adding new services and provision, to be sensitive to existing provision (see PO-16 and Appraisal of Responses to Alternative Options (RT-04-07)).
- 3.5.4 Perhaps the best way that the city centre can support the prosperity of the inner city is through the provision of employment. In spatial terms, the city centre is highly accessible to the ring of adjoining communities either through walking, cycling or public transport. The city centre provides in the order of 120,000 jobs, but despite the physical proximity and accessibility, inner city neighbourhoods have the highest unemployment rates in Leeds. Hence, it will be important to ensure

that new developments are harnessed to supply jobs for local people, both for construction and final user/occupiers. Consultation on the Alternative Options explored what scale of development ought to be expected to enter into training and employment agreements. The majority response favoured developments of 1000sqm or more.

**PO-37 To expect developers of schemes of 1000sqm or more to contact the City Council to explore what training & employment agreements might be appropriate.**

**To require developers of schemes on sites of 1 or more hectares to enter into training and employment agreements**

## **4 Proposal Area Statements**

- 4.1.1 Nine Proposal Areas are identified which present opportunity for redevelopment or change of strategic importance to the city centre. Areas of major change which already have planning permission have been excluded.
- 4.1.2 In addition, three areas are identified which have supplementary planning statements: Holbeck Urban Village, Mabgate and Kirkstall Road. These are known as “Renaissance Areas”.
- 4.1.3 Two of the main generic reasons for identifying the Proposals Areas are to ensure sufficient office space is available for the city and to identify opportunities to provide more public open space than will be normally required elsewhere in the city centre (ie 20% of sites of +0.5ha). It is also an opportunity to identify requirements appropriate to the site specific circumstances of each site.
- 4.1.4 Unless the Proposal Area statement says otherwise, all standard policy requirements of the CCAAP will apply.
- 4.1.5 The generic reasons for requiring office space are as follows:
- To help fulfil the primary objective of helping Leeds achieve a position as a major European business centre (i.e. it is based on creating the conditions in which major office space uses can be retained in, and attracted to, the City).
  - To provide the opportunity to accommodate large scale office developments which demand and require City Centre locations, including relocations from outside Leeds.
  - Given the existing compact nature, tight urban grain and intensity of

development within the heart of the City Centre, scope for large scale office developments is limited there. New sites need to be found on the fringe of the traditional City Centre and within the existing City Centre boundary

- To ensure that there is sufficient land for office use and therefore obviating the need for offices to locate outside the city centre, i.e. less sustainable locations.

4.1.6 The proposals outlined give an overall indication of the mix of acceptable uses and any routes or other proposals of strategic relevance to the city centre. It is not intended that they should provide detailed guidance on scale, appearance or design.

## 4.2 City Gate

### LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

4.2.1 The proposals area is situated to the west of the core city centre area. The area is highly visible from the Inner Ring Road and A58, which links directly to the M621. Kirkstall Road marks the northern boundary and the River Aire the southern boundary. Current uses are varied – the Yorkshire Post building is the largest, most prominent building, situated in a 'gateway' location leading into Leeds on Wellington Street, which leads to the railway station. The rest of the proposals area is contained within the river and major road boundaries with a mix of uses including a car park, travel inn, retail warehouses, a casino, currently vacant land, a park and incidental areas of open space adjacent to the road network. New student accommodation is situated to the northwest of the site, and the new residential development 'City Island' is to the southeast of the area.

#### PROPOSALS:

##### 1. Yorkshire Post site

i. If redeveloped in the future, a minimum office content of 20,000 sqm or equivalent to 100% plot ratio should be incorporated. The site offers the opportunity for a prestigious large scale, multi storey development, with office uses on lower floors.

**Reason:** as per generic reasons for office space in the city centre. Also, office use is important for the gateway location clearly visible from main arterial routes defining the entry point into the commercial edge of the city centre. Gateway locations demand buildings of design excellence to provide a positive impact on entering the centre.

ii. Hotel, leisure, conference and exhibition uses to complement the office use would also be acceptable. NB. A hotel use would be subject to PO15 and PO24 dealing with flood risk as the site falls within Flood Zone 3.

**Reason:** It is accepted that other main town centre uses would be appropriate. A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community.

iii. There is scope for ancillary small-scale uses that are necessary to service and directly support the Proposal Area and its principal office function. These should be genuinely ancillary and not be destinations in their own right. The inclusion of small-scale ancillary retail and retail services along with restaurants, bars and other uses should complement and support the office use.

**Reason:** To ensure that there is an appropriate level and range of support services and uses.

iv. residential development will be acceptable on upper floors within mixed use developments. NB. The site falls within Flood Zone 3 and is subject to PO05 and PO24 re. flood risk.

**Reason:** A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community.

v. Development should be appropriately set back from the bank of the river.

**Reason:** To provide an open corridor and to allow for the retention or creation of soft edged treatments in accordance with the Biodiversity and Waterfront Development SPD.

vi. The southern boundary adjacent the river needs to incorporate open space adjacent the river and a riverside walkway.

**Reason:** The riverside location provides the opportunity to 'open up' the riverside area more with a footpath link and provision of an area of open space.

vii. Development should incorporate or provide contributions towards a pedestrian footbridge across Wellington Road/the A58.

**Reason:** To provide the necessary linkages in the riverside walk

**2. 'City Gate site' (incorporating the area around the park, including currently vacant land, car park, retail and warehousing, but not the more recently developed restaurant, travel inn and casino)**

i. A minimum office content of 30,000 sqm or equivalent to 100% plot ratio should be incorporated. This site offers the opportunity for a comprehensive redevelopment, also for a prestigious, large scale, multi storey development, with office uses on lower floors. (Development of the Yorkshire Post site and City Gate site could be 'in balance' with each other in terms of design, height and massing terms).

**Reason:** as per generic reasons for office space in the city centre. Also, office use is important for the gateway location clearly visible from main arterial routes defining the entry point into the commercial edge of the city centre. Gateway locations demand buildings of design excellence to provide a positive impact on entering the centre.



ii. Hotel, leisure, conference and exhibition uses to complement the office use would also be acceptable. NB. A hotel use would be subject to PO15 and PO24 re. flood risk as the site falls within Flood Zone 3.

**Reason:** It is accepted that other main town centre uses would be appropriate. A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community.

iii. There is scope for ancillary small-scale uses that are necessary to service and directly support the Proposal Area and its principal office function. These should be genuinely ancillary and not be destinations in their own right. The inclusion of small-scale ancillary retail and retail services along with restaurants, bars and other uses should complement and support the office use.

**Reason:** To ensure that there is an appropriate level and range of support services and uses.

iv. residential development will be acceptable on upper floors within mixed use developments. NB. The site falls within Flood Zone 3 and is subject to PO05 and PO24 re. flood risk.

**Reason:** A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community.

v. Development should be appropriately set back from the bank of the river.

**Reason:** To provide an open corridor and to allow for the retention or creation of soft edged treatments in accordance with the Biodiversity and Waterfront Development SPD

vi. The southern boundary already provides a walkway along the majority of the riverside frontage. Any redevelopment would need to extend this along the whole of the site frontage.

**Reason:** A walkway will both open up the accessibility of the park, so increasing its usage, and provide a key pedestrian/ cycle/green link into the city centre.

vii. Development should incorporate or provide contributions towards a pedestrian footbridge across Wellington Road/the A58.

**Reason:** To provide the necessary linkages in the riverside walk

viii. Development adjacent to the park off Wellington Bridge Street needs to incorporate provision to open up the accessibility of the park through creation of green linkages/corridors to it.

**Reason:** The park is underused and it's accessibility and usage needs to be increased.

### **3. The "island" car park site immediately south of Kirkstall Road**

i. This site is required for car parking. However, a redevelopment of the site, which includes retention or an increase in the number of car parking spaces would be acceptable. The site is a 'gateway' location

where a minimum office content equivalent to 100% plot ratio of the site will be required.

**Reason:** as per generic reasons for office space in the city centre. Also this is a gateway site clearly visible from main arterial routes where the commercial edge of the city centre needs definition. Gateway locations demand buildings of design excellence to provide a positive impact on entering the centre

ii. Hotel, leisure, conference and exhibition uses to complement the office use would also be acceptable. NB. A hotel use would be subject to PO15 and PO24 re. flood risk as the site falls within Flood Zone 3.

**Reason:** It is accepted that other main town centre uses would be appropriate. A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community.

iii. There is scope for ancillary small-scale uses that are necessary to service and directly support the Proposal Area and its principal office function. These should be genuinely ancillary and not be destinations in their own right. The inclusion of small-scale ancillary retail and retail services along with restaurants, bars and other uses should complement and support the office use.

**Reason:** To ensure that there is an appropriate level and range of support services and uses.

iv. residential development will be acceptable on upper floors within mixed use developments. NB. The site falls within Flood Zone 3 and is subject to PO05 and PO24 re. flood risk.

**Reason:** A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community.

v. As the site is effectively an island surrounded by roads, any development proposals will need to provide for or contribute to creation of better pedestrian linkages.

**Reason:** to improve pedestrian access routes across major road barriers.

### 4.3 Elmwood Road & Brunswick Terrace

#### LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

4.3.1 The area is defined by the Inner Ring Road which is in a deep cutting to the north and to the west the boundary is the broad carriageway of Claypit Lane and to the east Wade Lane. The southern edge is punctuated by a series of office buildings strung along the Merrion Way frontage. The location is at a topographical high point within the city centre, on a ridge of land that contains the Merrion Centre shopping centre, immediately to the south.

## PROPOSALS

i. Gateway office location. This location at the northern edge of the defined city centre presents itself as a gateway entry point where office use should predominate to define the entry point into the commercial edge of the city centre. In particular the frontage to Claypit Lane offers an opportunity to make a positive and visible statement of office use.

**Reason:** as per generic reasons for office space in the city centre. Also office use would help distinguish between the residential communities of Little London and the commercial city centre proper. The locality offers sites for uses, that by their nature, require city centre locations and demand buildings of design excellence appropriate to this gateway location. The core of existing prestige office uses that currently exist along Merrion Way can and should be consolidated and not diluted with displacement by residential use.

ii. Whilst the principle use within this location will be expected to be office there is scope for leisure, hotel and related conference and exhibition uses to complement the office use.

**Reason:** To present due emphasis to the commercial edge of the city centre accepting that other specified main town centre uses would be appropriate.

iii. There is scope for ancillary small-scale uses that are necessary to service and directly support the Proposals Area and its principle office function. The inclusion of small-scale ancillary retail and retail services along with restaurants, bars and other uses should complement and support the office use and in addition support the student community that abuts the location.

**Reason** To ensure that there is an appropriate level and range of support services and uses.

iv. Residential use will be acceptable provided that it does not prejudice the delivery of the principal office use.

**Reason:** There is a significant quantity of residential development in and adjacent to the Proposals Area. To ensure that the best use is made of this gateway location and the city centre boundary is robustly defined it is considered that a predominance of residential use or development within the areas to be developed would be inappropriate.

v. New significant public open space, at a minimum of 20% of the site area, and in addition an opportunity to provide new pedestrian routes through to adjacent off-site public open space provision should also be provided.

**Reason:** Public open space is lacking in this location with disrupted links to the nearest green spaces at Queens Square and Lovell Park. There is a need for the development of this location to deliver a significant contribution to open space provision which will overcome the perceived deficiency and help to ameliorate the current over dominance of the local highway network.

vi. The development should provide for underground car parking as surface parking will not be supported. Opportunity exists to achieve permanent public car parking provision in the north of the City Centre: subject to the detailed car parking guidelines there could be potential for short stay provision on this site

**Reason:** A balance should be struck to ensure that pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles can mix safely.

## 4.4 Kidacre Street

### LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

4.4.1 This 8.5ha site forms a key gateway location into the City. It is within the city centre boundary yet just to the north of junction 3 of the M621. It is situated between Dewsbury Road to the west and Crown Point Retail Park to the east with the adjacent Kidacre Street providing the access to the Crown Point Retail Park service yard. To the south it is bounded by the Leeds to Castleford railway line and to the north by Holmes Street.

4.4.2 The site is predominantly in industrial use however there is a clear division between thriving, prestigious uses to the west of the site and cleared derelict areas to the east. Part of the site is in the ownership of National Grid and is still in operational use with two large gas holders dominating the area visually. The southern part of the site is the City Council owned Pottery Fields Highways Depot. There are vacant areas to the north of the gas holders, which are largely overgrown. Boundary walls have fallen into disrepair and this part of the site has become unsightly and unkempt. This is in strong contrast with the western part of the site which is a mixture of industrial units, including Apex Business Park. To the north of Apex, the site is predominantly in use as car showrooms and workshops, taking advantage of the frontage along Dewsbury Road and with well maintained landscaping, including tree cover creating a high quality environmental context.

4.4.3 The site is accessible by public transport along Holmes Street. It is about 15 minutes walk to Leeds City Station. Excellent road infrastructure exists within and around the site.

### PLANNING HISTORY

4.4.4 The western part of the site is allocated in the Adopted UDP as a Prestige Development Area and this objective has been partially achieved with the occupation by Apex Business Park and car showrooms. The Adopted UDP also identified the site as suitable for leisure, catering and public spaces. The Crown Point Retail Park to the east of the site was identified for retail warehousing – for large format

retailers who cannot easily be accommodated in the city centre. However the reality is that the Retail Park is tending to attract shops typically found on the High Street and hence it is functioning more as a shopping centre in competition to the main city centre shopping area, rather than as a retail park which is complementary to the city centre. Holmes Street to the north of the site is defined as a Proposed Pedestrian Corridor/ Public Space.

- 4.4.5 During the preparation of the Leeds UDP Review, an objection was received from Second Site Property Holdings Ltd on the grounds that land at Kidacre Street should be included as a brownfield housing allocation under Policy H3.1. However the Council defended its position of not inviting developer interests in the UDP Review – as it was only a partial review and the specific identification of housing allocations were not considered appropriate at that time.

## PROPOSALS

- i. B1 office use. For the entire site development, the total office floorspace should equate to a plot ratio of at least 200% or 170,000sqm. For substantial phases, office space provision should equate to a plot ratio of at least 200%. Smaller developments should not prejudice the potential future delivery of the required office space. **Reason:** This site is considered to be suitable for large scale office use in planning terms to achieve maximum accessibility by sustainable forms of transport for employers, customers and visitors. The site is in close proximity to the bus station and will be within a short walking distance from the proposed public transport improvements identified, i.e. new rail halt. Also, the site is located at a principal road "gateway" into the city centre, in a prominent location where there is scope to achieve buildings which by virtue of their considerable mass and/or relative height and design excellence will act as a landmark, signalling in a prestigious way, entry into the city centre.
- ii. Large format retailing  
**Reason:** to meet the needs of large format retailers to locate in the city centre.
- iii. Provision of an area of public open space  
**Reason:** to help meet the needs of the growing residential population in close proximity to the site and also to provide a quality environment for employees. Public open space should also be used to complement the arena and there may be an opportunity to host outdoor events on this site (refer to PO-26).
- iv. Provision of a major arena for live music and related conference and exhibition facilities and other commercial leisure uses, including a casino. The City Council is promoting provision of one new arena in Leeds, and in planning terms, this site is considered acceptable in

principle for this and other commercial leisure (D2) uses. Its suitability could be enhanced by improvements to the public transport accessibility to the site – which could be achieved by the provision of a rail halt or development of a tram/train spur at the southern end of the site.

**Reason:** fringe city centre sites provide an ideal location for an arena giving excellent public transport accessibility within 5-15 minutes walk and a range of supporting infrastructure – shops, hotels, bars/restaurants.

v. Residential use will be acceptable provided that it does not prejudice the delivery of the principal office use and multi purpose arena and associated facilities.

**Reason:** higher value uses are required on this site to help off-set the substantial cost of removal/ relocation of the gas holders and subsequent remediation. Residential is not inappropriate here as there is a significant quantity of residential development of varying scale and mix adjacent to the Proposals Area. However to maintain vibrancy it is considered that residential uses should be kept to the upper levels with active uses on the ground floor.

vii. There is scope for ancillary small-scale uses that are necessary to service and directly support the Proposal Area and its principal office and multi purpose arena / leisure function. These should be genuinely ancillary and not be destinations in their own right. The inclusion of small-scale ancillary retail and retail services along with restaurants, bars and other uses should complement and support the principal uses. There is scope for providing better pedestrian linkages to the prime shopping quarter and other parts of the city centre.

**Reason:** To ensure that there is an appropriate level and range of support services and uses.

## 4.5 Leeds General Infirmary

### LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

4.5.1 Leeds General Infirmary (LGI) is situated on the northwest side of the city centre. Immediately to the north west is the University of Leeds and to the north east Leeds Metropolitan University (LMU). To the east is the Civic Hall and Millenium Square, and the western side of the site adjoins Little Woodhouse Conservation Area. To the south of the site on Great George Street is a small shopping frontage and the Court buildings.

4.5.2 The LGI has been a hospital since 1867 and has grown incrementally since then. The site contains a wide range of buildings of varying design, scale and quality. The centrepiece is the Grade 1 listed original Victorian hospital designed by Gilbert Scott with additions by

Corson, which fronts onto Great George Street. Also listed are the Old Medical School on Thoresby Place (Grade II\*) and the University of Pathology (Grade II). The southern half of the LGI site lies within the City Centre Conservation Area. Attached to the Gilbert Scott hospital are later additions from both the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the most recent being the Worsley Building (University Medical School) dating from the mid 1970's, the Clarendon Wing at the western side of the site which dates from the early 1980's, and the Jubilee Wing which dates from 1997. The LGI has close links with the adjoining University of Leeds and is a major resource for the training of medical, dental and nursing students, as well as being a base for significant medical and related research

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

4.5.3 The Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust is currently developing a strategy for health care services across the city within the "Making Leeds Better" initiative. The focus of this initiative is to develop primary healthcare facilities to provide locally based care as an alternative to traditional hospital based services. This will require the reconfiguration of existing hospital services including a strategic shift towards a single acute hospital site. This requires an assessment of the existing building stock in terms of its fitness for the purpose of delivering 21<sup>st</sup> century healthcare. This may lead to requirements for major new clinical buildings which can only be delivered at St James' University Hospital rather than the LGI, and this in turn may result in large sections of the LGI becoming redundant for hospital use. This work is ongoing and there is currently no definitive plan for how much of the LGI will no longer be required for healthcare use, nor when this is likely to happen.

## **PROPOSALS:**

i. Any future potential redevelopment proposals must retain the listed buildings and those of architectural merit. Much of the site has been 'infilled' with smaller buildings added as later editions to the main hospital. Removal of these would focus attention more on the buildings of merit to be retained. This could be further enhanced by creation of open space around remaining buildings.

**Reason:** to celebrate and enhance the listed buildings and others of aesthetic merit.

ii. The Millenium Square frontage is important. Lower floor uses here should enhance the cultural and tourist attraction of this part of the city, and could include A3-A5 uses.

**Reason:** to enhance the cultural and entertainment attraction of Millenium Square and surrounds including the Civic Hall, museum, theatre, bars and restaurants.

iii. The Gilbert Scott building fronting Great George Street is an important frontage to be retained. Appropriate lower floor uses here

include active commercial uses such as galleries, exhibition space, bars and cafes.

**Reason:** To take advantage of the architectural and historic merit of the Gilbert Scott building to support the cultural attraction of the area and to complement the service centre function of the parade of convenience shops/cafes on the south side of Great George Street.

**iv.** Any redevelopment of the Gilbert Scott building should consider provision of better public access, possibly an east-west axis precinct through the Gilbert Scott wing, linking Thoresby Place to Millenium Square.

**Reason:** to enhance the pedestrian permeability of the city centre.

**v.** With the potential loss of hospital use on parts of the site, any redevelopment proposal should take into account the need for office provision. A minimum of 70,000sqm or the equivalent of 100% plot ratio of the area for redevelopment/reuse should be developed for office use.

**Reason:** as per generic reasons for office space in the city centre, but also to compensate for the loss of hospital employment and activity which supports shops, services and facilities in the locality.

**vi.** There is also scope for hotel or leisure uses to complement the office use

**Reason:** it is accepted that other main town centre uses would be appropriate. A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community.

**vii.** Residential development will be acceptable on upper floors within mixed use developments.

**Reason:** Such a location within this Proposals Area is highly sustainable/accessible.

## 4.6 Marsh Lane

### DESCRIPTION

4.6.1 The site is on the eastern side of the city centre. The site occupies a high profile location adjacent to the Inner Ring Road/A64 approach to the city centre.

4.6.2 The site is immediately east of Quarry Hill House and is bordered to the north by the A64 arterial road and to the south by the railway line.

4.6.3 A significant portion of the site currently lies derelict with other parts mainly in industrial use.

4.6.4 The site benefits from close proximity to the bus station and is likely to



be adjacent to any east Leeds Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route. This site also forms part of the wider search area to locate one of the possible additional City Centre rail halts. As such the site has the potential to become highly accessible by public transport.

- 4.6.5 Although close to the city centre, pedestrian connectivity is hampered by the busy road network and significant infrastructure works would be required to improve this.

## PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.6.6 The site is allocated in the Adopted UDP as a Prestige Development Area where it was recognised that most developments would be offices. Policy CC31 sets down those uses for which support will be given in PDAs as the principal use (i.e. Prestige office; Leisure, entertainment, recreation and cultural facilities; Conference and exhibition facilities; Hotels).

- 4.6.7 No significant schemes, in line with the previous UDP, have been implemented during the previous plan period.

## PROPOSALS

i. B1a) office use. For the entire site development, the total office floorspace should equate to a plot ratio of at least 100% or 66,000sqm. Both Marsh Lane and York Road frontage provide a highly visible location which is suitable for prestige office development.

**Reason:** This site is considered to be suitable for large scale office use in planning terms to achieve maximum accessibility by sustainable forms of transport for employers, customers and visitors. The site is in close proximity to the bus station and will be within a short walking distance from the proposed public transport improvements identified, i.e. BRT and new rail halt. Also, the site is located at a principal road "gateway" into the city centre, in a prominent location where there is scope to achieve buildings which by virtue of their considerable mass and/or relative height and design excellence will act as a landmark, signalling in a prestigious way, entry into the city centre.

ii. There is scope for a multi purpose arena development and related conference and exhibition facilities. The City Council is promoting the provision of one new arena in Leeds, and in planning terms, this site is considered acceptable in principle. Its suitability would be further enhanced by improvements to public transport to the site. This could be achieved by the provision of a rail halt; and/or development of the BRT route and stop at the western end of the site; and proximity to existing Quality Bus Corridors.

**Reason:** Fringe city centre sites provide an ideal location for an arena giving excellent public transport access within 5 - 15 minutes walk and a range of supporting infrastructure including shops, hotels, and bars/restaurants.

iii. There is scope for leisure and hotel uses to complement the office use and multi purpose arena.

**Reason:** to accept that other specified main town centre uses would be appropriate.

iv. Large format retailing

**Reason:** to meet the needs of large format retailers to locate in the city centre

v. Residential use will be acceptable provided that it does not prejudice the delivery of the principal office use and multi purpose arena and associated facilities.

**Reason:** There is a significant quantity of residential development of varying scale and mix adjacent to the Proposals Area. To ensure that the best use is made of this location and proximity to the existing and proposed public transport improvements it is considered that a predominance of residential use on the lower floors would be inappropriate.

vi. There is scope for ancillary small-scale uses that are necessary to service and directly support the Proposal Area and its principal office and multi purpose arena function. These should be genuinely ancillary and not be destinations in their own right. The inclusion of small-scale ancillary retail and retail services along with restaurants, bars and other uses should complement and support the principal uses. There is scope for providing better pedestrian linkages to existing and proposed supporting uses, for example the prime shopping quarter including the proposed Eastgate/Harewood Quarter proposal.

**Reason:** To ensure that there is an appropriate level and range of support services and uses.

vii. New significant public open space at a minimum of 30% of the site area.

**Reason:** Public open space is lacking in this location. There is a need for the development of this location to deliver a significant contribution to public open space provision which will overcome the perceived deficiency and help to ameliorate the current over dominance of the local highway network

viii. Pedestrian routes to the surrounding uses and the wider City Centre will need to be provided, including safe, direct and accessible route towards Quarry House and Marsh Lane (South west of the site) Enhance and improve existing pedestrian access from within the site to both Shannon Street and Railway Street. Improve pedestrian links to adjoining inner city areas including Saxton Gardens, Richmond Hill and Burmantofts.

**Reason:** Better pedestrian linkages will be required to address major road barriers both on a North – South and East – West axis. This will help in reinforcing connections with adjoining sites and the wider city

centre. .

**ix.** Developer contributions will be required to the proposed rail halt and other public transport improvements from developments within the Marsh Lane site and adjoining areas.

**Reason:** Better public transport provision is required to address existing deficiencies and redress the major barriers created by the busy road network. This will help in reinforcing connections with adjoining sites and the wider city centre. Infrastructure improvements and particularly improving the public transport connectivity with the city centre are necessary to unlock the potential of this site

## **4.7 Leeds Metropolitan University Civic Campus**

### **LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION**

4.7.1 The site is situated to the north west of the city centre. Leeds University is situated immediately to the north west, across the inner ring road, with the LGI to the south west and Civic Hall to the south. Many of the buildings are outdated in appearance, although the new entrance to the university on Woodhouse Lane has enhanced the frontage here.

### **PLANNING HISTORY**

4.7.2 There is planning permission for a new university building to the north of the Civic Hall, for the university business school together with a mixed use development of office, residential, hotel, educational and retail uses

### **PROPOSALS:**

i. LMU's redevelopment proposals, including the land to the north of the Civic Hall, may mean some of the older buildings could be redundant in future. Any redevelopment should allow for a mix of uses, with active lower floor uses. Appropriate uses are office development, hotel or leisure uses. Leisure uses, including a swimming pool, are to be particularly encouraged. Only ancillary, small scale retail uses would be appropriate here.

**reason:** A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community. Office or hotel developments are acceptable anywhere within the city centre boundary (subject to other overriding policy objectives such as the prime shopping area). Leisure uses would be particularly welcome due to the large adjacent student population. Also, the closure of the Olympic Pool means Leeds now lacks a central swimming pool, so such a use would also be acceptable in principle.

ii. Any redevelopment along the Portland Way frontage should be of a high quality design and sensitive to the setting of the Civic Hall adjacent.

**reason:** This frontage is important as it is adjacent the Civic Hall. Any development here therefore needs to be in keeping and enhance the architectural setting of the Civic Hall.

**iii.** This proposals area would be particularly acceptable for student accommodation. Such a use could be accommodated preferably on upper floors within a mixed use development.

**reason:** Such a location is highly sustainable; within the city centre where transport accessibility is good and adjacent to both universities, (so reducing the need to travel for students).

**iv.** Residential use is also acceptable, preferably on upper floors within mixed use development.

**Reason:** Such a location is highly sustainable, within the city centre where transport accessibility is good. A mix of uses will encourage a more vibrant community.

**iv.** Any redevelopment proposals on the north western boundary of the site (adjacent the inner ring road and University Proposals Area) should investigate the possibility of making provision for a linkage across the Inner Ring Road, ie. bridging the inner ring road

**reason:** The inner ring road is at a lower level than the site, and therefore a distinct barrier to access.

**v.** The University of Leeds Proposals Area Statement refers to development of a Science Park. This is also on the north western boundary of LMU Proposals Area. Development on the north western part of LMU site should therefore link in with any Science Park proposals.

**reason:** To make a comprehensive development; a Science Park would be of benefit to both universities. A linkage across the inner ring road would enable such a development to be well linked to both universities.

**vi.** There is no functional open space network around LMU. Any development proposals need to incorporate green linkages where possible, or contribute towards improving the grassed area around the 'Dry Dock', to the north east of the Proposals Area boundary and linkages across Woodhouse Lane to it.

**reason:** An open space network needs to be developed, with more green linkages, tied in especially with the open space network around the university. A more functional use of the grassed area around Dry Dock can be made with improvements to create a more defined open space area.

## **4.8 New Lane and ASDA**

### **DESCRIPTIONS**

- 4.8.1 The New Lane site forms a key gateway location into the City. It is situated between Victoria Road to both the west and south. To the east the boundary is Meadow Lane and to the north Great Wilson Street. The ASDA office site lies northwards between the New Lane site and the river. The ASDA offices were developed in the 1980s at relatively low densities (mostly 3 storey) with surface car parking. The site offers opportunity for redevelopment at much higher densities.
- 4.8.2 New Lane itself provides a clear demarcation between the uses that operate north and south of the road. The site north of New Lane is in industrial use with Hindle Valve operating there. The car park abutting Meadow Lane is well screened with heavy landscaping and an abundance of trees creating a good quality environmental context. The southern part of the site is in B1a) business use with Central Park.
- 4.8.3 The New Lane site is adjacent to the recently completed mixed use development at Bridgewater Place.
- 4.8.4 The overall site is highly accessible by public transport. Once the southern access is implemented at Leeds City Station the site will be within 5 minutes walking distance.

### **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.8.5 The overall site was allocated in the Adopted UDP as a Prestige Development Area where it was recognised that most developments would be offices. Policy CC31 of the UDP set down those uses for which support will be given in PDAs as the principal use (i.e. Prestige office; Leisure, entertainment, recreation and cultural facilities; Conference and exhibition facilities; Hotels).
- 4.8.6 No significant changes were proposed or implemented during the previous plan period.

### **PROPOSALS**

- i. B1a) office use. North of New Lane – For the entire site development, the total office floorspace should equate to a plot ratio of at least 300% or 51,000 sqm.

South of New Lane – Whilst this site already provides an important accommodation for small office users that require a City Centre location there is scope for making more effective use of the land due to its location in the City Centre and proximity to Leeds City Station. Any

redevelopment of the site should equate to a plot ratio of at least 300% or 42,000 sqm.

ASDA site – The City Council considers that the ASDA office is an important asset for the city centre with a large number of employees that contribute to the health and vitality of the city centre. In any redevelopment, the first preference would be for ASDA to remain in redeveloped offices. In any case, it would be expected that there should be no net loss of office space.

**Reason:** as per generic reasons for office space in the city centre. Also, this site is considered to be desirable for large scale office use in planning terms to achieve maximum accessibility by sustainable forms of transport for employers, customers and visitors. The site is within 5 mins walking distance from the proposed south side entrance to the train station.

The site occupies a high profile location within the city centre where there is scope to achieve buildings which by virtue of their considerable mass and/or relative height and design excellence will act as a landmark.

ii. Residential use will be acceptable provided that it does not prejudice the delivery of office use.

**Reason:** There is a significant quantity of residential development in and adjacent to the Proposals Area. To ensure that the best use is made of this gateway location and proximity to the Leeds City Station it is considered that a predominance of residential use on the lower floors would be inappropriate. However, use of the upper floors for residential will be acceptable.

iii. There is scope for ancillary small-scale uses that are necessary to service and directly support the Proposal Area and its principal office function. These should be genuinely ancillary and not be destinations in their own right. The inclusion of small-scale ancillary retail and retail services along with restaurants, bars and other uses should complement and support the office use. There is scope for providing better pedestrian linkages to existing and proposed supporting uses, for example at Bridgewater place and Crown Point.

**Reason:** To ensure that there is an appropriate level and range of support services and uses.

iv. Provision of pedestrian linkages will be required to address existing deficiencies both on a North – South and East – West axis.

**Reason:** This will help reinforce connections with adjoining sites and the wider city centre especially to the north of the City Centre.

## 4.9 The Brewery

### DESCRIPTIONS

- 4.9.1 This site occupies a high profile location within the city centre. It is situated between Meadow Lane to the west and Great Wilson Street/Hunslet Lane to the south. To the east the boundary is Black Bull Street and Waterloo Street/Bowman Lane to the north.
- 4.9.2 The current manufacturing use on the site has now become somewhat out of place with surrounding office and residential uses. The Brewery may during the plan period consider relocating which would free up the site for redevelopment. This would provide an opportunity to make efficient use of a brownfield site in the city centre and improve connectivity between the existing central area and the southern part of the city centre, especially Crown Point Retail park.
- 4.9.3 The site has good accessibility by public transport. Once the southern access is implemented at Leeds City Station and better pedestrian linkages made to it the site will be within reasonable walking distance.

### PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.9.4 The site had no site specific allocation in the Adopted UDP.
- 4.9.5 No significant schemes have been implemented during the previous plan period. Details of some schemes proposed south of Crown Point Road are provided below:
1. Former Plowright Printers, Crown Point Road: Part 4 storey and part 8 storey block comprising 46 flats, with ground and first floor offices and basement car parking (2006).
  2. Sheaf Street: Erection of 7 storey block comprising 32 one bedroom and 27 two bedroom flats, with ground floor office, and ground floor and basement car parking (refused planning permission).
  3. Chadwick Lodge 24 Crown Point Road: Change of use of training centre to offices (2001).

### PROPOSALS

- i. B1a) office use. For the entire site development, the total office floorspace should equate to a plot ratio of at least 150% or 150,000sqm.  
**Reason:** As per generic reasons for office space in the city centre. Also, this site is considered to be suitable for large scale office use in planning terms to achieve maximum accessibility by sustainable forms

of transport for employers, customers and visitors. The site is within 10 – 15 mins walking distance from the proposed south side entrance to the train station. The site occupies a high profile location within the city centre where there is scope to achieve buildings which by virtue of their considerable mass and/or relative height and design excellence will act as a landmark.

**ii.** Large format retailing.

**Reason:** to meet the needs of large format retailers to locate in the city centre

**iii.** Leisure, hotel and related conference and exhibition uses of a smaller scale and complementary to the office use. Any proposed hotel use should strive to be located in the lower flood risk zone of the site

**Reason:** To accept that other specified main town centre uses would be appropriate. To avoid locating more vulnerable development in high flood risk areas.

**iv.** Residential use is acceptable on parts of the site that are in flood risk zone 2 however on parts of the site that are in flood risk zones 3 residential use will only be acceptable if preferred options PO-05 and PO-24 can be complied with.

**Reason:** Residential development is more vulnerable to flood risk.

**v.** Ancillary small-scale uses that are necessary to service and directly support the Proposal Area and its principal office function. These should be genuinely ancillary and not be destinations in their own right. The inclusion of small-scale ancillary retail and retail services along with restaurants, bars and other uses should complement and support the office use. There is scope for providing better pedestrian linkages to existing and proposed supporting uses, for example at Bridgewater place, Crown Point and Clarence Dock.

**Reason:** To ensure that there is an appropriate level and range of support services and uses.

**vi.** New significant public open space at a minimum of 30% of the site area.

**Reason:** Public open space is lacking in this location. There is a need for the development of this location to deliver a significant contribution to public open space provision which will overcome the perceived deficiency and help to ameliorate the current over dominance of the local highway network.

**vii.** Pedestrian routes to the surrounding uses and the wider City Centre will need to be provided including a safe, direct and accessible route to the entrance of Crown Point Retail Park (i.e. Junction Street), the reopening of Hunslet Road and creating an east-west axis linking to the footbridge over Clarence Dock. Reinforce safe pedestrian accessibility on Meadow Lane, Hunslet Lane, Crown Point Road and Black Bull Street. An appropriate contribution should be made towards



providing an additional pedestrian link across the river via Sovereign Street/Concordia Street to City Station

**Reason:** Better pedestrian linkages will be required to address major road barriers both on a North – South and East – West axis. This will help in reinforcing connections with adjoining sites and the wider city centre especially to the north of the City Centre and to Clarence Dock.

## **4.10 University of Leeds Campus**

### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 4.10.1 This site encompasses the University of Leeds city centre campus and includes educational buildings, offices, social facilities, student residences and open spaces.
- 4.10.2 It is located in the north of Leeds City Centre and accessed primarily by the A660 Woodhouse Lane and, to some extent, from Clarendon Road. Immediately to the north of the site is Woodhouse Moor and the Woodhouse and Hyde Park inner city residential neighbourhoods.
- 4.10.3 Within the site is a hidden away area of open space known as St George's Field. This was the former Leeds General Cemetery which was converted to a quiet garden in 1969. Although not suitable for physical recreation it represents an under-used resource for outdoor relaxation and well-being. There are differences in levels between the open space and the rest of the campus and at some entrances it can only be accessed via steps.

### **PLANNING HISTORY**

- 4.10.4 The UDP highlighted the need for improved linkages between the University and the rest of the city centre. There are well-maintained open spaces on the University Campus which could help provide for the open space needs of city centre users.
- 4.10.5 Clobbery Street, at the western end of the campus, was identified in the UDP as a potential development site for either education, student housing, hotel or visitor accommodation, leisure uses or residential institutions.
- 4.10.6 The south-eastern part of the campus was also identified in the UDP for a core science park consisting of an innovation centre providing a technological base, starter units and step up units.

### **PROPOSALS**

- i. Science Park. The south-eastern part of the site has potential as a science park for incubator technology/business uses. This part of the Campus should be safeguarded for such a use. Student housing

development should not displace potential for a science park.

**Reason:** A science park would help new innovative business to start up and progress by taking advantage of the close proximity to research activities in the University and share University administration facilities.

ii. More could be made of St Georges Field for passive recreation and a tranquil space. It would benefit from enhancement with improved access for disabled people and seating.

**Reason:** to make the most of the limited amount of public open space in the city centre.

iii. An east-west public pedestrian route using University Road and a north-south route using the Willow Terrace bridge over the Inner Ring Road should be identified

**Reason:** to help connect the city centre to adjoining neighbourhoods

iv. Any redevelopment proposals to the south east of the site (adjacent the inner ring road and LMU Proposals Area) should investigate the possibility of making provision for a linkage across the Inner Ring Road, ie. bridging the inner ring road

**reason:** The inner ring road is at a lower level than the site, and therefore a distinct barrier to access.

## 4.11 Holbeck Urban Village

### LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

4.11.1 The area of Holbeck around Globe Road, Water Lane, Marshall Street and the Leeds and Liverpool Canal was the cradle of the industrial revolution in Leeds and is now the focus of Holbeck Urban Village. A range of mills and workshops were built by entrepreneurs which have resulted in a legacy of outstanding industrial heritage, including important buildings such as the Grade 1 listed Temple Works and the listed Italianate towers at Tower Works. The area contains two Conservation Areas: CA40: Central Area-Canal Wharf and CA62- Holbeck. The setting offered by the canal and river combined with the backdrop of the Leeds City Station sat on a complex of imposing brick arches add to the drama and unique character of this historic urban area within the city centre.

4.11.2 The area had been in decline for some time but important parts of Holbeck Urban Village have begun to be transformed but a lot of work still needs to be done to complete effective regeneration.

### URBAN VILLAGE REVISED PLANNING FRAMEWORK

4.11.3 The concept of an “Urban Village” was agreed by the City Council in May 1999 with the aims of regenerating the area as a physically, socially and economically sustainable community; protecting and

enhancing the built heritage with appropriate new uses; and protecting existing employment whilst providing new opportunities and training. A Revised Planning Framework was adopted in February 2006. This Revised Planning Framework sets out the planning and design framework for the regeneration of this special area and is an important means of achieving this objective.

- 4.11.4 The Framework reflects the policies operating in the “Riverside” and “Waterfront Strategy” areas and adjoining Beeston /Holbeck Comprehensive Neighbourhood Renewal Area.
- 4.11.5 The Canal Basin offers opportunities to create a high quality mixed-use development in a key waterfront location, and to link Holbeck to the City Centre in a way that will benefit both areas and assist regeneration within the Urban Village.

**STATEMENT:**

- 4.11.6 Due to the potential large scale contribution to housing supply, which Holbeck Urban Village presents, the designation as a ‘Strategic Housing and Mixed Use Site’ under UDP Policy H3-1A (Phase 1 housing allocation, 2003-8) is proposed to be carried forward into the City Centre AAP.

LAND IS ALLOCATED AS A STRATEGIC HOUSING AND MIXED USE SITE, SUBJECT TO:

- i. Preparation of a framework which will provide guidance on the sustainable development, mix and location of uses, conservation and urban design issues, the public realm, pedestrian permeability, vehicular access, parking, and methods of implementation.  
**Reason** It is intended that a vibrant sustainable community, based on a balanced mix of uses and the conservation of the outstanding historic environment is created where people will want to live, work and relax.
- ii. Preparation of development briefs for key sites.  
**Reason** Development briefs are considered to be an appropriate means to provide detailed guidance for particular sites.
- iii. Retention of a significant employment element, including existing and new businesses.  
**Reason** Employment will remain a key element, although some reconfiguration and relocation will be necessary. It is intended that business support and advice will be available to existing and new businesses. The Framework will guide development in the Holbeck (Holbeck Lane) area, respecting the dominance of employment use in the immediate area and its importance as a local source for jobs.
- iv. Provision of community, cultural, leisure and service facilities.  
**Reason** Housing will be just one element in this sustainable community. Other uses such as community, cultural, leisure and service facilities will be important components. Careful design, location and configuration of uses will ensure the conservation and reuse of the

historic fabric and minimise residential disturbance by other activities within the development.

v. An appropriate level of affordable housing being provided.

**Reason** The housing provided will offer a range of sizes, tenures and prices to encourage a genuine social mix and balance within the residential community.

vi. Environmental improvements to the public realm, including open public space, pedestrian routes, the Holbeck and the Leeds Liverpool canal.

**Reason** A high quality public realm, providing a safe, attractive environment, where the pedestrian and cyclist will have priority. This will include open public spaces, pedestrian routes within, and linking to beyond, the Urban Village area and the utilisation of pedestrian/cycling opportunities along the Holbeck and Leeds Liverpool Canal. Developers will be encouraged to create and enhance pedestrian routes through the area.

vii. Financial support for public realm and highway network improvements.

**Reason** Existing landowners and prospective developers continue to be closely involved in the project and some major developments have already commenced, which presents the option of securing developer contributions towards public realm and highway improvements. The City Council has been working closely with Yorkshire Forward and other partners to pursue the vision of the Holbeck Urban Village. Yorkshire Forward offer valuable regeneration expertise, financial support and Compulsory Purchase Powers.

viii. A satisfactory flood risk assessment, incorporating an appropriate drainage strategy (including any off-site works), shall be undertaken encompassing the whole area as delineated within the allocation site.

**Reason** To ensure that a proper assessment has been carried out to determine and assess development proposals.

## 4.12 Mabgate

### LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

4.12.1 Mabgate is a small area on the north east fringe of the city centre named after the historic thoroughfare which runs north-north-east from its junction with Regent St and New York Road (A64). The area has been defined for the purposes of a Planning Framework under preparation and is bounded by New York Road (south), Macaulay St (east), Mushroom St (north) and North St (east). It is predominantly an area of business premises, with an older historic character around Mabgate (the thoroughfare). It also includes a retail warehousing area around Regent St, the Leeds College of Building and a territorial army barracks. There is a market for residential apartments, and a number

of small development schemes have taken place and are in the pipeline.

**STATEMENT:**

**To plan Mabgate to accommodate further housing development without compromising its character and role as an area of business according to detailed guidance set out in the Mabgate Framework.**

#### **4.13 Kirkstall Road Renaissance Area**

4.13.1 The Kirkstall Road Renaissance Area extends westwards along the A65 road and river corridor as an addition to the city centre. The area covers 68ha and is predominantly in industrial and business use, with many sites at the city centre end of the area being proposed for redevelopment, and several redevelopments for high density student housing already constructed.

4.13.2 This statement sets the strategic policy framework, particularly with regard to limiting the scale of office floorspace in order that it does not supplant the more central city centre office development opportunities. More detailed guidance for the redevelopment of the area is provided by an informal framework document.

**STATEMENT:**

**To control developments to ensure that the quantity of office space is not excessive and that it is focussed toward the city centre end of the area.**

**Further out, office space purpose-built for users associated with Yorkshire TV and other media would be acceptable and ground floor level office space to overcome flood risk problems of ground floor residential uses may be acceptable.**

## **5 Supporting Documents**

**Published as part of the Preferred Options:**

- i Appraisal of Responses to Alternative Options
- ii Interim Consultation Report
- iii Sustainability Appraisal Report

**Background Material:**

- iv Initial Consultation Pack, Summer 2005 – Four Themed fact sheets & structured question/response forms: Growth, Use & Function, Movement and Quality & Safety of the Environment.
- v Consultation on Options, April 2006 – 10 Options Papers: Aim, Objectives & Strategic Options, Access Design & Conservation, Entertainment, Growth, Managing Resources, Movement, Open Space & Greenery, Residential, Retail
- vi Employment Land Review 2006
- vii Housing Market Assessment 2007
- viii City Living in Leeds 2003 University of Leeds & KW Linfoot Ltd.