

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

**Thursday, 30th August, 2012**

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

Councillors S Hamilton, E Nash,  
M Hamilton, G Latty, P Gruen, M Ingham,  
N Walshaw, D Blackburn, R Procter and  
M Harland

### **27 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed those in attendance to the August meeting of Plans Panel (City Centre) and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves.

### **28 Late Items**

There were no formal late items of business to consider, however the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information:-

- Application 10/00923/OT – Outline Planning Application for Redevelopment of land at Meadow Road – Appendix 1 (Conditions) (Agenda Item 7) (Minute 32 refers)

The document was not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but subsequently made available to the public on the Council's website.

### **29 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

There were no disclosable pecuniary and other interests declared at the meeting.

### **30 Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received on behalf of Councillor N Taggart.

Notification had been received for Councillor M Harland to substitute for Councillor N Taggart.

### **31 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **32 Application 10/00923/OT - Outline Planning Application for Redevelopment of Land at Meadow Road for Uses within the following classes B1, D2, C1, C3 (Up to 296 Residential Units) and Ancillary A1, A3, A4 AND A5 Uses, including associated works for the formation of Site Access Roads at Land Bounded by Meadow Road, Jack Lane, Bowling Green Terrace and Trent Street, Leeds 11**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an outline planning application for redevelopment of land at Meadow Road for uses within the following classes B1, D2, C1, C3 (up to 296 residential units) and Ancillary A1, A3, A4 and A5 Uses, including

associated works for the formation of Site Access Roads at Land Bounded by Meadow Road, Jack Lane, Bowling Green Terrace and Trent Street, Leeds 11.

Appended to the report were copies of the following documents for the information/comment of the meeting:-

- 10/00923/OT – Conditions (Appendix 1 refers)
- Extract of the Plans Panel (City Centre) minutes of the meeting held on 1<sup>st</sup> July 2010 (Appendix 2 refers)

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the site and had previously visited the site prior to the meeting.

Officers briefly outlined the proposals contained in the submitted report.

In his presentation, the Senior Planner referred to a Plans Panel Members workshop which had taken place on 16<sup>th</sup> September 2010 and informed Members that the completion of the Section 106 agreement remained outstanding as at today's date. Specific reference was also made to reserved matters in this regard which would be addressed at a later stage in order to give the developer some flexibility as the scheme develops.

At the request of the Chair, the Principal Engineer, City Development briefly outlined the highway implications, works and access arrangements to the site with specific reference to the cycle routes and travel plan.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Concerns expressed about the height of the tall building within the parameters of the site; the relationship of the said building with Bridgewater Place and that the outline permission was lacking detail and was based on trust (*The Senior Planner responded and outlined the following variations which would be dealt with individually:-*
  - *The scale of buildings would need to reflect the parameter plan*
  - *the application could have varied storey heights within the limits of the parameter plans*
  - *new parameter plans would be supplied with each reserved matters application which would be brought to Panel for agreement*
  - *the design code provides further information regarding the scale and form of the tall building and would inform the details of the proposals at reserved matters stage*
  - *Bridgewater Place was 30 storeys in height and was located on the north-south ridge of tall buildings which characterised the city centre and was referred to in the Council's tall building guidance which would be reflected by the proposed tall building on this site*
- Clarification if the proposal could have a super casino; the need for ward members to be involved in the recruitment process of the Section 106 Jobs

and Employment clause which should focus on the City & Hunslet and Beeston & Holbeck wards ; where affordable housing would be on the site  
*(The Senior Planner responded and outlined the following issues-*

- *The proposal did not include a super casino*
- *Local ward members would be involved in the Section 106 recruitment process*
- *Reserved matters would determine the location of affordable housing)*
- Clarification if a wind study had been undertaken on the site  
*(The Senior Planner responded and confirmed that a wind study had been submitted with specific detail to be addressed through reserved matters)*
- Concerns that the tall building had no relationship with the buildings below it; the blocks provided do not work and cast a shadow over the development; the development should not be pepper potted; clarification as to why Section 106 monies should be spent to create local jobs  
*(The Head of Planning Services responded and confirmed that in accordance with the policy requirements of Section 106 monies, local ward members would be consulted on where Section 106 monies was to be spent. The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that the developer was meeting the Section 106 policies in full and that any variations would be brought back to Plans Panel.*  
*In concluding, the Senior Planner informed the meeting that a full daylight and sunlight assessment had been undertaken with regards to the shadow effect. In relation to pepper potting across the site, phasing plans would be required by condition to control the timing of development across the site )*
- Concerns that the site was within a high crime area and that crime levels should be addressed as a matter of urgency; Metro's concerns regarding the level of car parking; that education provision should be addressed and that a phased approach should be introduced periodically  
*(The Chief Planning Officer responded and confirmed that ongoing discussions were been held with Children's Services in relation to where the monies would be spent around Inner City/Education priorities. The Deputy Area Planning Manager informed the meeting that at this stage Members were being requested to agree the principles of the development as defined by the use and parameter plans within the outline scheme. The specific details of the proposals would come back to Panel at reserved matters stage and adequate controls to achieve a secure environment and design would be discussed at that stage. The Senior Planner informed the meeting that a second city bus was not being sought by Metro. and does not form part of the list of public transport contributions identified in the SPD. In concluding, the Head of Planning Services referred to brownfield sites across the city and confirmed that the parameters had been looked at carefully and in a planned way. In relation to this proposal he recommended that the following two conditions should be attached to the application:-*
  - *the need to address the maximum amount of floor space on the site for each use*
  - *the need to implement a clear phased approach and master plan for each aspect of the development required to ensure flexibility and consistency)*
- Clarification if the scale of public art had been addressed by the developer

*(The Senior Planner responded and confirmed that a large piece of art work would be undertaken and work on this matter had already commenced as a result of one of the conditions added to the temporary car park approval.)*

- The need for progress on this site in view of the previous history and delays; the need for additional green space on the site
- Clarification of when the landscaping would commence and whom would be in charge of this issue

*(The Senior Planner responded and informed the meeting of the extent of landscaping that would be delivered with each phase of the development. The Deputy Area Planning Manager confirmed that the developer would provide the landscaping)*

- Reference to the multi-storey car park building and the need to ensure that no ginnells and allyway space is provided by the side of the building

In concluding, the Chair sought further comments on the proposals prior to making a decision on the application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The need for the meeting to acknowledge that the high crime rate in the City and Hunslet ward was mainly as a result of shoplifting and pick pocketing; the fact that there was no children in the City and Hunslet ward, apart from pre-school children, together with a need for money to be spent on pre-school/nursery provision within the area
- To welcome the development, but to acknowledge that a degree of flexibility was being sought for the quantum of proposed development but that adequate controls were in place to inform the design of the full details through the parameter plans and design code.

## **RESOLVED –**

a) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 1 and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations;

- public transport contribution (£1,101,310);
- education contribution (equating to £2980.42 for each 3+ bed dwelling if more than fifty 3 bed dwellings are provided);

Securing the travel plan, car club contribution and travel plan monitoring fee (£15,000);

- penalties (including financial) if the travel plan targets are not met;
- delivery of 5% affordable housing (or the percentage required by the affordable housing policy adopted at the time);
- public access arrangements to ensure 24 hour access is provided through the site
- securing the car park management plan;
- £20,000 on-street car parking mitigation fund if it is found that the development creates on-street parking problems in nearby streets;
- £6,000 for each of the pay and display parking bays removed from Trent Street, Bowling Green Terrace and Jack Lane (54 spaces = £324,000);
- ability to submit a viability appraisal if the developer believes the scheme and current contributions to be unviable;
- training and employment initiatives to ensure local people are involved in the

delivery of the scheme;

- section 106 management fee (£5250);

b) That in the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

c) That arising from discussions at the meeting, the following extra conditions be attached to the application:-

- the need to address the maximum amount of floor space on the site;

- the need to implement a clear phased approach for each aspect of the development required to ensure flexibility and consistency

(Councillor R Procter left the meeting at 3.00pm during discussions of the above item)

### **33 Application 11/04987/FU- Two Storey and Single Storey Side Extension to Form Enlarged Music Venue with Roof Bar and Terrace Over at the Faversham, 1-5 Springfield Mount, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds, LS2 9NG**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a two storey and single storey side extension to form enlarged music venue with roof bar and terrace over at the Faversham, 1-5 Springfield Mount, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds, LS2 9NG.

Appended to the report was copy of the conditions attached to the application for the information/comment of the meeting (Appendix 1 refers).

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the site and had previously visited the site prior to the meeting.

Officers briefly outlined the proposals contained in the submitted report.

In his presentation, the Senior Planner informed the meeting that the extension would create a modern building designed to protect neighbouring amenities.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Clarification of the how the smoking area would reduce noise nuisance
- The view expressed that the extension looked like 'a window less box' and that further work was required on the design and top storey proposals to make it more attractive to customers using the building
- The concerns expressed regarding the noise coming from the existing four speakers on the outdoor terrace, which was causing a general nuisance for local residents and whether or not the smokers area could be covered over in the winter
- The need for more restrictions to be applied to the outdoor terrace should it be approved at today's meeting

- The need for the developer and the applicant to develop a stronger bond and trust with local residents and to limit weekday operations to help young families living in the area
- The need to address the materials used for the extension in view of complaints received from local Councillors and Resident Groups
- To welcome the fact that a toilet extension would be removed from the site and that the main entrance to the pub would be improved and restored
- The need for the top storey to be reduced in size
- The need for appropriate shrubbery to break up the appearance of the extension

At the request of the Chair, the Chief Planning Officer, Deputy Area Planning Manager and Senior Planners responded individually to the above issues.

The Senior Planner informed the meeting that the noise management plan would be conditioned to protect amenity. In relation to the four speakers located on the outdoor terrace, conditions would prevent outdoor music on the proposed terrace. The Panel noted that the applicant had gone for a modern/contemporary look and that the introduction of more windows to the extension would result in a temptation to open more windows resulting in further noise nuisance.

The Deputy Area Planning Manager informed the meeting that the proposed extension and main building would be seen together only at an oblique angle and that the top floor roof light would not be visible from the south east or further a field due to the close proximity and dense planted nature of the south east site boundary.

The Chief Planning Officer commented that the architect had an excellent track record in designs of this nature and that a more sophisticated approach had been undertaken in relation to this application. The proposals went some way to improving the situation for local residents and he recommended to the Panel that Condition 4 in relation to the noise management plan should be revisited and strengthened.

#### **RESOLVED –**

a) That the application be granted permission, subject to the conditions and reason for approval set out in Appendix 1.

b) That arising from discussions at the meeting, approval be given to the following issues:-

- that condition 4 (noise management plan) be revisited and strengthened
- that materials be agreed at a future meeting at the condition discharge stage
- that the hours of use of the outdoor terrace bar be restricted as follows:- Sunday to Thursday 1100-2100 / Friday and Saturday 1100-2200.

#### **34 Applications 11/05399/FU- Six Storey and Four Storey Building comprising 27 flats with undercroft car parking and 11/05448/CA - Conservation Area application to demolish vacant college building, at Leeds College of Technology, East Street, Leeds, LS9 8DP**

Referring to Minute 88 of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2012, the report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a six storey and four storey building comprising 27 flats with undercroft car parking and Conservation Area application to

demolish vacant college building, at Leeds College of Technology, East Street, Leeds, LS9 8DP.

Appended to the report was copy of the non standard conditions attached to the application for the information/comment of the meeting (Appendix 1 refers).

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the site.

Officers briefly outlined the proposals contained in the submitted report.

It was reported that Members had made a number of comments at a Plans Panel Design workshop held on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2012 which were detailed in section 5.0 of the report.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the application.

Specific reference was made to the outwood facing balconies on the north side of the building which it was considered would only be used as storage areas with a request that they be removed.

At the request of the Chair, the Deputy Area Planning Manager responded and informed the meeting that the balconies were set into the building and not external protrusions and limited to 2 per floor facing East Street and Richmond Street. These had been retained by the applicant to provide visual interest to the building and at about 600mm deep they were considered unlikely to be used as storage areas.

#### **RESOLVED –**

a) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions (and any others which he might consider appropriate), and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following additional matters:

- Affordable Housing provision of 2 units with one being submarket and one being social rented

b) That in the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

(The meeting was adjourned at 4.10pm at the conclusion of this item and reconvened at 4.30pm prior to considering the pre-application for 223 bedroom student accommodation development at Woodhouse Square, Woodhouse, Leeds 3).

#### **35 Pre-Application - PreApp/12/00278 - 223 Bedroom Student Accommodation Development at Woodhouse Square, Woodhouse, Leeds 3**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to a proposed 223 Bedroom Student Accommodation Development at Woodhouse Square, Woodhouse, Leeds 3.

The following representatives attended and addressed the meeting:-

- Stephen Walker and Jo Steel on behalf of Centrino Developments Limited

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme.

The presentation highlighted the following key areas:-

- Location
- Site/Context photographs
- Existing Site Plan
- Listed Building and Conservations
- Sitelines
- Splayed walls to Back Claremont Grove
- Excavations/Hard/Soft landscaping
- Pedestrian Entrance and Service Vehicle lay by
- Upper Ground floor plan/Lower Ground floor plan with courtyard
- Proposed Elevation to Woodhouse Square
- Elevation materials including glazing
- Perspective view from Brandon Road
- Roof level detail

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues and the applicant team duly responded:-

- Clarification if the proposal was a traditional halls of residence or self contained flats  
*(The applicant responded and confirmed it would be a traditional halls of residence)*
- Clarification if this was existing accommodation or new accommodation; the approximate date when the contractor would be on site and whether or not a car free scheme would work in this area  
*(The applicant responded and confirmed that it was new accommodation. The anticipated completion was September 2014 and that they would be open to further discussion regarding the merits of the car free scheme)*
- Clarification if the applicant had undertaken market research in relation to this site  
*(The applicant responded and confirmed that market research had been undertaken)*
- Clarification if the northern boundary of the building was a blank wall  
*(The applicant responded it would have angled windows to avoid overlooking but that it could be a blank wall on the upper levels and agreed to provide this information)*
- Clarification of the potential loss of windows on the lower level of the building
- Clarification if there was a cross-section showing the relationship to the existing residential properties on Back Claremont Grove.  
*(The applicant responded that there wasn't, but agreed to provide this information)*



- The view expressed that the top storey level of the buildings were too ‘heavy handed’ and that removal of the overhanging eaves feature to the flat roof would significantly improve the appearance
- Clarification if it was possible to locate the plant on Back Claremont Grove and relocate the residential accommodation at basement level to face Woodhouse Square  
*(The applicant responded and confirmed that it would not be possible to re-locate residential accommodation in this way because internal amenity would be compromised )*
- Concerns that the appearance of the building looked ‘bland’ within a Conservation area and whether the building could be made more traditional  
*(The applicant responded and welcomed the opportunity to consider some more design alternatives with planning officers)*
- To place on record that not all Members of the Panel viewed the building as bland
- The need to address the proportion elements of the building to blend in with other buildings
- The need to obtain more evidence regarding the car free scheme and car parking in general

In concluding discussions, the Chair put forward the following specific matters for Members consideration:-

- do Members accept the principle of student housing on this site?
- do Members accept the principle of a car free scheme?
- Is the scale, form and design of the building acceptable and its relationship with the adjacent listed building?

It was the consensus of the meeting that in view of the sensitive heritage setting in the area and close proximity of a number of listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, that the Chief Planning Officer should have further discussions with the applicant with a view to improving the design quality of the scheme and to also address the issues regarding the design and relationship to Back Claremont Grove for consideration at a future meeting.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report and pre-application presentation be noted.
- b) That in view of the sensitive heritage setting in the area and close proximity of a number of listed buildings within the vicinity of the site, the Chief Planning Officer be requested to have further discussions with the applicant with a view to improving the design quality of the scheme and to also address the issues regarding Back Claremont Grove for consideration at a future meeting.

#### **36 Pre-Application - PreApp/12/00631 - Proposed Data Centre, Black Bull Street, South Bank, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to a proposed Data Centre at Black Bull Street, South Bank, Leeds.

The following representatives attended and addressed the meeting:-

- Peter Connolly, Yorkshire Design Group
- Nick Barnes, Garnett Netherwood Architects

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme and had previously visited the site prior to the meeting.

The presentation highlighted the following key areas:-

- Background details and photographs
- Introduction to Yorkshire Design Group
- Introduction to AQL
- Fibre Optik Network
- The site and surroundings
- Existing site Infrastructure
- Catalyst for future development
- Site permeability and connectivity
- Illustrative Master Plan
- Built form and open spaces
- Aerial view from the South
- View looking North up Black Bull Street/View looking down Black Bull Street
- Views looking west from New Dock
- Site Plan of Data Centre
- View of Data Centre from Black Bull Street
- View of Data Centre

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- To welcome the presentation and the vision and to acknowledge the importance of the issue
- To welcome the proposal for providing combined heat and power to adjoining sites and buildings, but to acknowledge that traffic calming measures would be a challenge
- The need to address the design of the building with a view to making it more 'human' and to consider introducing further changes to improve the elevational appearance
- To welcome the proposal to establish a Data Centre in Leeds, but to suggest improvements to the overall appearance of the building and acknowledge that Black Bull Street was a potential hotspot for speeding traffic
- To welcome the landscaping proposals to the front of the building
- To propose that a Plans Panel Workshop be convened to discuss the design of the building prior to a full planning application being considered
- To request the applicant to consider illuminating the building at night

At the request of the Chair, the applicant responded to the issues raised at the meeting and acknowledged that the photographs did not do the building justice. In view of the importance of the application, he welcomed the opportunity of re-

considering the design aspects of the building and re-affirmed that Black Bull Street did not require three lanes of traffic and that traffic calming measures were possible.

The Chief Planning Officer addressed the meeting and requested Members to support the proposals, in principle, and that he would have further discussions with the applicant with regards to work on the design of the building, travel implications, elevations and materials with a view to receiving a full planning application at the October meeting.

In concluding discussions, the Chair put forward the following specific matters for Members consideration:-

- is the principle of locating a data centre building on part of this site appropriate, given the potential importance of such a facility to the City Centre economy, and as a catalyst for the regeneration of the South Bank?
- is the general approach to the illustrative masterplan right for the area and does it complement the City's vision for the South Bank and the City Centre Park by creating appropriate links and physical relationships to surrounding sites such as New Dock ?
- is the form and massing of the building appropriate given the existing context of Indigo Blu, Brewery Wharf and New Dock developments, and evolving indicative context of the South Bank?
- are the architectural detailing and materials proposed appropriate for the building and do they project a modern and forward-looking image of this part of the City?

It was the consensus of the meeting that the above matters were acceptable, subject to further discussions with the applicant with regards to work on the design of the building, travel implications, elevations and materials.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report and pre-application presentation be noted.
- b) That the proposals be supported, in principle, and that the Chief Planning Officer be requested to have further discussions with the applicant with regards to work on the design of the building, travel implications, elevations and materials with a view to receiving a full planning application at the October meeting.
- c) That prior to considering a full planning application at the October meeting, the Chief Planning Officer be requested to convene a Plans Panel Workshop to discuss the design of the building, travel implications, elevations and materials.

(Councillor M Hamilton left the meeting at 5.30pm during discussions of the above item)

**37 Date and time of next meeting**

To note that the date and time of next meeting was Thursday 27<sup>th</sup> September 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

(The meeting concluded at 6.00pm)