

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 13TH DECEMBER, 2012

PRESENT: Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn,
M Hamilton, S Hamilton, G Latty,
T Leadley, J McKenna, E Nash,
N Walshaw, J Hardy, T Murray and
J Procter

41 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and paid tribute to David Marsh, the Municipal Correspondent at the Yorkshire Evening Post who was leaving the paper after 25 years. Councillor Taggart thanked him for his service to the people of Leeds and the Council and stated that he would be greatly missed

The Chair stated that in view of the workload of City Plans Panel, it would be likely that some additional meetings would be needed together with a workshop in the early part of the year on the NGT scheme and that dates would be circulated as soon as possible

42 Late Items

There were no late items

43 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests. However, in respect of applications 10/04597/OT – Wakefield Road Gildersome and 12/02470/OT – land between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue and Nepshaw Lane North, Councillor Leadley declared other interests through being the Chair of Morley Town Council Planning Committee which had commented on the proposals. As these applications were not being determined at this meeting, Councillor Leadley stated that he intended to take part in the discussions (minutes 48 and 49 refer)

Councillor Nash stated that in respect of application 12/04200/FU Kirkstall District Centre, she would not be declaring a disclosable pecuniary interest through being in receipt of a small income from the Co-op as although there was a Co-op store in the area, it was 1.5 miles from the subject site (minute 47 refers)

44 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R Procter who was substituted for by Councillor J Procter

45 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 22nd November 2012 be approved

46 Applications 12/04663/FU and 12/04664/CA -Position statement for the proposed demolition of existing buildings and erection of a 6 storey library with ancillary landscaping at the University of Leeds - land bounded by Woodhouse Lane and Hillary Place LS2

Further to minute 11 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 27th September where Panel received a pre-application presentation for a proposed library at Leeds University, Members considered a position statement on the scheme

Plans, photographs, graphics, story boards and sample materials were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and stated that the proposed student library would enable Leeds University to compete effectively to attract student numbers

Members were informed that the site was a sensitive one and was surrounded by heritage assets, some being Grade II Listed Buildings

One particular building which lay within the site was the former bank building which was now being used as a security office. Whilst the façade of the building was of interest, it was not Listed and that consideration had been given to its retention on site, however, due to the level changes of the building it was not felt this could be retained. For information, Members were informed that English Heritage supported the demolition of the former bank building as the replacement scheme was of higher quality

In terms of landscaping, there would be some loss of trees but replacement planting and new public realm would be provided

In addition to the library use, an ancillary café use would be included, with the ground floor being fully accessible to the public, schools, colleges and other universities. The upper levels would be for use by Leeds University only and would comprise study and book stacking areas, with feature windows providing views across the city and to the adjacent church

Roof top plant would be discrete and not impact on the overall visual effect of the building

The building would provide two entrances; the main entrance being off Woodhouse Lane, with a secondary entrance off Hillary Place

In response to Members' previous comments, the elevation to Hillary Place had been revised to reduce its dominance to the street. The building had been stepped back and an open podium level had been provided. Whilst the building required a wide footprint, it was not possible to increase its height, so architectural features had been used, e.g. slot windows, to increase the appearance of height. The building frontage now aligned with the smaller building on the adjacent site and benefitted from a simplified and refined palette of materials, comprising mainly Portland Stone and glass. The inclusion of a glass box 'lantern' at the top of the building provided vertical emphasis and created a presence on the skyline

Officers reported an objection received from Leeds Civic Trust but felt that this related to the previous version of the scheme and not the one being presented to Panel

Members commented on the following matters:

- the revisions which had been made to the scheme, which were an improvement but whether the building fitted in with the surrounding gothic buildings
- that the loss of a bank building was acceptable
- an acceptance that the development could not be built in the gothic style
- the lack of any relationship to the building above it, i.e. at the eaves line
- the Hillary Place elevation and that concerns remained about its massing
- the possibility of creating some interest on the glazing to link the building with the churches and the university, with wording relating to learning being suggested, which would echo the statement on the former BBC building on the opposite side of Woodhouse Lane
- that Members' comments had been taken on board but that further detailing was needed to indicate the building's use as a library, rather than just another University building
- the community use of the ground floor which was welcomed
- concerns about the blandness of two elevations when looking from the site to the former BBC building, as shown on the images
- the entrance on Hillary Place with concerns that this appeared dark, unwelcoming and required lighting. Concerns were also raised about the decorative grill element; that this did not add much to the design and required further thought
- the need for both entrances to make a statement and whether the steps on the Hillary Place entrance would be used in view of a lift also being included
- the number of car parking spaces being lost in the scheme and where cars would be displaced to

Officers provided the following responses:

- that the ground floor of the building would be open to everyone and this included the study areas as well as the café
- that the two elevations shown on the graphic facing the former BBC building were existing campus buildings and that their detail had not been included on the graphic but would be when the image was presented at the point when the application was ready to be determined
- that some VIP car parking existed on the site and that this would be relocated. The Panel's highways representative stated that there would be no new car parking provided in the scheme and that about 70 car parking spaces would be lost, however discussions were still ongoing with the University about the number of spaces which would need to be relocated, together with cycle parking, although the University was keen to encourage public transport use and the site was in a highly sustainable location in terms of bus routes. Members were also

informed that for the NGT, there would be the need for a rearrangement of the road network on Woodhouse Lane and Hillary Place, which would be opened up to University traffic, with further information on this being provided in the proposed NGT workshop for Panel Members, early next year

In response to the specific questions raised in the report, Members provided the following responses:

- that the proposed use was appropriate for this location
- that the design refinements were considered to be acceptable but that further detailing was required in view of Members' comments about the Hillary Place entrance; possible decorative glazing to link the building to the University and the nearby churches, and detailing/signage to properly indicate the use of the building
- that the demolition of the existing buildings was acceptable and that the decorative façade of the former bank building could be salvaged and relocated if required
- Members noted that further details would be provided about the relocation of car parking but were supportive in principle of the proposal to reduce the level of car parking on the site
- that the loss of the existing trees and the proposed tree replacement plans and other landscaping was acceptable but there was a need to ensure the proposed fruit trees did not overhang the footpath, in order to avoid accidents

Members discussed the possibility of deferring and delegating determination of the formal application to the Chief Planning Officer, however the majority of Members favoured the scheme to be considered by Panel

RESOLVED – To note the report and the comments now made and that the Chief Planning Officer be asked to submit a further report in due course, to enable Panel to determine the application

47 Application 12/04200/FU - Position statement for demolition of existing buildings and erection of A1 foodstore, five retail units (A1,A2,A3,A4 or A5), new club building for Leeds Postal Sports Association Club, community centre, improved public realm and associated car parking, servicing, landscaping and access improvements - Kirkstall District Centre Kirkstall Lane, Kirkstall Hill, Beecroft Street and Commerical Road Kirkstall LS5

Councillor M Hamilton joined the meeting at this point

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which set out the current position for a major retail led development in Kirkstall. Members were informed that the proposals had been presented to Plans Panel West in early September, which had generally supported the scheme

The previous scheme was shown to Panel for comparative purposes

The level changes across the site were highlighted as was the previous proposals to site the retail units on Kirkstall Hill

Members were informed that the current scheme brought the development to street level on the Commercial Road side. The first level would comprise the retail units and a tower feature which would incorporate the lift and stairs which would give access to all levels. The next level would include the Post Office Sports Club and the servicing arrangements for the development from a new road off Commercial Road; the next level would include the new supermarket, which could be accessed at ground level on Kirkstall Lane. The final level would see the location of the car park

The proposed materials would be red brick, stone cladding and some bronze detailing

As a lower building was now being proposed, it would have less visual impact than previous proposals for the site

Officers reported the receipt of an objection from a local resident which was outlined for Members' information. Receipt of 7 e-mails in support of the proposals were also reported

Members were informed that the proposals provided the opportunity to develop the site in a different way and to bring forward a scheme on a site which was challenging due to the level changes. The scheme would now provide two active frontages; better servicing and the retail elements at a lower level. Local jobs would also be created

At this point, the Chair referred to the comments in the report made by the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, which was part of West Yorkshire Joint Services which he also chaired, but stated that he was not declaring in interest

Members discussed the proposals and commented on the following matters:

- the effect of moving the bus stop which was located nearby on Kirkstall Lane. The Panel's highways representative stated that the bus stop would be moved to accommodate the junction changes, but would be retained
- the need for more work to be done on the Beecroft Street elevation; that planting and design should be considered but that any signage on this corner would need to be carefully controlled. Members were informed that discussions about the design of this elevation were continuing and that in respect of signage, this would require advertisement consent in its own right
- that the design of the building should reach the highest environmental and sustainable standards
- the amount of future development in this area and that this site should not be considered in isolation, particularly in terms of the traffic assessment which should be a cumulative assessment. The Head of Planning Services stated that agreed development had been incorporated into the transport assessment
- whether the active frontages were in the most appropriate location
- that this was an important junction coming into the city centre and there should be a statement building on the site

- concerns about the scale of the development and that a smaller scheme would be preferred, but recognising that the site was located in the heart of Kirkstall
- that the site was located in the heart of Kirkstall and the development was too big for a densely populated, residential area and was in the wrong location
- that a 24 hour use would need to be carefully considered in view of its impact on residents on Beecroft Street
- that compared to previous schemes for the site, this was better, especially as it used the slope of the site rather than working against it and that it had to be accepted that this was a large site and that a large building could reasonably be expected
- highways concerns as the size of the store was likely to attract shoppers from further away, leading to more traffic, together with concerns at the proposed junctions
- the need for more information about the tower, especially how it would work; whether it would be used by shoppers and the need for this element to be of good design as it would be a focal point, with possibly an increase in height being considered to make it a feature. The view was also expressed that a tower on the site was not appropriate
- the need for improved landscaping
- the impact on the views of Kirkstall Abbey, with the feeling that this was not now likely to be a significant consideration
- ensuring that the proposals related to the rest of the S2 centre, rather than the Kirkstall District Centre and the need to ensure it fitted in with the BHS site and Morrisons Supermarket, with a network of pedestrian crossings being needed to achieve this
- that the visual appearance of the supermarket from the Kirkstall Lane side was weak and that more was needed to make the roofline more positive and create a statement building
- that if built, the scheme could result in the surrounding area, particularly the shops, looking tired
- that the applicant was seeking a large store and that Panel could not redesign it but if, when the scheme came for determination, Members were minded to refuse it, the options needed to be considered
- concerns about the consistency of advice from Officers in view of no retail impact assessment being referred to for this scheme, when on other retail schemes, this was considered to be necessary
- that the applicant was Tesco, with concerns about the viability of other Tescos in the wider area, if this scheme was approved

In addressing the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following responses:

- on the principle of development on the site, the majority of Panel recognised the need for development

- in respect of the impact of the store on the character and appearance of the centre of Kirkstall, there were concerns about connectivity and the impact of the scheme on the wider area. The Head of Planning Services stated that there would be some impact but that the aim was to bring forward a scheme which worked and was capable of being implemented
- concerning the impact of the proposed development on the listed building on Beecroft Street, this had previously been commented on, however, Panel did have some concerns about the impact of 24 hour opening on nearby residents and that this needed to be considered further
- to note Members' comments about the design, scale and place making of the proposals
- in relation to the impact of the development on residential amenity, to note the concerns about 24 hour opening
- on the issue of the impact of the development on the local economy and the importance of the redevelopment of this site for the future of Kirkstall, it was accepted that the site needed developing but there were concerns about the impact this could have on retail in surrounding areas. The Deputy Area Planning Manager explained that as the proposals were in a designated town centre, there was no requirement in this case for the applicant to provide a retail impact assessment
- in terms of the proposals for pedestrian access to the development, further work on this element as well as public realm and sustainability were required. Regarding integration of the scheme with the rest of the Kirkstall District Centre, the Chief Planning Officer suggested that Members may wish to consider whether S106 contributions for this should be sought

RESOLVED – To note the report and the comments now made

48 Application 10/04597/OT - Outline application to lay out access road and erect light industry, general industry and warehouse development (Use Classes B1c, B2 and B8) a 115 bed hotel and pub/restaurant with car parking - Wakefield Road, Gildersome - Position Statement

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Members considered the first of two reports of the Chief Planning Officer in respect of development proposals on sites in close proximity to each other, in Gildersome.

Officers presented the report which set out the current position on an outline application for an employment led scheme comprising industrial and warehouse uses together with a hotel and pub/restaurant on an undeveloped, sloping site of approximately 3.23 hectares to the south east of Junction 27, between Wakefield Road and the M621. The site was surrounded by a number of existing industrial and offices uses, together with residential properties on Wakefield Road in close proximity

Members were informed about the main issues relating to the proposals which included:

- principle of development; that the site was mainly allocated for employment uses and that industrial use was acceptable in principle. In terms of the hotel/pub uses, these were usually seen as town centre uses. Paragraphs 10.3-10.8 of the submitted report set out the applicant's reasons for wanting to pursue these uses in an out of town centre location
- highways issues; that a new, signalised access junction was proposed to serve the site, with Highways Officers being satisfied on the provision of this. A 3 metre cycle route was also to be provided together with a bus layby. At the time the report was written, the application was subject to a Holding Direction by the Highways Agency relating to, amongst other matters, the scope and costs of works necessary at Junction 27, with Members being informed that the Holding Direction had been extended on 13th December 2012 to 31st January 2013
- landscaping proposals; the existing mature vegetation would be retained where possible, although a number of trees would be removed, some because they were diseased and some to facilitate development. Replacement planting would be provided, with the Council's Landscape Officer being generally happy with the proposals
- impact on residential amenity of the proposed 4 storey hotel use. Issues of overdominance or overlooking from the hotel use had been considered but due to the sloping nature of the site, and the distance to the nearest residential properties, it was felt that residential amenity would be adequately protected
- S106 agreement; that this was being negotiated and the need for Members' views on whether the hotel was needed to deliver the employment uses on the site

Members were informed that further comments had been received from residents and these would be detailed in a further report when the application was due for determination

Panel then discussed the impact of the proposed signalised junction on a resident who lived opposite the site and parked a caravan in his driveway, and referred to discussions held with the resident when Members visited the site that morning. Whilst it was possible for his vehicle and caravan to turn in his curtilage, it could be that his driveway would require widening to enable safe access on to the revised highway, with this to be paid for by the applicant

Members then commented on the following matters:

- the location of bus stop 10353, as set out in the submitted report; the absence of public bus services from that part of the A650 for five years, with two buses a day to serve Bruntcliffe High School, in term time only and that spending money to upgrade the bus stop to real time display could not be supported
- the possibility of retaining the wrought iron fencing which was on the site
- the lack of a compelling case to support the pub/restaurant use
- the planning history of the site, which originally was the remnants of a farm; the number of applications which had come forward for the site and the recognition that the site required

development but that this should be low density, light industrial development

- highways issues, with concerns that Gildersome roundabout was now working well but could once again become problematic if a more intensive development was approved
- the proposed hotel use and that there were several sites in the Morley area which could accommodate this use and that in respect of the pub/restaurant, this could also be located in either Gildersome or Morley
- that the site was isolated and would result in more traffic on the roads
- doubt about whether this was an enthusiastic or realistic proposal for the site
- that the site was not suitable for a hotel and that the suitability of the site for the pub/restaurant uses was questionable, particularly in view of the number of such establishments in Gildersome and Drighlington which had closed down through lack of trade
- the possibility that the hotel use was aimed at a wider area in view of its location, at the apex of neighbouring districts

Officers provided the following responses:

- that bus stop 10353 was not located where Metro had indicated it was and that updated comments on the application were being sought from Metro
- that there was an intention to retain materials which would also include the wrought iron fencing and some stonework

The Chief Planning Officer stated that the hotel was an important component of the scheme as the case was being made that a hotel and pub/restaurant should be out of centre, yet Morley was in need of investment and that details would need to be provided as to why this use could not be sited in Morley

In respect of the visual appearance of the development, the Chief Planning Officer stated that the appearance of this and the site being considered next on the agenda was important, especially from the motorway, as it would be the first view of Leeds from this side of the city and that this, together with the height of the proposals and the amount of landscaping had to be considered

In addressing the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following responses:

- about whether, in the circumstances, a hotel and pub/restaurant uses were considered to be appropriate to the site, if tied to the delivery of employment use on the site, there were mixed views on this, with the smallest majority in favour of the hotel use, but that guarantees were needed in respect of the whole site and the extent of the benefit had to be clearly set out. The possibility of a smaller hotel on the site was suggested but it was accepted that the issue of hotel use in the centre of Morley must be properly considered

- regarding the access arrangements and whether these were sufficient to deal with the anticipated level of traffic, there were mixed views on this with concerns being raised at the extent of the congestion in the evening peak
- concerning the landscaping proposals and whether these were sufficient to allow the development to proceed, further information was needed to enable full consideration of the landscaping and the positioning of buildings
- about whether the development could be considered to be harmful to residential amenity, Panel felt the development was located sufficiently far away not to be unduly detrimental to residential amenity
- in terms of the scope of the Section 106 Agreement, there was a wish for the bus route to be reinstated, with the Chief Planning Officer suggesting that in view of the importance of public access to the larger of the two sites being considered by Panel (minute 49 refers) there was the possibility this could be discussed with Metro to tie the two sites together
- finally, whilst there was the desire for the site to be developed, it was important that the applicant had a clear plan for it and town centre uses could only be considered as enabling if they ensured the delivery of the rest of the site via a legal agreement

RESOLVED- To note the report and the comments now made

49 Application 12/02470/OT - Outline application for proposed employment development for Use Classes B1(b) and B1(C) (research and development/light industrial uses) and B8 (storage and distribution uses) with new accesses, associated infrastructure and landscaping - Land between Gelderd Road/Asquith Avenue and Nephshaw Lane North, Gildersome - Position Statement

Plans and photographs were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which provided the current position in respect of proposals for an employment development on a 28.3 hectare undeveloped, former opencast mine site in Gildersome

Members were informed that there were a large number of issues to be resolved on this site and these included particularly complex highways issues. As set out in the previous report, the application was subject to a Holding Direction by the Highways Agency which had been extended to January 31st 2013

The topography of the site was challenging as there were substantial changes in levels on the site. In addition, a small residential development abutted into the site and a public right of way cut centrally across the site to a public footpath which runs down the western site boundary

Two vehicular access points into the site were proposed; one at Gelderd Road and the other from Asquith Avenue, both of which caused Officers concerns – at Gelderd Road the signals at this location were over capacity and could not be improved and in terms of Asquith Avenue, the presence of HGVs on this road should not be encouraged; discussions were

ongoing but as the development would be so large, it would need a number of access points and would give rise to local impacts. There was also the point as to whether a highway linkage should be made across the beck, given the topography and ecological corridor

Drainage was another issue on the site with local concerns being raised about flood risk. Although £300,000 was proposed towards flood mitigation, Gildersome Parish Council's concerns about flooding remained

The quantum of development and the impact of this on long distance views was also a concern, particularly in view of one of the units potentially being as large as the White Rose Shopping Centre

Panel discussed the report and commented on the following matters:

- that an access on Asquith Avenue did not work and that an access from Nepshaw Lane South should be considered as two main routes were likely to be needed
- that there were no bus services on the Gelderd Road frontage of the site and that the existing bus services in this area were being depleted
- that the sum put forward for water mitigation measures was not index-linked and that third-party land ownership would be required to deliver them
- that issues relating to highways, off site works and public transport had not been addressed and that much more work was needed on the proposals
- the possibility of the water mitigation measures being tied into the nearby woodland to provide environmental benefits
- that vehicular access to the site from Nepshaw Lane South should be considered and that Asquith Avenue was not suitable for vehicular access serving the development as it was too narrow, although two main routes into the site should be provided
- concerns about the size of the proposed units and whilst accepting that the site was earmarked for development, that there was a need to protect the amenity of the residents living in the properties located within the site

The Chief Planning Officer stated that the site was allocated for employment and that jobs were needed but that there were particular issues with the site which needed to be considered and that a design brief for the site should be provided. The quantum and form of the floorspace would need to be controlled and that a robust travel plan would be required

The need for a range of employment sites to be available within Leeds was stressed as was the need to react positively to planning issues on challenging sites such as this one, particularly in view of the length of time taken to progress this site

In addressing the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following responses:

- to note Members' comments concerning the principle of development
- that the applicant's proposals to improve accessibility were not appropriate to the site and that Asquith Avenue was not suitable

for vehicular access and that Nepshaw Lane South should be considered as a more suitable access point

- that Members did not consider the extent of the access arrangements were sufficient to deal with the anticipated level of traffic and that a design brief was needed
- to note Members' comments regarding the scope of the Highways assessment
- to note Members' comments on the scope of the highway conditions and the Section 106 agreement
- that the extent of the landscaping proposals were not sufficient to allow the development to proceed and this needed to be addressed
- that regarding nature conservation, there was the possibility of linking the water features to the woodland to provide ecological benefits
- that further information was required on the drainage improvements
- that the applicant be encouraged to work with the Council on a suitable development brief for the site

RESOLVED - To note the report and the comments now made

50 Preapp/10/00300 - Update presentation for alterations and amendments to the approved Eastgate and Harewood Quarter Development scheme - Land bounded by New York Road (Inner Ring Road A64) to the North, Bridge Street and Millgarth Street to the East, George Street and Dyer Street to the South and Vicar Lane and Harewood Street to the West LS2

Further to minute 6 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 27th September 2012, where Panel resolved to grant outline planning permission for amendments to the mix of uses for the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter development, Members considered a pre-application presentation for alterations and amendments to the approved scheme

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

Officers introduced the report and Members then received a presentation on the proposals on behalf of the developer

Members were informed that agreement had been reached with John Lewis for their anchor store and that work had been continuing with the Council to vary the proposals in order to bring the scheme forward in a phased way. Along with Millgarth Police Station which had been acquired by the Council, the Victoria Quarter had recently been acquired by the developer. Consideration was now being given to creating links from the Victoria Quarter to the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter development to form one scheme and this would necessitate some changes

Consideration was being given to whether a 21st century covered space could be created, with the intention being to take as inspiration and reference, the quality of the Leeds' historic arcades

In terms of car parking, John Lewis was keen to have a car park on the site and having considered the scheme in detail in order to deliver the car park in the first phase of development, the proposal was to demolish the Millgarth Police Station and move the NGT route onto the Ladybeck culvert, thereby leaving an adequate footprint on one side for the car park and a decent footprint for the retail development

The Leeds John Lewis would be designed with specific reference to the city, for example its cloth industry to ensure that it was of its time and place; was memorable and recognisable and that it stood for the city and the company. The design of the building also had to work for the store to ensure there was sufficient daylight and there was flexibility to changing retail trends

The time line for the scheme was given, with Members being informed that public consultation would commence in February 2013, with the application for Phase 1 being submitted in April and determined possibly in August 2013, with a start on site in 2014 and completion in autumn 2016

Members commented on the following matters:

General design issues

- that the detail of the John Lewis store had changed since the original planning permission had been granted; whether because of this there would now be the need for a bridge over Eastgate and how this change would affect the power generation plant off Bridge Street which had been approved
- the arcaded part of the scheme to the north of Eastgate and whether this remained part of the proposals
- that the original scheme was to create a new quarter whilst retaining much of what was there to enable a flow through from the Trinity scheme, however this did not now seem to be the case
- the need for details on achieving a safe transition to the development from the Victoria Quarter
- the design of the John Lewis building and whether it would look at odds with the Blomfield architecture which dominated this part of the city
- the need for the treatment of the John Lewis store to be consistent all the way round and not, as in the case of the Leicester store to have bland and functional rear elevations

Car park and highways

- that the demolition of Millgarth Police Station was welcomed but that there was a need to consider a similar treatment for the car park as would be on the John Lewis façade; that this was a very important issue and that despite its use, the car park should not look like one. As the site was a key gateway into the city it was important that the scheme was met by something which befitted the city and that in view of the likely cost of the John Lewis building, a poor quality car park would not be accepted
- the need to ensure there was no queuing traffic from the car park and that the exit was situated opposite the coach station on Dyer Street with concerns about whether there was sufficient capacity on that street

- that expectations for this development were high and that for many people, car parks were dark and unattractive but that for this scheme something much better had to be produced and that it would set the standard of how multi-storey car parks should look and that strategically, this was very important
- the possibility of integrating the car park into the store at basement level and the success of the Selfridges basement car park on Oxford Street, London
- that the availability of the Millgarth site could provide an opportunity to redesign the building, rather than simply bolting on the car park

The following responses were provided by the developer's representatives:

General design issues

- that the intention of building a bridge over Eastgate would need to be reviewed in the light of the development of the scheme
- that the Energy Centre on Bridge Street formed part of the second phase of development; that the developers were looking to future-proof phase 1 and to connect this to the energy centre when it came on line, as there would not be a sufficient number of shops in phase 1, however discussions were ongoing with the Council about connecting the markets to the Energy Centre
- that the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter did not compete with the Trinity development as it was for a different market
- that the transition to the development from the Victoria Quarter would be through the use of a raised platform on Vicar Lane (between the County Arcade entrance and the application site), which would enable this to be step free whilst still retaining vehicular access. Whilst a pedestrian-first approach was being encouraged, it was not possible to take the buses off Vicar Lane as there was nowhere else to divert them to. Whilst the final design of this had not been reached as discussions were still ongoing with highways, there would be an extended area of public realm
- in terms of the Reginald Blomfield architecture, this was stronger on the northern side of the site, with the southern side being more diverse. Whilst the Blomfield language was white Portland Stone and then brick, the use of Portland Stone on the John Lewis building was favoured, with this giving an element of the Blomfield language, whilst not trying to mimic it
- regarding the rear of the John Lewis store, this would be the site of the customer collect area and the design of this would be brought back to Panel

Car park and highways

- that the aim was for the car park to be of the same design quality as the John Lewis store however, the budget for the cladding of the car park was less than that for the store and that it was not as easy to work with a small budget and for it to look

the same and that a different model was being considered with interest being introduced through other elements

- in terms of the operation of the car park, John Lewis required tickets and machines, with these being located far into the car park to allow for queuing traffic to be within the car park. The car park would provide 600 car parking spaces and the volume of traffic would be controlled going in by ramps, and exiting by traffic lights, so it was felt there would not be queuing traffic on the highway
- in respect of the car park exit, work had been undertaken with highways over a long period of time with Members being informed that the developer was confident that a solution had been found which works both on entering and exiting the car park
- regarding the quality of the car park, as Hammersons were the largest retail owner in the UK, they knew how to build, manage and run car parks; the aim was for this car park to be the one of choice and there was a commitment to delivering the best car park in Leeds
- in respect of the massing and wrapping of the car park, every option had been considered, including a basement or roof top car park. The problem of integrating the car park into the John Lewis store was that it would create a building which would be overbearing
- that Members' comments about the car park were noted and the developer was mindful that the car park had to be a building of high quality

The Chief Planning Officer referred to the issues which had been raised about the scheme and the phasing and stated that if the whole of the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter was fully built out from the start, this could result in Trinity experiencing some empty shop units, whereas by phasing the development, prime and unique shops would be delivered in the first phase. This could only be seen as an economic advantage and adding to the prestige of the city and that Leeds was in a privileged position in respect of this scheme and that it was important for everyone to support the scheme

In summing up the debate, the Chair provided the following comments:

- that Panel understood the changes proposed to the scheme
- that the external design of the car park was a vital component of the whole scheme
- that concerns remained about how the car park would operate and that it must not lead to queuing traffic
- that Members were pleased with the relationship of the scheme to both the Victoria Quarter and the markets and that the proposed new arcades were welcomed

51 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday 17th January 2013 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds