

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 9TH MAY, 2013

PRESENT: Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

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

114 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the last City Plans Panel of the 2012/2013 Municipal Year. He announced that this would be the last Panel meeting for Councillor Murray, who was to be the next Lord Mayor and thanked him for his contributions and any other Members who would be leaving the Panel after this meeting

115 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED - That the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as designated as follows:

The reports referred to in minutes 121 and 130 under Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972 and the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3) and on the grounds it contains information relating to the financial or business of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). It is considered that if this information was in the public domain it would be likely to prejudice the affairs of the applicants. Whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, in all the circumstances of the case, maintaining the exemption is considered to outweigh the public interest in disclosing this information at this time

116 Late Items

The Chair admitted one late item to the agenda (minute 128 refers). The report which related to pre-application proposals at New Dock, Armouries Way, was not available at the time the agenda was despatched and required urgent consideration to enable Panel to have early sight of the proposals ahead of a formal application being submitted in late May. A copy of the report had been circulated in advance of the meeting

Although not formal late items, the Panel was in receipt of two supplementary reports in respect of Applications 12/03400/OT and 12/03401/OT, land at Royds Lane and Fleet Lane LS26, which set out further

representations which had been received (minutes 123 and 124 refer).
These reports had been circulated in advance of the meeting

Members were also in receipt of large scale, coloured layout plans of application 10/04597/OT – Wakefield Road Gildersome, which had been tabled by Officers (minute 120 refers)

117 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

Councillor Nash declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in application 12/01715/FU – proposals for a supermarket on land off Sandbeck Lane Wetherby LS22, through receiving a small income from the Co-op which had a small store in Wetherby (minute 122 refers)

Councillor Leadley also declared a significant other interest as he felt it was in the public interest to do so. This related to application 10/04597/OT – land at Wakefield Road Gildersome Morley, as he had objected to the application when it had first been submitted in 2010 (minute 120 refers)

118 Apologies for Absence

It was noted that Councillor P Gruen would be delayed due to attending another meeting

119 Minutes

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meetings of 26th March 2013 and 11th April 2013 be approved

120 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) Wakefield Road Gildersome Morley LS27

Further to minute 48 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 13th December 2012, where Panel considered a position statement for a mixed use development on land off Wakefield Road Gildersome LS27, Members considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the formal application

Plans, drawings and photographs were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the outline proposals for a mixed commercial and industrial development on land off Wakefield Road Gildersome LS27

Members were informed that the scheme had been revised since it was last presented to Panel and that a smaller hotel – at 90 bedrooms - was proposed and that this had been achieved by reducing the footprint which also addressed some concerns which had been expressed about landscaping. Unit 4 had also been set back by approximately 10m and the car park had been reduced to also increase the amount of landscaping within the scheme

In terms of the principle of hotel use on the site, this had been considered and the applicant had carried out a sequential test. Although

other sequentially preferable sites had been considered these were either too small or not available. Therefore Officers were satisfied on the principle of hotel use for this site

Regarding access, Highways were now satisfied with the proposed junction although a Highways Agency Holding Direction remained in force until 30th May 2013 in respect of the scope and cost of works at Junction 27. Although the principle of the targets and penalties in the travel plan had been agreed, the latest version of the travel plan needed to be referred to Highways for consideration and if minded to approve the application, this could be attached to the S106 Agreement

The full details of the landscaping scheme would be controlled by condition and a good scheme for the site would be essential

In respect of public transport, it was clarified that the closest bus stop to the site was on Street Lane and that it was this stop that the public transport planning contribution would be spent on

Minor typing errors in paragraphs 7.1, 10.3 and 10.4 of the submitted report were corrected

Two letters of representation were reported. One was from the resident at 69 Wakefield Road who had confirmed that an agreement had been reached with the applicant to carry out works to enable him to access his property with his caravan from the highway. A letter had also been received from the resident at 73 Wakefield Road who had raised concerns about his access arrangements if the scheme was agreed

If minded to approve the application, a further condition relating to sustainable construction was proposed

Members discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- the principle of hotel use on the site
- whether the Highways Agency had been consulted about the proposed warehouses
- the high cost of the development; the filling in of a disused railway tunnel that crosses the site and the need for this in view of its historic value
- the design of the pub/restaurant and the location of the car park in relation to this
- whether there were other residents on Wakefield Road whose access arrangements could potentially be affected by the proposals

The following responses were provided:

- that the Highways Agency had been consulted throughout the process and was satisfied with the proposals and the figure being provided for off-site highways works to the roundabout
- that a ground condition survey had been carried out for a previous proposal on the site and this had recommended the railway tunnel be filled in for building stability reasons
- that the application was in outline only but that the concerns regarding the position of the pub/restaurant car park in relation to the entrance to this building would be considered at reserved matters stage

- that there were 6 properties off this access point. In terms of the issue of manoeuvrability for the resident at 73 Wakefield Road, the Panel's Highways representative would look into this Panel considered how to proceed

RESOLVED – To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, plus an additional condition in respect of sustainable construction (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:

- Provision of a public transport contribution (£48,979)
- Contribution to off-site improvement works at Junction 27 (£44,971)
- Improvements to local bus stop (£10,000)
- Implementation of the travel plan (to be agreed) and monitoring fee
- Local employment opportunities
- Delivery of the physical infrastructure as set out and coloured blue and red on the additional plan circulated to Members

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

During consideration of this matter, Councillor P Gruen joined the meeting

121 Application 12/03459/FU - Multi-level development up to 17 storeys with 609 residential apartments, commercial units (class A1 to A5, B1, D1 and D2), car parking, associated access, engineering works, landscape and public amenity space - Land at Whitehall Road and Globe Road LS12

Further to minutes 105 – 107 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 11th April 2013, where Panel considered further reports detailing the S106 contributions in respect of the proposed mixed-use development on land at Whitehall Road and Globe Road LS12, the Panel considered a further report. A copy of the full viability assessment which had been considered at the meeting on 11th April 2013, was also submitted, for Members' information

Although one report had been classed as exempt as it contained detailed financial information, the Chair advised that unless any Member wished to revisit this aspect, it was not proposed to discuss the financial viability report further and therefore the public did not need to leave the meeting

Officers presented the report and advised Panel that an agreement had been reached with the applicant that of the £568,000 planning contribution to be made, £100,000 would be set aside to assist in the delivery of a bridge over the canal

On the suggestion made at the last meeting that the scheme could be financially re-appraised at each phase, the applicant had been unable to agree to this but had agreed to a re-appraisal after the development was 85% occupied, with Officers recommending this be accepted by Panel

RESOLVED - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:

- Contribution of £568,000 to be spent on affordable housing, education, public transport and/or public realm improvements as considered appropriate with £100,000 set aside to assist in the delivery of a bridge over the canal
- 30 units in phase one provided as assisted purchase units
- If the development is not implemented within 18 months of approval the scheme is to be financially re-appraised at the time of implementation and if viable, a further affordable housing contribution shall be provided in accordance with the level of viability and affordable housing policy at that time
- An assessment of profit at 85% occupation. If the developer's profit exceeds 25% an additional housing contribution of 50% of the excess profits will be made up to the level required by the affordable housing policy at that time
- Landing area for the canal footbridge
- Travel plan measures and monitoring fee of £5,125
- Car club contribution of £21,500
- Local employment and training clause
- Public access to public open space

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

122 Application 12/01715/FU - Erection of a supermarket and associated infrastructure, car parking provision for 265 vehicles and petrol filling station - Land off Sandbeck Lane Wetherby LS22

Having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this matter, Councillor Nash withdrew from the meeting

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 related to an application for a supermarket with associated infrastructure, car parking and petrol filling station on land off Sandbeck Lane Wetherby LS22, a site which was surrounded by a range of uses, these being agricultural, industrial and residential as well as being in close proximity to the A1

Members were informed that the site was allocated for employment use in the UDPR and that there was an extant outline permission for this use

The proposals were for a 24 hour Asda supermarket which would offer 70% convenience goods and 30% comparison goods. On-site car parking for 265 cars was proposed together with a petrol filling station. An in-store café

would be provided and an ATM. In terms of job creation, the scheme would provide 200 full-time jobs

In respect of public transport to the site, the applicant would fund the diversion of the X70 into the site for a period of five years, although this diversion would not run on an evening or on Sundays

The realignment of an existing bridleway would be required and there would be some loss of trees, although there was the potential for replacement planting

Attention was drawn to the context of the site in relation to Wetherby Town Centre and the retail offer which currently existed in the town. Members were informed that the Morrisons supermarket was the main food retailer in the town centre; that planning permission had been granted for an extension to that store and that it acted as a focal point and anchor for the town

In terms of retail policy, Members were informed that the NPPF directed the proposed foodstore to main retail centres first and then to smaller centres. The Council's independent retail consultant had considered the impact of the proposed Asda store and had assessed that there would be a 30% diversion of trade from the Morrisons store, if extended; 23% diversion of trade from Wetherby Town Centre and 21% diversion of trade from the overall catchment area, with Panel being informed that this should be given significant weight when considering the application. The remoteness of the site from Wetherby Town Centre at 1.2km away was also a factor; it was not an attractive walk from the site to the town and therefore it was unlikely to generate linked trips from the Asda store to the businesses and shops in Wetherby Town Centre

A revised travel plan had been recently submitted by the applicant but Officers had not been able to fully consider this. Members were informed that they might wish to allow time for this to be looked at in detail or might wish to determine the application on what had been previously submitted

Members were informed that there was considerable support for the scheme, particularly the jobs which would be created and the increased choice a new supermarket would provide, however there was also considerable opposition to the proposals. Having considered the application, Officers were of the view that it would have a significant adverse impact on the retail vitality of Wetherby Town Centre; that accessibility was poor and because of that would likely become a car borne destination and were recommending to Panel that the application be refused

If minded to accept the recommendation to refuse the application, Members were advised of a slight rewording of the first reason for refusal to acknowledge the likely negative impact of the proposals on planned investment in Wetherby Town Centre

Three further representations were reported, although it was stated that these did not raise any new issues

In view of the level of representations received, the Chair on this occasion allowed a period of up to 6 minutes per side for speakers to address the Panel

Members commented on the following matters:

- the level of overtrading by Morrisons in Wetherby
- that the proposals offered greater retail choice for local residents

- public transport to the site
- the design of the car parking in the scheme
- whether Officers were satisfied on the size, design and scale of the proposals
- future housing proposals in the area
- that the proposals were contrary to planning guidance
- that the proposals would not lead to linked trips and would deny trade to businesses in the town centre
- the difficulty in regenerating Wetherby Town Centre if it lost its current vitality and viability
- the possibility of another supermarket in this area being needed in the future but not necessarily at this time

The following responses were provided:

- that the level of overtrading by Morrisons would balance out if the Asda store was granted planning permission, however the implications of this had to be considered in respect of Wetherby Town Centre as a whole and it was felt that the Asda proposals would have a serious adverse impact on other town centre businesses overall, particularly in respect of the potential level of linked trips between town centre businesses
- that the X70 bus route would be reconfigured to take in the new store, however Metro was of the view that this would not be sustainable after the 5 year period of funding by the applicant
- that there were no concerns about the design, car parking proposals, size and scale of the supermarket
- that the housing site allocations considered by Executive Board had proposed housing in Wetherby and Thorp Arch but that this was at an early stage and in terms of outstanding housing proposals, there was the site at Spofforth Hill which Panel had received a pre-application presentation on at its meeting on 11th April 2013

Members considered how to proceed

RESOLVED - That the application be refused for the following reasons:

1 The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed retail store which would be located in an out-of-centre location, together with the absence of linked trips and lack of integration to the town centre, would likely to have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Wetherby town centre and is likely to have a negative impact on planned investment in Wetherby town centre. The proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy S5 of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and emerging Policies P5 and P8 of the Draft Core Strategy Leeds Local Development Framework

2 The Local Planning Authority considers that by virtue of the site's location, poor access to public transport services and with limited scope for walking trips, the movements to and from the proposed retail

store will be dominated by trips by the private car, contrary to Strategic Aim SA2 and Policy T2 of the Unitary Development Plans Review (2006), the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and emerging Policy T2 of the Draft Core Strategy Leeds Local Development Framework

3 The Local Planning Authority considers that the submitted Travel Plan is unacceptable as regards site assessment and audit, measures/actions, mode splits and targets, role of Travel Plan Co-ordinator and the form, timing and length of monitoring. As such, the proposal is considered detrimental to the aims and objectives of sustainable transport, contrary to Strategic Aim SA2 and Policies GP5 and T2c of the Unitary Development Plan Review (2006), the Supplementary Planning Document 'Travel Plans' and the National Planning Policy Framework and emerging Policy T2 of the Draft Core Strategy Leeds Local Development Framework

Following consideration of this matter, Councillor Nash resumed her seat in the meeting

123 Application 12/03400/OT - Outline application for residential development - Land at Royds Lane Rothwell LS26

Members considered the first of two reports of the Chief Planning Officer on applications for outline planning permission for residential development on Protected Area of Search (PAS) land in the Rothwell Ward

Although each application would need to be determined on its own merits, each raised similar planning issues. To provide some background to the applications Members received a presentation from David Newbury, Area Planning Manager

Members were informed that both sites were designated as PAS sites in the UDPR and as such were safeguarded for development in the future. As these applications were likely to be the forerunner for other developments coming forward, these were of strategic importance

Planning permission had been refused for development on the sites in 2009 with appeals being refused by the Inspector on grounds relating to housing land supply and accessibility and sustainability. This decision was a forerunner for the loss of 10 appeals by the Council on Phase 2 and 3 greenfield sites. Although these sites differed as they were PAS sites, the wider context of the need to deliver large housing numbers across the city had to be considered

The new planning guidance, the NPPF, placed an urgency on the delivery of housing and to address this situation, Executive Board had approved an interim planning policy to help manage the release of sites and enable the Council to have some control over this

The key factors in the applications before Panel were housing land supply and sustainability. The need to demonstrate a 5 year land supply was set out in national planning guidance. Whilst Leeds City Council considered it did have this level, unless this could be demonstrated it would be difficult to

resist the release of some of these sites. In calculating the 5 year land supply a quantum of PAS sites had been allowed but individual sites had not been identified. If a PAS site was felt to meet the interim policy, it would contribute to the 5 year supply, which would help resist development on Greenfield sites

In terms of sustainability, in 2009, the Inspector had concluded these two sites were not sustainable and there had been no significant change in circumstances regarding accessibility to and from the sites. However, the policy context had changed and the Council had taken the decision to release Phase 2 and 3 Greenfield sites, together with selective PAS sites

On both applications there was the possibility of using the affordable housing contribution to provide much needed extra care accommodation in Rothwell and this accorded with a report considered by Executive Board about new ways of providing this facility, with S106 Agreements being part of this

The Panel then considered the application

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 sought outline permission for the principle only of residential development on a 3.7ha Greenfield site located on the fringe of Rothwell, bounded by housing and recreation land and within reasonable walking distance from Rothwell Town Centre which hosted a good range of facilities

An indicative layout plan for 90 houses was shown, with Members being informed that the layout could be improved as could the position of the public open space on the site to provide homes which would meet design guidelines. In the event that extra care accommodation could not be achieved off-site, affordable housing at a level of 15% would be provided

If minded to approve the application, additional conditions were proposed which related to the delivery of the travel plan; further site investigations in relation to coal on the site and to limit the number of dwellings on the site not to exceed 90

Paragraph 7.18 of the submitted report was included in error and should not be considered in assessing the proposals. The walking distances to the nearby primary schools were also clarified

Reference was made to the supplementary report which detailed the further representations which had been received. The level of individual representations from the Rothwell Neighbourhood Forum was reported as being 69, but that it was felt that the additional representations did not raise significant new points

The Panel then heard representations from objectors and the applicant's representative. The Chair on this occasion allowed a period of up to 6 minutes for both parties to address the Panel

Members discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- that further information should have been provided to Plans Panel Members on the new interim housing delivery policy

- that planning permission had been refused in 2009 and that a clear explanation of what had changed since then was required
- the year 2016 referred to by a speaker and the relevance of this
- the position of Neighbourhood Plans in being able to refuse development which a community does not wish to see
- that a precedent would be set for PAS land if planning permission was granted on this site
- flooding and drainage issues which had been raised by an objector and whether the site was suitable for the proposed development
- how the local community could be reassured over the selection process for the two sites being considered
- that the issues of sustainability and accessibility raised by the Inspector in 2009 appeared still to be relevant but that less weight was being given to these issues and the reasons for this
- the level of planning contributions; that these often failed to fully match the needs of the area and whether this would be the case for the extra care accommodation being considered
- whether the 90 dwellings from this site would make much difference to the city's 5 year land supply

The following responses were provided:

- that the interim policy would be considered at the next Joint Plans Panel meeting but that these applications required determination at this time
- that in 2009 when planning permission was sought on the site, the policy regime was different; then it had been PPS3, now it was the NPPF and this placed a greater emphasis on the delivery of housing and on having a 5 year supply, plus 5%. Where a 5 year land supply cannot be demonstrated there is a presumption in favour of the development. In 2009 the Council had the Phase 2 and 3 Greenfield sites to release but these had now gone. This was the biggest change but what had not changed and had possibly worsened slightly was accessibility to and from the site. However, sites now had to be assessed in the broader context of the NPPF. The Chief Planning Officer explained further and stated that the current government had placed housing delivery at the centre of economic recovery, placing less emphasis on sustainability. The interim policy had been brought in by the Executive Board to manage the situation and in any event, towards the end of the 5 year period, some PAS sites would have come forward for development

- the reference to 2016 was in relation to the end date of the UDP Review
- that the evidence from appeal decisions indicated that the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan was not of itself a reason for refusal of an application
- In terms of precedent, that part of the Executive Board's decision was about not setting a precedent for all PAS sites but only for those which fulfilled the criteria set by the Executive Board, safeguarding other PAS sites for consideration through the Site Allocations process
- Concerning flooding and drainage, that Flood Risk Management, Yorkshire Water and the Environment Agency had been consulted on the proposals and no objections had been raised, subject to the submission of appropriate drainage measures and flood risk management measures
- that in relation to the issue of accessibility, the balance of consideration had changed due to the NPPF and that housing land supply and marketability of a site were strong factors over other matters
- that the developer contribution which could be used for extra care accommodation would not be enough to pay for the whole scheme but it would lessen the burden on the Council although this option would need to be worked up further, with details being brought back to Panel
- that all residential development, however small in number contributed to the housing levels the city had to achieve

Members further discussed the proposal with the following comments being made:

- that consultation on site allocations had been extensive, lengthy and detailed and that all Ward Members had had to accept difficult targets
- that although the timing of applications might be difficult, the Council was not in control of the process of submitting planning applications and had to be mindful of the timescales for dealing with them to avoid appeals being lodged against non-determination
- that the Council did not wish to build on Greenfield sites but national planning policy did not support that and the decision taken by Executive Board to introduce an interim policy was a way to set some criteria to best deal with the situation it faced
- that these sites were not being considered because they were at the top of a list of sites, but because applications had been lodged for them which had to be determined, and that Panel had deferred determination of them in April in order to give local people the opportunity to comment

- that this site did relate well to the settlement around it, that it was not a large development which was being proposed and that it would square off the land and regularise the boundary
- the need for Ward Members to be consulted on the S106 Agreement and to ensure that whether extra care accommodation or affordable housing was provided, the contribution should not be less for either use
- that the method used to consider the S106 Agreement on the Whitehall Road /Globe Road site should be adopted for this site
- that there were many brownfield sites, particularly in the City and Hunslet Ward where development was not progressing and that this should be followed up

RESOLVED – To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, plus additional conditions relating to the delivery of the travel plan; further site investigations in relation to coal on the site and to limit the number of dwellings on the site not to exceed 90 and the drawing up of a Section 106 Agreement to cover those issues set out in the submitted report and in consultation with Ward Members and subject to a further report being submitted to Panel for consideration of the Section 106 Agreement prior to the determination of the application

124 Application 12/03401/OT - Outline application for residential development - Land at Fleet Lane Oulton LS26

Prior to consideration of this matter, Councillors G Latty and R Procter left the meeting

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 sought outline planning permission for the principle only of residential development on a 3.45ha PAS site on the edge of Oulton, bordered by Oulton Conservation Area and bounded on three sides by residential properties and open farm land on the fourth side which formed part of the Green Belt

An illustrative layout was shown which indicated about 80 properties on site, mainly semi-detached dwellings but with some terraced properties and a large area of public open space which also served to mitigate against possible flooding issues. Extra care housing provision was also being considered on this site in lieu of affordable housing

If minded to approve the application, further conditions were proposed relating to the delivery of a travel plan, limiting the number of dwellings to no more than 80 houses, a condition relating to existing and proposed ground levels and submission and approval of finished floor levels

Reference was made to the supplementary report which detailed the further representations which had been received. The level of individual representations from the Oulton and Woodlesford Neighbourhood Forum was

reported as being 22, but that it was felt that the additional representations did not raise significant new points

The Panel then heard representations from objectors and the applicant's representative. The Chair on this occasion allowed a period of up to 4 minutes for both parties to address the Panel

Members discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- whether any flats were being included on the site
- that the developer would have been mindful of the timescales of Council discussions about housing land supply and that a precedent would be set by approving the application
- affordable housing and that having fought for many years to achieve on-site affordable housing on developments, there appeared to be a move to accepting a commuted sum and that whilst extra care housing would be beneficial to the community, the developers were not providing anything additional in terms of contributions
- that it would be for Panel to decide about affordable housing provision but that a review had shown that there was a great need for extra care housing in this area
- the need for Ward Members to be consulted on the content of the S106 Agreement and for Panel to consider the package being proposed

RESOLVED – To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer, subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report, plus additional conditions relating to the delivery of a travel plan, limiting the number of dwellings to no more than 80 houses, a condition relating to existing and proposed ground levels and submission and approval of finished floor levels and the drawing up of a Section 106 Agreement to cover those issues set out in the submitted report and consultation with Ward Members and subject to a further report being submitted to Panel for consideration of the Section 106 Agreement prior to the determination of the application

125 Preapps/10/00302 and 10/00303 - Leeds (River Aire) Flood Alleviation Scheme - Leeds Station to Knotstrop Weir - Pre-application presentation

Further to minute 59 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 17th January 2013, where Panel approved in principle applications which would implement the first phase of the city's Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS), Members considered pre-application proposals for the FAS from Leeds Station to Knotstrop Weir. Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer and received a presentation on the proposals by the applicant's consultants

Members were informed of the extent of the protection which would be from the railway station in the city centre to Thwaites Mill and at Woodlesford and Holbeck

The scheme would combine walls, riverside walls, landscaping and modifications to existing buildings to make them watertight, with the proposals being guided by the Design Vision and Guide

There would be approximately 2km of linear defences, with 1200m being in the city centre. The majority of the defences were below 1.2m in height and this was seen as a key benefit

At Holbeck, the intention was to retain the open aspect of the area and provide a wall where there were currently railings

At the Asda site, there would be approximately 600mm high walls and a small city park would be incorporated opposite the city arches

Navigation Walk was a sensitive area and 1.1m high walls were being considered at this location; these being a glazed flood wall, something which was being increasingly used to provide a defence whilst maintaining connectivity to the waterfront

At Roberts Wharf, local ground levels would be raised whilst ensuring this was DDA compliant

At Knostrop Cut, there would be the removal of a 600m length of Knostrop Cut to merge the canal and river. By doing this, the extent and height of the linear defences needed would be reduced. A section of the Transpennine Trail would need to be realigned but this would provide an opportunity to create a biodiverse area on the left bank

At Woodlesford, a 1 – 1.3m high grassed embankment was proposed

In terms of materials and finishes the approach was to design a flood wall specifically for its location so a range of materials such as sandstone paving, resin-bonded gravel and tegular block paving was proposed. Where brick was used this would reflect the colour of existing brickwork and would be enhanced by glazing and glass inserts. Wherever possible existing materials would be retained and reused. The change of character beyond Rose Wharf to a more rural setting would also be reflected in the materials selected with resin-bonded natural stone and earth banks being envisaged

Members commented on the following matters:

- whether the works at Woodlesford would complement the works needed for HS2
- that whilst less intrusive defences were welcomed, there was concern that some of these were too low and that river safety had to be considered
- concern about the removal of part of Knostrop Cut and whether this would have an impact on the navigability of the river
- that water turbines should be provided rather than Archimedes' screw

The following responses were provided:

- that proposals for HS2 had only recently been put forward and would take some time to be delivered; that the defences at Woodlesford were the first to be provided and that HS2 would need to respect what was in place
- that safety had been considered and low guard rails would also be provided
- that navigation of the river would not be affected by the removal of part of Knostrop Cut as capacity was not being built but conveyance was, i.e. how quickly water reached the city

- that Archimedes' screw was proposed as it was the most economic solution

The Chair stated that a site visit by boat should be arranged when the applications were ready for determination, in order to properly understand and appreciate the proposals

Members welcomed the scheme, particularly the use of a range of materials which respected and enhanced the riverside, although the need for good finishes to be achieved was stressed

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

During consideration of this matter, Councillors Leadley and Hardy left the meeting

126 Preapp/13/00223 - Outline proposal for 3 office buildings, multi-storey car park and pavilion unit with ground floor food, drink and gym uses and public realm - Whitehall Riverside Whitehall Road Lower Wortley LS12 - Pre-application presentation

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on pre-application proposals for an office-led development with multi-storey car park, pavilion unit with ground floor food, drink and gym uses and public realm on land at Whitehall Riverside, Whitehall Road, and received a presentation on behalf of the developer

Members were informed that a previous approval for the site had been granted for office, residential and a multi-storey car park. The proposals were to refresh the outline approval, particularly in light of the current strong market for office space of 20,000sqm and above

Strategically, the site was an important one and this was recognised by the three pedestrian routes through the site which would connect to the river and over the proposed footbridge to Holbeck Urban Village, the Southern Station entrance and beyond

Active frontages would be provided along Whitehall Road and at the corners of buildings. To increase the level of activity and animation on the site, glazed lifts were proposed

The vehicular strategy would re-use existing openings to provide an in/out access and shared surface area. A new, separate cycle lane would be created

The scheme provided an opportunity to create a boulevard along Whitehall Road and two garden spaces would be provided in the scheme. A pavilion building, envisaged as a café would also be provided

In response to the points raised in the report for Members' consideration the following responses were provided:

- that Members agreed that the proposed uses for the site were appropriate
- that Members agreed that the general siting of the buildings, provision of public realm, balance of hard and soft landscaping and location of future pedestrian routes would be appropriate to

create a sense of place to the Waterfront and Whitehall Road and ensure pedestrian connections linking across the site from the riverside to the rest of the Prime Office Quarter via Wellington Place to the north. The Head of Planning Services stated there was a need to consider how the corridors worked in respect of wind

- that in terms of heights of buildings, the Chief Planning Officer suggested that further consideration be given to this, particularly the height relationship to buildings on the other side of the road

Members welcomed the renewed interest in office development in this location

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

During consideration of this matter, Councillor J McKenna left the meeting

127 Preapp/12/00494 - Proposed student accommodation buildings and new external space - Land between Belgrave Street and St Alban's Place LS2 - Pre-application presentation

Prior to consideration of this matter, Councillor S Hamilton left the meeting

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

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer on pre-application proposals for student accommodation and new external space on land between Belgrave Street and St Alban's Place, which was situated within a Prestige Development Area; with the majority of the site being identified as protected public space in the UDPR. Members also received a presentation on behalf of the developer

Members were informed initially about the landscaping proposals for the scheme. Whilst the amount of public space would be reduced and existing landscaping would be removed, a considerable planting scheme, to include significant planting levels of mature trees was proposed. The existing space which was not well used currently would be reshaped, replanted and seating provided

The site would be well connected to the surrounding area with two primary pedestrian routes existing through the site, with some widening of footpaths being proposed

In terms of the buildings, three buildings were proposed which would provide a total of 300 student bedrooms in a mix of clusters sizes together with a café, gym and small commercial unit

The proposed materials were a mixed brick palette which would provide a blend of colours, glazing and copper feature elements on the gable ends. The Chair again raised the issue about the colour reproduction of the graphics being seen by Members, as these were not accurate

In response to the points raised in the report for Members' consideration the following responses were provided:

- that Members agreed the proposed location of the site for student accommodation. The issue was raised that in view of other likely city centre student accommodation proposals, whether there should be a policy which set a cap on the amount of student accommodation in the city centre, or whether there was a mix of uses which could be considered to be appropriate, with Officers being asked to provide information to Panel Members on this. The Chief Planning Officer advised Panel that work was being carried out on this
- that any development proposals needed to fully mitigate for building on protected open space and for the loss of trees. Concerns were raised about the loss of green space and whilst a quantitative improvement to the existing space was required, there should also be replacement open space provided elsewhere, (e.g. in upgrading New Briggate in front of the Grand Theatre), with concerns where that could be sited. A plan which showed a gain to the wider area was requested
- that Members agreed that existing pedestrian routes both within and around the site which connect with the city and surrounding areas need to be improved as part of the development and that levels need to enable access for all users
- regarding scale and massing, there were some concerns raised about the height of the buildings and that this was a gateway site and that buildings of exceptional quality and design were required in this location
- in terms of materials, some concerns were raised about the use of brick which was regarded as being reminiscent of development in the city in the 1980s – 90s; that the elevations appeared bland; that there were large expansions of wall and that the windows gave the buildings a monolithic appearance The Chair reiterated the need for top quality materials and design for the site and stated that more work was needed on this
- that the general arrangement of proposed uses were appropriate to the site's location and future uses, with the possibility being suggested by Panel of the accommodation being used by visitors out of term time
- that Members agreed to the removal of the pay and display spaces and for the need to provide a strategy for the management of student vehicles at changeover times

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

128 Preapp/13/00074 - Proposals for change of use of retail and restaurant units to office, restaurant, bar and leisure uses including addition of

mezzanines and external alterations - New Dock, Armouries Way Hunslet LS10

Further to minute 12 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 5th July 2012, where emerging proposals for New Dock (formerly Clarence Dock), South Bank were presented, Members considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer and received a presentation on behalf of the developer Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting

Members were informed of the latest thinking to revitalise the area which would include providing new work space/office accommodation; convenience shopping for residents, workers and visitors to the site; restaurants, particularly at waterside locations to maximise the benefits of this feature, the creation of a venue space to hold a range of events, exhibitions and art installations; new signage and extensive new public realm, with a series of planning applications being submitted in due course for these elements

The work space element would see the conversion of approximately one third of the existing retail units to office accommodation which would provide contemporary interiors in an unconventional office layout

My Street, the convenience shopping element would also provide permanent, themed gardens which would enable residents and visitors to enjoy new outdoor spaces. In terms of landscaping, the existing trees would be retained but further landscaping would be provided to create a boulevard

The Restaurant Boardwalk would see existing retail units being converted to form 5 family restaurants, some with permanent outdoor covered terraces. A new route through would be created to better link the development to its wider surroundings

The old marketing suite would be refurbished to create a focal point, with Members being shown the first draft of design proposals for this, to indicate the thinking for this building

The new leisure venue would provide a 9,000 sq ft space which would hold events year round

In response to the points raised in the report for Members' consideration the following responses were provided:

- that Members agreed that the proposed range of uses for the site were appropriate in principle
- that Members agreed that the package of proposed refurbishment and public realm works would help to promote New Dock as a destination in its own right and generate activity that would create a catalyst that would be complementary to the South Bank and City Centre Park initiatives. Members welcomed the interesting proposals and stressed the need for good pedestrian links being created to the city centre. In terms of the vision for the marketing suite, concerns were raised about this, with Panel being informed that this was work in progress

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

Following consideration of this matter, Councillor P Gruen left the meeting

129 Preapp/13/0040 - Proposed alterations and change of use - Rivers House 21 Park Square South LS1 - Introductory report

Members received a report of the Chief Planning Officer introducing pre-application proposals for a change of use and alterations to Rivers House, Park Square LS1. It was noted that the detailed report had been classed as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3)

RESOLVED - To note the report

130 Preapp/13/00400 - Proposed alterations and change of use of Rivers House 21 Park Square South Leeds LS1 - Pre-application presentation

With reference to minute 129 above, Panel considered a report deemed as exempt under Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4(3), which set out emerging proposals for Rivers House, 21 Park Square South LS1, which was situated in the City Centre Conservation Area and was surrounded by listed buildings

Members considered a report of the Chief Planning Officer outlining the proposals and received a presentation on the scheme by the developer

Details of the proposed alterations were outlined, which included remodelling the internal space to provide a range of offices and hub space for visitors. Members were informed that although externally the building was impressive, internally there was little to commend it apart from the generous sized windows and some art deco stair cases

The mansard roof which had been a later addition to the building was proposed to be removed and replaced with a glass roof which would also provide an outside courtyard café and roof top garden

In response to the points raised in the report for Members' consideration the following responses were provided:

- that the proposed use of Rivers House for the use set out in the submitted report was appropriate and acceptable, with Members welcoming the potential boost to the local economy this could provide
- that Members agreed that the design proposals were acceptable in principle and that when brought back for determination, that detailed studies of the proposed roof form, including visualisations and appropriately scaled samples were available for Members' consideration. The opportunity to include photo-voltaic cells on the roof was raised. The need for a quality scheme, particularly in terms of the roof, in this sensitive location was stressed

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

131 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday 6th June 2013 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Thursday, 6th June, 2013