

## **CITY PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 2021**

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

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,  
P Carlill, D Cohen, A Garthwaite, P Gruen,  
S Hamilton, G Latty, A Khan, E Nash,  
P Wadsworth, N Walshaw and R Finnigan

### **88 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals.

### **89 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public**

There was no exempt information.

### **90 Late Items**

There were no late items. Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 11 February had been circulated following the publication of the agenda.

### **91 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations.

### **92 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor C Gruen. Councillor S Hamilton was in attendance as substitute.

### **93 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 11 February be confirmed as a correct record.

### **94 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

### **95 Application 19/05272/FU - Horsforth Campus, Calverley Lane, Horsforth, Leeds, LS18**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the development of 152 affordable dwellings (C3) with associated access and landscaping at the Horsforth Campus, Calverley Lane, Horsforth.

The application was previously presented to Plans Panel in October 2020 when it was deferred as follows:

‘That the development of the site be accepted in principle but further discussions on design are to take place’

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

The following was highlighted:

- There was extant approval for up to 70 dwellings on the central portion of the site.
- Revised site plan – this had made improvements with more open space between dwellings and throughout the site with more areas for open play.
- CGI images of how the proposals would look were shown including the apartment block. These images also showed the site layout including house types, boundary treatments, parking areas, play areas and open space.
- It was felt that concerns previously made by the Panel had been addressed. There had been reductions in the amount of highways space, increase of open space and pedestrian areas. There had also been alterations to the apartment block and house types.
- There had been some late representations made by Horsforth Ward Councillors but these did not raise any new material planning considerations in relation to the application.
- The application was recommended for approval.

In response to questions from the Panel, the following was discussed:

- Types of trees to be planted were still to be decided as part of the final landscaping plan, but due consideration would be given to these being species that were of an appropriate size and would not become over-dominant.
- There would not be a formal cycle way on the path round the site so it would not be lit. It was more intended for the surrounding pathways to be for pedestrian use and ‘with ‘natural’ surveillance from the surrounding dwellings.
- Pavement parking was always a possibility in such types of development layout – but there were a number of laybys to try and reduce this. Road widths would also allow for cars to park without using the pathway.
- Minimum garage sizes should allow space to fit cars. There were only seven proposed houses on site with garages.
- Footways would be two metres wide.
- With regard to meeting Policies EN1 and EN2, it was reported that there would be photovoltaic panels to all properties and also electric

vehicle charging points. There would be conditions to the application to ensure it was policy compliant.

- It was felt that the contemporary style offered by the use of flat roof dormers on a number of the house types provided a more unusual, distinctive approach compared to the inclusion of pitched dormers.
- Residents would make financial contributions towards the management of outside areas and the s106 Agreement would ensure that Stonewater themselves would be managing the greenspace in the long-term as opposed to a third party management company.
- Sustainability issues with regards to policies EN1 and EN2 had been presented to the Panel in October 2020 and included information relating to water usage, solar panels and electric charging points for vehicles. In this respect, the application was compliant with current policies.
- Further issues to be taken up with the architect would include windows on the E2 house type and the massing of the apartment block.
- Concern that the buildings were of a soulless and drab appearance.
- Concern that there had only been small changes to the design and layout.
- Position of the apartment block – there had been previous concern that this should be moved but there had not been a change in the positioning. Due to the constraints of the site with relation to roads and parking it was not possible to re-position the apartment block. There had been changes to the design to soften the shape. It was felt that there was still further work that could be done on the design of the apartment block.
- The apartment block was not aimed at a specific age group. It had been situated at the entrance to the site as a feature.
- The site was 100% affordable housing which may limit what amendments could be made to the scheme if it was to remain viable with the 100% affordable housing provision.
- The layout was wavy in places to protect existing trees, and with elongated access roads due to the topography of the site overall.
- The siting of the pumping station was due to gravity and not flooding issues.
- The three character areas that were proposed reflected surrounding areas in Horsforth.
- Play areas – there would be more informal play areas and places for natural play (e.g. trim trails, boulders etc.) rather than a formal playground.
- The CGI images did not show the finer design details.
- The open greenspace would be open to all members of the public.

Members were invited to comment on the application. The following was raised:

- There has not been a great deal of improvement. Just a few small tweaks around the edges, particularly in relation to the design.

- The design was poor and not of good enough quality for Leeds. It was acknowledged that Members could not take it upon themselves to design schemes proposed ‘by Committee’, but felt that a better quality design was needed to adequately reflect the exceptional quality of dwellings in the surrounding area.
- Concern that there would be a substantial cost to residents for maintenance of the open spaces and play areas. While the provision of 100% affordable housing was therefore appreciated, there was the concern that living on-site could become unaffordable due to the maintenance and upkeep charges.
- The changes that had been made were an improvement but the overall scheme was not good enough.
- The massing of the apartment block was too much for the position. It either needed to be moved or lowered.
- The CGI images did not do the design justice and the layout and open play areas were a good feature as were the house types.
- There had been an improvement with more space between houses.
- There was room for aesthetic improvements but the proposals would provide a pleasant area for family living.
- There was a need for further discussion regarding the proposals and the application should be deferred again.
- Concern regarding the maintenance of open space and any un-adopted highways and who would do this.
- Concern regarding the potential size of the pumping station – it was reported that this would be hidden mainly underground and landscaped above.
- Development of the site was welcomed and the principle of use for housing was accepted, as there was now going to be no potential for the college building to be restored etc. However, it was hoped that a more exceptional development could be brought forward.

A motion was made and seconded to defer the application for further discussion regarding design following the concerns of the Panel. It was also requested that further information be provided with regard to Policies EN1 and EN2.

The Area Planning Manager summarised the discussion. Members were reminded that the application had previously been agreed in principle with a deferral to resolve issues surrounding design. Issues that had already been resolved and voted on at the October 2020 Panel meeting were not to be opened for debate again. Although there was some support for the scheme there was still concern regarding the scale, design and massing of the apartment block and further design improvements were desired. Issues regarding maintenance and sustainability were not covered by the deferral but there was still an opportunity to bring further information on these to the Panel.

Members were asked to mention specific design improvements they would like to see. These included the massing, scale, design and citing of the

apartment block; certain house types; parking arrangements; footpaths/cycle routes and the road layout.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for provision of further information and discussion on aspects as noted above, to be brought back to Panel once these had been progressed further with the applicant.

**96 Application 19/03109/FU - Land at Whitehall Road and Globe Road, Leeds, LS12**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a hybrid application for full planning permission for the erection of new residential dwellings with ancillary commercial uses (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, D1 and D2) and landscaped public realm; outline application for an associated 'hub' building in a flexible commercial use (A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, D1 and D2) on land at Whitehall Road and Globe Road, Leeds.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

The following was highlighted:

- The application was in two parts. Full permission was sought for 8 buildings with a total of 783 apartments and 3,000 square metres of ancillary, commercial and leisure space. Outline permission was sought for a standalone building ('The Hub') and 3,000 square metres of commercial and leisure space.
- The site covered 2 hectares in total. There had been considerable development activity in the surrounding area.
- An image was displayed showing the massing and building types that were proposed. Further images showed the proposed layout, façade treatments, boundary treatments and materials to be used.
- Improvements and widening of footpaths and installation of a pedestrian crossing were proposed.
- Extensive wind tunnel testing had been carried out – temporary mitigation measures would need to be installed until the adjacent site was developed.
- Public space, landscaping, biodiversity features.
- Provision of communal spaces.
- Land would be reserved for a footbridge to the canal towpath, but this did not form part of the current scheme proposed.
- Graphics displaying views from and around the site were shown.
- Provision of the full affordable housing requirement was not viable. There could either be 27 units or 80 units at 20% discount.

In response to Members questions, the following was discussed:

- Whitehall Road would still have an austere appearance – different iterations had been considered and safety issues have to be

considered for widening of footpaths and putting in cycle lanes. A conscious decision had been made for the design to reflect the 'harsher' nature of the city scape along Whitehall Road. However if there was opportunity for greening and softening the space at street level this would be considered.

- It was envisaged that the connection with Globe Road would be the element that would feel most pedestrianised and 'user friendly' with greenery etc. incorporated as part of the design.
- There would be conditions agreed with the Canal and River Trust to ensure there would be no adverse impact on the canal, either during construction or post-development.
- There would be conditions to ensure that lighting did not adversely affect the railway, i.e. causing glare or dazzling for drivers.
- There would be some informal play areas within the site, with it very much being part of the scheme's overall ethos to create a new community as a result of the development coming forward.
- It was not felt that there could be any more provision of affordable housing. A representative of the District Valuer explained the process that had been applied to reach the existing position.
- It was intended to start the development within eighteen months.
- The main focus was to provide residential accommodation and that would support the other uses on the site.
- The Hub building will not form the focus of the development at this point in time, but is envisaged as coming forward in due course.
- The Canal and River Trust had been supportive and had not objected to the proposals.
- Taxi drop off points and parking for disabled people – there would be lay-bys on Globe Road for pick up and drop off and an internal service road that could be used. However, overall it was envisaged that this would be a pedestrian-orientated development and the whole site has been designed to be fully accessible.
- Policy does not require new developments to connect into the district heating system. However, the applicant was engaged with the Council regarding possible connectivity with the system in the future.
- Gas boilers would be used on the development, to provide its own power energy centre.
- There was opportunity for more planting and greenery along Globe Road.
- There had not been any comments made by Public Health in relation to the proposals, such as regarding provision of further health facilities to cater for the residents. Such additional infrastructure requirements as this were not required as part of the allocation for the site.

Members were invited to comment on the application. The following was highlighted:

- The area had been a wasteland for too long and this was a good proposition. It opened up the canal area and was a modern design. It would be good to see more green infrastructure.

- More outdoor amenity space would be an improvement.
- It was preferred to see a policy compliant application but there was an acceptance to the reasons for not meeting the full allocation for affordable housing.
- Some concern regarding future health provision.
- The provision of a bridge should be highlighted as essential.
- Further consideration could be given to colour schemes used in the appearance and materials.

The Area Planning Manager summarised the discussion. Reference was made to the following:

- Members broadly supported the proposal
- Amenity space – more than 50% of the main site would be public open space that had no vehicular space.
- More greenery and different brickwork could be negotiated further and dealt with by condition.
- Public Health could be consulted as to see whether more GP/Health Services would be needed or whether any health facility could be sited in this location.
- Affordable housing – there was not choice between the options but the Panels views would be considered when finalising the Section 106 agreement.

**RESOLVED** - That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the draft conditions set out in Appendix 1 (and any amendments to the draft conditions and other additional conditions which he might consider appropriate); the completion of a revised Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and designers response to the same; and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- Affordable Housing: accept 3.44% (benchmark levels) or 10.21% (20% discount levels) as on-site affordable housing provision to be managed directly by the PRS provider as detailed in Para's 3.14-3.15 & 9.25-9.28 of the report.
- Reassess the viability of the scheme when the reserved matters application for The Hub comes forward to establish whether Affordable Housing should be increased.
- £200,000 off-site highway works contribution (or £100,000 with tunnel infilling and regrading works to be carried out by the applicant)
- £20,000 Traffic Regulation Order amendments
- £195,945.75 Residential Travel Plan Fund (option to use up to £100,000 to contribute to the canal bridge)
- £46,000 Bus shelter improvements
- £7,098 Travel Plan Review fee
- Compliance with Travel Plan requirements including Travel Plan Coordinator
- Provision of 2 car club spaces
- Access to and maintenance of public open space areas
- Provision of-land for the canal bridge landing

- Dedication of land to be used for highways improvements
- Employment and Training for Local People

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.

**97 Application 20/03428/FU - Land off Flax Place, Richmond Street, Marsh Lane and East Street, Richmond Hill, Leeds, LS9**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer referred to an application for two residential blocks including access, parking provision, drainage layout and landscaping at land off Flax Place, Richmond Street, Marsh Lane and East Street, Richmond Hill, Leeds. The application had been considered at the meeting of the City Plans Panel held on 7 January 2021 when Members had resolved not to accept the officer recommendation and that it be deferred to allow officers to prepare detailed reasons for refusal.

Site plans photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the report:

The following was highlighted:

- A further letter of objection had been received regarding the lack of benefits for the community and concerns regarding the design and massing.
- Affordable housing – Members were reminded that there had been a viability appraisal with regard to the provision of affordable housing. Reasons for refusal with respect to this were that the proposals did not fulfil policy requirements for affordable housing.
- Open space and landscaping –the development did not provide adequate open space and the landscaping scheme was of poor quality.
- Design and massing – the proposals were over dominant and failed to protect the visual amenity of the area.
- Community facilities – the development failed to provide facilities in terms of retail and GP/health provision.
- Parking and road safety – low provision of on-site parking would lead to parking on the adjacent site and surrounding highways leading to safety issues and damaging the amenity of others.

Members were invited to make comments. The following was highlighted:

- The five points individually did not give grounds for refusal but cumulatively highlighted that this proposal was not right for this site.
- Suggestion that condition 4 be amended with regard to provision of retail units and GP/health facilities.
- The application was inferior to what was previously proposed on the site.



The Area Planning Manager summarised the discussion.

**RESOLVED –**

**REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE REASONS SET OUT BELOW:**

- 1) The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development fails to provide the full policy requirement for affordable housing. The proposal is thereby contrary to Policy H5 of the Core Strategy, Policy GP5 of the UDP Review.
- 2) The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development fails to provide the full policy requirement for on-site open space and is without adequate provision of landscaped on-site green and amenity spaces, with the on-site landscaped green and amenity spaces being of poor quality, to the detriment of the amenity of future users of the spaces. The proposal is thereby contrary to Policies G5 and P12 of the Core Strategy, Policy GP5 of the UDP Review and Policy AVL8 of the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan.
- 3) The Local Planning Authority considers the design of the proposed development to be unacceptable in respect of its over-dominant massing and the architectural detailing to its facades and that as a result it fails to protect the visual, residential and general amenity of the area. The proposal is thereby contrary to Policy P10 of the Core Strategy, Policy GP5 of the UDP Review and the sustainable design guidance contained in the NPPF (paragraphs 124 and 130).
- 4) The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development fails to provide community facilities in the form a retail unit and/or a GP/health surgery. The proposal is thereby contrary Policy GP5 of the UDP Review and Policy AVL8 and AVL9 of the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan.
- 5) The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed development's low provision of car parking spaces on site would result in parking on the adjacent and surrounding highway network to the detriment of highway safety and the amenity of existing residential occupiers. The proposal is thereby contrary to Policy T2 of the Core Strategy, Policy GP5 of the UDP Review and the sustainable transport guidance contained in the NPPF (paragraph 109).

*(Councillor A Garthwaite left the meeting at the conclusion of this item).*

**98 Pre-Application 20/00476 - Leonardo Building/Thoresby House, 2 Rossington Street, Leeds, LS2 8HD**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of a

pre-application proposal for the change of use and extension to offices and creation of a new standalone building to form student accommodation at the Leonardo Building and Thoresby House, 2 Rossington Street, Leeds.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the proposals.

The following was highlighted:

- The site had been sold in two parts. Number 2 George Street had been sold separately to the Leonardo Building and Thoresby House and would be subject to a separate application.
- The proposed use of the building met policy requirements and sustainable re-use.
- There would be the erection of a new building on the car park adjacent in between Leonardo Building/Thoresby House and 2 George Street.
- Heritage of the area was a key design driver.
- It was proposed to retain key features of the buildings.
- There would be a façade replacement of the office side of the Leonardo Building.
- Massing of the buildings would be stepped down from Woodhouse Lane to Cookridge Street.
- Connectivity in and around the site and access through the site.
- Proposed floor plans within the buildings.
- Landscaping proposals.
- CGI Images of the proposals demonstrating views from the surrounding areas.

In response to Members comments and questions, the following was discussed:

- The mix of accommodation across the buildings would be attractive undergraduates, post graduates and young workers. There was a broad spectrum of accommodation to suit changing demands. In turn, the range of accommodation to be provided meant that it was adaptable if the demand for student accommodation altered in the long-term, thus the proposal was robust.
- Size and design of the accommodation units, including the materials proposed to be used at this stage.
- There would be detailing on the façade of the new building to the side facing the old school.
- Some concern regarding the height of the proposed new building and that it may be over dominant.
- The atrium would be retained with a new staircase between Leonardo and Thoresby buildings.
- The corner rooms facing onto Millennium Square would be amenity rooms.
- Ventilation and noise attenuation measures.

- The ground floor area of the new building would be aimed towards amenity and could include uses such as cafes and other community and public use. Thought could be given to active street frontages where possible.
- There would not be any car parking spaces available with the accommodation.

Members broadly supported the proposals and agreed that there was a need for more detailing on the new building.

In response to questions outlined in the report, Members considered that the proposed use of the site for student accommodation and loss of office accommodation was acceptable in principle. It was also considered that the living conditions within the student accommodation would be acceptable, subject to further details of the design and space standards being provided. The emerging principles in respect of design were supported, but with the comment from some Members to be noted that had raised concern regarding over-dominance.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and discussion be noted.

## **99 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday, 11 March at 1.30 p.m.