



SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

**Meeting to be held in Civic Hall, Leeds on
Thursday, 6th July, 2023
at 1.30 pm**

MEMBERSHIP

Councillors

C Campbell
R Finnigan
T Smith
E Taylor
J Garvani
H Bithell (Chair)
E Bromley
Buckley
N Manaka
A Rontree
P Wray

Please do not attend the meeting in person if you have symptoms of Covid-19 and please follow current public health advice to avoid passing the virus onto other people.

Note to observers of the meeting. To remotely observe this meeting, please click on the 'View the Meeting Recording' link which will feature on the meeting's webpage (linked below) ahead of the meeting. The webcast will become available at the commencement of the meeting.

<https://democracy.leeds.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=950&MId=12255&Ver=4>

We strive to ensure our public committee meetings are inclusive and accessible for all. If you are intending to observe a public meeting in-person, please advise us in advance of any specific access requirements that we need to consider by email (FacilitiesManagement@leeds.gov.uk). Please state the name, date, and start time of the committee meeting you will be observing and include your full name and contact details.

**Agenda compiled by:
Tasha Prosser
Natasha.Prosser@leeds.gov.uk
Governance Services
Civic Hall**

A G E N D A

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
1			<p>SITE VISIT LETTER</p> <p>APPEALS AGAINST REFUSAL OF INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS</p> <p>To consider any appeals in accordance with Procedure Rule 15.2 of the Access to Information Rules (in the event of an Appeal the press and public will be excluded)</p> <p>(*In accordance with Procedure Rule 15.2, written notice of an appeal must be received by the Head of Governance Services at least 24 hours before the meeting)</p>	

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
2			<p>EXEMPT INFORMATION - POSSIBLE EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC</p> <p>1 To highlight reports or appendices which officers have identified as containing exempt information, and where officers consider that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information, for the reasons outlined in the report.</p> <p>2 To consider whether or not to accept the officers recommendation in respect of the above information.</p> <p>3 If so, to formally pass the following resolution:-</p> <p>RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following parts of the agenda designated as containing exempt information on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information, as follows:-</p> <p>No exempt items or information have been identified on the agenda</p>	
3			<p>LATE ITEMS</p> <p>To identify items which have been admitted to the agenda by the Chair for consideration</p> <p>(The special circumstances shall be specified in the minutes)</p>	
4			<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS</p> <p>To disclose or draw attention to any interests in accordance with Leeds City Council’s ‘Councillor Code of Conduct’.</p>	
5			<p>APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE</p>	

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
6			<p>MINUTES - 8 JUNE 2023</p> <p>To receive and consider the minutes of the previous meeting held Thursday, 8th June 2023.</p>	7 - 10
7			<p>20/02710/FU - CARTWRIGHT HOUSE, SPRINGWELL ROAD, HOLBECK, LEEDS, LS12 1AX</p> <p>To receive and consider the attached report of the Chief Planning Officer regarding an application for demolition of existing building and construction of a 36 storey residential development with ancillary commercial space, landscaping, and external amenity space - Cartwright House, Springwell Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS12 1AX.</p>	11 - 42
8			<p>DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING</p> <p>To note the date and time of the next meeting as Thursday, 3rd August 2023 at 1.30 p.m.</p> <p><u>Third Party Recording</u></p> <p>Recording of this meeting is allowed to enable those not present to see or hear the proceedings either as they take place (or later) and to enable the reporting of those proceedings. A copy of the recording protocol is available from the contacts named on the front of this agenda.</p> <p>Use of Recordings by Third Parties– code of practice</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Any published recording should be accompanied by a statement of when and where the recording was made, the context of the discussion that took place, and a clear identification of the main speakers and their role or title. b) Those making recordings must not edit the recording in a way that could lead to misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the proceedings or comments made by attendees. In particular there should be no internal editing of published extracts; recordings may start at any point and end at any point but the material between those points must be complete. 	

To all Members of South and West
Plans Panel

Planning Services
The Leonardo Building
2 Rossington Street
Leeds
LS2 8HD

Contact: Steve Butler
Tel: 0113 224 3421
steve.butler@leeds.gov.uk

Our reference: SW Site Visits
Date: 22/06/2023

Dear Councillor

SITE VISIT – SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL – THURSDAY 6th July 2023

Prior to the meeting of the South and West Plans Panel on Thursday 6th July the following site visit will take place:

Time		
Depart Civic Hall 11.00		
Arrive 11.20 - Depart 11.40	20/02710/FU - Demolition of existing building and construction of a 36 Storey residential development with ancillary commercial space, landscaping and external amenity space - Cartwright House, Springwell Road, Holbeck	
12.00	Return Civic Hall	

Please notify Steve Butler (Tel: 3787950) if this should cause you any difficulties as soon as possible. Otherwise please meet in the Ante Chamber at 10.55 am.

Yours sincerely

Steve Butler
Group Manager
South and West

www.leeds.gov.uk

general enquiries 0113 222 4444



This page is intentionally left blank

SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 8TH JUNE, 2023

PRESENT: Councillor H Bithell in the Chair

Councillors C Campbell, R Finnigan,
T Smith, E Taylor, J Garvani, E Bromley,
Buckley, N Manaka, A Rontree and P Wray

SITE VISITS

Councillors C Campbell, T Smith, J Garvani, H Bithell, L Buckley and A Rontree attended the site visit earlier in the day.

1 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

2 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public

There were no exempt items.

3 Late Items

There were no formal late items.

4 Declarations of Interests

No interests were raised.

5 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies.

6 Minutes - 11 May 2023

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meeting held Thursday, 11th May 2023 be approved as an accurate record.

7 21/09266/RM - Former Airedale Mills, Moss Bridge Works, Town Street, Rodley, Leeds, LS13 1HP

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a Reserved Matters application for layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping for the erection of 67 dwellings pursuant to outline approval 18/01501/OT, Former Airedale Mills, Moss Bridge Works, Town Street, Rodley, Leeds, LS13 1HP. The application was presented before Members on 16th February 2023.

Issues presented at the previous Panel meeting included pavement parking, improved accessibility to greenspace, design, and environmental considerations.

The Legal Adviser to the Panel set out the procedure to be followed and outlined some preliminary matters.

Photographs and slides were shown throughout the officer presentation, and Panel members were provided with the following information:

- Airedale Mills formerly occupied the site, and it is positioned in a triangular form between the Leeds-Liverpool Canal to the south/south-west and the River Aire to the east/south-east. The northern boundary is the access road to the Rodley Nature Reserve which lies to the east.
- The surrounding area is mixed, with Mill Bridge Works on the opposite side of the Leeds Liverpool Canal and to the south-east of the site lies Airedale Wharf, a residential cul-de-sac. The access over the bridge also serves Rodley Cricket Club and Rodley Nature Reserve.
- Pictures presented showed the change in levels where the adopted road will be as well as existing mature trees. The development seeks to retain trees, as well as the installation of a new 3m ecology buffer. The ecology buffer will provide an 8m separation buffer from the development to River Aire. Additional mitigation measures are proposed including a cat mesh fencing to the gardens of the dwellings.
- The proposed development consists of mixed units (2, 3 and 4 bed dwellings), including attached, semi-detached and an apartment block (1 and 2 bed units). 51 dwellings in total, and a 16 unit apartment block. Minor design elements have been proposed to the units to incorporate stone heads and cills to provide consistency to the surrounding area, as well as general landscaping arrangements and tree planting in the street scene and to the front of a number of properties.
- The site layout has been amended, at the request of members, to reorientate plots 7-16 in order to provide frontages facing the River Aire along with changes to plot 33 to create a dual aspect, again facing the River Aire. Options to change the proposed townhouse properties were explored but were not amended due to the change in levels. Officers consider the current layout of these properties an appropriate design. Additionally, changes to these properties would leave insufficient space in the rear gardens.
- Central dwellings and the bungalow comply with accessibility standards.
- The greenspace to the rear of the apartment block will be made available for all residents in the proposed development. A 50,000 contribution is also proposed for on and off-site greenspace contribution.
- 10 affordable units have been proposed.

Members were informed that further representations have been received from a local ward councillor and Rodley Nature Reserve. Comments referred to the ecology buffer creating a space for habitats not to be removed and

comprehensive plans to be provided to outline how the area will be protected. The position of the drainage pipe isn't yet fixed on the plan, and Rodley Nature Reserve have been asked to be involved in the final positioning of the pipe. Further representations have also been received from Councillors Amanda and Andrew Carter, regarding safety and operational issues with the swing-bridge.

Further to questions from Panel Members, the following information was relayed:

- Proposals include the provision of air source heat pumps and water butts. The applicant did not explore solar panels as part of this application. A legal definition in terms of how the 10% energy generation to be met on site was provided; whereby energy can be generated through various measures and no further development can take place until the condition regarding EN1 being satisfied is met. The applicant has suggested that the condition can be met through air source heat pumps, if not, the condition cannot be discharged, but if breached appropriate enforcement action could be taken and a variation application will have to be submitted.
- Members of Panel raised concerns that the proposed parking to the bungalow is not adequate in terms of accessibility, and it was requested that two 'side by side' spaces be provided to the bungalow to provide maximum space in terms of access. Officers confirmed this can be incorporated and shown on a revised plan.
- There is no specific lighting scheme, and any lighting arrangements will be in consultation with the nature officer. The impact upon bats and ecology is mitigated through appropriate lighting.
- The Nature Reserve and Cricket Club have their own parking, and issues regarding parking as a result of the development, is not likely. There is space on the development for visitor parking and the site is policy compliant in regard to this.

Comments from Panel Members raised the following key issues:

- Assurances to be sought regarding enforceability of conditions relating to heat and energy generation. A request was made that figures are sought in terms of EN1 and EN2, for future applications.
- The layout of the site from the previous application has not been improved as a whole and it is felt that there is a missed opportunity in terms of the layout in relation to the surrounding canal and river.
- The proposed housing units do not meet the Neighbourhoods for Living Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and it was felt that the housing units lack security and does not provide an adequate amount of greenspace for future residents.
- Concerns regarding the single access point to the ecology buffer and a comment that maintenance is not required, and the buffer should not be tampered with. It was confirmed that the gate will remain locked and is simply a point of access in emergencies. Additionally, there were concerns regarding the implementation of the fence prior to the first occupation, and potential damage caused to the ecology buffer from machinery. Further to this, officers confirmed that the applicant is

agreeable to a condition that identifies exclusion zones that will be fenced off.

- The final decision of where the rainwater drain is situated should be confirmed in consultation with Rodley Nature Reserve. Officers confirmed that Rodley Nature Reserve will be involved in the process, and they can be consulted. However, the ultimate decision lies within the responsibility of the local authority.
- Whilst it was acknowledged that access is not considered as part of the application, this remained a concern and posed possible security implications subject to the swing-bridge not operating as it should.

A motion was put forward to move an amendment to the officer recommendation. To approve the application subject to an additional condition regarding a scheme for signage to make clear that greenspace to the rear of the flat block was open to all residents to be submitted and approved by the LPA and to extend the delegation to include the submission of a revised layout relating to the bungalow to secure 'side by side' parking for disabled residents. This motion was moved and seconded, and therefore it was: **RESOLVED** – To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the addition of a condition relating to signage to the greenspace and revised bungalow/parking layout.

8 Date and Time of the Next Meeting

To note the date and time of the next meeting as Thursday, 6th July 2023 at 1.30 p.m.

The meeting concluded at 14.45.



Originator: Stephen Littlejohn

Tel: 0113 378 8885

Report of the Chief Planning Officer

SOUTH & WEST PLANS PANEL

Date: 6th July 2023

Subject: 20/02710/FU - Demolition of existing building and construction of a 36 Storey residential development with ancillary commercial space, landscaping and external amenity space - Cartwright House, Springwell Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS12 1AX

Developer: City Life Holdings 5 Ltd c/o ID Planning, 9 York Place, Leeds, LS1 2DS

Electoral Wards Affected:

Beeston & Holbeck

Ward Members have been consulted.

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

RECOMMENDATION: This report is brought to Plans Panel for information. Officers will present the details of the emerging scheme to allow Members to consider and comment on the proposals at this stage and ahead of a formal plans panel presentation.

INTRODUCTION:

- 1 The proposal relates to a major residential-led scheme of 402 apartments over 36 storeys with ancillary commercial to the ground floor in Holbeck on the fringe of Leeds city centre.
- 2 The scheme is presented by the developer as a second phase of development associated with the adjacent development for 224 apartments over 16 storeys and a commercial unit at ground floor, previously approved under application reference 16/05198/FU in June 2017 and includes some shared external amenity space.

- 3 The proposed scheme is brought to South and West Plans Panel, following an earlier pre-application presentation of the proposals by the applicant at City Plans Panel, presented on 21st November 2019. The scheme presented at pre-application stage differed substantively from the scheme presented here, being for a block of 24 storeys with a different use of materials.
- 4 Members were supportive with the principle of developing this site for combined residential and commercial use and were of the opinion that the tower block proposed would be acceptable in view of wider streetscape views, taking account of both the existing and emerging context.
- 5 A copy of the minutes of that meeting are appended to this report as Appendix A.
- 6 The proposed scheme has been brought to South and West Plans Panel for information due to the length of time since the initial pre-application presentation and the subsequent changes to the scheme. It would be beneficial to put the final scheme before South and West Plans Panel at this stage due to the main impacts and benefits being focused in the Beeston and Holbeck ward which falls within the South and West Plans Panel area. This report is intended to inform Panel Members to allow them to make comments on various aspects of the proposal.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

- 7 The site lies close to the junction of Whitehall Road, Springwell Road and Springwell Street, which is located in an area of transition just outside the boundary of the designated City Centre, the boundary of which aligns with the railway line just to the north-east. The site is also located along the Whitehall Road corridor, which links traffic (including regular public transport) to and from Leeds Railway Station.
- 8 The site is currently occupied by low rise (two storey), mid to late 20th century commercial buildings, which appear to be in partial / limited employment use. Springwell Road itself contains further late 20th century commercial and office blocks, generally two / three storey or similar.
- 9 To the north-east of the railway line / junction, within the City Centre, there are partially built sites containing modern offices (Doncaster Monkbridge / "Latitude") and cleared land (Globe Road / "Green Bank").
- 10 The site lies in an area which was historically more characterised by heavy industry and the railway. As the historical industries have ceased, many nearby sites have been cleared and benefit from planning consents for large, new mixed uses which include much residential development.
- 11 Heading north-east, towards Leeds Railway Station, there are a number of large-scale office blocks currently under construction along the Whitehall Road corridor, in particular at Wellington Place (MEPC). Other recently completed developments include a new Premier Inn Hotel, and a large mixed used development ('Central Square') on the former Lumiere site. More directly south-west of the site is a relatively modern 4 storey mixed use block

which accommodates a carpet and sandwich shop on the ground floor, with flats above. Further south-west along Whitehall Road, some warehouse and car showroom buildings are also evident in the locality.

- 12 To the immediate north-east side of the boundary, a Network Rail goods yard and sidings exists connecting with the Whitehall Rail junction. This is allocated in the Natural Resources & Waste Local Plan. The main part of the sidings is currently operated by Biffa Waste Services who are in effect operating a waste transfer facility which deposits Council street cleaning waste products by lorry and which is removed during the early hours of the morning by freight trains. A second part of the area is currently used by Network Rail for other uses including track maintenance trucks and signal design teams housed in portacabin blocks. An older warehouse style building also exists, which is largely unused. Should a viable further freight operation (or expansion of the current operation) be demonstrated it is possible that the use of these sidings could be further expanded.
- 13 The western edge of Holbeck Conservation Area lies at its closest point, approximately 100m to the south of the site. The Holbeck, South Bank Urban Village boundary lies at its closest point around 225m to the south-east on Water Lane. Holbeck (Lower Order Local Centre) at its closest point lies about 475m to the south.

PROPOSAL:

- 14 The proposed development is for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a 36 Storey residential development with ancillary commercial space, landscaping and external amenity space.
- 15 The development provides 402 residential apartments broken down into the following:
- 194 x 1 bed apartments (48%)
 - 169 x 2 bed apartments (42%)
 - 39 x 3 bed apartments – (10%)
 - 88m² of flexible commercial floorspace providing an active frontage at ground level
 - Secure Cycle Storage; space to accommodate up to 424 bicycles; 400 bike racks and 24 Sheffield hoop style racks
 - Secure parking for 18 cars including 2 disabled spaces. All parking spaces to have an Electric Vehicle Charging point.
 - Secure parking for 14 Motorcycle spaces
 - Communal terrace with a Gross Internal Floor Area of 32,794 sqm and a Net Internal Floor Area of 22,870 sqm
- 16 All of the residential apartments are designed to meet or exceed the nationally described space standards as set by Leeds Core Strategy Policy H9. The proposed development also incorporates a communal garden sky garden terrace at roof level providing panoramic views of the city centre and beyond.
- 17 The Proposed Development provides 7% on site affordable housing units; 29 units in total with a mix of 1-bed, 2-bed and 3-bed units, located on floors 02,03,04 & 30.

18 The proposal will include a wind mitigation scheme which is evolving as outlined below.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

19 PREAPP/18/00245 - Demolition of existing building and creation of residential development (24 stories) with 288 apartments and a commercial unit. Will serve as a second phase to the adjacent radius development 16/05198/FU – Panel Members accepted the principle of a tall residential building in this location.

20 16/05198/FU - Demolition of existing buildings and erect multi-level development comprising 224 apartments and commercial unit with associated car parking and landscaping Approved – 07.06.17 (Applications for various discharge of condition applications approved in 2019 Refs: 19/03777/COND, 19/04105/COND and 19/05498/COND) *Adjacent site*

21 On the adjacent railway sidings site, the following is noted: 18/00775/FU - Waste treatment facility for the recycling and transfer of street cleaning residues including ancillary buildings and external fixed plant. Approved - 15.02.2019 (operative on site)

HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS:

22 A proposal for a 24 or 30 storey residential block constructed in brick was put before City Plans Panel on 21.11.19. Members were supportive in principle of a tall residential block in this location. The proposal differed from the current proposal in terms of height, landscaping and balcony provision and it is considered that the current proposal is a markedly different scheme to the one put before Panel. Given the additional height and increase in number of dwellings, the difference in building materials and removal of external landscaping and balconies, along with the amount of time since Members at City Centre Panel came to a view, it has been decided between Officers and Panel Chairs that the current full application should be determined at South and West Plans Panel. In this way the scheme for a tall structure will have been looked at by Members both in a City Centre context and with regard to impacts and benefits in the area outside the City Centre, specifically in Beeston and Holbeck.

23 The application originally came in at 46 storeys. This was reduced to 36 by negotiation with Officers and the relevant re-consultations took place. Consequently further negotiations took place with regard to impacts on heritage, which continued from discussions relating to the 46 storey version of the proposal.

24 Further negotiations have also taken place with Officers with regard to provision of off-site highway works and with regard to wind mitigation. Issues related to the adjacent railway siding and associated waste transfer use currently operational on the site have been discussed and appropriate mitigation with regard to noise and odour agreed upon.

25 An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion has been carried out, concluding that significant wide ranging environmental effects are not expected to arise

from the proposed development, either individually or cumulatively with other developments, and therefore an EIA is not required.

26 CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Statutory

- Yorkshire Water: No objection subject to conditions.
- Highways: Further information and amendments required and subsequently provided. No objection subject to conditions and S106 obligations.
- HSE: Does not fall under the remit of Planning Gateway One due to it being validated prior to 01.08.21.
- Leeds Bradford Airport: Required further information which was provided. No objection subject to informative.
- Network Rail: Expresses concerns with the proximity of residential development adjacent to the boundary of the site. The Network Rail site is designated as a Supplemental Strategic Freight Site, which means that Network Rail is obliged to make the land available to any freight company where a viable freight use is demonstrated and has no authority to limit the nature of the operations on land, hence current occupation of the site by Railfreight and Biffa for the movement of waste by rail. Network Rail point out that all rail operators have a statutory defence against noise nuisance and they question the impact the necessity for mechanical ventilation and non-opening windows could have upon the housing environments and amenities of future occupiers. Any future occupiers of adjacent sites will be unable to seek redress for noise nuisance through Environmental Protection legislation. If the LPA is minded to approve the application Network Rail asks for conditions to be added relating to various other potential impacts such as lighting, drainage and boundary treatments.
- Holbeck Neighbourhood Forum: No response

Non-statutory

- Education Services: No response

District Heating Network: It is likely that Leeds PIPES heat network will be available in this area in the next 3 years. However, if the building has been designed using an entirely electric system it is understandable that a future connection is not considered viable.

Sustainable Development Unit: Further information required and supplied.

Flood Risk Management: Further information required and subsequently agreed. No objections subject to conditions.

Historic England: **02.02.20** Required submission of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA)

14.12.20 (Following the submission of the HIA):

Conservation Areas: Agree with the HIA assessment that the proposed tower would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of Holbeck Conservation Area and the Canal Basin Conservation Area, although it is not clear exactly the extent of the visual impact with regard to the Grade II* listed Midland Mill.

Temple Mill, Grade I Listed: Require confirmation that the proposed tower will be screened from key views.

Leeds Minster, Grade 1 Listed: Require further assessment/ verification of south and west-facing views of the church.

Parkinson Building: Plate 110 [in the HIA] shows how the proposed new tower would compete in terms of colour and angle to the Parkinson tower.

Where less than substantial harm has been identified to the significance of heritage assets, this should be given considerable weight in the planning balance.

19.07.22 (Following reduction in height):

Reiterate previous advice relating to Marshall's Mill, Temple Mill and Leeds Minster as the HIA has not been updated.

18.10.22 (Following updated HIA)

Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds, however the following still needs to be addressed: No verified views have been provided for previous issues raised relating to Marshall's Mill, Temple Mill and Leeds Minster. The Authority should consider the potential impact on these assets and be satisfied that the level of impact would be in line with the conclusions of the revised HIA. In reaching a decision the LPA will need to consider whether there are any public benefits arising from these proposals which outweigh any harm to the significance of heritage assets as identified by the HIA.

- Design Team: Do not consider they can support the application due to the scale.
- Landscape Team: Object to the application on the grounds of impacts on the local green corridor to the rear of the site, overshadowing effects on the greener development to the north and lack of greenspace/amenity space for residents.
- Access Officer: Pleased to see the M4(3) units include 3 beds and 2 beds. Ideally there would also be some smaller 1 beds available as H10 asked for choice of type of unit.
- Local Plans: Discussion of policy implications which contributes to the assessment in the main body of the report.
- Conservation Team: No objections with regard to heritage.
- Environmental Health: No objection subject to conditions.
- West Yorkshire Archaeology: No apparent significant archaeological impacts
- Contaminated Land: No objection subject to conditions
- Minerals Team: Note that the adjacent rail siding is protected under Policy Minerals 13 for rail freight use and recommend that consideration be given to the potential impacts of such a 24/7 intensive industrial use. The applicant should also demonstrate how the use and operation of Site 13 would not be prejudiced by the proposed development.
- WYCA: Support the principle of residential development with ancillary commercial space in this location and the significant contribution it will make to increasing housing

growth and employment opportunities within Leeds and the wider City Region. Support the provision of cycle storage and the application of a Residential Travel Plan Fund for the site. Suggest that the level of motor cycle parking provision seems high. Support the provision of affordable housing.

Influencing Travel Behaviour:	S106 obligations to be agreed
Environmental Studies:	No objection subject to a condition relating to glazing specification and ventilation strategy.
West Yorkshire Police:	No response
Employment and Skills:	Employment and skills targets to be included in the S106 agreement.
Ramblers Association:	No response
Nature Team:	Raise some concerns addressed in the report
Wind:	The proposed scheme includes a number of mitigation measures that are necessary to control wind safety on and off site. LCC should ensure that the proposed measures are acceptable.
Environment Agency:	No response

Public Response

27 The application was advertised in the Yorkshire Evening Post on 05.06.20 and by site notice on 27.05.20. 7 letters of objection were received and 5 letters of support.

28 Issues Raised

Objections

- Concerns re height at 46 storeys
- Concerns re provision of associated infrastructure
- Have wind and flooding been taken into account?
- Vertical access – provision of sufficient lifts and stairs (Civic Trust)
- Lack of daylight to at least 2 flats per floor and lack of natural ventilation (Civic Trust)
- Totally enclosed lobbies with too many units (Civic trust)
- Too little outdoor open space (Civic Trust)
- Lack of local amenities (Civic Trust)
- Sustainability credentials (Civic Trust)

- Key view identified in neighbourhood plan along Holbeck Top Moor side neglected (Civic Trust)
- New block over-dominant with the adjacent scheme (Civic Trust)
- Concerns re space standards
- Concerns re means of escape
- Concerns re impact on Holbeck Conservation Area
- No private amenity space
- Substandard internal layout with too many flats round a core
- Developer has proposed three other schemes in Holbeck which haven't been delivered

Support

- New business opportunities
- First glass tower in Leeds
- Design well-mannered and of high quality (Civic Trust)

29 Ward Members provided the following responses:

30 As three Ward Councillors we would like to object to this development. We feel the following:

- Overall we feel that it is too big and would dominate the skyline in some parts of Holbeck.
- There clearly is not enough parking and we believe that this could have an impact on Holbeck residents. We do not believe it is close enough to the City Centre that people opt to not have cars.
- There isn't even enough secure bike storage for everyone who is expected to live in the building, which seems particularly unhelpful.
- Not enough community green space. While there is a small amount of green space available for residents, this is very exclusive and does not provide a benefit to the wider community.
- We are concerned about the wind impact given Bridgewater Place and fear future mitigations could be unsightly (but necessary).
- The project meets only the minimum social housing requirements

31 The application was then re-advertised, after amendments, by site notice only on 27.05.23. No further representations were received.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

32 **Statutory Context**

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For the purposes of decision making at this site, the Development Plan for Leeds currently comprises the following documents:

- The Leeds Core Strategy (Adopted November 2014 and as amended by the Core Strategy Selective Review 2019)
- Saved Leeds Unitary Development Plan Policies (UDPR 2006)
- The Natural Resources & Waste Local Plan (NRWLP 2013) including revised policies Minerals 13 and 14 (2015).
- Leeds Site Allocations Plan (SAP 2019)
- Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan (2018)

These development plan policies are supplemented by supplementary planning guidance and documents.

33 **Development Plan**

34 Leeds Core Strategy (CS)

Leeds Core Strategy sets out strategic level policies and vision to guide the delivery of development investment decisions and the overall future of the district. The site is located outside the City Centre boundary. The most relevant policies are set out below:

- Spatial Policy 1 Location and scale of development.
- Spatial Policy 2 hierarchy of centres and spatial approach to retailing, offices, intensive leisure and culture
- Spatial Policy 6 Housing requirement and allocation of housing land
- Spatial policy 7 distribution of housing land and allocations
- Spatial Policy 8 Economic development priorities
- Spatial Policy 9 Employment
- Spatial Policy 11 Transport infrastructure investment priorities such as pedestrian improvements
- Policy CC3 Improving connectivity between the City Centre and Neighbouring Communities.
- Policy H3 Housing Density
- Policy H4 Housing Mix
- Policy H5 Affordable Housing
- Policy P10 Design
- Policy P11 Heritage
- Policy P12 Landscape
- Policy T1 Transport management
- Policy T2 Accessibility requirements and new development
- Policy H9 Space Standards
- Policy H10 Accessible Dwellings
- Policy EN1 Carbon dioxide reduction
- Policy EN2 Sustainable design and construction

- Policy EN4 District heating
- Policy EN5 Managing flood risk
- Policy EN8 Electrical Vehicle Charging
- Policy G5 Open space provision
- Policy G8 Protection of important species and habitats
- Policy G9 Biodiversity Improvements

35 **Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review 2006 (UDPR) Saved Policies**

Relevant Saved Policies include:

- Policy GP5 all planning considerations
- Policy N25 Boundary Treatments
- Policy BD2 / BD5 design and siting of new buildings
- Policy LD1 landscaping

36 **Leeds Natural Resources and Waste DPD**

The plan sets out where land is needed to enable the City to manage resources, like minerals, energy, waste and water over the next 15 years, and identifies specific actions which will help use natural resources in a more efficient way.

Relevant policies include:

- Air 1 management of air quality through new development
- Water 1 water efficiency including sustainable drainage
- Water 7 surface water run-off
- Water 2 protection of water quality
- Water 4 development in flood risk areas
- Water 6 flood risk assessments
- Land 1 contaminated land
- Land 2 development and trees
- Minerals 2 sand and gravel
- Minerals 3 coal safeguarding
- Minerals 13 Transport Modes

37 **Relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance (SPD/SPG):**

- SPD Tall Buildings Design Guide (2010) and Consultation Draft (2019)
- SPD Building for Tomorrow Today: Sustainable Design and Construction (2011)
- Transport SPD (2023)
- SPD Accessible Leeds (2016)
- SPG Neighbourhoods for Living (2003, 2015)
- Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan (2018)

38 **Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan**

- R1: Continuing Regeneration
- C3: Improving Health and Wellbeing
- H1: Affordable Housing
- H2: Housing Mix
- E1: New employment uses
- G1: Strategic Green Infrastructure and Local Green Corridors (SG1 – Viaduct)
- G4: Improving the Public Realm
- HC7: Positive Design
- T1: Increasing Opportunities for walking and cycling
- T2: Reducing air pollution and congestion

39 **Site Allocations Plan**

The Site Allocations Plan was adopted in July 2019. Following a statutory challenge, Policy HG2, so far as it relates to sites which immediately before the adoption of the SAP were within the Green Belt, has been remitted to the Secretary of State and is to be treated as not adopted. All other policies within the SAP remain adopted and should be afforded full weight.

The SAP identifies the adjacent site, with which the application site shares some land, as general employment (SG-21). The adjacent site has planning permission for 224 apartments which has been implemented.

40 **National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF)**

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied (para 1) and is a material consideration in planning decisions (para 2). It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development (para 7). So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (paras 10-11). It states that decision makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible (para 38).

42 The Framework sets policies on the following issues which are relevant to this planning application proposal (including section numbers):

- 2 Achieving sustainable development (paras 7-14)
- 4 Decision making (paras 38 - 58)
- 5. delivering a sufficient supply of homes (60-80)
- 6 Building a strong competitive economy (81-83)
- 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities (92-97)
- 9 Promoting sustainable transport (104-113)
- 11 Making effective use of land (119-125)
- 12 Achieving well designed places (126-135)
- 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change and flooding (152-169)
- 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment (174-188)
- 16 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (including paras 189-208)

Other Legislation

43 Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the “Listed Building Act 1990”) reads:

“In considering whether to grant planning permission... for a development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority...shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses”

KEY ISSUES

Principle of Development

Employment Uses

44 The site contains a use currently/last recognised for employment purposes. The site is also recognised in the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan as being part of a wider area along the Whitehall Road axis in which light industrial uses are encouraged. The site is recognised as not being in an employment shortfall area. The adjacent site, considered by the applicant to be ‘Phase 1’ of a scheme for two tower blocks, is allocated within the SAP for employment uses, although this allocation was given after permission for a residential scheme was granted on the site.

45 Although the proposal site would contain a commercial use at ground floor this is likely to be retail rather than light industrial and would be ancillary to the residential scheme above. Policy EC3 in the Core Strategy states that proposals for a change of use on sites which were last used or allocated for employment will only be permitted where the proposal would not result in the loss of a deliverable employment site necessary to meet the employment needs during the plan period. Spatial Policy 9 requires a minimum of 493ha of general employment land. The site is only 0.3 ha in size, not allocated for employment in the SAP and adjacent to an implemented housing site.

46 While Policy E1 in the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan encourages the development of employment uses in the locality, this is subject to a consideration of amenity issues. The proposal would also contribute to the delivery of policy R1 which states that development should seek to make Holbeck a more attractive and healthier place to live and work through providing, amongst other things, providing a choice of quality but affordable housing, creating the opportunities for a variety of local jobs in an improved environment, enhancing green infrastructure and local greenspace and improving connections to the city centre and adjoining neighbourhoods.

Residential Use

47 Policy H2 in the Core Strategy states that new housing development will be acceptable on non-allocated land, providing that the number of dwellings does not exceed the capacity of transport, educational and health infrastructure and should accord with accessibility standards. It is noted that objectors have raised the issue of educational and health infrastructure.

48 It is not considered that the proposal exceeds the capacity of transport, educational and health infrastructure. Highways have raised no objections to the proposal with regard to the impact on the local highway network. CIL contributions would be made available to provide improvements to infrastructure such as education provision and other improvements. However, given the size of the units proposed, and location of the development it is considered the demand on education provision would not be substantial. It is also considered the proposal complies with the adopted Accessibility Standards. The site lies adjacent to the boundary of the city centre and is within a 10-15 minutes' walk to local services both within the city centre and Holbeck. Imgram Road Primary School (within Holbeck) is within a 20 minute walk and direct bus service from the site, and Ruth Gorse Academy, Black Bull Street (secondary school) is also within a direct 30 minute walk from the site.

49 With regard to housing density, policy H3 in the Core Strategy requires net densities within the City Centre and fringe (defined as up to 500m from the boundary) to be as a minimum 65 dwellings per hectare. The proposed development comes in at over 1200 units per hectare and therefore meets the minimum density requirement.

Retail uses

50 The proposal includes 88sqm of 'flexible commercial floorspace' which would be restricted by condition to include E, F1 and F2 only. Such uses would provide an active ground floor frontage, generate footfall, provide vibrancy to the development and serve the residents and users of the scheme in the main but would also be open to the local community. Any retail space would be limited in floorspace and range of goods (i.e. small scale convenience retail only where within Class E of the general Permitted Development Order) and on this basis is not considered to undermine the vitality of the prime shopping area within the city centre; providing a direct and targeted element of convenience retail / food eatery types uses to support the other proposed uses in the scheme and vicinity of it. Control of this matter could be addressed by conditions.

Minerals

51 The proposal site is located within mineral safeguarding areas for both sand/gravel and coal, protected by policies Minerals 2 & 3 in the NRWLP. However, at 0.3ha in a built-up area with an emerging residential context, the footprint of the site is too small to feasibly extract either mineral on a commercial basis.

52 The proposal site is located adjacent to a protected railway siding covered under policy Minerals 13. The site is protected from development that would prejudice its long-term ability for rail freight. It has been argued by Network Rail that a residential development so close to the site could prejudice its long-term survival. However, Network Rail also point out that all rail operators have a statutory defence against noise nuisance which would suggest that the site is not in jeopardy by complaints generated by an adjacent use. Furthermore, case law relating to 'agent of change' principle has set a precedent in this regard in which the later development would be responsible for its own protection with regard to amenity. This will be taken up later in the report but in terms of principle, it is not considered that the terms of policy Minerals 13 are breached.

Tall Buildings

- 53 The location of tall buildings in and around the city centre is governed by the adopted Tall Buildings Design Guide SPD. There is also an updated version of the SPD in progress which is currently out for consultation and carries some weight at the current time. At 36 storeys the proposed building does fall into this category and, although the applicant argues that it is one of a pair, the first of which has already been approved, it should be pointed out that the approved building is only 16 storeys in height and the design steps up to this in an interesting way. In terms of principle, however, the approval of a 16 storey building adjacent does form part of the emerging context of the surrounding area, as do the developments to the north just across the railway line. The proposed tower would form part of a cluster with developments at Globe Road, Latitude and Whitehall Riverside, as well as the adjacent block currently under construction, albeit at a much larger scale. The Tall Buildings Design Guide as adopted states that groups of high buildings are to be preferred to a few dispersed or lonely solutions, so the scale does become relevant and Members are asked to take a view on whether or not the scale of the proposed is in keeping with, or goes against the emerging context.

Question 1. Do Members continue to support the principle of a residential tower in this location?

Question 2. If so, do Members support the height of the tower at 36 storeys?

Design and Heritage

- 54 Policy P10 in the Core Strategy states that new development for buildings and spaces should be based on a thorough contextual analysis and provide good design that is appropriate to its location, scale and function. This is complemented by guidance in the Tall Buildings Design Guide (TBDG). Policy P11 states that development proposals will be expected to demonstrate a full understanding of historic assets affected. Where appropriate, heritage statements assessing the significance of assets, the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will be required to be submitted by developers to accompany development proposals. Concerns have been raised by Ward Members about impact on the skyline and by other objectors in relation to impacts on Holbeck Conservation Area.
- 55 While the Council's Design Team have expressed concerns about the height of development, a previous iteration of the proposal, at 24 storeys was considered acceptable in principle by City Centre Plans Panel at pre-application stage. It is noted that the Civic Trust expressed concerns over the height at 46 storeys and this has now been reduced to 36. This is still a tall structure and it has to be said that the relationship between the proposed and the adjacent development known as 'One Springwell Gardens' presented as 'Phase 1' of the development is slightly awkward. Whereas the first Phase is being developed out in brick in a stepped arrangement which curves around the boundary of Springwell Rd and Whitehall Rd, the proposed sits nestled within the curve. There is a striking contrast between height, shape and materials between the two, with the proposed development being a tall, sleek losenge, faced in glass with metallic panelling. It is a matter

of opinion as to whether or not this contrast works but the overall impact is certainly less visually heavy than it would be using brick throughout. The simple form of the building is elegant, with a crown element at the top and brick-plinth element to the ground floor. The ground floor frontage will include the reception area and a commercial use, creating an active frontage at ground level. The requirement for wind mitigation, also picked up by Ward Members, has been looked at closely and has gone through a number of iterations. The proposed structures, which are still developing in design, will add an element of interest to the streetscene by providing distinctive sculptural forms. However, the amount of mitigation required may undermine this. This is taken up below in the 'Wind Mitigation' section of the report.

56 In terms of longer views, the impact on the skyline of Leeds will be significant but the views considered important within the TBDG have been accounted for in the applicant's Design and Access Statement. The adopted TBDG states that redirection and restraint is required with tall buildings so that the city can develop as part of a meaningful composition, especially when seen from a distance. The proposed building will be seen from longer distances, in terms of its height, location and design as having a visual connection with Bridgewater Place to the east, providing a lighter contrast to the emerging tall but less high structures being constructed in brick around the southern part of the city centre.

57 With regard to Holbeck Conservation Area and the wider heritage impacts around the City Centre, a Heritage Impact Assessment has been submitted which takes into account 55 heritage assets and 10 key views. It has been demonstrated that the proposed development will sustain the significance of the vast majority of heritage assets and key views. In the following cases, the proposed development was found to cause less than substantial harm to significance:

- Former Yorkshire Bank, Holbeck Lane (non-designated)
- Holbeck Conservation Area (designated)
- Central Area Canal Wharf Conservation Area (designated)
- View from Cabbage Hill, Upper Wortley (key view)

58 Further views were requested by Historic England, relating to Marshalls Mill, Temple Mill and Leeds Minster, some images have been provided and the only slight concern remains with the impact on Leeds Minster as shown on Plate 96 in the Heritage Statement. The Statement argues that the 1.7km distance between the proposed Tower would mitigate the impact on the key view west towards the Minster and it is accepted that this would most likely be the case. Neither Historic England nor the Council's Conservation Team have objections to the proposal with regard to heritage.

59 A further technical point relating to the findings of the Heritage Impact Assessment is that legislation and the NPPF require there to be a wider justification in terms of public benefits where there is less than substantial harm to heritage assets, which has been concluded in the report. NPPF Paragraph 202 states that where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case the applicant argues that the wider benefits include:

- Redevelopment of a vacant, brownfield site in a highly sustainable location;
- Erection of a high-quality, landmark building which will make a positive contribution to the architectural diversity of the Leeds skyline and catalyse further regeneration within the Holbeck area;
- Provision of 402 no. residential units (194 no. one bed, 169 no. two bed and 39 no. three bed apartments), making a significant contribution to the Council's 5- year supply of housing land and encouraging sustainable, city centre living;
- Provision of 88sqm of flexible commercial units, creating opportunities for employment within the site;
- Creation of employment opportunities throughout the construction phase of the development, as well as in the ongoing maintenance of the proposed building;
- Creation of indirect demand for local services in association with the future residents of the building

To this could also be added the on-site provision of Affordable Housing and a significant contribution towards off-site Green space improvements.

Question 3. Do Members support the design of tower including use of materials?

Housing Mix

- 60 Policy H4 in the Core Strategy stipulates that developments should include an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes to address needs measured over long term, taking into account the nature of the development and the character of the location. For developments of over 250 units a Housing Needs Assessment should be submitted, addressing all tenures so that the needs of the locality can be taken into account at the time of the development. The supporting text to the policy provides a guide as to the preferred housing mix. The supporting text also states that policy H4 aims to ensure that the new housing delivered in Leeds is of a range of types and sizes to meet the mix of households expected over the plan period, taking account of SHMA preferences and, crucially, difference in demand in different parts of the city. A scheme of 100% flats, for example, may be appropriate in a particular urban context.
- 61 In this case the proposal relies on 100% flats and would be undeliverable otherwise. Although the location is city centre fringe, this is considered acceptable as it forms part of a general movement south of city-scale tall buildings and is considered to have a positive impact in terms of the regeneration of the area.
- 62 With regard to size, the table provided in support of policy H4 suggests that, across the whole of Leeds, the target is a mix of 10% 1 bed, 50% 2 bed, 30% 3 bed and 10% 4 bed+. The current proposal offers a mix of 48% 1 bed, 42% 2 bed, 10% 3 bed and no 4 bed+. This fits within the maximum provision suggested in the supplementary table to H4 for 1 & 2 bed units and within the minimum allowance for 4 bed+ but falls short of the guidance for a minimum of 20% 3 bed units. The applicant justifies this level of provision within their Housing Needs Assessment by arguing that lower numbers of 3 bed units have been previously approved by the local planning authority. The applicant then goes on to argue that the 10% figure is significantly higher than the existing city centre provision which is at just 1% 3 beds and refers to other schemes in the area.

- 63 Policy H4 itself does not require compliance with the supplementary table which serves as guidance only, but the policy does require consideration of the nature of the development and the character of the location. The high density means that the development does provide 39 x 3 bed units which is not an insignificant number of family units. With regard to the form of development and character of the location, it should be borne in mind that the level of amenity space provided within the development is not necessarily geared towards children and would likely appeal to a different demographic. Green space provision in general within the locality, however, would be improved by the contribution provided under policy G4 (see below). The applicant argues that the proposed mix is in line with the aspirations of policy H2 in the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan which states that single bedroom properties should be prioritised, subject to an updated local Housing Market Assessment where appropriate.
- 64 Although the Housing Needs Assessment as submitted does not provide a local Housing Market Assessment, it does rely on demonstrating that the proposed development would be consistent with other recently approved developments of a similar nature.

Question 4. Do Members support the proposed Housing Mix?

Affordable & Accessible Housing

- 65 The applicant has stated that the proposed development would consist entirely of Public for Sale housing (PfS). As such, Policy H5 in the Core Strategy requires 7% on-site provision, with 40% affordable housing for Intermediate or equivalent affordable tenures and 60% affordable housing for Social Rented or equivalent affordable tenures. The affordable units should be a pro-rata mix in terms of sizes and house types of the total housing provision and they should be suitably integrated throughout the development site. Out of a total of 402 units, the proposal includes 14 x 1 bed and 12 x 2 bed and 3 x 3 bed. This works out to 7% with an acceptable mix. The full provision, along with the 40/60 tenure split would be secured within the S106 agreement.
- 66 With regard to the integration of the units throughout the development, 26 no 1 & 2 bed units are to be provided on floors 2, 3 & 4 and 3no 3 bed units are to be provided on floor 30. It should be pointed out that all 3 bed units for the development are to be provided on floors 30 – 33. Members are asked for their view on the integration of the units.
- 66 Policy H10 requires 30% of dwellings to meet the requirements of M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of Part M Volume 1 of the Building Regulations and 2% of dwellings to meet the requirements of M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' of Part M volume 1 of the Building Regulations. Where the scale of development would generate more than one accessible dwelling, the mix of sizes, types and tenures of M4(2) and M4(3), unless the applicant can demonstrate an evidenced need locally to provide accessible housing in dwellings of a particular size, type and/or tenure. Drawings illustrate the proposed provision of accessible housing to be policy compliant in terms of number and this can be supplemented by an appropriate condition with regard to mix.

Question 5. Do members support the provision of Affordable Housing across floors 2,3,4 and 30?

Residential Amenity

- 67 With regard to space standards, Policy H9 in the Core Strategy provides standards regarding gross internal floor area and built-in storage. With regard to floor area, plans demonstrate that the proposal is policy compliant in this regard, with a commitment in the Design and Access Statement to fulfilling the other terms of the condition. This can be supplemented by a planning condition to ensure full compliance.
- 68 With regard to available light, Policy BD5 in the UDP states that all new buildings should be designed with consideration given to both their own amenity and that of their surroundings. This should include usable space, privacy and satisfactory penetration of daylight and sunlight. The Civic Trust raised the point that, on any typical floor plan, the two pairs of flats opening into the recess will be in the shadow of the two wings on either side on an almost permanent basis. The applicant has taken this on board with the amended design, which lowers the original scheme from 46 to 36 storeys and changes the internal layout to provide more spacious corridors and, instead of recesses, the design has changed to create a slight projection which doesn't block the sunlight from any windows.
- 69 There will undoubtedly be shadow cast between the proposed development and One Springwell Gardens which sits to the north-west. The sun, travelling from east to west along a trajectory to the south would take direct sunlight away from all of the windows on the eastern elevation of One Springwell Gardens. This will add to the domineering relationship between the two. However, the applicant argues that One Springwell Gardens was designed with the proposed development in mind, which is why the former development included roof-terraces which face south, with the curvature of the building following the trajectory of the sun during the afternoon. This allows for extended hours of sunlight within the communal podium space which should afford the apartments in One Springwell Gardens sufficient, if not direct, sunlight. There has been no Sunlight Assessment submitted to provide any further clarity or comfort with regard to this but an additional page was provided as an addendum to the Design and Access Statement.
- 70 The Landscape Team make reference to overshadowing of the development to the north, however this development is over a hundred metres away with a wide section of railway line in between. Given the city centre context this is not considered to represent significant harm to amenity.
- 71 With regard to natural ventilation, Policy BD5A stipulates that the design of all development should maximise opportunities to conserve energy and water resources and use materials appropriate to these aims. The applicant's Design and Access Statement states that the construction methodology as currently modelled minimises the space heating and DHW heat load for the development. This construction takes into consideration the merits of air tightness and thermal insulation which assist in achieving thermally efficient buildings. Policy BD5 is also relevant in that the closed ventilation system is a requirement of reducing noise internally from the nearby railway sidings and is also essential to manage any potential breaches in the environmental permit for the adjacent waste processing and

storage use with regard to odour. Having said this, there is an option for residents to open ventilation panels that sit behind fixed perforated facing panels which form part of the external structure. This would enable residents to have natural ventilation if required.

72 With regard to noise and odour emissions from the adjacent railway sidings, the Environmental Health Team are satisfied that this can be managed by mitigation being factored into the construction methodology of the building, along with appropriate management schemes which can be conditioned in.

73 With regard to lack of private amenity space, the most recent version of the scheme does include a 'sky garden', gym/swimming pool and podium-level communal terrace (shared with the adjacent development known as 'One Springwell Gardens'). This would also be off-set by a substantial contribution towards off-site Green space which would be brought forward in consultation with ward members.

74 The relationship with the adjacent block, currently under construction, is, by city centre standards, quite generous. Separation distances between primary windows come in at 35m, which is ample, but there is undeniably an overbearing impact. The applicant justifies this by presenting the two as connected developments, including shared podium level amenity space and vehicular access arrangements. It is notable that no Glint and Glare assessment has been submitted with regard to the adjacent block and this may be an issue of some concern to potential residents of that block. On the south-eastern side of the building the distance between primary windows and the adjacent frontage comes in at 18m angled away so that the relationship is less domineering. The adjacent land use is commercial and the site is not allocated for housing so any further residential development would be a windfall site and is not to be taken as a given. There are, however, some benefits to the addition of a further residential block for the existing One Springwell Gardens. It does provide a visual screen from the commercial area further along Springwell Rd and it helps to formalise the location as a residential area, more associated with Whitehall Road and the similarly dense residential developments known as 'Globe Road' and 'Latitude Purple'.

Question 6: Do Members consider the levels of amenity provided for residents to be sufficient?

Question 7: Do Members consider the relationship between Phases 1 and 2 to be acceptable?

Landscaping and Public Realm

75 The proposed development doesn't provide any public realm benefits on site, other than a widening of the footpath where the wind mitigation structures are located. Ward Members have picked up on this and have raised concerns. The Council's Landscape Team also have concerns relating to the loss of existing trees and impact on the Leeds Habitat Network.

76 Policy G9 in the core strategy stipulates that there is no significant adverse impact on the integrity and connectivity of the Leeds Habitat Network. A strip of land adjacent to the north-east boundary of the site forms a strip designated within the local plan as part of Leeds' Habitat Network. Although this is not programmed for removal within the development

proposals, care will have to be taken to ensure the integrity of the strip is retained. This can be achieved by planning condition. The proposal does involve the loss of 2 groups of trees which have been identified as category C in poor condition. New tree planting is proposed throughout the external garden space which will occupy the podium-level amenity area.

- 77 Policy G9 also requires that the design of new development enhances existing wildlife habitats and provides new areas and opportunities for wildlife and that there is an overall net gain for biodiversity commensurate with the scale of development. In order to demonstrate this the applicant has submitted a BNG assessment which concludes that the proposed development will provide a net gain for biodiversity in compliance with Policy G9. This would involve an increase in both habitat units and hedgerow units of over 100%. However, it is noted that the proposed development does not meet the required trading rules set by DEFRA Metric 4.0. This is due to the loss of Mixed scrub, which is a medium distinctiveness habitat under the metric. In order to satisfy the trading rules, native scrub planting is recommended by the report to provide a minimum of 0.11 habitat units. This could be achieved by replacing 0.017ha of introduced shrubs with moderate condition Mixed Scrub of native species. This can be managed by condition. It is considered that the proposal complies with Policy G9 if the proposed conditions are added.
- 78 Policy G4 in the Core Strategy stipulates that residential developments of 10 dwellings or more provide a prescribed amount of publicly accessible green space either on-site or, if this is not achievable, through either equivalent off-site provision or financial contribution. In this case the applicant states that on-site provision is unachievable due to the constraints of the site and the nature of the connection between the proposed development and One Springwell Gardens. Consequently the applicant accepts the need to provide a financial contribution which will deliver the required level of green space improvement within the locality. The calculation of the amount has been carried out in line with policy and comes to £494,681.31. This will be secured through the S106 agreement.
- 79 With regard to the financial contribution, the site falls within an area identified in the Neighbourhood Plan as 'SG1 – Viaduct', which includes most of the commercial area in the northern part of the Neighbourhood Plan area. It is therefore likely that opportunities will be available for the commuted sum to be directly related to improving the surrounding area in line with the aims and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Question 8: Do Members consider the provision of funding towards local Greenspace projects an acceptable alternative to on-site provision?

Highway Issues

- 80 Ward Members have picked up on the relatively low level of parking and have raised some concerns at this. There were also concerns raised about the level of bike provision initially but this has been subsequently improved to accommodate the number of residential units. Policy T2 in the Core Strategy and the Transport SPD provide the policy context for Highway matters.
- 81 The proposal site is located in a highly sustainable area and easily meets the accessibility criteria set out in Appendix 3 of the Core Strategy. Leeds Rail Station is only 1km distant,

and the heart of the City Centre is similarly within this range. Whitehall Road is a main arterial route into the City Centre and benefits from excellent public transport links. The nearest bus stops are located within a 5 minute walk. There is also walking access to leisure and retail services. Owing to the site's location, a low level of parking provision (18 spaces all with EVC's) is considered acceptable. As there is a likelihood of detrimental on-street parking as a result of the proposed development the developer will be required to make a contribution towards Traffic Regulation Order amendments in the surrounding streets. A contribution of £10,000 to be secured by S106 agreement. Proposed levels of EVC charge points, disabled spaces and bicycle parking in the final scheme provided are in accordance with Policy. Off-site highway works would be required to implement the vehicular access and the provision of car-club spaces. The works would be delivered via an appropriate agreement between the developer and the Council.

82 However, the applicant has stated that the overall parking stock is to be shared with One Springwell Gardens (224 apartments with 53 spaces), equating to a total of 626 apartments with 71 spaces (11%). The Highways Team consider this unacceptable because the original number of parking spaces for Phase 1 was deemed acceptable in its own right and now, with a further shift away from high levels of parking the lower level for the 2nd Phase is considered acceptable in its own right. This will therefore have to be managed by condition.

83 The applicant has submitted a comprehensive Travel Plan in line with policy, which is considered by the Council's Influencing Travel Team to be very good and the proposal to develop a dedicated App to promote sustainable travel is a welcome addition. A Residential Travel Plan Fund and monitoring fee will be secured by S106 agreement. As part of the Council's ongoing push to improve cycling infrastructure which would to a large degree benefit the residents of the proposed development a contribution is being sought to be put towards the provision of a cycle scheme along Whitehall Rd.

Question 9: Are Members happy with the low level of parking being off-set by the requirement of a contribution towards cycling infrastructure?

Wind Mitigation

84 The Tall Buildings Design Guide states that appropriate mitigation in the form of wind diffusers, resilient trees, podium buildings, large canopies and appropriate building massing should be considered to prevent excessive wind speeds. For safety reasons, soft landscaping is not considered appropriate to mitigate wind impacts on the public highway or pedestrian walkways. The TBDG also recognises that wind mitigation is a specialist area and advice should be sought from experienced practitioners. As the project has evolved, a number of iterations of the wind/microclimate assessment have been submitted by the applicant and peer reviewed by the Council's consultant. The latest Review accepts the findings of the applicant's report, which concludes that pedestrian level wind conditions in the nearby surroundings are predicted to meet the safety criteria and are predicted to be substantially acceptable for existing and planned pedestrian uses. The Review advises that a view should be taken by the LPA as to the acceptability of the proposed measures in planning terms.

85 The measures proposed involve sculpted structures on the front and side elevations, raised baffles partition at podium level, screens within the podium garden area, arranged in spokes and a series of large screens to the rear. The applicant's report also recommends that a bus shelter for the bus stop at the junction of Springwell Road and Whitehall Road be agreed in the S106 agreement. The most significant structures are the sculpted elements on the footway to the front of the development. There remain concerns that some of the structures might impinge on Highway land or obstruct the ground floor active frontage. It is considered that this matter can be resolved with submission of further drawings which show more detail. Visually, the designs are still evolving but the indicative drawings and models show that something of visual interest can be achieved which would make a positive contribution to the street scene. However, the amount of mitigation could create visual clutter around the entrance to the building and along Springwell Road and Members are asked to comment on this.

Question 10: Do Members consider the amount of wind mitigation required and the emerging design solutions acceptable in principle?

Climate Change

86 Policy EN1 in the Core Strategy requires all developments of 10 dwellings or over to achieve 20% less than Building Regulations Target Emission Rate and to provide a minimum of 10% of the predicted energy needs of the development from low carbon energy. Applicants are expected to submit an Energy Assessment with their application based on expected end user requirements to demonstrate compliance with this policy. The applicant has submitted the required Assessment which demonstrates compliance with the policy. The construction methodology as currently modelled minimises the space heating and DHW heat load for the development, which will then be met by a combination of solar photovoltaic cell and passive heat sources. Average improvement in the emissions rate is 36.14% and average energy provision from low carbon energy is 10.36%.

87 The proposal also complies with Policy EN2 which requires major residential developments to meet a water standard of 110 litres per person per day.

88 With regard to Policy EN4, which requires a connection to a District Heating Network, the Councils District Heating Network Team accepts that the proposal relies entirely on a dry electrical heating system which provides the lowest carbon solution for the development and is in line with the Net Zero Carbon in operation transformation.

Safety and Security

89 Policy P10 in the Core Strategy requires developments to create safe and secure environments that reduce the opportunities for crime. Policy GP5 in the UDP requires development proposals to seek to avoid danger to health or life. Some objections have been received which refer to safety issues related to the internal layout such as the number of units being served per core. It is noted that since the original scheme was submitted amendments have been received to the internal layout of the building which improves these features.

- 90 With regard to reducing opportunities for crime, conditions relating to CCTV coverage, secure bicycle storage and access control measures. Subject to detailed design to be secured by a security strategy condition and details of all built measures in the public realm being addressed in tandem with the finalised landscaping scheme (to maximise opportunities to design such features into the public realm and minimise their visual impacts) the development would accord with CS policy P10.
- 91 Policy T30C in the UDP requires buildings to take into account aviation safety. Leeds/Bradford Airport has been consulted and, after recommendations were complied with are satisfied that sufficient details have been submitted to ensure appropriate aviation safety measures such as lighting will be applied. An informative is recommended which relates to the developers obligations in this regard.
- 92 With regard to fire safety and internal layout the applicant confirms that the building has been designed in compliance with BS 9991:2015, Fire Safety in the design, management and use of residential buildings. Although HASE has been consulted with regard to fire safety, as the application was validated prior to August 2021, it does not fall within the remit of Planning Gateway One Regulations and so no further comments have been made.

Drainage

- 93 A Flood Risk Assessment has been supplied by the applicant in accordance with Policy Water 6 in the NRWLP. The Flood Risk Management Team accept that the application site is located in Flood Zone 1 and not at risk of any critical flood risks that require specific mitigation. With regard to Policies Water 1 and 7, (water efficiency and surface water drainage), the FRM Team are satisfied with the submitted surface water drainage strategy, which includes SUDS in the form of a 'Blue Roof', subject to conditions.

Planning Obligations and CIL

- 94 A legal test for the imposition of planning obligations was introduced by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended in 2019). These provide that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is:
- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms,
 - (b) directly related to the development; and
 - (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

The proposed scheme produces the need for the following obligations which it is considered meet the legal tests:

- Leeds City Council Travel Plan Review fee of £5,416
- Provision of Leeds City Council Car Club provider parking spaces x 3
- Provision of a Residential Travel Plan Fund of £102,811.50
- Affordable housing on site provision (29 units)
- Offsite Greenspace contribution commuted sum (£494,681.31)
- Contribution towards Whitehall Road cycle infrastructure (£117,000) (TBC)

- Provision for TRO amendments (£10,000)
- Loss of revenue from on-street parking (£10,000)
- Provision of Bus Shelter on junction of Springwell Road and Whitehall Road (£20,000)
- Employment & Skills co-operation / initiatives
- Section 106 management fee

95 This development is liable to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and is likely to generate a CIL charge of £211,451.66. The Neighbourhood Forum would receive 25% of all CIL contributions. This figure is presented for information only and should not influence consideration of the application. The infrastructure requirements for this development are likely to relate to public transport and public space provision. Consideration of where any Strategic Fund CIL money is spent rests with the Council's Executive Board and will be decided with reference to the Regulation 123 List (or Infrastructure Funding Statement as the case may be) at the time that decision is made.

CONCLUSION

96 The proposal would provide a large-scale residential development in an accessible and prominent location. It would include 7% Affordable Housing, to be provided within the scheme. The commercial unit would provide employment opportunities and service occupiers in the local area. The proposal would include significant Biodiversity Net Gain. The additional commuted sum required under Policy G4 of the Core Strategy would contribute significantly to accessible Greenspace in the Beeston and Holbeck area. There would be less than substantial harm to heritage assets in the area which need to be justified in terms of planning benefits. Members are requested to provide comments on the proposal prior to the application being brought to Panel for determination.

97 The key questions asked in the report above are as follows:

98 **Question 1. Do Members continue to support the Principle of a residential tower in this location?**

99 **Question 2. If so, do Members support the height of the tower at 36 storeys?**

100 **Question 3. Do Members support the design of tower including use of materials?**

101 **Question 4. Do Members support the proposed Housing Mix?**

102 **Question 5: Question 5. Do members support the provision of Affordable Housing across floors 2,3,4 and 30?**

103 **Question 6: Do Members consider the levels of amenity provided for residents to be sufficient?**

104 **Question 7: Do Members consider the relationship between Phases 1 and 2 to be acceptable?**

- 105 **Question 8: Do Members consider the provision of funding towards local green space projects an acceptable alternative to on-site provision?**
- 106 **Question 9: Are Members happy with the low level of parking being off-set by the requirement of a contribution towards cycling infrastructure?**
- 107 **Question 10: Do Members consider the amount of wind mitigation required and the emerging design solutions acceptable in principle?**

Background Papers: 20/02710/FU

- **PREAPP/18/00245 - Pre-application presentation for the demolition of the existing building and creation of residential development ("Springwell Gardens II") with 288 apartments and a commercial unit. This is a second phase to the adjacent 'Radius' ("Springwell Gardens I") development (16/05198/FU) at Cartwright House, Springwell Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS12 1EX**
- [Meeting of City Plans Panel, Thursday, 21st November, 2019 1.30 pm \(Item 87.\)](#)

To consider a report by the Chief Planning Officer which sets out details of a pre-application presentation for the demolition of the existing building and creation of residential development ("Springwell Gardens II") with 288 apartments and a commercial unit. This is a second phase to the adjacent 'Radius' ("Springwell Gardens I") development (16/05198/FU) at Cartwright House, Springwell Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS12 1EX

Minutes:

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a Pre Application proposal for the demolition of the existing building and creation of residential development ("Springwell Gardens II") with 288 apartments and a commercial unit. This was the second phase to adjacent Radius ("Springwell Gardens I") development (16/05198/FU) at Cartwright House, Springwell Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS12 1EX

Members visited the site prior to the meeting. Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site / location / context
- The site lies within the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan and within the South Bank Regeneration Area
- The proposal is to construct a 24 storey residential building, containing 288 apartments: 72 one bed suits, 80 one bed apartments, 122 two bed apartments and 14 three bed apartments
- All apartments would meet Nationally Described Space Standards
- Active frontage onto Springwell Road
- Secure cycle storage
- Parking for 24 cars
- 11 motorcycle parking spaces
- Communal terrace at first floor level linking in with Phase I
- Rooftop landscaping
- Large balconies
- Affordable Housing 7%, preferred option to provide off-site (Policy H5)
- Key views

Members raised the following questions:

- Would a noise survey be undertaken
- Would all the apartments have a balcony
- Would Affordable Housing provision be provided
- Would any wind studies be undertaken
- Was overlooking of the balconies an issue
- How would the greenery be maintained, especially that incorporated as part of the 'hanging' design on the building's façade

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representatives said:

- The Applicant confirmed that a full noise assessment would be undertaken. In addition, there was the intention to incorporate high performance glazing and a number of other measures within the design to assist with noise mitigation and ensuring appropriate ventilation.
- Discussions are underway with neighbouring landowners (including Network Rail) and these would continue as the applicant works towards an application submission. However, this is a City Centre scheme and there will inevitably be activities that are associated with a City Centre location that generate some noise impact.
- Members were informed that all apartments would have a balcony
- The Affordable Housing contribution would be delivered at 7%, on-site provision had been considered and it was hoped that this site would be attractive for registered providers, such that it may be possible to have on-site delivery
- Members were informed that a full wind assessment would be undertaken and submitted. The development of Springwell Gardens I had already provided some protection for the application site from prevailing winds, but further mitigation measures would be considered as necessary.
- The Planning Officer confirmed that some overlooking could take place but due to the good separation distance of 25-35 metres, and given that both phases were part of one overall scheme within a high density City landscape, the proposals were seen to be acceptable.
- The maintenance of the greenery was an important factor and further consideration was required, but keeping it adequately maintained would be a priority – particularly given that the greenery on the façade was such a key feature of the design proposal.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- All Members were supportive of the emerging scheme commenting that it was an imaginative, high quality proposal
- Members welcomed the greenery and the inclusion of 3 bedroom flats within the City Centre
- Could a condition be added to address the maintenance of the 'hanging' greenery on the building's façade and that a robust approach for this was secured going forward
- Could more details be provided about the residential amenity, particularly relating to noise impact and adequate ventilation
- Could sample materials be provided, the colour of the materials should better reflect phase 1

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion Members provided the following feedback:

- Members were supportive with the principle of developing this site for combined residential and commercial use
- Further information was required in respect of the residential use of the building proposed as positioned and designed relative to the adjacent railway sidings
- Members were of the opinion that the tower block proposed would be acceptable in view of wider street scape views, taking account of both the existing and any "future" context (as per already consented schemes)
- The external design of the proposed blocks was considered to be acceptable subject to addressing the comments about materials
- Members were supportive in principle of the emerging designs in respect of the greenery attached to the building
- Members considered the level of car parking to be acceptable in this immediate locality
- In respect of the Council's declaration of the Climate Emergency and the detailed design/ carbon impact, Members expressed the view that the proposals were promising but more details and a commitment to further provisions were required


The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation suggesting that Members appeared to be generally supportive of the development.

RESOLVED –

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation


Supporting documents:

- [PREAPP/18/00245, item 87. !\[\]\(a88007b249b36c75dcbde101f514cec3_img.jpg\) PDF 865 KB](#)



SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL





PLANS PANEL PRESENTATION

SCALE 1:2500



© Bluesky International Ltd and Getmapping Plc [2023]

PLANS PANEL PRESENTATION

SCALE 1:2500

SOUTH & WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY 6th July 2023

Page 43



APPLICATION: 20/02710/FU


PROPOSAL:

Demolition of existing building and construction of a 36 Storey residential development with ancillary commercial space, landscaping and external amenity space

ADDRESS:

**Cartwright House
Springwell Road
Holbeck
Leeds
LS12 1AX**





PLANS PANEL PRESENTATION

SCALE 1:2500



www.leeds.gov.uk


© Bluesky International Ltd and Getmapping Plc [2023]

PLANS PANEL PRESENTATION

SCALE 1:2500



www.leeds.gov.uk




3.0 HOLBECK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

HOLBECK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

KEY

- Site Boundary
- Holbeck Urban Village
- Holbeck Neighbourhood





PHASE 1

PHASE 2

Versa Leeds Studios

Network Rail Whitehall Yard

Christian's Carpets

Unison

Arnold Clark Leeds Motorstore / Fra! / Jeep...

Mad4mini

Lubetec UK

Bevan House

Image © 2023 Airbus











Page 54

□ Proposal at pre-application stage



4.3 SCALE STUDY


EXISTING CONDITION - Whitehall Road Area and Holbeck Urban Village



FUTURE CONDITION - Whitehall Road Area and Holbeck Urban Village



EMERGING CONTEXT




FUTURE CONTEXT - NTS





Plate 2 – Location of the application site in relation to nearby Conservation Areas (1, Holbeck; 2, Central Area Canal Wharf; 3, Leeds City Centre).

MAP 2 – NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN BOUNDARY




PRODUCED BY CITY DEVELOPMENT, GIS MAPPING & DATA TEAM, LEEDS CITY COUNCIL

HOLBECK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Policy G1 – Strategic Green Infrastructure and Local Green Corridors

Development of land which lies within or alongside the strategic green infrastructure (identified on the Policies Maps 4 and 9) and/or includes or lies alongside the proposed local green corridors in the following locations (also identified on the Policies Maps 4 and 9) should include the provision of green space and/or planting appropriate to the scale of development, including street trees, safe cycling routes and footpaths where possible:


- **SG1** – Viaduct;
- **SG2** – Land west of Ingram Road;
- **SG3** – Matthew Murray Site;
- **SG4** – Tilbury Road;
- **LGC1** – Elland Road;
- **LGC2** – Brown Lane;
- **LGC3** – Holbeck Moor Road/Creskell Road/Nineveh Road/Sweet Street;
- **LGC4** – Sweet Street/Marshall Street;
- **LGC5** – Bridge Road.



PRODUCED BY CITY DEVELOPMENT, GIS MAPPING & DATA TEAM, LEEDS CITY COUNCIL Produced by: NI Date: 15/01/2018




5.7 ELEVATIONS

PROPOSED NORTH EAST ELEVATION



5.9 MATERIALITY - ELEVATIONS

PROPOSED NORTH EAST ELEVATION - MATERIALITY




MATERIAL PRECEDENTS



1
UNITISED CURTAIN WALLING SYSTEM, HERMETICALLY SEALED DOUBLE GLAZED UNITS, FLOOR TO CEILING, BARRIER GLASS TO INTERNAL PANE.




2
FACADE - HERMETICALLY SEALED DOUBLE GLAZED UNIT, WHITE ENAMELLED FINISH TO INNER PANE, ENCAPSULATED INSULATION TO REAR



3
FACADE - PPC ALUMINIUM WHITE PERFORATED VENTILATION PANEL



4
PLINTH - RED BRICK TO MATCH ONE SPRINGWELL GARDENS




5
FACADE - PPC ALUMINIUM WHITE PERFORATED VENTILATION PANEL TO WIND MITIGATION SCREENS; CONTINUITY OF DETAIL TO ENSURE THAT WIND MITIGATION APPEARS PART OF THE BUILDING.







Figure 1.4b – Proposed development, all permanent mitigation measures in place: view from southwest








1.4 SUNLIGHT / DAYLIGHT





Note: This is a colour drawing. In order to ensure any subsequent reproduction is viewed correctly it is to be re-printed in full colour

KEY


- - - SITE BOUNDARY
- - - ADDITIONAL SITE OWNERSHIP BOUNDARY


1. Site Allocation Strategy & Site Scheme Final Plan	05.09.20
2. Final Plan update to reflect all PC queries	07.02.22
3. Final Plan update to correct for all queries	08.07.22
4. Response to planning comments	08.08.22
5. Approved 2021 issue	08.11.21


NICK BROWN ARCHITECTS

15/07/22

// Planning	
Model:	15/07/22
Project:	Springwell Gardens II Springwell Road, Leeds
Scale:	1:200
View:	Proposed Site Plan
Author:	NBS
2016-119	A1
2016-119-P102-E	












□ FLOORS 2 - 14



ACCOMMODATION SUMMARY

TOTAL NO. OF UNITS

	TOTAL NO.	
1 BEDS	194	48%
2 BEDS	169	42%
3 BEDS	39	10%

TOTAL NO. OF UNITS 402

7.11 POLICY H5 - AFFORDABLE

The proposal provides 7% on site affordable housing units; 29 units in total (mix of 1-bed, 2-bed and 3-bed units, located on floors 02,03,04 & 30.

PROPOSED 2ND 3RD & 4TH FLOORS

KEY

 - AFFORDABLE UNITS

PROPOSED AFFORDABLE UNITS

	SQM	SOFT	BEDS
A202	62.7	675	2
A203	64.0	688	2
A204	64.0	688	2
A205	65.3	703	2
A206	45.2	477	1
A207	45.2	487	1
A208	44.1	475	1
A209	37.9	408	1
A212	38.8	417	1
A213	39.8	429	1
A302	62.7	675	2
A303	64.0	688	2
A304	64.0	688	2
A305	65.3	703	2
A308	44.1	475	1
A309	37.9	408	1
A312	38.8	417	1
A313	39.8	429	1
A402	62.7	675	2
A403	64.0	688	2
A404	64.0	688	2
A405	65.3	703	2
A408	44.1	475	1
A409	37.9	408	1
A412	38.8	417	1
A413	39.8	429	1


A30

SUMMARY

	TOTAL NO.
1 BEDS	14
2 BEDS	12
3 BEDS	0
TOTAL NO.OF AFFORDABLE UNITS	26



□ FLOOR 30




FLOOR 33









Question 1. Do Members continue to support the Principle of a residential tower in this location?

Question 2. If so, do Members support the height of the tower at 36 storeys?

Question 3. Do Members support the design of tower including use of materials?

Question 4. Do Members support the proposed Housing Mix?

Question 5. Do members support the provision of Affordable Housing across floors 2,3,4 and 30?

Question 6: Do Members consider the levels of amenity provided for residents to be sufficient?

Question 7: Do Members consider the relationship between Phases 1 and 2 to be acceptable?

Question 8: Do Members consider the provision of funding towards local green space projects an acceptable alternative to on-site provision?

Question 9: Are Members happy with the low level of parking being off-set by the requirement of a contribution towards cycling infrastructure?

Question 10: Do Members consider the amount of wind mitigation required and the emerging design solutions acceptable in principle?



SOUTH & WEST PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY () 2022

END OF PRESENTATION

Page 84

