

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 15TH FEBRUARY, 2024

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors C Campbell, B Anderson,
K Brooks, P Carlill, K Dye, C Gruen,
A Khan, A Maloney, P Stables and
R. Stephenson

SITE VISITS: Councillors C Campbell, B Anderson, K Brooks, K Dye,
C Gruen, A Khan and J McKenna

58 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

59 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

There was no exempt information on the agenda.

60 Late Items

There were no late items.

61 Declaration of Interests

No declarations were made.

62 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors D Cohen and D Blackburn.

Councillors R Stephenson and P Stables were in attendance as substitutes.

63 Minutes - 18 January 2024

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2024 be confirmed as a correct record.

64 Applications 23/01249/FU and 23/01250/LI - The Roundhouse, Wellington Road, LS12 1DR

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the change of use and conversion of the existing Roundhouse building to provide indoor and outdoor leisure facilities for temporary use inclusive of Padel courts, changing/welfare facilities and external parking.

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

The Panel was informed that the following wording should have been included at the end of the recommendation section in the first page of the officer's report:

"In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the Panel resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the applications shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer".

Issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The proposals were for the installation of indoor and outdoor Padel courts. Padel was the fastest growing sport in the world and is popular in city centre locations.
- The site was allocated for housing in the Development Plan and was required to be determined by Panel as a departure from the Plan.
- The Roundhouse building was Grade II listed and was last used as a vehicle hire business.
- It was proposed for 5 outdoor courts on what was currently tarmac and hard standing.
- Details of access and car parking.
- Land to the front of the site would be used for cycle and pedestrian improvements including the footbridge.
- There would be five courts inside the building with changing areas, a café and a reception in the centre. There would not be any harmful building alterations.
- It was proposed that the Padel courts would be a temporary use for 10 years. The landowner was not currently offering the land for housing development.
- Benefits of the proposal included the safeguarding of a heritage building and provision of a leisure facility in a high density residential area.
- Floor plans showing the court layout and inside layout were displayed.
- There would be a one way vehicle system through the site. There would be up to 28 car parking spaces with 4 disabled spaces. There would also be cycle parking.
- There would be areas of landscaping.
- The large vehicle entrance doors to the Roundhouse would be removed and the original appearance to be reinstated.
- The lighting columns to the outdoor courts would be 6 metres in height.

In response to questions to officers and the applicant's representative, the following was discussed:

- There was no concern regarding the site not being used for housing. A higher number of units had been achieved in the city centre than what was suggested in the Site Allocation Plan. There was a health supply

of forthcoming housing with the majority under construction or having planning permission.

- Environmental Health had been consulted regarding noise disturbance from the site. It was recognised that there was noise disturbance from traffic due to the proximity of the A58. With regards to potential noise disturbance from the Padel courts, this was difficult to quantify as there was no track record to measure against. It was recommended that use of the courts be restricted until 9.00 p.m. Noise levels could be monitored when the site was in operation.
- The ramp towards the old railway line would be demolished.
- The time restrictions would help to mitigate the potential for noise disturbance so that residents were not disturbed when general background noise levels are likely to be lower.
- Energy use – there would be no heating requirements for the indoor areas and energy use would be relatively small. There was already a power supply to the roundhouse and the developer promoted the use of low energy lighting and sustainable energy.
- There was no evidence of what the impact of having an outdoor exercise facility close to a busy road would be with regards to air pollution. There would be a benefit for people exercising and other outdoor activities took place through the city such as jogging and cycling.
- The applicant would be providing free taster sessions and a program with schools. The facilities would be all inclusive and equipment could be provided. Community was high on the agenda and 10% of profits from the centre would be used towards local community projects.
- The exterior of the building would be cleaned and repaired. It was hoped to reinstate original fixtures where possible.
- There would be free sessions available to unemployed/people on low incomes and reductions to other groups including blue badge holders and NHS staff.

In response to comments from the Panel, discussion included the following:

- There was potential that noise disturbance could go on longer than after the terminal hour of use of the courts as people leave the site.
- This was an imaginative re-use of the building and an opportunity to preserve a heritage building.
- There could be a more creative approach to landscaping and use of greenspace.
- Although the site was allocated for housing it seemed reasonable to use the site for such a facility that was aimed at local people.
- There was scope across the site for more landscaping and planting.
- The proposals provided an excellent opportunity for re-use of the site in an area that would be heavily populated.
- The hours of use proposed had been decided in order to prevent noise disturbance to residents. Conditions could cover requirements for the time external lighting is to be turned off and for the operator to have a noise management plan.

- There were still ongoing negotiations with regards to the landscaping and there would be attempts to maximise the amount of planting on site.
- There could be flexibility with regards to the operating hours between the inside and outside courts. This could be monitored as part of the noise management plan.
- There was very little landscaping on the site at the moment and this development would make a significant improvement.
- The applicant was proposing to put in landscaping where feasible and extend planting proposals to the front of the building.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the specified conditions set out in Appendices 1 and 2 (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- Travel Plan Review fee of £3,682
- Transfer of land for A58 footbridge improvement
- Monitoring fee

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the Panel resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the applications shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

65 Application 23/06266/FU - Site to the North of Whitehall Road (land at the former Doncaster Monk Bridge Works)

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the construction of an office building with associated facilities, parking and landscaping at a site to the north of Whitehall Road (land at the former Doncaster Monk Bridge Works) Leeds.

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

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The proposals were presented to Panel as a pre-application in August 2023.
- Initial outline consent was granted in October 2007.
- The proposals had the full support of a Local Ward Councillor.
- The proposals were for a 12 storey office building with a ground floor café and co-working spaces. There would be landscaping improvements and the provision of 10 car parking spaces which would all have electric charging and 138 cycle storage spaces.
- There would be a roof terrace with soft landscaping and a living wall.

- Details of the elevation treatments and materials to be used were displayed.
- There would be a landscaped buffer around the development which would include tree planting.
- There would be vehicular access to the site from Whitehall Road.
- Reference to the heritage of the site and how this would be included within the landscaping of the site. There would also be reference within the internal fabric of the building.
- Possibility for future connection to the Leeds District Heating Network.
- CGI images of how the development would appear were displayed.
- Wind mitigation proposals.
- The application was recommended to be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval.

In response to questions to officers and the applicant's representative, the following was discussed:

- Concerns regarding security of the footpath towards the railway bridge running behind the screened off parts of the colonnade. It was reported that this path would be in addition to the pedestrian route to the front. The screens would be porous and there would be lighting.
- The screens on the colonnades were for wind mitigation and the area would be covered with CCTV and have lighting. There would be elements of natural surveillance to the area. There would also be 24 hour security at the building.
- There would be a maintenance plan for the landscaped areas and green walls. Rainwater would be used to feed the green walls. There would be monitoring of the maintenance agreement. The maintenance agreement would also cover the replacement of landscaping that had reached the end of its lifespan.
- There would be a bi-directional cycle path along Whitehall Road along with a footway.

In response to comments from the Panel, discussion included the following:

- The scheme was generally favourable but there were still concerns regarding the safety of the screened off area of footpath.
- The cycle path was part of the Active Travel Fund project and did not form part of this application.
- West Yorkshire Police had been consulted regarding the application and there was a condition relating to security.
- It was proposed that the application be deferred for further detail on the screened area of footpath.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to allow for further information to be provided with regards to security issues regarding the screened footpath and the permeability of the screens.

(Councillors B Anderson and R Stephenson left the meeting following the conclusion of this item)

66 Application 22/04852/FU - Holdforth Court, Brussels Street, Leeds, LS9 8AT

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for proposed demolition works and the erection of a 10 storey building to create a co-living residential development at Holdforth Court, Brussels Street, Leeds, LS9 8AT.

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

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- Photographs of views to and from the site were displayed.
- It was proposed to have as much active frontage as possible to the building onto Brick Street and Brussel Street.
- The existing trees at the junction of Brick Street and Brussels Street would be retained and there would be opportunity for more tree cover around the site.
- Ground floor plans would include a gym, cycle storage and communal spaces.
- Pedestrian routes were displayed.
- Communal living schemes attracted contract workers on short term leases.
- Floor plans showing studio apartments were displayed. This would meet or exceed minimum space standards. There would be communal kitchen facilities on each floor and the studios would have basic cooking facilities.
- The top two floors would be in a recessed glass element and although they would meet space standard some of the space would not be usable.
- The location of the site in relation to Leeds Minster, Quarry House and the area designated for tall buildings.
- There was a further bat survey to be undertaken at the site and this could not be done until May 2025.

Representatives of Leeds Civic Trust addressed the Panel with concerns and objections to the application. These included the following:

- The site was in a pivotal location and any development would set a precedent for the area and needed a building that was well designed and would not act as a barrier to other areas.
- The area needed more green space.
- The building needed a full active and engaging frontage.
- The ground floor would not contribute to the street life and place making.
- Landscaping was insufficient.
- The architectural form was not inspiring.

- There would be an impact on the conservation area.
- This a key gateway site to the city and needs an exemplar building.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
 - The site was a key view from the Minster. More activity needed introducing around the ground floor level.
 - Balconies could give the building more texture and variety.
 - There was no direct access to greenspace or outdoor space for residents.
 - There was no opposition to a new building on this site but not of this design.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel. The following was discussed:

- There would be no impact on heritage assets in the area.
- The design of the building did enable engagement with Brick Street and Brussels Street.
- Not all aspects could be engaging at street level with the need for facilities such as bin and cycle storage.
- In response to questions, discussion included the following:
 - There had been close work with officers in the design of the building. The site was constrained with highways on three sides and this had influenced the design. The top two floors were designed with reflective glass which would help the building disappear into the skyline. There were also various other features in the design of the building.
 - There had been considerable changes to the initial proposals following discussion with officers.
 - There was need for this kind of accommodation in Leeds. This was based on issues including demographics, employment rate, university retention and property demands in the city.
 - Materials had not yet been finally decided and would be covered by condition.
 - The possibility of a green wall on the Brussels Street frontage could be considered. The applicant would be trying to do as much as possible with regards to landscaping.
 - The external amenity spaces did not usually remain open till late in the evening and would normally close around 10.00 p.m.
 - There would be small kitchenette areas within the studios.
 - A full sample panel of materials to be used could be made available.

In response to questions to officers, discussion included the following:

- All apartments would have access to daylight – the majority would have one large window and one smaller window.
- The apartments would have storage space as described in standard space requirements. These kinds of apartments tended to be on short term lets and residents may not need lots of storage.

- Existing parking restrictions in the area would remain.
- The proposals were good for a difficult shaped site – the design was simple and clear with the base, middle and top.
- The building will have to be artificially ventilated to prevent noise disturbance from the road and the railway. Installation of balconies would allow sound bleed and would not necessarily improve the amenity of the occupiers.
- Possible connection to the district heating scheme was covered by a condition to the application.

In response to comments from the Panel, discussion included the following:

- Concern that not all apartments met space requirements and there was too much corridor space and not enough living space.
- The design of the building was ok and not over dominant.
- Could the condition regarding affordable housing be specific to the Hunslet and Riverside ward?
- Could the stone setts be saved as part of pavement improvements?
- Concern that the co-living facilities on the ground floor would not be suitable for or used by all residents.
- The possibility of joining up the corner units to make 2 person studios.
- All apartments met minimum space standards although four apartments on the upper floors had some space that wasn't usable due to the shape. Guidance referred to the overall space and not whether it was usable. The communal spaces within the development would compensate for any shortfalls.
- Concern that the smaller apartments on the upper floors were not acceptable.
- Each floor had some communal space in the form of kitchens, dining areas and lounge areas.
- The principle of a co-living development at this site was acceptable.
- It was proposed to defer the application to allow for further discussion regarding the concerns of the Panel with regards to the size and layout of the smaller apartments.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to allow further consideration of the space and layout provided for the smaller apartments.

67 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 14 March 2024 at 1.30 p.m.