

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 16TH MAY, 2024

**PRESENT:** Councillor H Bithell in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, P Carlill, D Cohen,  
K Dye, A Khan, A Maloney, J Heselwood  
and J Garvani

### 87 Election of Chair

A nomination was made and seconded for Councillor Bithell to Chair the meeting.

**RESOLVED** – That Councillor Bithell be elected as Chair for the meeting.

### 88 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

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

There was no exempt information on the agenda.

### 90 Late Items

There were no late items.

### 91 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations.

### 92 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors K Brooks and C Campbell. Councillor J Garvani was in attendance as substitute.

### 93 Minutes - 11 April 2024

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 11 April 2024 be confirmed as a correct record.

### 94 Applications 23/06280/FU & 23/06281LI – Springfield House, Hyde Street, Woodhouse, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of adjoining wings and erection of replacement buildings of

between 4 and 13 storeys to create purpose-built student accommodation; internal and external alterations to listed building including partial reinstatement of historic floor plan, revealment of side elevations, replacement of windows and replacement of stone steps to front entrance to facilitate level access. Hard and soft landscaping works at Springfield House, Hyde Street, Woodhouse, 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:

- There had been in-depth pre-application work that had involved design and conservation officers.
- There was an objection from Historic England. The site fell within the Woodhouse/Clarendon Road conservation area. The building was Grade 2 listed and there were Grade 2 listed buildings and a Grade 2\* listed building elsewhere within the university campus.
- Springfield House was originally constructed as a residential villa and was listed in the 1960s. It was converted into office use in the 1980s when the wings were added to the building.
- Plans showing the layout of the existing wings to the building and the proposed wings were displayed. The new proposals would cover a similar footprint with four and 5 storey blocks to the south west of the site and 10, 11 and 13 storeys to the north east.
- Greenspace to the south east of the site would be retained.
- Springfield House would remain at the heart of the site with the historic front door to be used as the main entrance. There would be glazed links to the new wings.
- Servicing for the building would be done from Clarendon Way and Seminary Street using existing accesses.
- The listed building would be more clearly articulated with the new proposals.
- Floor plans were displayed. Amenity, bin storage and cycle storage would be at ground floor with further amenity at first floor level. There would be cluster flats and studio flats which would provide 343 bedspace and these would meet emerging space standards.
- There would be photovoltaic panels on the roof.
- Trees to the front of the building would be retained and the area to the south would have seating and planting. There would be courtyard areas to the rear. Materials for use in landscaping and plants for soft landscaping were displayed.
- Elevation drawings were displayed. Initial proposals had seen a reduction in the height of the proposed blocks at the south west which was considered more sensitive to the conservation area. The different kinds of materials and details were also displayed.
- View of the how the proposals would appear from surrounding areas were displayed.

- There were outstanding highways issues to resolve. These included pedestrian connections to the university due to the lack of dropped kerbs and the impact on disabled access. The applicant was in discussions with the University and it was proposed to resolve these matters through delegated decision before final determination of the application.
- Wind mitigation - although there was some protection from trees there needed to be a fixed wind baffle on site for permanent wind mitigation. This would be covered by condition.
- There would be a Section 106 agreement of £155,000 for offsite pedestrian and cycle improvements.
- There had been a withdrawn objection from the owner of the Lodge building and they had now confirmed their support.
- It was considered to be a good location for student accommodation and would provide an improvement to the street. The application was recommended for approval subject to the resolution of highways matters and referral to the Secretary of State.
- Samples of materials and a scale model were made available for Members inspection.

Objectors to the application addressed the Panel. Issues highlighted included the following:

- A representative of The Faversham addressed the Panel. The Faversham was only 10 metres from the site and it was felt that their concerns had not been addressed and the proposals would be damaging to their business. The venue had 60 wedding bookings this year and the outdoor areas to the premises were integral to the running of the business. The proposals would overlook these outdoor areas and be intrusive to privacy. Lighting from the blocks would also change the landscape. The premises had operated for 21 years and these proposals would be detrimental to a business with over 30 full time employees.
- A local resident and member of the Little London & Woodhouse Community Association addressed the Panel. This was a massive development which would tower over existing buildings and impact on the grade 2 listed buildings destroying the aesthetic of this place. The proposals would also dwarf and trivialise Springfield House. Granting this application would set a precedent for further tall buildings in the area and showed contempt for the aesthetics of the area, the conservation area and Leeds.

The applicant's representatives were invited to address the Panel. Issues highlighted included the following:

- Pre-application work had been carried out on the scheme since 2022.
- It was appreciated that applications of this nature would attract concerns from neighbours and work had been carried out to address

any concerns with supporting evidence especially with regards to noise, light and views.

- It was acknowledged that there were impacts on heritage assets but many of these were positive and outweighed any negative impacts. There were many enhancements to the listed building and conservation area.
- Springfield House had previously been inward looking losing its sense of place. The proposals would address this and bring its use back into the heart of the site.
- The applicant had addressed concerns of objectors during the application process.
- In response to questions from the Panel, discussion included the following:
  - Consultation – the applicant had engaged with objectors and shown the models and designs and explained how the design would still provide them with privacy. There had also been acoustic assessments to demonstrate there would not be an issue with noise pollution.
  - Based on technical evidence there would be no loss of amenity with regard to sunlight and daylight or acoustic disturbance. The issue of overlooking had been addressed through the design of the building.
  - There had been positive dialogue with the university regarding the highways enhancements that were required.
  - There would be the removal of some undergrowth to improve visibility and surveillance at the front of the site and lighting levels and CCTV coverage would be improved.
  - There would be improvements for pedestrians crossing at Hyde Street/Clarendon Way and this would be completed under a Section 278 agreement.
  - There would be a segregated pedestrian route adjacent to the servicing area.
  - There would be the use of photovoltaics and air source heat pumps. Should the district heating scheme extend up to that part of the city, that could also be used.

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

- With regards to the objections from Historic England there were concerns regarding the taller element of the proposals but it was felt that the benefits of the scheme which improved the visibility of the listed building outweighed any harm.
- Concern that the proposals would be the start of overdevelopment in the area.
- The tallest element of the proposals had been situated at the least sensitive part of the site where there was already a context of buildings of significant mass.
- The lower level windows would not overlook The Faversham due to the change in ground levels and tree cover. The upper level windows in the

northern elevation of the tallest element would have an outlook over The Faversham grounds but an area which was to the front of the Faversham and which comprised a driveway and some greenspace which was already overlooked from the public highway on Springfield Mount. As a result officers considered that there would not be a detrimental impact on the privacy and amenities of The Faversham.

- It was requested that the Chair viewed the highways proposals prior to approval by delegated decision.
- Concern regarding the taller elements of the proposal and a suggestion that the application be deferred for further consideration.
- It was pleasing to see a purpose built student accommodation scheme to be in a more appropriate location.
- This was a good quality design and would fit in with the area.

The officer recommendation was moved and seconded.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to referral to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities; resolution of the outstanding Highways Matter outlined in paragraphs 153-158 of the report; the specified conditions set out in Appendix 1 (and any amendment to these and addition to others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- Travel Plan
- Leeds City Council Travel Plan Review Fee of £5,405
- Contributions for offsite cycling and walking improvements (Subject to agreement as per para 153 of the report)
- Car Club contribution £10,000
- Traffic Regulation Orders £10,000
- Wayfinding signage £12,000
- Control of student occupancy
- Provision of public access through the site
- On site greenspace provision
- Local employment and skills
- Section 106 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, or decision to finally dispose of, the application shall be delegated to the Chief planning Officer.

*(At the conclusion of this item, the live stream of the meeting was stopped due to technical difficulties but the meeting remained open to the public. It was reported that the minutes would be made available to the public online).*

**95 Pre-application 24/00010 - Blenheim House, Duncombe Street, Leeds, LS1 4PL**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of a pre-application presentation regarding proposals for a purpose built student accommodation development including a mixed offer of cluster and studio units totalling c717 units and associated amenity spaces at Blenheim House, Duncombe Street, Leeds.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the presentation. Members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

The applicant's representatives gave the Panel a presentation. The following was highlighted:

- The proposals were still at the early design stage. The wider setting of the area had been taken into account with regards to listed buildings, conservation area and the local Neighbourhood Forum.
- Proximity to the universities and safe walking routes.
- There had been detailed dialogue with Planning Officers during the development of the proposals.
- There would be amenity provision in excess of guidance at ground floor level.
- The main entrance would be set back from the street and all access would be security controlled and have CCTV.
- Details of the upper floor accommodation and examples of typical room layouts.
- Rooms would have floor to ceiling windows to maximise daylight.
- Analysis undertaken had shown that there would be no impact to key views from the site.
- Design and materials – further design work had been undertaken and inspiration was taken from historic buildings and other developments in the area.
- There would be green roofs and roof terraces. The development would use air source heat pumps and have photovoltaic panels.
- There would be an area of public realm on Marlborough Street which would provide opportunities for social interaction. There would be softer landscaping on Duncombe Street with opportunities for a pocket park and formal play area. There would also be soft and hard landscaping in an external courtyard to the building.
- Views from the approaches to the site were displayed.
- The proposals would provide a sustainable, high quality scheme with enhanced landscaping in a gateway position.

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

- Concerns regarding the loss of existing trees. It was confirmed that 15 of the 19 trees on the site would be removed. There would be mitigation planting in the courtyard and an enhanced public realm.
- The current building on site was not suitable for re-use. The proposed footprint for the new building would enable the public realm

improvements and there were other technical considerations including the positioning of sewerage pipes.

- The proposed new building would be set back further from Duncombe Street and closer to the A58. This would enable further space for public realm works.
- The proposed building would improve surveillance in the area.
- The proposals were at an early design stage and the relation of the development to nearby residential properties was explained with regards to levels and how the building would be stepped back.
- The new public realm space would include areas to the Duncombe Street side. This would be achieved by having the building closer to the A58.
- The building would be exclusively for student use.
- Concerns regarding another student accommodation development on the fringe of the city centre and what impacts this may have on other facilities due to students only being there for part of the year.
- The scale of the proposals seemed appropriate but there was concern regarding the loss of trees.
- In response to questions set out in the report, the following was discussed:
  - Subject to confirmation of detailed proposals, most Members supported the end use of the site for Purpose Built Student Accommodation.
  - With regard to the emerging appearance, scale and setting to the proposed building, there was some concern regarding the impact on Marlborough Grange and it was queried whether the proposals at that side could be scaled down as well as set back. It was reported that proposals were still subject to wind testing before final details were confirmed.
  - Members supported the emerging relationship to the existing residential premises to the north subject to the comments above about the potential to further lower the building height.
  - Members had concern regarding the loss of trees to facilitate the proposed development. While the loss of the U graded trees was felt acceptable it was felt that these should be replaced on site.

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

## **96 Pre-application 24/00053 - Wellington Road and Armley Road, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of a pre-application presentation regarding proposals for a multi-storey residential development with ground floor commercial uses (Class E), internal and external amenity spaces, integral cycle storage and accessible car parking provision at a site at Wellington Road and Armley Road, Leeds.

Site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the presentation. Members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

The applicant's representatives gave the Panel a presentation. The following was highlighted:

- The proposals would create a new sustainable urban community.
- The proposals were for a 325 unit Build to Rent model with high quality amenities and on site management.
- This would be a car free development with an emphasis on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.
- Green spaces would be delivered for residents and the public.
- The site was less than a mile from the City Station and was part of a wider area of growth and regeneration.
- There had been previous outline consent for the site and the new proposals offered a more sustainable development with more green space. There would be a plaza and courtyards as well as commercial spaces.
- Floor Plans were displayed. There would be plant, bin storage and cycle storage at ground floor as well as the three commercial units.
- There would be large provision of 3 bedroom units.
- Materials – these would be primarily red brick to reflect the heritage character of the area.
- Façade treatments – there would be some balconies and apartments would have floor to ceiling windows.
- CGI images of the proposed buildings and open spaces were displayed.

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

- There were planned pedestrian and cycle route improvements in the vicinity and past the site at Armley Road and the nearby Gyrotory and improved pedestrian connections to the City Centre had been delivered through the nearby "Junction" development .
- The commercial properties would be small but suitable for uses such as convenience stores or cafes.
- There would be further discussion with transport operators with regards to bus provision.
- There was six schools within one mile distance of the site.
- There would be provision of accessible roof terraces and some green roofs.
- The building design would help to achieve a balance between maximising daylight provision and preventing overheating
- The site was currently unkempt with self seeded trees. There would be some tree loss at the site, but there would be significant planting.
- Potential use of the commercial units for health provision.
- Some concerns regarding pedestrian accessibility and public transport access to day to day facilities.
- The need for security gate features on children's play areas.
- In response to questions outlined in the report, the following was discussed:



- Members considered that the proposed use of the site for residential with ground floor commercial uses was appropriate in principle.
- Members supported the emerging scale and layout of the development.
- Members supported the emerging landscaping of the site.
- With regard to the proposed approach to car parking, there was some support for a car free development but some concern regarding the lack of public transport accessibility. It was felt that further information on bus services and pedestrian accessibility was required.

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

**97 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

Thursday, 13 June 2024 at 1.30 p.m.