



---

**PLANS PANEL (CITY CENTRE)**

---

Meeting to be held in the Civic Hall, Leeds on  
Thursday, 5th July, 2012  
at 1.30 pm

---

**MEMBERSHIP**

Councillors

S Hamilton  
J McKenna  
E Nash  
N Taggart (Chair)  
P Gruen  
M Ingham  
N Walshaw

M Hamilton

G Latty  
R Procter

D Blackburn

# A G E N D A

Item No	Ward	Item Not Open		Page No
6			<p><b>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</b></p> <p>To confirm, as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012.</p> <p><b>(Copy attched)</b></p>	1 - 6

## Plans Panel (City Centre)

Thursday, 21st June, 2012

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors J McKenna, M Hamilton,  
G Latty, P Gruen, M Ingham, N Walshaw,  
D Blackburn, R Procter, M Coulson and  
A McKenna

### **1 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed those in attendance to the June meeting of Plans Panel (City Centre).

He also welcomed those new Members on the Panel, together with Councillors A McKenna and M Coulson who were attending as substitutes.

### **2 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

### **3 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors S Hamilton and E Nash.

Notification had been received for Councillor A McKenna to substitute for Councillor S Hamilton and for Councillor M Coulson to substitute for Councillor E Nash.

### **4 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

### **5 Application 11/05239/FU - Use of Site as Car Park (225 Spaces) at Ingram Row, Holbeck, Leeds 11**

Referring to Minute 87 of the meeting held on 10th May 2012, the report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for use of site as car park (225 spaces) at Ingram Row, Holbeck, Leeds 11.

The Area Planning Manager, Planning Services briefly outlined the background details and proposals contained in the submitted report.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues and officers duly responded:-

- The concerns expressed that if Ingram Row was not to be approved, this would leave it as the only site without both a use and the associated environmental improvements

- The concerns expressed again that the Panel should not breach Council policy by approving this application. Officers responded that as part of the comparative assessment of all the commuter car park applications received before 19<sup>th</sup> December 2011 pursuant to the City Centre Commuter Car Parking Policy (CCCCP), this proposal could not be separated from the proposal for the next best placed site which complied with the CCCCCP cap of 3200 parking spaces. This fact combined with the environmental and safety benefits represented by the proposals for the local area was considered to constitute special reasons for exceeding the policy cap in this case
- Clarification if the conditions were suitable. Officers responded that they reflected the conditions imposed on the other recent commuter car park approvals
- Clarification if whether or not the temporary five year planning consent could be removed or revised in view of the aspirations for regeneration of the Holbeck area. Officers responded that the length of consent reflected the CCCCCP position. However it was considered that the temporary nature of the consent would help to ensure that permanent redevelopment of the site would not be prevented in more favourable economic conditions
- The need to re-examine the general issue of safety and security of car parks at a future date
- To consider incorporating the landscape proposals on this site as part of a future permanent redevelopment of the site
- Clarification of what approach the planning department would take in respect of other car park applications. Officers responded that these would be assessed against the Council's adopted policies and guidance. In view of the fact that the comparative assessment process detailed in the CCCCCP had now been concluded and the 3200 space policy limit had been reached, it was likely that future applications for commuter car parks will be resisted
- The need to maintain the option of low cost parking in the Holbeck area

**RESOLVED-** That the Panel notes and approves the suggested conditions and the reasons for approval of this application.

**6 Application 12/01191/FU -Variation of Condition 34 of Planning Permission 11/01979/EXT (Proposing Design Changes including provision of a roof top bar, a feature glass lift, an increase in height of the building, an increase in basement floor space and a reduction in the number of hotel bedrooms) at car park 'D', Portland Crescent and Cookridge Street, Leeds LS2 3AW**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application on a variation of Condition 34 of Planning Permission 11/01979/EXT (Proposing Design Changes including provision of a roof top bar, a feature glass lift, an increase in height of the building, an increase in basement floor space and a reduction in the number of hotel bedrooms) at car park 'D', Portland Crescent and Cookridge Street, Leeds LS2 3AW.

Officers briefly outlined the proposals contained in the submitted report.

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the site.

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- Clarification of the roof line proposals
- Clarification of the external materials to be used
- The need for the Panel to be given reassurances that there would not be a future wind problem at the site and that the wind study had been undertaken properly bearing in mind the potential loss of life and the recent Bridgewater case
- The need for the Panel to be provided with more up to date details in relation to the Employment and Training Section 106 clause
- The need for the Panel to be provided with more detail in relation to the car parking arrangements and numbers
- The need for more detailed consideration to be given to the landscaping conditions/proposals in view of the prime location of the site to include specific tree planting i.e. pleached trees and appropriate sculptures and water features/fountains to compliment the building and area
- Clarification of the external lighting of the building with specific reference to the visual lift proposals
- Clarification of proposals relating to the roof top bar area and whether the top floor should be fully glazed
- Clarification of the current conditions attached to car parking permission at the Rose Bowl

At the request of the Chair, the Area Planning Manager, Planning Services responded individually to the above issues.

He informed the meeting that with regards to the wind survey, officers were unable to give guarantees that there would be no incident arising from future freak weather conditions. However the applicant's wind study had been carried out appropriately and had been verified by the Council's independent wind consultant. It was considered that the wind conditions likely to be generated around the development would be acceptable for the proposed use of the area.

In relation to the training and employment Section 106 clause, it would not be acceptable to go beyond the use of "reasonable endeavours" to secure local employment and training opportunities arising from the development but he stated that the Chief Officer, Employment and Skills, Environment and Neighbourhoods was very active in this area and worked closely with the Chief Planning Officer to secure local employment and training benefits.

In relation to the proposed landscaping details it was suggested that these were brought back to Panel prior to discharging the landscaping condition.

The rooftop design had been carefully considered by the design officer and it was considered a wholly glazed top floor would not provide the best appearance and junction with the floors below. The framing to the top floor better tied the finish to the

rest of the building design. The external finishing material would be a predominantly natural limestone cladding.

In conclusion, he informed the meeting that there was no car parking for this site as alternative car parking was available within close proximity of the building i.e. Rose Bowl, Woodhouse Lane Multi-storey and because it was considered that with the existing on-street parking controls there would not be an adverse impact on the highway. Also the Rose Bowl was controlled as a short stay car park.

**RESOLVED-**

- a) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following:-
  - obligations; public transport contribution (£123,760); travel plan and monitoring fee (£2,500);
  - compensation for loss of five on-street parking bays (£37,240);
  - tree contribution due to the removal of trees at the site (£40,000);
  - employment and training initiatives; Section 106 management fee (£2,250).
- b) That in the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the resolution to grant planning permission the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.
- c) That prior to the Chief Planning Officer discharging the landscaping conditions on this application, this issue be brought back to the Plans Panel meeting for consideration.

**7 PREAPP/10/00302 and PREAPP/10/00303 - Leeds (River Aire) Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS), Leeds Station to Knostrop Weir**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to Leeds (River Aire) Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS), Leeds Station to Knostrop Weir.

The following representatives attended and addressed the meeting:-

- Andrew Wheeler, Highways and Transportation (Applicant)
- Michael Nichols, Arup
- Nigel Foster, Arup

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme.

The presentation highlighted the following key areas:-

- History of flooding in Leeds with specific reference to the Crown Point area
- History of the scheme
- Details of the proposed scheme including:-
  - Project Definition
  - Project Description
  - Scheme Delivery
  - Key Constraints and drivers

- Key benefits
- The funding streams
- Based on the Council's Design Vision and Guide
- Walls (Linear Defences), Weirs
- Knostrop Cut proposals
- Proposed Consultation and timescales

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues and the applicant team duly responded:-

- Clarification of the current proposals around upper Kirkstall, Wellington Bridge and the reasons for the removal of Knostrop Cut
- To welcome the report on flooding, but to convey concerns that the authority continued to give planning permission to areas which were prone to flooding
- Clarification of the improvements at Knostrop Cut in relation to walking and cycling
- Clarification if there would be any significant downstream effects in other areas arising from the proposals and the need for officers to liaise with Wakefield Council in this regard

**RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report and pre-application presentation be noted.
- b) That this meeting notes that Plans Panel (East) would be consulted on the scheme and that the final proposals would be brought back to Plans Panel (City Centre) for approval.

**8 Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> July 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

(The meeting concluded at 3.20pm)

This page is intentionally left blank