

# Public Document Pack

Supplementary Information

City Plans Panel – 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016

Agenda Item 6 – Minutes of the City Plans Panel Meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2016

This page is intentionally left blank

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 3RD MARCH, 2016

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

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn,  
S Hamilton, G Latty, T Leadley,  
C Campbell, A Khan, K Ritchie, E Taylor,  
G Wilkinson, E Nash and C Towler

### 106 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

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

There were no resolutions to exclude the public.

### 108 Late Items

There were no late items submitted for consideration.

### 109 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

No declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests were made.

However Councillor Leadley declared a significant other interest in PREAPP/14/0066) Residential Development, Outline for Circa 170 dwellings at land between Thorpe Lane and Bradford Road, Tingley as he knew the owner of an adjacent site.

### 110 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Walshaw, Ingham and R Procter.

In attendance as substitutes were Councillors Nash, Towler and Wilkinson.

### 111 Minutes - 11th February 2016

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> February be approved as a correct record. Subject to the following insertion being made:

Minute No. 104 PRE-APPLICATION Reference PREAPP/15/00956 – Proposal for mixed use residential development at Left Bank, Former Hydro Aluminium Foundry, Clarence Road, Hunslet, Leeds 10

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 24th March, 2016

“Members attended a site visit prior to the commencement of the meeting”

## **112 Matters Arising**

Minute No 93 Outline application 14/06534/OT at Quarry Hill

It was agreed the wording for the correction to the minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> January 2016 to do with this item be amended to read;

“There was an agreement in place with Caddick and Leeds City Council for a multi storey car park to be built. However this would not be built unless it was established that it was viable to do so. “

Minute No. 104 PRE-APPLICATION Reference PREAPP/15/00956 – Proposal for mixed use residential development at Left Bank, Former Hydro Aluminium Foundry, Clarence Road, Hunslet, Leeds 10

It was confirmed to Members that the rubbish deposited on the river banks had not been cleared yet, this would be raised with the applicants as the planning application is submitted and progresses further.

## **113 84 KIRKSTALL ROAD, LEEDS LS3 1LS PLANNING APPLICATION REF. 15/05029/OT VARIATION OF CONDITION 3 (APPROVED PLANS) OF APPROVAL 11/01850/EXT TO ALLOW A VARIATION IN MIX OF ACCOMMODATION, AMENDED DRAWING TO INDICATE RESIDENTIAL USE ADJACENT TO KIRKSTALL ROAD AND AMENDMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENT**

**RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION REF. 15/05030/RM FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT UP TO 11 STOREYS COMPRISING RESIDENTIAL WITH GROUND FLOOR A3/A4 UNIT, UNDERCROFT CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPED PUBLIC SPACE**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which proposed a variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of approval 11/01850/EXT to allow a variation in mix of accommodation, amended drawing to indicate residential use adjacent to Kirkstall Road and amendment of affordable housing requirement and a reserved matters application ref. 15/05030/RM for mixed use development up to 11 storeys comprising residential with ground floor a3/a4 unit, part undercroft and part surface car parking and landscaped public space.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item.

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

- Affordable housing provision had been reduced from 15% to 5% in line with current adopted Core Strategy policy. However it was highlighted that the number of residential units had increased to 107;
- Where flats had north facing windows provision had been made for these to be dual aspect;
- Details of the materials to be used for construction of the building;
- The screening work to be undertaken to reduce the visual impact of the car park, this to be a planted solution to create a green wall. Furthermore Members were shown designs of a deck (green screen) above the car park which would partially screen parked cars;
- Concerns about the effects of wind on the development had been considered and landscaping had been proposed as a way of mitigating against this.

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

- The change from a mixed use development to a residential only scheme, which Members considered, on the face of it, seemed like a big change to the application. Members were informed that the approach being used here was consistent with our general approach as the proposed building occupied the same floor space, scale and footprint parameters set by the outline approval;
- It was noted that the north facing courtyard of the building would mean a lack of sunny amenity space for the residents and that the proposed planting would be limited due to restriction on the types of plants that would grow in a north facing area;
- Members discussed that it would be preferable to turn the building round. However the Panel were informed that the layout plans had been approved in 2011 and that it was not now possible to request the developer to change these pursuant to the reserved matters application;
- The possible effect of strong winds on the development and how this had been mitigated against;
- Flooding was discussed and it was confirmed to Members that flood water from the recent floods had reached the Kirkstall Road side of the building. However the proposed floor level would be 1 metre higher than the height reached by the floods;
- The location of the affordable housing within the development. It was confirmed that as yet it was undecided where this would be; and
- Members confirmed that they would prefer to see the car park associated with the development to be constructed using block paving to help reduce the amount of surface water run off.

Throughout discussion of this item Members sought assurance about the likely start date for meaningful construction of this development. The architect to the scheme confirmed that the developer was actively marketing the

scheme and that a condition existed which meant the developer had to commence within one year of approval of the scheme. The Head of Planning Services also commented that officers would investigate ways of ensuring it was a meaningful start on site as part of the implementation of the scheme.

The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that concerns raised about the effects of wind could be dealt with as part of the conditions imposed on the developer and that further work would be done with the developer in relation to securing appropriate design mitigation measures. It was also confirmed that if the developer did not make a start on the scheme within a year then a fresh application would be required to be made.

## **RESOLVED –**

To DEFER and DELEGATE the two applications to the Chief Planning Officer for approval , subject to the specified conditions at Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate), and following the completion of a Deed of Variation to the original Section 106 Agreement to cover the following amended obligation:

- Affordable Housing at 5% of the total proposed units in accordance with current Leeds Core Strategy policy for this location. The remainder of the Section 106 agreement as amended in 2011 remains unchanged and would be carried forward by Deed of Variation onto application 15/05029/OT:
- Public Transport Infrastructure Improvements (SPD5) contribution £24, 824
- Off-site landscaping contribution for works in the vicinity of the site £10,000
- Off-site highways works contribution for works in the vicinity of the site £50,000
- Travel Plan measures car club trial provision contribution £6,500
- Travel Plan monitoring fee £5,220
- Public access through the site
- Provision for enhancement to Traffic Regulation Orders in the local area up to £5,000
- Cooperation with local jobs and skills initiatives
- Management Fee £5,250

- 114 Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00627 Demolition of existing shared rugby/cricket stand and replacement shared North/South stand and demolition of existing Southern Terrace and replacement South Stand to Rugby Ground, St Michaels Lane, Headingley Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00660 Residential Development for circa 40 dwellings at land off Weetwood Avenue, Weetwood. Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00661 Residential Development, Outline for Circa 170 dwellings at land between Thorpe Lane and Bradford Road, Tingley**

Members received a report of the Chief Planning Officer and received a pre application presentation on behalf of Leeds Rugby for the demolition of existing shared rugby/cricket stand and replacement shared North/South stand and demolition of existing Southern Terrace and replacement South Stand to Rugby Ground, St Michaels Lane, Headingley, the residential development for circa 40 dwellings at land off Weetwood Avenue, Weetwood and the development of circa 170 dwellings on land between Thorpe Lane and Bradford Road, Tingley.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item on all three sites.

The Head of Planning Services introduced the report and explained the ownership of the Weetwood and Tingley sites and how they related to the application to develop the North/South Stand and the South Stand at Headingley Stadium.

Members were shown a video of how the proposed stands would look.

Representatives of the developer, were in attendance and provided the following additional information:

- That Headingley Stadium made significant contributions to the local economy and that these proposals were critical to securing the future of Test Match cricket when the staging agreement was considered in 2019. During Test matches 650 people are employed and that the Stadium, generates £4.8 million in visitor spending each year;
- The residential sites at Tingley (171 dwellings) and Weetwood (46 dwellings) if approved would provide funding for and enable the development of the stands. The representative took the Panel through the details of the residential sites;
- The development of the North / South Stand would meet ECB requirements to stage International Cricket. The developments as a whole would result in an increase in the capacity of the cricket ground and a reduction in capacity at the rugby ground;
- The benefits to the community that the rugby and cricket clubs make through their charitable foundations; and
- That the Rugby South stand would have to be built first followed by the dual North / South Stand

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

- The history behind Leeds Rugby's ownership of the Tingley and Weetwood sites, the prices paid for the sites and the current values;
- The possibility for value engineering to reduce the costs of developing the stands;
- Traffic in the area on match days and that work would be required to be done to mitigate against the effect of this;
- Noise on matchdays was considered and it was noted that the new stands would be designed to reduce the impact of crowd noise;
- Timings of the development and the reliance on the sale of the land at Tingley and Weetwood for housing in order to progress the stands. Furthermore it was confirmed that additional funding would also need to be found to complete the stands but that all money from the sale of the two residential sites would be used for the stands;
- The number of applications was discussed, Members commented that they would have preferred one application to encompass the re-development of the North / South Stand and the South Stand;
- Members commented that further work would need to be done in relation to the applications to build houses at Tingley and Weetwood and that the development at Tingley was too dense;
- Members noted that if the North/South Stand was re-developed there would still be no guarantee of international cricket after the 2019 staging agreement ends between Yorkshire CCC and the ECB;
- It was noted that the clubs undertake charitable work and that the stadium is an asset to Leeds. However Members commented that there were no obvious benefits to the residents of Tingley and Weetwood who would lose green belt land and gain more houses putting pressure on roads, schools and health centres; and
- It was confirmed that Leeds Rugby and Yorkshire CC had no other saleable assets.

The Panel then heard from the Weetwood Residents Association who objected to the proposals. Information put forward included:

- That Weetwood Residents Association supported developments at Headingley Stadium but not at the cost of losing valuable greenbelt;
- Allowing the development of the Weetwood site to fund the stadium would possibly be a breach of planning process; the residents association considered that this was not a circumstance exceptional enough to develop greenbelt;
- The development of the stands did not fairly and reasonably relate to the development of the greenbelt land and would not provide public amenity to Weetwood residents;
- If the developments were to proceed there is no guarantee of international cricket at Headingley; and
- That the proposals would need to be determined by the Secretary of State.



The Head of Planning Services read out three emails from ward members commenting on the proposals, these were from:

- Councillor Walshaw (Headingley) who highlighted concern over the design of the stadium and commented that work needs to be done to improve the flow of traffic around Headingley on matchdays and deal with noise;
- Councillor Dunn (Ardsley & Robin Hood), who raised concerns about the loss of green space in Tingley and likely traffic implications; and
- Councillor Renshaw (Ardsley & Robin Hood) who raised strong objections to the loss of green belt at Tingley and further pressure on infrastructure at Tingley.

Members further commented that they wanted to see world class sporting facilities in Leeds. However they felt this was an enabling application being used to contribute to facilities in Headingley and that the people of Tingley and Weetwood would feel little benefit and lose important green belt. Members recognised that these two sites were in the Draft Site Allocation Plan but not in phase 1 but that they were still greenbelt land. Besides this Members felt that much more work would need to be done to improve the layout of the residential developments.

Members responded to the questions featured at paragraph 6.23 of the submitted report as follows:

1. Members wished to see Headingley re-developed and were supportive of this taking place. However the Panel had concerns about bringing forward development of the green belt at Weetwood and Tingley ahead of the conclusion of the site allocations process.
2. Members felt that they did not have enough information to comment on the design of the residential sites or Headingley Stadium. They did feel that there were too many dwellings on the Tingley site, that the apartments in the Weetwood scheme should be removed and that careful consideration would need to be given to the relationship of the new south rugby stand to dwellings on St Michaels Lane.
3. Members were concerned about the loss of the urban green corridor at Weetwood and the impact this could have on the Conservation area.
4. Members felt that careful consideration needs to be given to the highways surrounding the stadium but also the impact to highways by building new houses at Tingley and Weetwood.
5. The other issues members wished to raise at this stage were the importance of local people benefitting from any development and also that flooding would need to be considered at the Tingley site. Finally Members considered that legal advice should be sought in relation to the “enabling development” issue with regards to both the Weetwood and Tingley sites

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the report and presentations be noted.

**115 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

1.30pm Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> March 2016.