

City Plans Panel

27<sup>th</sup> April 2017

Supplementary Information - Agenda Item No.9

(Application No.16/05198/FU)

This page is intentionally left blank



---

**Supplementary Report of the Chief Planning Officer**

***CITY PLANS PANEL***

**Date: 27<sup>th</sup> April 2017**

**Subject: Planning Application 16/05198/FU**

**Proposal for demolition of existing buildings and construction of multi-level development comprising 224 apartments and commercial unit with associated parking and landscaping, at Land At Corner Of Whitehall Road And Springwell Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS12 1AW**

**Applicant: Citylife**

---

**RECOMMENDATION: Defer and Delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the specified conditions (and any others which he might consider appropriate), and following completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following additional matters:**

- **Affordable Housing: to undertake a 3 month exercise to explore provision on-site, in the event of that failing then to accept a commuted sum of £634,474 towards off site affordable housing provision in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision to be paid on occupation of the first residential unit. The retention of the building as a Private Rented Scheme (Build To Rent) for a minimum period of 10 years from first occupation. To secure payment of an additional sum of £240,800 on the sale of the first of any unit to be sold within 10 years of the occupation of the building**
- **Employment and Training for Local People**
- **Contribution of £15,000 Traffic Regulation Order (including car club space);**
- **Contribution of £5,000 Loss of revenue for lost parking space for Car Club space;**
- **£15,000 Car Club fund for residents;**
- **£38,900 Sustainable Travel Fund; and**
- **£3,120 Travel Plan Monitoring fee.**

**In the circumstances where the Section 106 Agreement 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.**

**1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 This is a supplementary report to be read with the main report to Panel, in order to clarify some of the matters raised in the report. These matters relate to the following sections:
- 1.2 Height of the scheme (refers to paragraph 1.1 of main report).
- 1.3 Highways request for contribution towards pedestrian crossing (refers to paragraph 7.24 of main report).
- 1.4 Affordable housing (refers to paragraph 7.31 onwards of main report).

## **2.0 Height of Scheme**

- 2.1 The introductory paragraph of the main report infers that the height of the proposed buildings have increased since the scheme was submitted to Members at the pre-application stage. In essence the scheme as put to Members at pre-application stage is the same as the current scheme with some very minor variations in configuration to allow for stair heights etc. The pre-app scheme put forward a 16 storey building, as the current one does and the maximum height of the new build remains at 50.3m. The pre-app scheme did indicate a height of 47.6m but this was to the top of the roof terrace and not the parapet that sits at roof level. The concept of the scheme has remained the same, alterations have been undertaken to take account of Member comments, wind issues and finer points of detailing.

## **3.0 Highways Contribution**

- 3.1 With regard to the highways contributions for a crossing on Whitehall Road, in discussions between planning officers and the applicants it was felt that the contribution could not be justified on planning grounds due to the lack of planning policy grounds on which to base it. Within the draft Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan there is a desire to improve connectivity which does include additional crossings that make it easier for pedestrians to get around. However at the moment that Plan is draft only and there are two existing crossings on Whitehall Road on the journey into the city centre where most residents are likely to travel to for services and leisure. As it stands therefore there was considered to be not enough justification to ask for this contribution.

## **4.0 Affordable Housing**

- 4.1 To provide greater clarity to Members with regard to the ability to provide affordable housing on site, the applicants have approached major Registered Affordable Housing Providers (RPs) to seek to fulfill the terms of our affordable housing policy and have offered the following to these RPs:
  - 4.1.1 Full 5% provision pepper-potted within the building.
  - 4.1.2 Full 5% provision located within only the smaller block to improve efficiency of management and maintenance.
  - 4.1.3 Full 5% provision plus ability to own remaining apartments within the smaller block, to provide complete autonomy for management and maintenance.
- 4.2 Unfortunately the RPs approached by the applicant were not prepared to take on any of the offers generally due to the fact that these are apartments and not traditional family houses which is currently their preferred option (the RPs approached by the applicant cited issues of management/maintenance charges that apartments bring as well as

issues of shared ownership and management). As a result of this the applicants stated they would have to fall back on the provision of a commuted sum in order to meet the policy requirements.

4.3 However following further discussions with Council Officers to consider the position of other RPs, the applicants have agreed to undertake further investigations into the provision of on-site affordable housing and this will be written into the S106 agreement such that it will now include an additional 3 month process in consultation with the Council's Housing Growth Team, to secure the provision of affordable housing on site by undertaking the following work:

4.3.1 Re-marketing the site to RP's for on-site provision pepper potted within the building.

4.3.2 Discuss with RP's the option of providing on-site affordable in the smaller block to improve management efficiency and costs.

4.3.3 Look at the option of providing "Blended sub-market" housing managed on site at intermediate rents only by the applicants own funders or their agents.

4.3.4 Look at the possibility of Leeds Housing managing the affordable housing on site.

4.4 The applicants have already begun working with our housing growth team in order to pursue the above further and are clearly committed to providing affordable housing on site if there is a way to make it work. If these activities fail and no provider can be confirmed then the affordable housing commuted sum would be provided as detailed in paras. 7.35 and 7.36 of the main report. This clearly meets the terms of our policies and demonstrates clear commitments on behalf of the applicants to providing affordable housing.

4.5 With regard to the calculation of the commuted sum it should be noted that at para's 7.35 and 7.36 the calculations are incorrectly referred to as sums per square metre, this should in fact be per square foot. The sums calculated are correct; it is just the terminology in the report that is wrong. The corrected lines should therefore read:

4.5.1 "These calculations were based on a sale value of £185 per square foot" (para 7.35, line 3).

4.5.2 "This is based on the assumption that the sale prices within this development would reach £205 per square foot on the open market" (para 7.36, line 5).

4.6 As stated above the actual sums calculated are correct and reflect fully the methodology used on other sites for affordable housing commuted sums on PRS schemes. The recommendation box at the top of this report has been amended to reflect the additional requirements for the s106.

## **5.0 Conclusion**

5.1 The above is intended to clarify certain parts of the main officer report, the recommendation remains unchanged and is for approval of the scheme subject to the completion of a s106 agreement.

This page is intentionally left blank