

City Plans Panel

20th February 2020

(Agenda Item No.6 –
Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on
30th January 2020)

This page is intentionally left blank

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 30TH JANUARY, 2020

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors C Campbell, P Carlill, D Cohen,
A Garthwaite, E Nash, P Wadsworth,
N Walshaw, G Latty, P Gruen, K Brooks,
R Finnigan and D Jenkins

A Members site visit was held in connection with the following applications:
PREAPP/20/00018 – New terminal and changes to the day time flight regime
at Leeds/ Bradford Airport, Application No.17/08262/OT – Residential
development at West Ardsley, WF3 and PREAPP/19/00511 – Highway works
and new entrance to Leeds Train Station, Leeds 1 and was attended by the
following Councillors: K Brooks, P Carlill, C Campbell, R Finnigan,
D Jenkins, G Latty, J McKenna, E Nash, P Wadsworth and N Walshaw.

101 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

102 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

There were no items identified where it was considered necessary to exclude
the press or public from the meeting due to the confidential nature of the
business to be considered.

103 Late Items

Although there were no late items the Chair did accept the inclusion of
Supplementary Information in respect of Agenda Item No. 8 (Application No.
17/08262/OT – Outline Application for Residential Development to land off
Haigh Moor Road, West Ardsley (Minute No.109 referred) and additional
representation in respect of Agenda Item No. 14 (PREAPP/20/00018 – New
Terminal Building and change in daytime flight regime at Leeds/Bradford
International Airport (Minute No.108 referred)

104 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests made at the
meeting.

105 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: D Blackburn, C Gruen and A Khan

Councillors: K Brooks, R Finnigan and D Jenkins were in attendance as substitute Members.

106 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 6th January 2020 were submitted for comment/ approval.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 6th January 2020 be accepted as a true and correct record.

107 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Former Marsh Lane Railway Station (Minute No. 95 referred) – With reference to the previous meeting when this issue was discussed the Chief Planning Officer now reported the receipt of a letter from the West Yorkshire Combined Authority. The letter suggested that whilst Marsh Lane can be looked at again, previous studies have indicated that stopping trains so close to Leeds centre creates dis-benefit for existing passengers. Furthermore the track and signalling constraints in this area affect feasibility which would make it difficult to build a business case.

RESOLVED – That the issue be referred to the Development Plans Panel for further consideration.

108 PREAPP/20/00018 - New Terminal Building and Change In Daytime Flight Regime at Leeds Bradford International Airport

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of a Pre-application proposal which sought the provision of a new terminal building and a change in the daytime flight regime at Leeds Bradford International Airport.

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

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site / location / context
- At the current time Leeds Bradford Airport was not looking to construct the approved extension (Application No. 18/06788/FU approved December 2018) but intends to upgrade the airport's facilities by building a new passenger terminal.
- The new terminal would be environmentally sustainable, high quality, modern (fit for purpose) and would improve passenger experience,

satisfy future demands and enable the airport to deliver on a highly ambitious sustainability agenda.

- The new building will be located to the eastern area of the airport on the existing runway apron.
- The building is likely to be three floors (including a mezzanine level) and will be 34,100 sqm
- Lower ground floor will provide surface access to the forecourt and access to the main terminal by lifts and escalators
- Ground floor (main terminal) will provide the check in hall and the arrivals halls along with baggage reclaim, customs and baggage make up
- First floor mezzanine (main terminal) will include immigration and associated facilities linked to the western walkway
- Second floor (main terminal) – this includes central search and departure lounge with associated retail, food and beverage, duty free and premium lounges. It provides direct access
- A western walkway will be provided alongside the new terminal building and will provide contact stands for approximately 12 aircraft.
- The new terminal building will be targeted as an 'excellent' accredited rating under the BREEAM standard which will be designed to maximise energy efficiency and incorporate energy generation on site.
- The proposal will involve a new and modified vehicular (and pedestrian/cycle) access from Whitehouse Lane. The existing car park will be reconfigured to provide new internal service roads, bus parking and pick up and drop off points. A new forecourt will be provided to the east of the terminal building.
- The proposal will also involve the relocation of the existing fuel tanks and reconfiguration of the existing car parking. The intention is to maintain the same level of parking, and if additional car parking is required this can be provided at Viking Car Park, which is owned by the airport.
- The proposal also involves changes to the day time flight regime which was originally approved in 1993. The current daytime period for the airport is 0700 to 2300, with the night time period 2300 to 0700. The proposal is to change the daytime period so it will be 0600 to 2330 and shorten the night time period to 2330 to 0600.

Members raised the following questions:

- Why was it crucial that the flight regime is changed
- Had local community groups been consulted about the proposed new flight times
- What are the proposals for the old terminal building
- What were the proposals to protect residents from aircraft noise at night
- The City Council had recently declared a climate emergency, why were you not using the existing planning permission
- Does freight fly from LBA

- Could a further explanation of quota counts be included in any subsequent reports to Panel
- How will future automation impact on job growth
- How will passengers be kept dry outside the terminal building
- Is the design of the terminal building 'future proofed'
- How will public transport expansion be progressed in connection with the airport expansion
- What are the airports plans to achieve net zero carbon

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representatives said:

- Members were informed that flight-times were changing (06.00 – 23.30) to fit in with other EU and UK airports and ensure efficient use of aircraft (carriers want to rotate aircraft 3 times a day to maximise their assets)
- It was reported that the consultation process had only just started and included plans for community group engagement
- Members were informed that, for now the air traffic control tower would remain but the rest of the terminal building would be demolished to be replaced with hotel, office and warehousing accommodation linked to the airport in the long term
- In terms of noise mitigation measures, it was reported that proposals were still at an early stage but control and management of the flight time regime would be undertaken with greater levels of protection being put in place. Noise Consultants had been instructed and the airport understood their obligations to protect residential amenity
- Implementing the existing planning permission would not be environmentally sound in the context of changing Government Policy. It is intended that the new terminal building would achieve an 'excellent' accredited rating under the BREEAM standard which would be designed to maximise energy efficiency and incorporate energy generation on site. There was also a requirement to fit new X-ray equipment within the new terminal building and the new configuration allows new aircraft (quieter and more fuel efficient) to be brought in.
- Members were informed that no freight flew from LBA and there were no future discussions planned
- Offers confirmed that further details on quota accounts would be included in future reports to Panel
- The job projection forecasts would take account of planned automation processes
- There would be a 30m plaza off-set to the new terminal which could include canopies to the bus terminals and taxi ranks
- The design of the terminal building is initially planned to accommodate 50,000 passengers. It is a modular design which would allow future expansion if required
- It is anticipated that the planned train station will be operational by 2023 with bus shuttle times to the airport of no more than 2-3 minutes. There will also be additional bus route frequency

- The buildings and operations airside will be net zero by 2023. For flights the zero carbon targets are linked to Government Policy.

The Panel heard from Nicky Ford and Robert Huggle, Leeds residents who objected to the proposals

Ms Ford said that only recently Leeds City Council had declared a climate emergency and we now found that proposals were coming forward for a new airport with an increase in passengers from 4 million to 7 million which will result in significant increase in CO2 emissions. The responsible residents of Leeds do not want this, only 3% of residents would fly from Leeds, so where was the benefit. Aircraft noise is a big issue and a lot of children find it difficult to sleep if they are in the flight path, noise is a mental health issue which can bring on stress and anxiety.

Mr Huggle said that he supported the comments made by Ms Ford and in addition he welcomed plans for a new carbon policy for the airport by 2030 and suggested that we must see Leeds become a greener city

Questions to Ms Ford

- What has been your experience of aircraft noise over the past 10 years
- Aircraft noise may be reduced from newer aircraft
- It is anticipated there would be a large increase in passenger numbers, if they didn't go to Leeds/Bradford they would travel by car/train to Manchester creating more CO2 emissions

In responding Ms Ford said:

- Aircraft noise leads to a pause in conversation. Night-time flying is now more of a problem, scary even terrifying. Also you can hear the planes on landing from the reverse thrust
- The climate emergency provides new opportunities for new ways of working. Unless planes can be much cleaner then society needs to reduce flying
- I would like to see sustainable travel to all areas.

Questions to Mr Huggle

- Would you consider the carbon emissions to be acceptable
- CO2 emissions from the UK were dropping but this was not the same with other countries

In responding Mr Huggle said:

- There was a general commitment to reduce CO2 levels, more big changes were required, cleaner planes in particular
- I live in Leeds and take responsibility for Leeds levels. Per Capita emissions in the UK is greater than elsewhere

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion Members provided the following feedback:

- Members expressed the view that there was too little detail within the report and greater information was required on the matters they had raised
- The Panel need a greater understanding of aircraft noise
- Members asked that a workshop session be established to provide clarity on a number of issues and allow Members the opportunity to consider the best way forward

The Chair thanked the developers and local residents for their attendance and contributions suggesting that proposals were at an early stage and far more detailed information was required

RESOLVED –

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation
- (iii) That a workshop session be established up to provide clarity on a number of issues and allow Members the opportunity to consider the best way forward

109 Application No. 17/08262/OT - Outline application for a residential development with all matters reserved save for the two principle accesses off Westerton Road and Haigh Moor Road, (but not to include access within the site), three points of access at Upper Green Avenue, Sandringham Drive and Hill Top Lane, associated works, public open space provision and accessibility and qualitative improvements to local greenspace to land off Haigh Moor Road and Westerton Road, West Ardsley, Leeds WF3.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of an outline application for a residential development with all matters reserved save for the two principle accesses off Westerton Road and Haigh Moor Road, (but not to include access within the site), three points of access at Upper Green Avenue, Sandringham Drive and Hill Top Lane, associated works, public open space provision and accessibility and qualitative improvements to local greenspace to land off Haigh Moor Road and Westerton Road, West Ardsley, Leeds WF3.

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

Planning Officers addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Thursday, 20th February, 2020

- Site/ location/context
- The proposal is to develop 299 dwellings within two sites that are allocated under the Council's recently-adopted SAP, with associated works
- Creation of public open spaces, a nature reserve and wider accessibility and qualitative improvements.
- The developable parts of the two SAP sites are separated into four plots.
- The collective development of the four plots will facilitate the creation of various public open spaces and the enhancement and improvement to Haigh Wood and surrounding public rights of way.
- Accesses into the four parcels of housing land including two principle accesses from Westerton Road and Haigh Moor Road; and three points of access from Upper Green Avenue, Sandringham Drive and Hill Top Lane.
- House types to range in size, type and tenure.
- 15% Affordable housing is proposed.
- The areas surrounding the site comprise of residential properties, interspersed by local facilities, including small shops, schools, public houses and other local community facilities.
- The areas of residential properties are interspersed with public open spaces and wider agricultural fields that are defined as Green Belt land.
- To the east of Haigh Moor Road there is Ardsley Reservoir, whilst to the west – within the middle of this site – there is Baghill Beck and Haigh Woods.
- Various public footpaths cross the application site and link the residential streets with the wider public green spaces.
- There are some historic Grade II Listed buildings within the wider area, however, none are sited within the proposed development site.
- The site is policy compliant and in accordance with the Site Allocation Plan (SAP)
- The site is considered to be sustainable and meets National/ Local Plan requirements

The Planning Case Officer reported the receipt of further representations following publication of the application on the 22nd January 2020.

- Recent housing developments had increased traffic in the area and this would make things considerably worse;
- The road infrastructure is at capacity and junction 28 of the M62 and sections of the A653 and the A650 are particularly bad;
- Insufficient doctors and schools for additional families
The applicant has a responsibility to improve ecological networks such as Haigh Woods and achieve biodiversity net gains;
- The development is unsustainable;
- The development will adversely affect Haigh Woods;
- The area has had its fair share of housing

Officers reported that the above comments do not raise any new issues and had been responded to in the original report. However, it should be clarified that Haigh Woods itself is not proposed to be developed and the proposal seeks to enhance the woodlands both in terms of the biodiversity and accessibility for all local residents.

The Panel heard from Councillor L Mulherin who was objecting to the proposal

Councillor Mulherin said that the local road network would not be able to cope with additional traffic, picking up and drop off at the local Primary School was already difficult. Access to local amenities from this site was poor, there were no proposals for a new school in the area, and there would be an adverse impact on the historic woodland

Questions to Councillor Mulherin:

- As Executive Member responsible, you had the responsibility for bringing forward the SAP, the submitted report indicates that this site is policy complainant but you're suggesting it's not.
- Do you consider this particular development to be unsustainable
- You appear to be supportive of the SAP but not when the application is in your own back yard
- Are there any shops within walking distance of the 4 site

In responding Councillor Mulherin said

- The Site Allocation Process was a lengthy process and was ongoing before I became Executive Member responsible. I have consistently opposed the proposal as a local ward member. I welcome a policy where the City Council has a 5 year land supply. I am not opposed to the SAP, my objections are just to this particular proposal
- The existing road network would not be able to cope with increased traffic movements, there is poor public transport in the area, a trip to the local GP surgery by bus could take up to 2 hours
- Other sites within the SAP have similar issues
- There are no shops in West Ardsley, the nearest shops/ amenities are in Tingley

The Panel heard from Councillor W Kidger who was also objecting to the proposal

Councillor Kidger said she was not opposed to the development of houses but this site was not the right location. This application has attracted a lot of objections and there is a strong feeling in the local community that to

include this site within the SAP was wrong. The local community want to save the Greenspace

Questions to Councillor Kidger

- Is it your view that the inspector and SAP process was wrong
- Do you consider the highway network to be unsafe in this area

In responding Councillor Kidger said

- Yes the SAP allocation was wrong
- There was already significant congestion on the highway network, which was unsafe, and the development of houses in this area would add to the congestion

The Panel heard from Councillor J Elliott who was also objecting to the proposal

Councillor Elliott said accessibility in this area was poor, there was not a reliable bus service, the highway network would not be able to cope, there was already considerable problems at Junction 28. This site did not meet the access requirements for the SAP

Questions to Councillor Elliott

- You consider this site to be unsustainable on the grounds of accessibility

In responding Councillor Elliott said:

- The bus service in this area was poor, there were no nearby train stations and the local highway network was congested – Yes, the site was unsustainable

The Panel heard from Mrs A Parnham who was also objecting to the proposal on behalf of West Ardsley Action Group.

Mrs Parnham said she was opposed to the application on sustainability grounds; schools in the area were already full so where would children from any new development go to school. The highways are congested and the proposals would adversely affect the biodiversity of the woods. The inclusion of this site within the SAP was wrong and would be inappropriate development for the settlement of West Ardsley. There are many errors in the SAP process and this site does not meet the targets.

Questions to Mrs Parnham:

- Are there parking problems in the area
- If infrastructure matters were resolved would the proposed development be acceptable

In responding Mrs A Parnham said:

- Yes there are parking problems on local streets in the evenings and at weekends
- The community objections were not a result of 'nimbyism'

The Panel heard from Mr G Whitford, Applicants representative who was speaking in support of the of the application

Mr Whitford said the adoption of the SAP was completed after a lengthy consultation process and detailed consideration of the objections raised. The City Council now had a 5 year land supply policy. The development of this site is compliant with legislation. As part of the proposal Haigh Wood would be protected and secured by obligation within the Section 106 Agreement. All the objections made are relevant but these have been considered and addressed in the SAP process. This site conforms with the accessibility standards with the SAP. A significant contribution would be provided for improvements to the local highway network. Affordable housing provision would comply with adopted policy and £2 million of CIL contribution can be put towards local school provision and other infrastructure improvements. Members were informed that this application was not in conflict with NPPF.

Questions to Mr Whitford

- The contribution to M62 Junction 28 was sizable but the other highway contributions appeared to be modest
- What consultation had taken place with the local community
- The Inspector said the site is sustainable but local ward Members are not of the same view
- How will the site ecology be enhanced
- Do some parts of the site fail to meet the Council's accessibility standards
- How many buses serve the site per hour
- What proportion of West Ardsley does the site represent

In responding Mr Whitford said

- The figure to be provided was based on the impact of the development on the local highway network. LCC Highway Officers clarified that the contribution would go towards mitigating cumulative impact of all developments within the area on the local road network. The site does not meet accessibility standards.
- It was reported that no consultation had taken place with regard this specific application, but consultation/ objections had been considered as part of the SAP
- The views of Local Ward Members can be taken into account but this has been designated as a sustainable site by the SAP

- The local ecology will be enhanced by planned management of the woods and site
- The site does not meet all elements of the accessibility standards
- There was a frequency of 1 bus per hour to different destinations but accessibility and sustainability considerations need to be looked at in the round and balanced against the benefits of the development
- He did not have information on the proportion of the site area or proposed housing numbers in relation to West Ardsley as a whole.

Questions to Officers:

- This site appears already to be poorly served, local highway network, transport and amenities – Development of this site would make the situation worse. Members were of the view that contributions were not sufficient in amount and were concerned that the highways improvements could not be paid for until such time as more development had taken place on other sites.
- The Climate Emergency was not declared until recently and a lot of vehicle movements may be generated by this development
- All local schools are full, where would children from the development go to school
- Are officers still of the view that this site is policy compliant and accords with the Development Plan
- What proportion of the area of West Ardsley does the site represent
- What level of affordable is required in the area
- Will the Council's residential space standards and housing mix targets be met
- Does the assessment of cumulative impact on highway network take account of the planned development within the neighbouring Kirklees Authority area

In responding to the issues raised, Planning Officers/ the applicant's representatives said:

- The Chief Planning Officer said the SAP had been adopted after an extensive site selection process which focus on settlement development across Leeds. There would be an infrastructure delivery plan to recognise and align to planned housing growth in respect of highway improvements and school growth but it is recognised that some sites are in areas of existing deficiency
- Sustainability considered through a Local Plan Review
- There was no requirement within the SAP to provide land for school development on these two SAP sites, instead other sites within the locality have been identified for school provision and the CIL contribution from the development can be put towards local school provision
- The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that overall the scheme is supported by and complies with the Development Plan

- Officers did not have information on the proportion of the site area or the proposed housing numbers in relation to West Ardsley as a whole
- The requirement for affordable housing provision in this area is 15% of the total units proposed
- This is an outline application and the details of residential unit sizes and housing mix will be addressed at reserved matters stage in accordance with the Council's adopted policies
- The Transport Assessment has taken into account the impact of the planned development on the neighbouring site within the Kirklees Authority

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- More information is required about the nature and timing of local highway infrastructure improvements
- Further information about school provision in the area is required
- Access to shops and healthcare provision is a concern
- The type and size of house proposed for this site requires more consideration
- Possible impact on a local beauty spot
- This site does not meet detailed accessibility, infrastructure and sustainability requirements
- It is recognised that these are allocated housing sites but 299 houses is considered excessive for these sites
- More consultation is needed with local residents to address their concerns

The Chair thanked Local Ward Members, residents and the developers for their attendance and contributions. He said this application had been discussed thoroughly but there still remained issues of concern.

Panel discussed the way forward and were minded to refuse the planning proposal. It was considered that the reasons for refusal needed to be specific to the proposals for this site.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred to allow the Chief Planning Officer to prepare and bring back to Panel detailed reasons for refusal based on the following:

- The narrowness and nature of the access roads leading to the entrances to the sites
- The lack of information on the mitigation that is required to address the impact on the local highway junctions
- The failure of the site to meet the Core Strategy accessibility standards for housing development

110 Application reference 19/01010/FU - Major planning application for demolition of existing buildings, construction of two residential (Use Class C3) buildings including communal areas for residential use,

servicing, basement car parking, landscaping, public open space and highway works at land off Marsh Lane, Saxton Lane and Flax Place, Leeds, LS9 8HE

With reference to the meeting of 19th October 2019 and the decision to defer and delegate the application to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the draft conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

The Chief Planning Officer now submitted a report which explained that one of the obligations to be included within the agreement was to provide 15 No. affordable housing units on site. This figure was the result of the independent review, undertaken by the District Valuer's Office, of a Development Viability Appraisal submitted by the applicant. The report concluded that although the applicant could not afford the full policy compliant position of 7% of the total units as affordable housing the applicant could afford to provide 4.23% (15) of the total units as affordable housing in addition to the other Section 106 and CIL obligations. The units would be provided at the Council's adopted affordable benchmark rents and proportionally reflect the mix of accommodation type and unit sizes proposed within the overall development.

It was reported that following lengthy discussions with the developer and funders of the development and due to the difficulties of providing on-site affordable housing in this case, and taking into account the flexibility provided for affordable housing on Build to Rent (BtR) schemes by the Council's adopted policy, it had been concluded that the commuted sum option was now the preferred route. The applicant had also stated that the timetable for the commencement of construction was to be on site in Q2 of this year, and so the requirement to receive planning permission was now urgent.

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- The affordable housing was not able to be provided on-site and the proposal was now to provide a commuted sum which would be spent in the vicinity of the site.
- Members queried if the commuted sum would be spent within the same Ward
- In agreeing to an off-site commuted sum, were we not setting a precedent

In responding to the issues raised, Planning Officers said:

- Officers confirmed that under the revised adopted Core Strategy policy (H5) a commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision was policy compliant for BtR development
- Members were informed that there was a proposal to potentially use the commuted sum on a neighbouring development
- Members were informed that a revised policy had already been adopted and an off-site commuted sum was policy compliant

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Thursday, 20th February, 2020

- If this was a different type of residential development, on-site affordable housing would be required

Referring to the revised adopted policy the Chair said that an off-site commuted sum for affordable housing provision was now policy compliant and in this particular case would move the project forward.

RESOLVED – To approve a revision to the obligations agreed at City Plans Panel on 10th October 2019 in respect of affordable housing provision i.e. from 15 affordable units to be provided on site to an off-site commuted sum of £1,084,881.

(Under Council Procedure rule 16.5 Councillor C Campbell required it to be recorded that he voted against this decision)

111 Application No. 19/06325/FU - Part demolition of the existing buildings, a change of use to and the construction of an Apart-Hotel (C1), leisure (A4) and commercial uses (B1) at 161 - 167 The Headrow, 19 - 21 East Parade, Leeds, LS1 2QS and Listed Building Consent Application 19/06326/LI for the part demolition of the existing buildings, a change of use to and the construction of an Apart-Hotel (C1), leisure (A4) and commercial uses (B1) at 161 - 167 The Headrow, 19 - 21 East Parade, Leeds, LS1 2QS

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sought the part demolition of the existing buildings, a change of use to and the construction of an Apart-Hotel (C1), leisure (A4) and commercial uses (B1) at 161 - 167 The Headrow, 19 - 21 East Parade, Leeds, LS1 2QS and Listed Building Consent (Application 19/06326/LI) for the part demolition of the existing buildings, a change of use to and the construction of an Apart-Hotel (C1), leisure (A4) and commercial uses (B1) at 161 - 167 The Headrow, 19 - 21 East Parade, Leeds, LS1 2QS

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

Planning Officers addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site/ Location/ Context
- Proposal – New 5 storey building at 19 – 21 East Parade and to convert existing the adjacent Grade II Listed former Jubilee Hotel to create a 43 unit apart-hotel (C1)
- Commercial space at ground floor to be used either for office proposals (B1) or a bar use (A4).
- To the rear a raised, enclosed, private deck area will be created for use by guests in the aparthotel.
- Materials; red brick and slate roofing

- Corbeling detailing around the windows
- Green walls to frontage and courtyard area

Members raised the following questions to officers/ applicant's representatives

- In the future, if this building was to convert to flats, would it be permitted development
- Would it be possible to include a brick feature to the corner of the roof of the new building
- Would there be any public realm benefits from this development
- Would it be possible to secure a public transport contribution
- Where would taxis pick up and drop off
- Would a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contribution be required

In responding to the issues raised, Planning Officers/ the applicant's representatives said:

- Members were informed that planning permission would be required for any such conversion
- Officers confirmed that the issue would be discussed with the applicants architect
- It was reported that an extra section of the footpath had already been secured but neither the potential impact of the development nor adopted planning policy required further obligations to be provided for public realm and public transport improvements
- The LCC Highways Officer confirmed that pick up and drop off would be located down the side of the building (Park Cross Street)
- Members were advised that the amount of CIL contribution would be £7314.55 in this case

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- The majority of Members welcomed the design of the building
- Members welcomed the proposals for the green walls
- One Member wished to see a brick feature to the top corner of the new building
- One Member suggested that the finials were unnecessary
- Welcome active street scene
- Welcome opportunity to view sample materials at condition discharge stage

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation, commenting that Members appeared to be supportive of the application

RESOLVED –

- (i) That Application No. 19/06325/FU be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the

submitted report and any others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate.

- (ii) That Application No. 19/06326/LI be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions in Appendix 1 of the submitted report and any others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate.

112 Application No. 19/06529/FU - Part 15 storey, part 2 storey hotel building (Use Class C1), with ancillary restaurant and bar, conference and meeting facilities, gym, associated landscaping, access and servicing arrangements and other associated works. Advertisement Application 19/06528/ADV for a digital advertisement screen to the side elevation of the new hotel building both at land between the Eastgate Roundabout, Dyer Street and the A61 to the east of the Victoria Gate multi storey car park, Leeds, LS2 7JL.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of an application for part 15 storey, part 2 storey hotel building (Use Class C1), with ancillary restaurant and bar, conference and meeting facilities, gym, associated landscaping, access and servicing arrangements and other associated works. Advertisement Application 19/06528/ADV for a digital advertisement screen to the side elevation of the new hotel building both at land between the Eastgate Roundabout, Dyer Street and the A61 to the east of the Victoria Gate multi storey car park, Leeds, LS2 7JL.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

Planning Officers addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site/ location/context
- The proposal is to create a new part 15, part 2 storey hotel development (205 bedrooms) - Use Class C1
- Conference space would be provided at first floor level, with associated meeting rooms.
- Restaurant space, an entrance lobby and bar lounge (Use Class A3 and A4) at ground floor level
- A digital screen (advertisement display) located on the north facing façade of the building.

Members raised the following questions to officers/ applicant's representatives

- The digital screen, was it on all the time (24/7) and what was located behind the screen
- The cycle store, would it be secure

In responding to the issues raised, Planning Officers/ the applicant's representatives said:

- Officers confirmed that the screen would be switched off at night (Conditioned). The screen is integrated into the façade of the building with hotel rooms located behind.
- Members were informed that the cycle store would be a secure facility

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- The majority of Members welcomed the design of the building commenting that it was: attractive, of a high quality, an innovative design and would make a positive economic impact to the area
- One Member suggested the design was ugly and that a stunning design was required in this location
- Some Members expressed the view that they would like to see some green walls

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation, commenting that the majority of Members appeared to be supportive of the application.

RESOLVED –

- (i) That Application No.19/06529/FU be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the submitted report and any others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate and subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the following obligations:
 - Employment and training of local people
 - The provision of publicly accessible areas
 - Provision of a Travel Plan Review fee of £3,630.00
- (ii) In the event of the Section 106 Agreement having 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.
- (iii) That Application No. 19/06528/ADV be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the submitted report and any others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate

113 Application No. 17/02594/OT - Outline application with all matters reserved except for access, for the creation of a new community comprising up to 800 dwellings, a food store (A1) (up to 372 sq.m), primary school and public open spaces at Land off Racecourse Approach, Wetherby, LS22.

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Thursday, 20th February, 2020

With reference to the meeting held on 29th August 2019 and the decision to “ defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the submission of an amended Masterplan and Access Parameter Plan and following the delivery of a vehicular access into the site from York Road to meet the SAP Site Requirements (mechanism by which the vehicular access can be delivered by the applicant and how this is controlled be through the Section 106 Agreement or by condition (whichever is most appropriate) and subject to the conditions specified in the submitted report (and any other conditions which the Chief Planning Officer may consider appropriate) and the completion of a section 106 Agreement to cover the obligations set out in the report dated 29th August 2019”.

The Chief Planning Officer now submitted a report indicating that it had not been possible for the applicant to secure a vehicular access across the third party land in the south western corner of the allocation as the landowner shows no signs of wishing to develop their part of the allocation at the present time, although improvements for cyclists and pedestrians can still be delivered. Alternatives had been discussed and the applicant could deliver a bus gate into the site from York Road which would enable development of the site to proceed.

The Planning Case Officer reported the receipt of further representation from: the Wetherby Civic Society who expressed concern about the lack of a safe route for students attending Wetherby High School and the avenue of protected trees along York Road should be retained. Better Wetherby were also of the view that the avenue of trees be retained.

The Panel heard from Councillor A Lamb and Mr P Catton (Better Wetherby) who were objecting to the application

Councillor Lamb said the SAP allocation was subject to a number of conditions: the avenue of trees must be retained and full vehicular access to the site is required that meets accessibility standards. It is understood the land owner in question is unwilling to sell, therefore full vehicular access cannot be achieved. This application does not need to be rushed, time needs to be taken to find a proper solution.

Mr P Catton supported the comments made by Councillor Lamb and added that it was all too easy to give into developers on highway matters, the conditions of the SAP must be adhered to. He also expressed concern about the lack of a safe route for students attending Wetherby High School.

There were no questions to Councillor Lamb or Mr Catton

The Panel heard from Mr M Johnson (Applicant’s Agent) who spoke in support of the application.

Referring to the meeting of 29th August 2019 Mr M Johnson said that strong conditions had been drafted and there was also the obligations within the

Section 106 Agreement, however there remained a mild problematic issue in terms of access to the bottom corner of the site. An alternative access arrangement had been identified (the provision of a bus gate), if Members were supportive of the proposal and outline permission was granted then the Masterplan could be delivered.

Questions to Mr M Johnson

- Had the developers pursued any offers of land options with the owners of the SW corner of the SAP allocation
- The majority of Members were of the view that 3 access points were required for this site

In responding Mr M Johnson said

- Members were informed that the land owner was not willing to sell at this stage therefore full access to the bottom corner of the site could not be delivered, but bus access was achievable from York Road
- The LCC Highway officer confirmed that 3 vehicular access points should be provided

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- The majority of Members were of the view that a vehicular access is required for this site from the SW corner, off York Road
- Members expressed the view that the avenue of protected trees be retained
- It is important that the conditions of the SAP are met
- The land ownership issue needs to be pursued by the applicant , it should not become a problem for the City Council
- The option to provide a bus gate and not full access to the site is not acceptable
- Panel's previous resolution in respect of this application should be adhered to

It was moved and seconded that the Panel's previous resolution in respect of this application should be adhered to

The Chair thanked Ward Members, representatives from Better Wetherby and the applicants representative for their attendance and contributions, commenting that it appeared to be the view of Members that the Panel's previous resolution in respect of this application should be adhered to

RESOLVED –

- (i) That the contents of the report be noted
- (ii) To note the continuing issues around vehicular access to the site

- (iii) To reaffirm that progression towards granting Outline Planning Permission (17/02594/OT) remains in accordance with the resolution made at the meeting held on 29th August 2019

114 PREAPP/19/00511 - Alterations and improvements including a new entrance onto New Station Street, the pedestrianisation of New Station Street, the provision of cycle hub, the upgrading of pedestrian routes from Bishopgate Street onto Neville Street and Dark Neville Street and the provision of segregated cycle routes and associated works.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of a Pre-allocation proposal for alterations and improvements including a new entrance onto New Station Street, the pedestrianisation of New Station Street, the provision of cycle hub, the upgrading of pedestrian routes from Bishopgate Street onto Neville Street and Dark Neville Street and the provision of segregated cycle routes and associated works.

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

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site / location / context
- Development of a multi-modal transport interchange.
- Pedestrianisation of New Station Street from the junction with Boar Lane to the point where it meets City Square, with only service vehicles and British Transport Police vehicles allowed access
- Major improvements to the main entrance, enhancing the image of the station and creating a gateway to the city.
- Complete re-design and re-building of the station entrance connecting Bishopgate and key pedestrian access routes to the east and south of the city centre.
- Accessibility improvements through the installation of new pedestrian lifts connecting Bishopgate and the station entrance.
- Enhanced pedestrian and cycle friendly routes through Neville Street, Dark Neville Street and Victoria Road to actively promote sustainable forms of transport.
- Improving connectivity across the city centre by installing high quality cycle lanes on key strategic gaps in the city centre.
- Installation of the 700 storage cycle hub at the junction of Bishopgate Street with the Neville Street Bridge providing connectivity from the Station to the cycle routes around Leeds centre and wider district. The cycle hub will include space for electric bikes and is expected to offer maintenance and repair services in addition to storage facilities.

- Infrastructure improvements will help support the Climate Emergency agenda by encouraging uptake of sustainable forms of transport.

Members raised the following questions:

- Solutions were needed for pick-up and drop-off area at the Aire Street entrance
- The proposal is to reduce traffic on Neville Street, where will the traffic be redirected to
- The creation of a 700 space cycle hub appeared too large, was it necessary to be so big
- Taxis waiting on Concordia Street may become problematic
- The proposed cycle lane within the dark arches, could it be repositioned down one side and not down the centre of the street as currently proposed

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representatives said:

- It was reported that this was the first stage of a bigger plan. New Bus Schemes, new highway layout and revised taxi and private hire arrangements all required addressing but work would only be carried out as funds became available. Traffic flow around City Square has its own programme but the presented proposals were part of a more holistic solution
- Members were informed that other similar cycle hub schemes in Sheffield and Exeter were well used
- Members were advised that Taxis queuing on Concordia Street was just one option, ranks could also be located on Call Lane and Sovereign Street but further consultation was required
- It was suggested that due consideration would be given by officers to the repositioning of the cycle lane running through Neville Street/ Dark Neville Street.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- This would be a very demanding scheme, make sure you plan for unintended consequences.
- A number of Members welcomed the provision of a large cycle hub, suggesting it was a really positive step forward
- The proposals for the new station were welcomed but the whole area needs to be looked at and the proposals understood within this wider station context.

In offering comments on the officers' questions in the report:

- Members supported the emerging building design and proposal to remove the wall to Bishopgate Street
- Members supported the emerging landscape scheme

- Members supported the approach to traffic calming and pedestrian/cycle improvements subject to a detailed Transport Assessment and subject to more information on wider proposals for the station area.

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation suggesting that Members appeared to be generally supportive of the development.

RESOLVED –

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation

115 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 20th February 2020 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds