

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 25TH NOVEMBER, 2021

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

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

### **SITE VISITS**

Members site visits was held in connection with the following: Application 20/04464/OT - Proposed residential development on land south of the A64 York Road, Application 20/08521/OT - Capitol Park, Morley – proposed employment uses, Application 21/05142/FU – Proposed mixed use development at Lisbon Street, Leeds and was attended by the following Councillors: D Blackburn, G Latty, E Nash, R Finnigan, C Gruen, N Walshaw, C Campbell and J Mckenna

#### **90 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

#### **91 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public**

There were no items which required the exclusion of the press or public.

#### **92 Late Items**

There were no late items of business identified.

#### **93 Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

#### **94 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

#### **95 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Members considered the minutes of the previous meetings held on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2021.

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meetings held on 28<sup>th</sup> October 2021 be approved as a true and correct record.

## **96 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

Referring to Minutes No. 88 – Application No. 19/01988/RM - Layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for 450 new homes to land off Lane Side Farm, Victoria Road, Churwell, Morley, Leeds. Members reminded officers that the Resolution included a requirement to establish a Local Liaison Group to look at the phasing and rolling out of the scheme and requested if this could be pursued.

The Group Manager Planning Services confirmed the necessary actions would be pursued.

## **97 Application No. 20/08521/OT - Hybrid planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and structures; earthworks to form development platforms, drainage features, embankments and bunds; strategic landscaping, alteration of existing access road, including works to existing Topcliffe Lane and junction with A653 and construction of new access road, to serve employment development and outline consent for the construction of employment floorspace (Use Classes B2 and B8 with ancillary office) and associated servicing and infrastructure including car parking, vehicle, pedestrian and cycle circulation, landscaping and ecology works, noise mitigation, drainage features and all associated infrastructure to land at Capitol Park, Topcliffe Lane, Morley, Leeds.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out detail of an hybrid planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and structures; earthworks to form development platforms, drainage features, embankments and bunds; strategic landscaping, alteration of existing access road, including works to existing Topcliffe Lane and junction with A653 and construction of new access road, to serve employment development and outline consent for the construction of employment floorspace (Use Classes B2 and B8 with ancillary office) and associated servicing and infrastructure including car parking, vehicle, pedestrian and cycle circulation, landscaping and ecology works, noise mitigation, drainage features and all associated infrastructure to land at Capitol Park, Topcliffe Lane, Morley, Leeds.

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

The Planning Case Officer addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal which included the following issues:

- Site/ Location/ Context
- Identified as a suitable general employment site within the Site Allocation Plan (SAP) – 38.44 hectares in size
- Some land to the north of the site is designated as Green Belt

- The development is located near strategic highway network and employment land
- The proposal is to construct five large scale units ranging in size from 3,901.9sqm to 49,238.7sqm (Employment space)
- Social, economic benefits
- Full demolition of existing buildings on site
- Earth works to create the necessary development platforms, associated accesses, embankments and attenuation areas.
- Extensively landscape the site and surrounding zones to provide visual buffers and ecological benefits
- Biodiversity improvements to the area including drainage and surrounding greenspace
- The development to achieve BREEAM standard and will be designed to maximise energy efficiency and incorporate energy generation on site
- Contribution of £3m for highway mitigation works at Junction 28 (Prior to the development becoming operational) £1.18m on other road junctions within the vicinity
- Travel Plan to connect with the Morley area
- Good connections to the wider region
- Creation of 1300 jobs to serve the local community
- Construction and operation to be undertaken in phases

The Planning Case Officer reported the receipt of a further 13 further representations from members of the public and 2 representations in support of the application. All representations received raised no new issues, all material considerations having been previously considered and dealt with in the report.

The Panel then heard from Town Councillor Oliver Newton and Chris Bell who were objecting to the proposals.

Councillor Newton said he was aware of at least 393 objections but some had not been put onto the planning portal, there was complete disrespect for local residents. Councillor Newton said if the proposal was to proceed the units would be operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week leading to light pollution and noise. Commenting on the public rights of way he said there had been much discussion on the issue, but no one would use the footpaths during the construction period. Referring to the highway implications, Junction 28 was referred to as a bottle neck, a single accident could bring traffic to a standstill in the surrounding areas, and this could be further compounded by increased traffic generated by this development.

Mr Bell said he was supportive of Councillor Newton's comments but in addition there was overwhelming opposition from local residents to the proposal. He said Leeds City Council had signed up the Climate Emergency agenda, it was now time to back this up.

Questions to Town Councillor Oliver Newton and Chris Bell

- Could you expand further on the noise, pollution and traffic implications associated with the site
- Would the creation of new woodland not bring environmental benefits to the area
- How would local people travel to the site
- Was there existing alternative empty warehouse space in the Morley area
- The site is designated as employment land in the SAP, is it this particular proposal you're objecting to, or any development on this site
- We've already been informed that there's lots of industrial space locally so any development locally would add to traffic congestion in the area

In responding Town Councillor Oliver Newton and Chris Bell said

- The construction phase would be for a period of 4 -5 years, during that time construction traffic would use the local road network creating further noise/ air pollution and traffic generation
- Members were informed that the woodland would take a long time to become established, so any benefits would be far into the future
- It was suggested that with up to 1300 car parking spaces employees would be encouraged to access the site by car, the site was on the top of a hill so cycling would be difficult
- Members were informed that the end users were in the logistics sector, Howley Park, Asquith Avenue and Bruntcliffe Lane all had empty warehouse space
- There had been no confirmation of end user in terms of employment opportunities
- Other locations would spread the traffic generation but the proximity to Junction 28 would compound the problem

The Chair thanked Town Councillor Oliver Newton and Chris Bell for their attendance and contributions

The Chair then invited the Hannah Richardson (Agent) to speak in support of the application.

Ms Richardson said the application was recommended for approval in planning terms because it was identified as a suitable general employment site within the Site Allocation Plan. She explained the area of biodiversity would be maintained and would deliver change and improvements for the local community. Members were informed that opportunities for large scale warehousing was expanding and this development would bring 1300 new jobs to local people and would also contribute £2.2m in Business Rates which would be a huge boost for the Morley area.

Questions to the Developers:

- What type of employment is likely to be generated from this site

- The use classes proposed for this site are a concern to local residents
- This is a high location visible from miles around, presumably a significant amount of landscaping would be required to reduce the visible impact
- What measures are to be incorporated to mitigate against traffic generated from the site
- The configuration of the buildings was an area of concern
- Was the layout indicative at this stage
- You suggest this would be a huge boost for Morley but only 5 out of the 398 representations are supporting this application, are the objectors misguided
- Unit No.5 appeared to be very large, had any consultation been undertaken with local residents
- Could consultation on Unit No.5 be undertaken as part of the Reserved Matters Application

In responding the Developers said:

- Members were informed that the site may include a Logistics Scheme but there may also be some advanced manufacturing, but no occupiers had been identified yet
- The rise in online retail requires manufacturers to have nearby large scale warehousing, there are no other large scale warehousing opportunities in the Morley area.
- Members were informed that 10,000 trees would be planted for this development, there would also be sympathetic improvements to local footpaths and high bunds would be created to mitigate against visual amenity.
- Working with LCC Highways, Kirklees Highways and the National Highways Agency we are contributing to an £8m scheme of highway improvement work at Junction 28. In terms of traffic generation from the site, it was intended that heavy goods vehicles would operate outside peak hours.
- It was suggested that the layout could be altered, but it was necessary to use a sufficient quantum amount of floorspace
- Members were informed that the Masterplan was indicative at this stage
- The objectors were not wrong, but this application would bring huge benefits to the people of Morley with links to the Morley Town Fund which would create and deliver local jobs.
- Members were informed that a website had been created to publicise the proposals, but no consultation had taken place with local residents.
- It was confirmed that public consultation would be undertaken on Unit No. 5 as part of the Reserved Matters Application

The Chair thanked the Developers for their attendance and contributions

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- How does the proposal represent a sustainable development and deliver biodiversity gain
- The indicative design was confusing, we need to see the detail to understand the potential impact of the height of the units; does panel get restricted to the layout and height parameters; why can't unit 5 be moved away from residential premises
- It was suggested that existing views should be maintained
- Why is the identified highway congestion in the report acceptable
- Is there a lack of travel planning details because we don't have identified occupiers

In responding to the issues raised, officers said:

- The location of the site was considered sustainable in regards to its access to the services and facilities at Morley Town Centre and the building construction aims to meet BREEAM excellent sustainable design standards.
- The existing site is mostly agricultural land. The proposals would provide enhanced tree and other soft planting and provide a variety of plant species which results in significant biodiversity gain
- The Planning Case Officer said the parameters set the maximum limits of the buildings but the actual size and details of the design within these limits would be considered and determined at reserved matters application stage. It was considered that the proposed bunding and gap between unit 5 and the nearest residential premises creates an acceptable relationship
- The Planning Case Officer said the loss of private views were not a material planning consideration
- The planning requirement in relation to this development was not to demonstrate "nil detriment". There would be an addition to existing traffic queues but these will not gridlock the existing road network and therefore the impact is considered acceptable.
- The full details of the travel plan measures would be agreed prior to occupancy

In offering comments Members stated the following:

- It was generally accepted that this location was suitable as a general employment site
- Members welcome the footpath improvement works
- A number of Members were of the view that this was inappropriate development within the greenbelt given its potential 24 hours operation, suggesting greenbelt should only be used in special circumstances
- A Logistics business had the potential to generate a significant amount of noise, create light pollution and was not acceptable in close proximity to local residents
- Traffic generation from the site was highlighted as a potential issue

- The site was visible from most areas of the city, Members were not convinced that the proposed mitigation measures were effective enough
- Members considered that further details about the height and configuration of the units was required, CGI's and cross sections would have been useful
- Clarification about the type of employment to be generated from this site would be useful
- Members express concern about the significant number of objections received from local residents.

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion, the Chair suggested that a significant number of concerns had been raised by Members and that further details/ clarification was required.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred to receive further details about:

- The impact on the greenbelt and in particular whether the proposed drainage works could be provided within the employment site,
- The position of the units,
- The proposed hours of operation,
- Greater clarity on the landscaping proposals, particularly the tree planting
- Greater clarity on connectivity with Morley Town Centre
- Greater clarity on the local employment agreement measures.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was passed unanimously.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred to receive further details about:

- The impact on the greenbelt and in particular whether the proposed drainage works can be provided within the employment site,
- The position of the units,
- The proposed hours of operation,
- Greater clarity on the landscaping proposals, particularly the tree planting
- Greater clarity on connectivity with Morley Town Centre
- Greater clarity on the local employment agreement measures
- Greater clarity on possible congestion associated with the junction of the A653 and the A650.

**98 Application No. 20/04464/OT - Outline Application for circa 875 dwellings including means of primary vehicle access and central spine road and associated infrastructure works. (All other matters reserved) to land to the South of the A64 York Road and the North of Leeds Road, Leeds**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of an outline application for circa 875 dwellings including means of primary vehicle access and central spine road and associated infrastructure works. (All other matters reserved) on land to the South of the A64 York Road and the North of Leeds Road, Leeds.

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

The Planning Case Officer addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal which included the following:

- Site/ Location/ Context
- East Leeds Extension, Housing Allocation (Middle Quadrant)
- Leeds ELOR Route
- Outline planning permission for circa 875 dwellings, including means of primary vehicle access, central spine road and associated infrastructure works (All other matters reserved).
- The scale and nature of the development proposed means that it is Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) development, so is accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES), as well as an illustrative masterplan to demonstrate how the relationships with east Leeds, nearby villages and ELOR can be addressed.
- Views onto Greenspace
- Spine Road throughout the development
- ELOR York Road junction access
- Public Transport penetration, bus stop locations
- Segregated cycleway
- Greenspace drainage infrastructure, run-off to Cock Beck
- Section 106 Agreement to include an ELOR contribution (£19,717,413)
- 15% Affordable Housing provision
- Contribution towards Primary Education

The Planning Case Officer reported the receipt of further correspondence from a Ward Councillor who was requesting the public consultation be “ramped up”. There was also some concern about the provision of wellbeing facilities in the area, given this was just one of the of the four proposed housing development for the East Leeds Extension. The proposals had been discussed on a number of occasions at the East Leeds Extension Consultative Forum. A further letter had also been received expressing some concern about debris in Cock Beck and the potential for flooding.

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- The ELOR had already been decided, are members now being asked to approve the principle of the housing development i.e. circa 875 dwellings plus the means of access because the details around house type/ housing mix is vague.



- Based on the number of units proposed there was some concern about over-development of the site, had any approaches been made to reducing the number of units.
- Was there likely to be an impact on traffic into Scholes Village
- Where was the local centre going to be located.
- There was a disused railway line running through the site, could it be preserved as a footpath
- Had Healthcare Partners been formally consulted on future Healthcare provision in the area
- Had there been any discussions about play space provision in the area

In responding to the issues raised, officers and representatives of the applicant said:

- The Planning Case Officer said currently the housing mix was indicative. This indicative mix was in accordance with housing mix policy and had been used to calculate the site greenspace requirements. The reserved matters application would determine the actual housing mix provision.
- Members were not being asked to approve a detailed housing layout at this stage. Approval was sought for the access details to the site and the general arrangement of housing development areas and greenspace areas. The Group Manager said the application set out a site wide masterplan which indicated not only where housing would be provided but also the strategy for greenspace provision, connectivity through the site and site wide drainage.
- The Planning Case Officer said that once the details of the phases had been received and the greenspace provision, distance between dwellings and other residential design requirements factored in, it would then be possible to determine the actual number of dwellings which could be provided at Reserved Matters stage
- Members were informed that access into Scholes would be along Leeds Road, there was no other vehicle access
- The Planning Case Officer said the Local Centre would be located within the northern end of the adjacent Southern Quadrant site, together with existing facilities being available in Swarcliffe
- It was confirmed the disused railway line would be retained as a footpath
- The Planning Case Officer said comments had been received from the East Leeds Health sub-group, which includes local GPs, officers and culture representatives as to what was required in the area, and specifically for the local centre. It was also reported that the new Windmill Health Centre in Swarcliffe would also assist in delivering Healthcare into the area
- Members were informed that play spaces would be provided but that further discussions would take place with Parks and Countryside and the Consultative Forum to determine the details

In offering comments Members stated the following:

- A number of Members expressed concern about the quantum of development and requested if the proposed 875 dwellings could be the maximum
- More reassurance was required around green space provision, the rural character needs to be maintained
- It was important that the house types must be of the highest quality in design
- Further re-assurance around future Healthcare provision was required
- An exemplar development was required, zero carbon (Do residents require a car)

It was moved and seconded that the application be approved subject to the number of dwellings being a maximum of 875.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was passed.

### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to removal of the current holding direction by National Highways, the conditions specified in the submitted report, the number of dwellings being a maximum of 875 (and any amendments or additional conditions that the Chief Planning Officer may consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:
  - East Leeds Orbital Route (ELOR) contribution of £19,717,413, via a roof tax to be paid on new dwelling completions at six monthly intervals.
  - Affordable Housing – 15% provision on site (with a 60% social rent and 40% intermediate split).
  - Primary education contribution - £12,320 per dwelling with two or more bedrooms (excluding flats with less than three bedrooms) x 0.25 (being the average child place generated by a family unit) x 0.97 (being a locational factor), to contribute towards the provision of a 2FE primary school in the Southern Quadrant of the East Leeds Extension.
  - Barwick Road cycle improvements contribution - £256,300.
  - Signal improvements at the Eastwood Lane/Barwick Road/Church Lane junction - £100,000.
  - Off-site highway mitigation works at the ‘dumbbells’ and main roundabout of J46 of the M1, if these are not secured by condition (as listed in the conditions).
  - Bus service improvement contribution - £750,000, to be spent on increasing the frequency of bus services, including amendments to the route(s) to access the spine road, or such other public transport enhancements as may be agreed.

- Bus stops contribution - £70,500, to be spent on 3 bus stops with shelters and real time information and 3 bus stops with poles.
- Residential Travel Plan Fund - £511.50 per dwelling, to be spent on Travel Plan measures and/or other sustainable travel measures.
- Travel Plan monitoring fee - £8,116, to be spent on the monitoring of the Travel Plan.
- Footway and cycleway provision – to secure a scheme of footway and cycleway links to the areas around the site.
- On-site Greenspaces – to be provided commensurate with dwellings in each phase of development, including provisions for future management. Greenspace also includes a scheme of play facilities.
- Spine Road – Need to enter into a Highways Agreement with the Council to construct and dedicate the spine road, with provisions for phasing.
- Commitment to Local Centre implementation plan
- Employment and training initiatives.

(ii) In the event where the Section 106 Agreement has not been completed within 3 months of the Panel resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the application shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

**99 Application No. 21/05142/FU - Hybrid application for full planning consent for the erection of one building for residential accommodation (Class C3) with two ground floor commercial units (Class E); one building for student accommodation (Class Sui Generis); one building for hotel accommodation (Class C1) and co-working office accommodation (Class E); modifications to existing vehicular, cycling, and pedestrian infrastructure and outline planning consent for erection of one building for office accommodation (Class E), including basement car parking, access, landscaping with all matters reserved for future consideration with exception of access to land at former Swimming Pool Site, Lisbon Street, Leeds, LS1 4PH.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of an hybrid application for full planning consent for the erection of one building for residential accommodation (Class C3) with two ground floor commercial units (Class E); one building for student accommodation (Class Sui Generis); one building for hotel accommodation (Class C1) and co-working office accommodation (Class E); modifications to existing vehicular, cycling, and pedestrian infrastructure and outline planning consent for erection of one building for office accommodation (Class E), including basement car parking, access, landscaping with all matters reserved for future consideration with exception of access to land at former Swimming Pool Site, Lisbon Street, Leeds, LS1 4PH.

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

The Planning Case Officer addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site/ Location/ Context
- Former International Swimming Pool site, currently used for car parking
- Constraints of the site, some protected trees
- Located on the site is a footbridge ramp and steps to the north western boundary and connects to the opposite side of the Leeds Inner Ring Road to Duncombe Street.
- The proposal, the construction of 5 buildings on site ranging in height from 11 to 33 storeys.
- Building 1 - Two residential towers providing up to 629 Build to Rent (BTR) C3 residential units, of 33 and 22 storeys, with a ground/podium level link and two commercial units (Class E) at ground floor level.
- Building 2 - Student residential building providing 548 purpose-built student bedspaces of 24 storeys in height and 714 sqm of dedicated internal and external amenity space.
- Building 3 - Mixed use part aparthotel building (C1) providing approximately 120 rooms and part office accommodation providing 3,128 sqm (GEA) floorspace (Class E), of 14 storeys, ground floor to include active ground floor Class E use
- Building 4 – (Outline Planning Permission) - Office building of up to 13,108 sqm (GEA) sqm (Class E) 11 storeys, including ground floor and basement car parking (providing up to 50 car parking spaces).
- Enhancements to the existing pedestrian/cycle bridge's south eastern access, where it 'lands' in the site.
- Landscaping scheme including lawned area the provision of 84 new trees and character planting areas
- Public Art/ play features
- External cycle spaces
- Affordable Housing Provision (7%) via an off-site commuted sum
- Wind mitigation measures (Further wind assessment to be undertaken to determine the acceptability of the wind conditions on the footbridge over the A58)

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- The landscape/ greenspace areas had the potential to look untidy if not properly maintained, could assurances be provided that regular maintenance would be undertaken
- Could Officer comment on the concerns raised by the Leeds Civic Trust
- The site would allow public access throughout the site, had public safety been a consideration during the design stage.
- Would wind mitigation be controlled by condition

- The footbridge over the ring road, who was responsible for its maintenance
- How long was the building period for the development, would it be done in phases
- The affordable housing provision was this to be provided by an off-site commuted sum and why had this particular option been selected
- The proposed student cluster bedrooms appear to be very small at 13 sqm
- The proposed barrier along the pedestrian route (adjacent to the ring road) could a green wall treatment be considered

In responding to the issues raised, officers and representatives of the applicant said:

- Members were informed that the site would remain in the ownership of the developer and it would be in their best interests for the site to remain tidy. The LCC Legal Officer said that an obligation within the Section 106 Agreement would also provide further reassurance in terms of securing continued maintenance of the landscape/ greenspace areas
- The LCC Conservation Officer said there was no harm to the Listed Buildings but there was harm to views of heritage assets in terms of the tall buildings breaking the skyline (Park Square was provided as an example). It was suggested that by aligning colour tones with existing buildings, this offered mitigation on the skyline. Also the public benefits of regenerating a large brownfield site outweighed the less than substantial harm identified to the setting of heritage assets.
- Members were informed that adequate lighting would be provided throughout the public areas and also high-definition CCTV, this together with on site management would achieve good natural surveillance
- The Group Manager Planning Services said this was an exposed site and open to prevailing winds and the wind assessment work had identified a range of mitigation measures were needed to address potential on site wind safety issues. The details of the measures and their provision would be controlled through planning conditions
- The Planning Case Officer reported that maintenance of the footbridge was the responsibility of the local authority
- The applicant's representative said the build period would comprise 2 phases with an anticipated timescale of 3 years from the grant of planning permission for the first phase and a further 18 months for the second office development phase
- The applicant's representative confirmed the affordable housing provision would be provided by an off-site commuted sum which was an option under Council Policy H5 of the Leeds Core Strategy. In terms of choosing the off-site commuted sum option, it was suggested that operating different tenure types was a difficult management issue

- Members were informed that the cluster bedrooms met the required standard in the emerging SPD for student housing space standards, but the cluster flats also had communal areas for wellbeing purposes
- The LCC Highways Officer suggested that any materials selected for the barrier structure would need to be vandal proof and the screen needed to be demountable for access and maintenance purposes to the inner ring road retaining wall. There it would not be possible to provide a green wall.

In offering comments Members stated the following:

- In general Members were of the view that this was an attractive, well designed scheme and could regenerate this part of the city
- One Member had concern that the height of some of the buildings impacted on the heritage views
- A number of Members expressed concern about natural surveillance and the pedestrian safety implications of the proposed screen structure to the A58 and requested it be looked at further in consultation with the Police and that the matter be controlled by planning condition

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion, the Chair suggested that the scheme had improved significantly since last presented.

It was moved and seconded that the application be approved in accordance with the report recommendation subject to a further planning condition to control pedestrian safety measures in relation to the impact of the A58 screen.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was passed; 12 votes in favour, and 1 abstention.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (i) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (or as amended or added to as considered appropriate by the Chief Planning Officer) a further planning condition to control pedestrian safety measures in relation to the impact of the A58 screen and subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement to deliver the following planning obligations:

- Offsite Affordable Housing contribution equivalent to the full policy compliant position for 7% of the total residential units
- Controls on the proposed student housing and apart hotel use to ensure compliance with the Council's policies
- Provision of public access rights through the site
- Management and maintenance of footbridge landing steps
- Residential Travel Fund for residential use (£160,866.75)
- Car Club Trial provision for office use (£8440)
- Travel Plans and Travel Plan monitoring fees (£14,840)

- Cooperation with local jobs and skills initiatives during construction
- Provision of a Section 106 Agreement management fee

(ii) In the event 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.

**100 PREAPP/20/00478 - Pre-application presentation for proposed mixed-use scheme comprising two student residential accommodation buildings and a multi-use event building on the site of Yorkshire Bank, Merrion Way and land fronting Clay Pit Lane, Leeds, LS2 8NZ**

With reference to the meeting of 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 when Members received a pre-application presentation for a proposed mixed-use scheme on the site of Yorkshire Bank, Merrion Way and land fronting Clay Pit Lane, Leeds LS2 8NZ.

In the discussion that followed Members raised the following concerns at the 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2021 meeting

- Members considered the loss of office accommodation and proposed use of the sites for a multi-use events' building and student accommodation was acceptable in principle. The amount and density of student accommodation in the area was highlighted as a concern.
- Members did not support the proposed scale and form of Block A and had concerns about the appearance of Block B. Further design details about the multi-use event building were required
- Members did not support the approach to green space and landscaping around the development, particularly the loss of trees

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a further report which set out detail of a revised mixed-use scheme comprising two student residential accommodation buildings and a multi-use event building on the site of Yorkshire Bank, Merrion Way and land fronting Clay Pit Lane, Leeds LS2 8NZ.

Site photographs, plans and a virtual fly through were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the item.

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

- Site / location / context
- Former Yorkshire Bank site, the site had now come forward for disposal

- Currently there was a significant amount of development taking place around the Leeds Arena site
- The proposed revised scheme offered a potential land swap opportunity with the City Council
- Members were informed that the Leeds Arena building was never designed as a focal point
- The revised proposal - Block A would be retained as previously proposed, a 38 storey building comprising 720 student bedspaces with external surfaces finished in planar facets of clear glazing and polished anodised aluminium panels.
- Block B - The revised proposals remove the previously proposed limb facing Clay Pit Lane, a reduction in the length of the Merrion Way elevation, fragmentation of the limb fronting Brunswick Terrace and reconfiguring this part of its mass to form a part 20, part 16 storey element. As a consequence of these changes the number of student bedspaces in this building would reduce from 543 to 490. Further, the reduction in the floorplate enables the existing trees in the planter at the junction of Merrion Way and Clay Pit Lane to be retained. In terms of materiality, it is now intended to use large panels of terracotta to form the principal grid of each of the elements of Block B.
- The modified multi-use building would be brought forward at a later date, in common with the approach taken in developing the arena, this part of the application would be in outline with parameters for the building scale agreed, supported by a design code document establishing key principles of design and appearance.

There were no questions raised by Members

In offering comments, Members noted the following:

- In general Members were supportive of the revised proposal
- One Member said he was not entirely happy
- Members were supportive of the of the design of the tower block A
- Members welcomed the reduced massing of block B, allowing the Arena to be seen was viewed as a positive
- Members welcome the retention of some of the existing trees
- Members welcomed the suggestion to re-use the granite from the former Yorkshire Bank building within the proposal
- The connectivity/ links throughout the scheme were supported

In offering comments on the questions posed in the Officer Report:

- In general, Members were supportive of the proposed scale, position and form of Block A
- Members were supportive of the revised scale, position and appearance of Block B



- Members were supportive of the revised footprint of the multi-use building and the approach to landscaping

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation of the revised proposals

**RESOLVED –**

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

**101 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** - To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2021 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.