

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY, 2022

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

Councillors D Blackburn, K Brooks,  
P Carlill, D Cohen, 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:  
PREAPP/21/00379 – Residential development, 87-92 Kirkstall Road, Leeds,  
LS3 1HS and PREAPP/21/00324 -Proposed mixed use development on land  
south of Sweet Street, Holbeck, Leeds LS11 9BX and was attended by the  
following Councillors: D Blackburn, A Garthwaite, C Gruen, G Latty and  
J Mckenna,

#### **114 Chair's Opening Comments**

The Chair announced the retirement of John Grieve, Senior Governance Officer within Democratic Services.

In paying tribute, the Chair said John had worked for the Council in excess of 40 years, many of those years servicing the various planning committees and dealing with some of the most significant planning applications for the city, the Leeds Bradford Airport application being one of the most recent examples.

Other Members joined the Chair in sharing their own experiences in working with John, his knowledge, calm manner and willingness to assist was constantly referred to.

On behalf of the Chief Planning Officer, the Head of Development Management , also acknowledged the work carried out by John, suggesting his experience and helpful manner would be greatly missed by the service.

Members and Officers Joined the Chair in expressing their thanks and best wishes to John in his future retirement.

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

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

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

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

#### **117 Late Items**

There were no late items of business identified.

#### **118 Declaration of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

#### **119 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: C Campbell and R Finnigan.

#### **120 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Members considered the minutes of the previous meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2022

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meetings held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2022 be approved as a true and correct record

#### **121 MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**

There were no issues raised under matters arising.

#### **122 PREAPP/21/00379 - Pre Application Presentation for demolition of the existing building and structures and the redevelopment of the site for residential dwellings (use class C3), flexible commercial space (use classes E and F1) and associated refuse and plant infrastructure, landscaping, new public realm and open space at the former Arla Foods site, 87 - 91 Kirkstall Road, Burley, Leeds, LS3 1HS**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application presentation which sought the demolition of the existing building and structures and the redevelopment of the site for residential dwellings (use class C3), flexible commercial space (use classes E and F1) and associated refuse and plant infrastructure, landscaping, new public realm and open space at the former Arla Foods site, 87 – 91 Kirkstall Road, Burley, Leeds 3.

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
- Former Arla Foods site on the south side of Kirkstall Road
- Commercial units on the northern side of Kirkstall Road, further commercial units are located to the south-east of the site
- To the south of the site is the Leeds-Liverpool Canal
- The "L" shaped site is 2.07 hectares (Vacant brown field site) located in a flood zone area
- Demolition of the existing building and structures
- The proposal – Development of five residential blocks ranging in height from 7 to 13 storeys (618 residential units)
- Build to rent apartments – 308 x 1 bed (50%), 248 x 2 bed (40%) and 62 x 3 bed (10%)
- Commercial units at ground floor level

- Materials – Principally constructed in brick with horizontal stone banding and a lighter brick base. A regular pattern of windows would feature across each building with deep reveals and a slender slash glazing design
- 230 car parking spaces, all spaces intended to be provided with electric vehicle charging points (30% provided initially)
- A single point of vehicular access/egress would be provided on Kirkstall Road with an “exit only” on Washington Street
- Landscaping/ planting strategy, in excess of 100 trees to be planted, public space, safe play areas all based around a central park
- Connectivity – Cycle routes/ Riverside walkway

Members raised the following questions to the developer’s representatives:

- From Kirkstall Road the massing of the buildings creates the impression that the site is enclosed, could consideration be given to “splitting” the first building to provide some riverside views
- As the development was being promoted as family friendly, it was queried why there are so many 1 bed apartments (50%) when there is a shortage of family accommodation in this area
- The car parking provision, was 230 spaces feasible for this size of development
- The demand for electric vehicles is predicted to increase significantly in the next 5 years; could consideration be given to providing more electric vehicle charging points, above the proposed initial 30%
- How large were the proposed balconies and could more be offered (given experiences with Covid-19 and restrictions to the use of Public Open Space during the Pandemic)
- How do people engage with each other in this type of development “playfulness”
- Was a nursery/ creche facility to be included within the development
- The proposed public open space provision, would it be accessible to everyone or for tenants use only.
- Councillor E Nash asked if she could be provided with a list of the proposed tree and hedge species

In responding to the issues raised the developer’s representatives said:

- The Architect said the intention was to provide a link through the site, creating a sequence which draws people through the site to the river which was approximately 150m away
- Members were informed that feedback suggested there was a demand for 1 bed apartments and a Housing Needs Assessment would be included within the application
- Members were informed that careful consideration had been given to the car parking provision, the vast majority of journeys being outward from the city centre for work purposes
- The applicant said the level of EV Charging Points was being dictated by demand. The aspiration to deliver 100% was correct, and the

infrastructure would allow for this, but provision had to be on a sensible phased basis, allowing technological advances to be taken into account. In doing so they explained that their current portfolio developments are showing only a 0.2% take up of EV Charging Points

- The Architect said the dimensions of the balcony were 1.8m x 2.5m and with a wind assessment would be provided as part of the application, they would look at whether the number of balconies could be increased
- The Applicant said they had a number of years' experience in delivering high-level community engagement (since 2014). It was suggested that it was important to ensure the tenants were engaged and did not feel isolated. The communal aspects of the development will be encouraged to be well utilised.
- The applicant confirmed that there was provision for flexible mixed-use space within the development and such facilities such as a creche / nursery may come forward at a later date
- The Applicant confirmed that the public open space would be accessible to everyone.
- The Applicant confirmed that the requested information on tree and hedge species would be supplied to Councillor E Nash

In offering comments, Members raised the following issues:

- The area of Kirkstall should be seen as a residential area, this location is not the City Centre, more family accommodation should be provided
- The majority of Members expressed concern about the lack of family accommodation and requested if further consideration could be given to the housing mix in respect of the preferred minimum suggested threshold targets of policy H4
- Could arrangements be made to review Core Strategy Policy H4 Housing Mix
- Could the applicant give further consideration to the provision of more electric vehicle charging points, the demand will be far higher within a short period of time (Also consider the use of universal plugs)
- Could more balconies be provided
- The proposed brickwork appears over several stories could become too bland, more character is required

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

- Members were supportive of the emerging outer layout and scale of the proposed development. The proposed housing mix was not supported. It was asked if one of the apartments blocks be considered for family accommodation only.
- Members generally welcomed the emerging elevational design and proposed material palette

- Members considered the proposed level of electric vehicle charge points to be unacceptable.

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation suggesting that Members were generally supportive of the emerging design, but further consideration was required around the proposed housing mix and more consideration was required on the level of electric vehicle charging points

#### **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 the Chief Planning Officer be requested to consider and review the application of Core Strategy Policy H4 (Housing Mix)

**123 PREAPP/21/00324 - Pre-application presentation for proposed development comprising residential apartments, commercial (offices and leisure), hotel and a travel hub on land largely bounded by Sweet Street, Meadow Road, Jack Lane and Bowling Green Terrace, Leeds LS11 9BX**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application presentation for proposed development comprising residential apartments, commercial (offices and leisure), hotel and a travel hub on land largely bounded by Sweet Street, Meadow Road, Jack Lane and Bowling Green Terrace, Leeds, LS11 9BX

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
- The site area extends to 3.79 hectares
- The "City One" site lies within the southern part of the designated City Centre. It is bounded by Sweet Street to the north, Meadow Road to the east, Jack Lane to the south and Bowling Green Terrace to the west.
- The south-western corner of the site is 6.0m higher than the north-east corner. High pressure gas mains run below ground across the northern fringe and south-east corner of the site resulting in no build zones in these areas. Trent Street runs east to west across the site providing access to a large primary substation located towards the centre of the site.
- Meadow Road is the main distributor to the City Centre from the M621

- The southern extent of Holbeck Conservation Area is located 120m to the west at the junction of Sweet Street West and Marshall Street. The conservation area includes a number of listed buildings.
- Major mixed use development scheme
- The proposed development seeks the construction of up to 11 buildings ranging in height from 5 - 42 storey's in height - Residential apartments (2,200 maximum), commercial (offices and leisure) up to 70,000sqm, hotel (450 beds) and a multi-storey travel hub and /or basement car parking providing a maximum of 691 car parking spaces; up to 2,850sqm of ground floor use Class E(a-g) floorspace (with single retail units limited to 465sqm) with a minimum provision of 1,000sqm of Use Class E(a-g) floorspace across the development.
- New Masterplan
- Proposed new network of streets, including new green street
- Key constraints: Gas lines and electricity sub-station (Alternative configuration if sub-station removed)
- Landscaping strategy, tree lined public open space, introduction of rain gardens
- Pedestrian priority environment, connectivity and permeability at the heart of the masterplan
- Timescale – Commence latter 2022 with completion of first phase towards the end of 2025

Members raised the following questions to the developer's representatives:

- This is a large development, possibly up to 4,000 residents, are there any amenities provided or located nearby: eg doctor's surgeries, nurseries and schools
- The scale of this development is difficult to grasp. Could the areas of greenspace be combined to form larger, discrete areas of public realm rather than linear streets.
- Do the large linear buildings and spaces have the potential to cause wind tunnelling.
- Meadow Road filters into the M621, was sufficient planting been provided to combat particulates from vehicles
- In respect of the electricity sub-station, were there any plans to relocate it, and if it was to be moved, would it be your intention to build on it or could it be greenspace.

In responding to the issues raised the developer's representatives said:

- The Applicant confirmed that commercial space was available within the development for such amenities as a doctor's surgery. In terms of nearby schools, it was confirmed there were existing schools within the locality
- The Architect said the intention was to create a sense of openness with some of the streets being 25m in width. There would also be huge areas created with streets largely being given over to amenity space.

- The Architect reported that no safety issues had been identified following wind modelling, the massing of the buildings was deliberately organised to address wind impact
- The Architect said the buildings along Meadow Road would be set back 10m, there would be a 3m wide planting strip and there would also be a 3m cycle path, the intention was to provide a series of soft landscape filters to help combat poor air quality
- The applicant confirmed that relocation of the electricity sub-station was being considered and if it could be removed, the area would be redeveloped. Responding to a question, what if the sub-station was to remain, Members were informed the brickwork and door would be refurbished and then covered with a landscaped screen.

In offering comments, Members raised the following issues:

- In general Members welcomed the principal of the development
- The majority of Members were of the view that not enough useable greenspace was being provided relative to the scale of the development. The proposed linear pieces of greenspace were “underwhelming” and were not the same and as useable as a green square
- There was more work to be done in terms of design and massing. Architectural treatment needs to make a contribution to the spaces, with a variation in building design.
- Too many people were being crammed onto a small site
- A policy compliant housing mix needs to be provided
- This is a large development and needs to cater for all ages with appropriate facilities, a depth of vision is required
- Ideally the electricity sub-station requires removal and turned into greenspace
- Possible wind implications, was a concern
- More details about site security and connectivity both to the City Centre and neighbouring communities were required

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

- Members were not supportive of the proposed scale and form of development
- Members considered the emerging approach to landscape and public realm was not acceptable; more greenspace was required
- Members considered that more details were required in terms of the development’s emerging provisions for transportation and connectivity
- Members were not supportive of the emerging approach to sustainable development, more detailed information was required

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation suggesting that Members appeared to be generally supportive of the principle of the development, but there were a significant number of issues to address.

**RESOLVED –**

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

**124 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** - To note that the next meeting will take place on Tuesday, 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.