

## **SOUTH AND WEST PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 1ST JULY, 2021**

**1.30 P.M.**

**PRESENT:** Councillor E Taylor in the Chair

Councillors B Anderson, C Campbell,  
S Hamilton, D Ragan, P Wray, Burke,  
D Collins, T Smith and D Jenkins

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

There were no appeals.

### **25 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of the Press and Public**

There was no exempt information.

### **26 Late Items**

There were no late items.

### **27 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations.

### **28 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillor R Finnigan.

### **29 Application 19/01489/FU - Index House, 70 Burley Road, Leeds, LS3 1JX**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for the demolition of Index House and the construction of student residential accommodation and ground floor commercial units at 70 Burley Road, Leeds.

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

The following was highlighted in relation to the application:

- There would be a total of 57 bed spaces in the development and 3 commercial units at ground floor level.
- The applicant had been brought to Panel due to the level of local concern regarding additional student accommodation in the area and the position of the site in relation to Rosebank Primary School.

- Pedestrian routes to the university campuses.
- The footprint of the building would cover the entire site with no space for parking.
- Internal floor plans were shown. Three commercial units at ground floor level. First floor comprised of cluster flats, communal space, cycle and bin storage with exit to Hollis Place. Other floors consisted of cluster and studio flats.
- The original scheme was for a nine storey building. This had been reduced by two storeys.
- There had been meetings with Rosebank Primary School to discuss their concerns. Windows that overlooked the school would be treated with obscured glass. The Children's Services Safeguarding Officer had not raised concerns as residential developments near to schools was not unusual. It was also felt that managed accommodation such as this could be seen as preferable to open market housing.
- A solar study had been carried out and had shown that there would only be a minimal level of overshadowing.
- The development was considered to be of good quality in a sustainable location and close to the university.

The Panel heard from objectors to the application. The first objector represented Rosebank Primary School and the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Concerns raised included the following:

- This would add to the already high concentration of students living in the area.
- Highway concerns – no disabled parking or parking for servicing/delivery vehicles or taxis.
- The tall building would alter the style and character of the area.
- The development would take over a year to complete and cause disruption to the school.
- There was a severe lack of social housing in the area and families were getting pushed out.

The second objector represented the Five Ways Recovery Academy, a charity to support people with drug and alcohol problems that operated from the converted chapel adjacent to the site. Concerns raised included the following:

- The proposals would overlook and damage the privacy offered to users of the academy.
- There would be a loss of light to external areas that are used for therapy sessions.
- Internal lighting relied on the use of natural light and this would be lost. Open views would be replaced with concrete walls.
- The noise and disturbance caused by development would disrupt services offered at the academy.
- The client group at the academy had a range of health problems.

In response to questions, the following was discussed:

- The Rosebank Millennium Green was an open public space adjacent to the site.
- The school had been involved in two meetings with the developer. There had not been any consultation with the Five Ways Recovery Academy.
- The building work would prevent the Academy from providing their usual services.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- The application had developed following significant engagement with planning officers and the local community.
- The site was well located with education establishments and also the public transport network.
- The proposals had been significantly altered following consultation including a reduction in height.
- This would be a high quality development and replace a poor quality building.
- A CIL payment and greenspace payment have been agreed.
- There would be controls over the occupancy of the building and a working relationship would be developed with the school.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
  - Open market residential accommodation was considered but student accommodation was considered preferable due to the neighbouring school.
  - The application had been reduced from 83 bedspaces to 57.
  - The contributions for CIL and greenspace would not be discounted.
  - The greenspace contribution would be used in the proximity of the development and potentially with the school.
  - There had not been any consultation with the Five Ways Academy. It was not believed that the proposal would overshadow their property.
  - The construction management plan would take account of surrounding premises to minimise any disruption.
  - The site was considered to be a sustainable location for students and would help recycle other housing currently used by students.
  - The proposal was for a 6 storey building and not 7 storey as shown in the presentation.
  - There would be parking bays to the front and there was a public car park on the other side of the road.
  - There would be a management strategy in place for student arrival and departure at the building. There would be a staggered approach and possible offer of incentives for those who don't arrive by private car and alternatives including provision of shuttle buses.

- The site could be considered for redevelopment and purpose built student housing would take the pressure of the use of other housing.
- The site was a brownfield site.
- At six storeys it was not considered to be a tall building.

In response to questions to officers, the following was discussed:

- The original plans had been reduced by three storeys.
- Members had visited the site previously. Consultation had focused on the relationship with the school and it was felt that further consultation with the neighbouring charity should be considered.
- Some spaces would be set aside in the Burley Road Car Park for residents of the building.
- There would be a traffic regulation order to allow for a servicing bay to facilitate deliveries to the building.
- It was felt that students who wished to drive would seek accommodation that had parking facilities.
- The proposal would generate approximately 21 two-way vehicular movements during the day. Delivery vehicles would be expected to use the servicing bay and enforcement measures would be taken where this did not happen.
- The site was between a high density area of student accommodation and residential areas. It was considered to be in a sustainable location and the proximity to university campuses would not generate an increase in traffic.

A motion had been made to defer the application on grounds of highways issues and the impact on the rehabilitation centre to the rear of the site. This was seconded and voted on.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for the following:

- The highways safety parking impacts considered cumulatively with other student residences in the area.
- Consideration of the impact of the building on a Rehabilitation centre located to the rear.

Following the vote further concern was raised with regards to the need for further discussion on design and the massing of the building. Further advice was sought following the meeting and Members were informed that matters that had not been debated today could be considered when the application was brought back to Panel.

### **30 Date and Time of Next Meeting**