

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 11TH AUGUST, 2022

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, K Brooks,
P Carlill, A Garthwaite, C Gruen,
P Wadsworth, A Khan, A Maloney and
B Anderson

21 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

22 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

There was no exempt information.

23 Late Items

There were no late items.

24 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations.

25 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors C Campbell and D Cohen.

Councillor B Anderson was in attendance as substitute.

26 Minutes - 14 July 2022

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2022 be confirmed as a correct record.

27 Application 19/04510/FU - Sayner Lane and Clarence Road, Hunslet, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a multi-generation building comprising a primary school, nursery, 72 bed care home, 80 flats and a café at Sayner Lane and Clarence Road, Hunslet Leeds.

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

The following was highlighted in relation to the application:

- The site was a brownfield site and allocated for development under the Aire Valley Action Plan.
- The original plan to have a buffer between the site and glassworks was not to be carried through. Air quality and noise reports had been agreed with Environmental Health and there would be mechanical ventilation to avoid any amenity problems.
- There would be the provision of 80 apartments, a 72 bed care home, provision for a primary school, a nurse's office and a café.
- The proposals were for the scheme to be relatively traffic free with some parking spaces for the care home and disabled parking.
- Tree planting was proposed to be in excess of the guidelines but there would be a commuted sum if that was not achievable.
- There would be a commuted sum for the biodiversity shortfall on site.
- The apartments were all considered to be policy compliant with full delivery of affordable and accessible housing.
- Carbon saving – council and building regulation standards would be exceeded.
- Floor plans for the development were displayed.
- Off site highways works and delivery would include parking, requirements for traffic calming, crossing points and traffic islands. These would be conditioned as part of the application. There would also be a commuted sum to off site traffic regulation orders.
- The proposals were not considered to be harmful to nearby listed buildings.

In response to questions and comments from the Panel, the following was discussed:

- With regards to connectivity the application was part of a wider estate and works were already underway on other sites which included public access routes and a footbridge over the river.
- There was education provision for older children in the local area and there had not been any concerns raised by Children's Services regarding provision for older children.
- There would be natural surveillance for the pedestrian routes as they ran through residential areas. There would also be street lighting.
- There would not be a specific pick up and drop off point for the school but would be some opportunity for short stay parking on surrounding streets. Pupils and staff would be encouraged not to travel by car.
- There was no provision for a GP surgery within this scheme but in the wider estate there was opportunity to provide space for a GP surgery and this could be considered for future phases.
- Data had shown that people living in this kind of development reduced their car ownership.

- The cheapest properties provided in the area would be approximately £140,000. Affordable properties would be available throughout the scheme and would be developed to the same quality as other properties.
- Provision of job opportunities for people who would be occupying the development.
- Members were broadly supportive of the application although there was some concern regarding the lack of car parking for the school and whether this could work both for the school staff and without causing highway issues.

RESOLVED - That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the specified conditions set out in Appendix 1 (and any others which he may consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 111 agreement under the Local Government Act 1972 and a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- Affordable Housing 7% - 4 x 1 bedroom apartments on the first floor and 2 x 2 bedroom apartments on the second floor. Four of these will be for social rent and 2 for intermediate affordable housing. In the interests of mix, at least one of the 2 bedroom units should be for social rent.
- Traffic Regulation Order to manage any overspill parking issues in the surrounding area as a result of the development: £25,000.
- City Centre/fringe wayfinding scheme for improved signage: £20,000
- Travel Plan and Travel Plan Monitoring Fee of £3,377 for the Residential Travel Plan and £3,377 for the School Travel Plan, both subject to an annual increase for inflation.
- Residential Travel Plan Fund £20,640.
- Co-operation with Local Jobs and Skills Initiatives.
- Tree replacement. A financial contribution may be required based on CAVAT assessment of tree removal if the replacement of trees according to planning policy cannot be achieved on site.
- Greenspace – 1,822sqm of green space to be laid out on site according to an agreed drawing and £18,850.11 to be paid as an off-site commuted sum.
- Biodiversity net gain contribution of £33,250 towards biodiversity improvements in Leeds.

28 Application 22/00361/FU - Land off Water Lane, Holbeck Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented an application for a multi-level residential development (Class C3) with associated hard and soft landscaping and rooftop amenity space at a site on land off Water Lane, Holbeck, Leeds.

The application had been deferred at the previous meeting of the City Plans Panel.

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

The following was highlighted in relation to the application:

- Panel concerns on viability and lack of affordable housing – the applicant had worked with their funding provider to take a longer term approach which allowed for an enhanced offer. There would now be 5% affordable housing and these would all be 3 bedroom units. There would also be funding towards pedestrian works.
- Concerns regarding carbon emissions and lack of 100% electrical vehicle charging at the outset – there would now be 100% availability at the time of the first occupation.
- The site was connected to other developments in the area and was compatible with the emerging character of the area.
- Pedestrian improvements included new crossing points, wider footpaths and additional lighting under the viaduct arches.
- There was a reduction in the travel plan funding but an improved offer for provision of greenspace in the wider area.
- Housing mix – city centre living showed that there was a need for more smaller units.
- Landscaping – there would be provision of informal children’s play areas and use of natural materials.
- The development would have a 100% electric heating system and there would be use of mechanical ventilation and photo voltaic cells.

In response to questions and comments from the Panel, the following was discussed:

- Members were supportive of the proposed improvements to the movement of traffic including the provision of a one way system.
- Benches with back supports would be provided in the open spaces.
- There would be a maintenance agreement for the play equipment.
- Members were supportive of the revised proposals and officers and the developers were thanked for their work in addressing the concerns previously raised.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions at Appendix 2 of the report (and any amendment to or addition of others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate), subject to resolving the outstanding concerns of the Health and Safety Executive and subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the following:

1. Employment and training of local people
2. Publicly accessible areas
3. Affordable housing provision which is subject to viability (in line with option 4 as detailed in paragraph 8.9 and Appendix 1 of the report)
4. Travel Plan review fee

5. The provision of two Leeds City Council Car Club provider parking spaces
6. The provision of a Residential Travel Plan Fund which is subject to viability (see paragraphs 8.12, 8.13 and Appendix 1 of the report)
7. A contribution towards pedestrian and cycle improvements in the area which is subject to viability (see paragraphs 8.12, 8.13 and Appendix 1 of the report)
8. A Traffic Regulation Order affecting resident's on street parking, within an 800m radius of the site (see paragraphs 8.12, 8.13 and Appendix 1 of the report)
9. A green space contribution which is subject to viability (see paragraphs 8.12, 8.13 and Appendix 1 of the report)
10. A management fee

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the Panel resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the applications shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

29 Application 22/01889/FU - Yorkshire Bank, Merrion Way and land fronting Leeds Arena, Clay Pit Lane, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a hybrid planning application for the demolition of Yorkshire Bank, Merrion Way and the construction of two student residential accommodation buildings and a multi-use events building on the site of the Yorkshire Bank, Merrion Way and land fronting Leeds Arena, Clay Pit Lane, Leeds.

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

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included the following:

- The application sought the demolition of the existing Yorkshire Bank building, the construction of two multi storey student accommodation blocks and outline permission for a multi-purpose events building. Pre-application presentations had been received by the Panel in September and November 2021.
- The site fell within the city centre boundary and the proposals were appropriate for the area.
- The scale of the proposed buildings was appropriate for the area which was mentioned in the tall buildings design guide.
- Views of the site from surrounding areas were displayed.
- It was proposed to phase the development with the first two phases being the student accommodation blocks.
- There would be landscaping with additional tree planting.
- Floor plans of the proposed student accommodation buildings were shown. Room sizes met guidelines.
- CGI images of the proposed buildings were displayed and Members were shown samples of the proposed materials to be used.

- The proposed multi-purpose events building would be equivalent to seven storeys in height.
- The site was not in a flood risk area but there was a need to manage the drainage of surface water.
- A revised report was currently under consideration by the Nature Conservation officer.
- There was ongoing discussion with the Health and Safety Executive regarding fire safety.
- There had been objections to the application, primarily due to the provision of a multi-purpose events venue. These related to the impact of the multi-purpose events building on Harrogate. An assessment had been provided which indicated up to 1% of trade would be diverted away from Harrogate and up to 6% from Harrogate Convention Centre.

The Panel heard objections from a representative of the Harrogate Convention Centre. These related to the proposals for a multi-purpose events centre and included the following:

- There was no objection to the student accommodation blocks.
- The main objection was the absence of consultation between Leeds City Council with Harrogate Convention Centre and Harrogate Borough Council regarding the proposals. It was not believed that the impact on Harrogate had been assessed and that the economic assessment case was flawed, inaccurate and out of date.
- It was felt that the negative impact on Harrogate had been underestimated by 15%.
- There had been a strong relationship between the Convention Centre and Leeds City Council and it was surprising that there had not been any consultation.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
 - Although there had not been a formal planning consultation with Harrogate Borough Council regarding the submitted application, prior to submission of the application, there had been contact between Leeds City Council Director of City Development and the Chief Executive of Harrogate Borough Council regarding the proposals which had invited engagement and Harrogate Convention Centre had been made aware of this.
 - Harrogate Convention Centre stated that they had been made aware of the proposals prior to the submission of the application but the size of the multi-use event space had increased when the application was formally submitted. It was hoped that there could be a deferral to allow for consultation to take place.

The applicant's representative addressed the Panel. The developer had been working on the scheme for two and a half years and was aware of the initial contact with Harrogate Borough Council. The scheme was compliant with policy and included an assessment of the impact in Harrogate. In response to questions from the Panel, the following was discussed:

- It was hoped to salvage some of the material from the Yorkshire Bank Building and there may be opportunity for re-use within the public realm works.
- The material for the second student accommodation building would be terracotta with a colour palette to work with the listed buildings opposite. There was some concern expressed regarding the use of dark grey colouring.
- It had not yet been decided whether the phases of building would overlap.
- Concern that there would be a visual impact on the view of the arena.

The legal officer advised the Panel that statutory duties had been satisfied in terms of consultation and that the Council had gone beyond that by making initial contact with Harrogate Borough Council so they were alerted to the application at concept stage.

In response to questions and comments from the Panel, the following was discussed:

- A city the size of Leeds should have a conference facility of the size proposed.
- An independent report had concluded that there would not be a significant adverse impact on Harrogate.
- Policy required an assessment for the provision of conference facilities and the assessment carried out was considered to be acceptable.
- The illustrative white block for the multi-purpose event centre was just to demonstrate the maximum parameters.
- There had not been an initial objection as it was thought that the size was smaller than the maximum size now proposed.
- The proposal for the multi-purpose events building was not just for conferences. There was opportunity through the planning process to control the kind of activity at the centre.
- The developer would commence works on the student accommodation as soon as possible should the application be approved.

A motion was made to defer the application for further consideration to be given to the objections that had been submitted. This was seconded and voted on.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred

30 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 8 September at 1.30 p.m.