

## **Plans Panel (City Centre)**

**Thursday, 4th February, 2010**

**PRESENT:** Councillor M Hamilton in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, T Hanley, G Latty,  
J McKenna, J Monaghan and E Nash

### **55 Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared personal/prejudicial interests for the purposes of Section 81(3) of the Local Government Act 2000 and paragraphs 8 to 12 of the Members Code of Conduct

Councillor E Nash – Application 08/01914/FU Lumiere Building – declared both personal and prejudicial interests as a member of the Co-operative Group. Councillor Nash had been elected to the Group since the pre-application presentation and the Co-Op had premises very close to the application site (minute 58 refers)

Councillor T Hanley – Application 09/04815/OT Leeds Arena - declared a personal interest as a member of Leeds Civic Trust. The Civic Trust had commented on the application (minute 60 refers)

Councillor J Monaghan – Application 09/04815/OT Leeds Arena - declared a personal interest as a member of Leeds Civic Trust and a member of the North Street and Regent Street Residents' Association as both organisations had submitted comments on the proposals (minute 60 refers)

### **56 Apologies for Absence**

No apologies for absence were received

### **57 Minutes**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2009 be approved as a correct record

Councillor Nash, having earlier declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following matter, withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the decision making process

### **58 Application 08/01914/FU - Lumiere Development, Whitehall Road/Wellington Street, Leeds**

The Panel considered a report by the Chief Planning Officer on the current position with regards to the Lumiere development and setting out four proposed reasons to refuse application 08/1914/FU (which set out revisions to Application 06/01622/FU approved in April 2007) relating to the scheme.

The Panel was aware of the planning history of the site. Panel had delegated authority to grant permission for Application 08/1914/FU for the revised scheme to officers on 22 July 2008 subject to completion of a Section 106 Agreement (S106).

The report before Panel today outlined the lack of progress of the scheme and the attempts made to encourage the developer to complete and sign the S106 necessary for the final grant of the permission. A copy of the July 2008 report and minutes of that meeting were included for reference.

Development works on site ceased in July 2008. KW Linfoot, joint developer of the scheme, went into Administration in February 2009, following which the Local Planning Authority (LPA) contacted Fraser Properties as the partner developer to seek to finally dispose of the application due to the failure to complete and sign the 106 Agreement.

The Head of Planning Services reported that the agent for the application had responded just prior to the meeting stating their agreement to the matter being presented to Panel for determination. In essence this report sought approval to move the application from Part 1 of the Planning Register (current schemes) to Part 2 (Historical schemes). The Panel was assured that this would not represent the end of the Lumiere development as the 2007 permission remained extant and could be completed. Mechanisms existed for developers to seek an extension on the time limit of permissions and this could be done in this case.

The Panel was advised that there were 62 similar schemes in the city centre where there was an extant permission where an extension of time could be applied for.

The Panel discussed problems reported generally with developers being able to deliver contributions detailed within S106 Agreements, particularly having regard to the current economic climate. The Head of Planning Services reported on government advice that encouraged LPA's take a flexible approach in such cases, such as reviewing the date of contributions payments, if that would assist the delivery of the overall scheme. Additionally, a developer could make an application to vary the terms of a S106 attached to permission, however he emphasised the need for developers to remain in contact with the LPA particularly about any changes in circumstances as failure to deliver the S106 would be an enforcement matter.

Members expressed regret that the scheme had not been progressed. The Panel whilst supporting the officers' recommendation contained within the report also sought to emphasise their continued support for the Lumiere development and remained keen to see the 2007 permission implemented

**RESOLVED** – To refuse the application for the following reasons:

1) In the absence of a completed signed Section 106 Agreement the proposal fails to deliver any provision of affordable housing and therefore does not address, and is contrary to, the national strategic housing policy objectives outlined in paragraphs 9 and 10, 20-24, and 27- 29 of PPS3 (Housing), the

regional requirements in policy H4 of the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS – May 2008) and the requirements in the City as stated in policies GP7, H11 and H12 of the adopted Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and amplified in Revised Supplementary Planning Guidance 3 (SPG3 – Feb 2003) and the Housing Need Assessment Update (SPG Annex, July 2005 - Revision April 2009).

2) In the absence of a completed signed Section 106 Agreement, the proposed development has failed to make the necessary contributions to enhancements and improvements to public transport infrastructure required by Policy T2D of the adopted UDPR and amplified by LCC. Supplementary Planning Document on Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions such that existing traffic congestion and public transport service, accessibility and capacity problems would be aggravated by the proposal. This is contrary to the sustainability objectives of PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) and PPG13 (Transport); regional advice contained in RSS policy T1; and policies GP7, CC1, T2(ii) and T2D of the adopted Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006) and the SPD on Public Transport Improvements and Developer Contributions.

3) In the absence of a completed signed Section 106 Agreement, there is no means of securing adequate levels of public access, in terms of the number of access points, routes through and the times of access to these routes, across the site. This creates the potential for this site, which is at a key point in the layout of the city centre, to be privatised, hindering easy access and connectivity through this important landmark city centre site. This would be contrary to the objectives of PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) and policies GP5, GP7, CC1, CC9, CC12, CC13, BD3 and N12 of the adopted Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006).

4) In the absence of a completed signed Section 106 Agreement, the proposed development has failed to make the necessary contributions to enhancements and improvements to the local highway and footway network such that existing traffic congestion, accessibility and capacity problems would be aggravated by the proposal. This is contrary to the objectives of PPG13 (Transport); regional advice contained in the RSS, policy T1; and policies GP7, CC1, T2(i) and T2D of the adopted Leeds Unitary Development Plan Review (2006)

Councillor Nash resumed her seat in the meeting

**59 Application 09/05038/OT - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of six Storey Office Block with basement parking at 6 Queen Street and 28A York Place, Leeds**

Members considered the report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out proposals for an office block development with basement car parking at 6 Queen Street/28A York Place.

Plans and architects drawings of the proposals were displayed along with photographs of the existing building, streetscene and photo montages showing the proposed building in-situ.

The Panel had received a pre-application presentation on early proposals for the development in July 2009. Since then the applicant had responded to comments made at that presentation and the subsequent amendments were highlighted within the report. The Panel viewed slides showing the earlier proposals with the revised scheme for comparison and noted the following in particular:

York Place elevation – the window patterns gave a vertical emphasis, creating the form of terrace properties to the street frontage. The windows were set in deep reveals with brick settings. Larger windows were to the ground floor in keeping with the style of the surrounding area but more glazing in smaller windows were located to the upper floor with the 5<sup>th</sup> floor set back to lessen the impact of the height

Queen Street elevation – the architects' drawings showed the use of brick, with brise soleil added to the upper floor and the vertical influence of the windows. Windows were again set in deep recesses and the 5<sup>th</sup> floor was set further back, appearing as a glazed box

Corner feature - more glazing had been introduced which provided a lighter touch to the treatment of the corner, whilst still linking the two elevations and retaining the vertical feel.

Officers reported the contents of a letter received from Leeds Civic Trust since the despatch of the agenda which broadly welcomed the improvements made to the Queen Street elevation but did comment on the deletion of the use of Portland Stone from the York Place elevation. Officers responded that the use of brick better reflected materials in the area and was more appropriate. The Civic Trust reiterated its concern as to why relatively modern buildings required demolition and officers responded they were relatively poor performers in terms of BREEAM standards and the new build would achieve the "excellent" standard.

Officers reported the contents of the comments now received from METRO regarding the development being well situated in terms of public transport but querying whether the number of car parking spaces could be reduced.

Officers highlighted the request for a 5 year time limit on the permission, rather than the usual 3 years, and explained the current occupiers of the building had a lease until 2012. A 5 year permission would allow the developers time to gain possession of the building.

Additionally, a query had been raised regarding financial viability and the terms of the Section 106 Agreement. A Viability Assessment had been completed and revealed that if the Local Planning Authority sought the public transport infrastructure contributions the whole scheme would not be viable. Officers had responded to this approach by suggesting that the viability could be reconsidered when the scheme commences as part of the Section 106 agreement.

The Panel discussed the following:

Heights – Members noted a comment made that, although it was accepted that pedestrians would not see it, the 5<sup>th</sup> floor was one storey too high for this development and prevented the new building sitting in the streetscene. Officers responded there were varying top floor heights in the locality, some at 7 storeys. This development had regard to Policy which suggested new development be kept to “within a one floor limit”

Elevations – Panel generally felt the scheme had improved although there was one comment made that the revised elevation on Queen Street was the least successful

Sustainability – Members queried the wording of the condition and suggested a more robust approach be taken to sustainability to ensure the developers had to meet RSS policy and provide those matters detailed in Condition 22, rather than “consider” their provision.

Officers responded that the BREEAM report submitted showed this new building would meet the BREEAM excellent standard. The condition required the developer to investigate the matters listed (green roofs, SUDS etc) and if these could not be provided, the developer would have to provide the LPA with technical analysis of why these measures could not be implemented.

Corner feature – welcomed the revisions to the corner elevation which previously was felt not to marry the two street elevations. A comment regarding the views through the glass feature up the staircase was noted.

Viability – the Panel were not convinced over the present viability of the scheme given the capital cost of the scheme and noted it would not commence until at least 2012. Members discussed the proposed amount for public transport contributions which they did not consider to be a large sum in comparison to the cost of the scheme and expressed concern that this would only be agreed subject to acceptance of the Viability Appraisal (VA)

Public transport infrastructure – The Panel reiterated their concerns that although this new office accommodation would house more staff no contributions to the public transport infrastructure were immediately proposed to support the anticipated additional public transport journeys. Officers were recommending the LPA look again at the level of contributions prior to commencement of development works by which time the market was expected to recover and anticipated yields from the scheme would be higher. If the contribution expected by the LPA was stated now, the figure could be incorporated into the developers’ build costs.

Courtyard space – noted this would be a north facing and enclosed area and likely to be cold, hard space. Members commented on the type of landscaping proposed

Materials and colour – The Panel commented on the slides representing the intended materials and particularly the colour of the bricks to be used as this

was different between the representations of the previous and current proposals.

The Civic Architect addressed the Panel with regards to -

Design - noted the comment about design quality, however he felt this had to be balanced against the alternative view of this being a simple design

Bricks - noting the comment about colour of bricks he acknowledged the slides showed differing colours, stating the brick to be used was likely to have more orange textures than red and there was no reason why the new build could not match the reference building at 27 York Place

Corner feature - the architects new drawing had just been submitted, and he felt the image showed the panels to cover the floor plates to be too light in colour - a gun metal grey colour would be less visible within the glass corner feature. The Panel agreed with this approach and suggested the colour of the frame supporting the glazing on the upper floors be revised to match.

The Head of Planning Services highlighted the requirement to provide 1:20 detailed drawings which would ensure the LPA was provided with sufficient detail of the quality of the scheme and concluded the discussion by outlining amendments to the proposed recommendation as

- the public transport contribution to be fixed at this stage and index linked
- the treatment of the panels within the glass corner and upper floor glazing to be addressed
- condition 16 should also require the provision and retention of shower facilities in the basement

**RESOLVED** - That determination of the application be deferred and final approval be delegated to the Chief Planning officer subject to:

- (a) the conditions specified in the report (and any others which he might consider appropriate)
- (b) an amendment to Condition 16 to include the provision and retention of shower facilities
- (c) the resolution of the treatment of the panels within the glass corner feature and upper floor glazing
- (d) and the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement within 3 months from the date of resolution unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Chief Planning Officer, to include the following obligations;
  - Public transport contribution of £103,235 index linked
  - Travel Plan with monitoring fee of £4,215.
  - Commitment to use reasonable endeavours to cooperate with LCC Jobs and Skills Service during and post construction regarding employment at the site and use local contractors, sub-contractors and material suppliers where appropriate (but noting that the applicant is a construction company based in Halifax and therefore already has a labour force available for construction).
  - £600 monitoring fee for the public transport contribution

(Under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16:5 it should be noted that Councillor Latty abstained from voting on the above matter)

**60 Application 09/04815/OT - Position Statement - Development of Leeds Arena by Leeds City Council at a site bounded by Clay Pit Lane/Inner Ring Road/ Wade Lane/Jacob Street/Brunswick Terrace, Leeds**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a position statement on the development proposals for the Leeds Arena. The Panel had previously visited the site and had received a pre-application presentation on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2009.

Members noted receipt of comments from both statutory and non statutory consultees and were aware of recent comments in the press from the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) regarding the design of the Arena.

Mr P Crabtree, the Chief Planning Officer, addressed the meeting and acknowledged the comments made by CABE and in response, he clarified that CABE had accepted the site was suitable for the Arena development but had queried the approach adopted to the planning process. Mr Crabtree explained that securing Outline permission would provide assurance that the principle of the development was agreed in the first instance, and allow the necessary contracts and road closure orders to be progressed. Mr Crabtree stressed the importance of this development to the city and its aspirations and that it would have a significant regenerating impact on the northern part of the city centre.

The Principal Planning Officer then explained that Outline permission would provide the developer with flexibility in the design process whilst keeping overall momentum in the planning process.

The contents of an additional letter of representation received from the North Street and Regent Street Residents Association were reported regarding residents' parking controls and improved pedestrian links, particularly through the site to the Lovell Park area.

Plans and aerial photographs of the site were displayed at the meeting. Photos showing views to and across the site from various vantage points, including photo montages with the proposed Arena in-situ, were also displayed. Officers reported their view the Arena sat well within the site however the developer was aware the Brunswick Street elevation required further consideration.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the proposal was supported by national and local policy and would deliver sustainable economic benefit. He highlighted the benefit of this site being close to the city centre and good transport infrastructure/pedestrian links and went onto outline the following matters:

Bus stops – to be improved within the immediate locality with an NGT stop proposed on Woodhouse Lane

Pedestrian access – the piazza will provide a new north-south route and a new northern footpath will link with the eastern network and provide through routes towards Eastgate/Harewood Quarter

Junctions – a new crossing will be provided on Clay Pit Lane designed to accommodate high volumes of pedestrians; the Merrion Way/Brunswick Terrace junction will be improved to include a raised plateau to assist pedestrian movement around the Arena and the Clay Pit Lane junction at The Coburg public house will also be improved

Car parking – there were an estimated 2,900 car parking spaces within 400m of the site and on-street parking will be discouraged in residential areas. Existing Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) and Residents Parking Permit areas will be improved and extended. Parking spaces for disabled people would be provided on the access road, Tower House Street, Merrion Way and possibly in Queen Square.

The application is supported by a Travel Plan designed to reduce single car occupancy. The applicant had also confirmed that a public transport contribution would be paid in accordance with the SPD.

Service access road – this road will incorporate a turning head and provide a drop-off/pick-up point for taxis. Coaches would drop-off at Wade Lane; a “lay-over point” for coaches for the duration of events was yet to be identified. The Principal Planning Officer indicated that potential noise disturbance from the late night movement of event vehicles is an issue upon which there is continuing work

Amenity – the highest part of the Arena was designed to project away from the Opal 3 residential student block.

Mr J Thorp, the Civic Architect, briefly outlined the motivation for the design process and confirmed his support for the “fan-like” shape of the Arena itself within this site and the proposed access arrangements. He reported on the current challenges presented to the design team as being:

- Public realm – the need to ensure this is a viable space and can accommodate the movement of patrons attending when there is a full capacity event at the Arena
- Access – the need to ensure there are both detailed considerations of access to the Arena and general access to the site from various points across the city

The Principal Highways Officer outlined the balance of priorities between patrons arriving in the city centre to attend an Arena event at the same time as commuters leaving the city centre. Additional traffic and footfall would also be generated for matinee events during the weekends. This would require careful management. The traffic modelling undertaken so far confirmed that the highway network could accommodate the additional traffic generated by the Arena with some alteration to signal timings.

The report sought to identify planning policies relevant to the arena development, confirm the details of the planning application and identify outstanding issues; to update Members on the outcome of the initial consultations and to seek the Panel's comments on a number of key issues as highlighted in the report at paragraph 9.9.



The Panel acknowledged the importance of the Arena development to the vitality and economy of the city and went on to discuss the following matters with officers:

Queens Square – contained a public park and some residential property. Patrons should be discouraged from using this site as a short-cut to the arena.

- Officers responded that the applicant had conducted a pedestrian movement study and this was not one of the preferred routes. Signage could be used to discourage its use and highlighted the new pedestrian initiatives and footway along Providence Place which would encourage patrons away from this area

Merrion Centre Car park – the entrance requires careful controls to balance pedestrian and vehicle priorities

Disabled access/transport – Panel members were in receipt of an e-mail from a representative of the Access Committee for Leeds. Members discussed whether the 35 space taxi rank on the service road would provide sufficient space for pick-up/drop-off for wheelchair accessible vehicles as some of these required extra space for manoeuvring and whether the road could incorporate an area designated specifically for such vehicles. Members also commented that the population generally was aging, and there would be a subsequent increase in the numbers of people with mobility issues who would require the use of taxis/private hire vehicles to transport them closer to the Arena. The Panel noted a query why the service road could not be a through-road.

- The Principal Highways Officer confirmed there would be sufficient space for all the necessary vehicle movements and time required for all passengers to disembark. The service road arrangements were being discussed with LCC Taxi and Private Hire Section and representatives of the taxi trade.
- It was reported that creation of a through-road onto Clay Pit Lane would conflict with pedestrian priorities, level changes and incur more costs. A new junction there could not, in any event, provide a right-turn facility as there was not enough space on Clay Pit Lane for stacking turning vehicles prior to the Inner Ring Road junction signals. All traffic would have to go left and back into the city centre, there would not be any advantage in terms of traffic routing and there would be concern that this would conflict with pedestrian movements across Clay Pit Lane towards the car park and increase U-turns at the bottom of Clay Pit Lane.
- Officers highlighted the fact that not all 142 events per year suggested for the Arena would be capacity events, or evening events and officers were confident that the existing city centre car parks could cope with the additional visitors subject to the careful signage, management and control of the visiting traffic.

Noise impact – Panel expressed concern over possible noise impact on the residents of Opal 3 and the Harrison Potter Homes nearby; especially as the Arena could be in use 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. A suggestion was made to restrict the use of the Arena to cease at 00:00 midnight, whilst

acknowledging the service road would still be in use after this time whilst events were dismantled.

- Officers responded that restricting the hours of use would adversely affect the use of the Arena and restricting the hours for stage clearance would not be acceptable

Clay Pit Lane development sites - Panel discussed the two proposed development sites and the impact the Arena would have on any future proposals here, and similarly the impact of any high rise development on these two sites. Members suggested that the sites could be utilised as pick-up/drop-off points for the Arena until their development commenced.

- The Civic Architect responded stating the LPA did not envisage the 2 sites to be suitable for “tall building” development.

Public realm – the two proposed development plots appeared to reduce the available public realm space and Members were keen to ensure that LCC provided a high quality landscaping scheme and that the pedestrian routes made proper links with existing routes and the city centre.

- The Civic Architect reported on current consideration of making a defined edge for the site at Claypit Lane, and rather than using temporary landscaping whilst the development took place, to use better quality, but ultimately “sacrificial landscaping” instead

Pedestrian access – any proposals must include routes through to Lovell Park and those routes must be carefully considered in terms of safety and amenity

- Officers agreed to ensure that this would be addressed through the evolution of the scheme.

Car Parking – the Panel sought more detail of the off street strategy particularly on which areas would be included. The Panel were concerned that patrons, who did not wish to pay to use the car parks, would park in residential areas such as the Lovell’s or Hyde Park, or on North Street, and walk to the site.

A suggestion to utilise the derelict nearby Caspar site as a car park was made but officers reported this was not within the gift of LCC as it was not an LCC owned site

Members added that there were existing businesses on North Street which flourished due to the car parking available through the day and evening, any arena users parking there would have a negative impact on those businesses. Members also highlighted the fact that Leeds already benefited from a strong night time economy and visitors already made use of the existing city centre car parks during the evenings. Members were keen to ensure that the car parking and highways strategy could manage the conflicting visitor priorities.

- The Principal Highways Officer reported that the adjacent residential areas were covered by Residents car permits schemes largely to prevent daytime commuter parking and these schemes would be extended to address night –time parking too.

Coaches – further detail of the “layover area” was required and the Panel was keen to ensure this was not on Woodhouse Moor which was regarded as a sensitive area

(Councillor Hanley withdrew from the meeting for short time at this point)

The Panel then went onto discuss the issues highlighted in the report as recommendations to consider and:

- considered the location of the arena and agreed to endorse the preferred location
- agreed to confirm the acceptability of the outline application process and the design approach being pursued

With regards to the issues at 9.9 of the report, the Head of Planning Services, in agreement with Panel, summarised the main areas for future consideration as:

Suitability of the site – noted the Panel agreed the preferred location but key issues were whether the site would cope with the projected people and vehicular movements and the impact of the Arena on the existing residents. Assurances were sought on the future of the two development plots and how the Arena site works

Building parameters – the scale, footprint, height and “fan shape” of the proposals were broadly accepted, but further information on the two adjacent development blocks was required

The off-street car parking strategy – more detail on the overall strategy (including controls in the adjacent neighbourhoods) was required especially to cover the night time economy particularly

- How will visitors be directed to available spaces
- How the impact on local communities will be managed
- Details of existing controls and those proposed with the application

Service road provision – details to include the taxi/disabled parking provision (including the lay-over site) and how the cul-de-sac arrangement will work

Pedestrian access and suitability of the routes to and from the site – further consideration of the Lovell Park area was required and more detail of proper links through and to the site required (to include Merrion Street, Merrion car park and Queens Square)

The public realm – the two development plots and how they work in the future will be a key issue for Members to consider. In the short term these were vacant spaces but in the long term would be developed and impact on the arena and the space about the site available for patrons

The 24/7 service arrangements – more detail of the noise implications was required

Finally the Panel noted the aspiration to present the Outline application to the March meeting, but due to the number of issues identified, the submission timetable may have to be revised

**RESOLVED** – That the contents of the Position Statement and the comments of the Panel be noted

Councillors Hanley; Latty and J McKenna withdrew from the meeting at this point. Councillor Nash withdrew for a short time before the Panel moved onto the next item of business

## **61 Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Panel Document Policy Position Report (Preferred Option)**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report in support of a presentation to Panel on the Natural Resources and Waste Development Plan Document (NRWDPD). The Development Plan Panel had considered the Policy Position Report on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2009 and referred the matter to each of the Plans Panels as part of the wider public consultation process taking place between 18 January and 1 March 2010.

An Officer from the Strategy and Policy Section within City Development Department presented the report and tabled a copy of the Policy Position Report Summary at the meeting. The Summary was now being distributed as part of the consultation process and available to the public at the consultation road shows. The main points of the document were outlined relating to:  
Land use – the need for efficient use of previously developed land, particularly contaminated land and the need to safeguard existing rail sidings and canal wharfs in order to promote less use of the road networks for haulage. Holbeck sidings and Marsh Lane had been identified within the City Centre Plans Panel area

Minerals – existing mineral sites to be safeguarded from building development to ensure continued reserves. None identified within this Plans Panel area.

Water resources – space for floodwater should be created by protecting areas of functional floodplain and by ensuring that developments in flood risk areas provided space for flood water. Developers should be required to take measures to reduce the rate of surface water run-off and include water efficiency measures within their development proposals. A particular issue for city centre developments would be discouraging applicants from regarding the whole of the site to the boundary line as a developable area.

Air quality – Developers to be requested to include measures for improving air quality commensurate to the size of the development and investigate the benefits of low emission zones.

Energy – significant encouragement to be given to greater use of renewable energy generation. A map was displayed showing the areas of Leeds most suitable for wind power generation and attention was drawn to the map showing the location of the four possible new strategic waste sites. The importance of reducing, re-using and recycling waste was highlighted and the need to generate energy from waste.

Members commented that every new dwelling should be issued with a water butt and discussed the reliability of wind power for general energy generation compared to traditional fossil fuelled power. The Panel broadly supported the promotion of haulage movements by water rather than road, and noted a suggestion to actively encourage LEZ's around the Ring Road in order to tie in with and protect the future of the use of low emission buses in Leeds.

**RESOLVED** - That the contents of the report and the presentation and the comments made by the Panel be noted

**62 Date and time of next meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note the date and time of the next meeting as Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> March 2010 at 1.30 pm