

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

**Thursday, 5th July, 2012**

**PRESENT:** Councillor N Taggart in the Chair

Councillors S Hamilton, J McKenna,  
E Nash, M Hamilton, P Gruen, M Ingham,  
N Walshaw, D Blackburn, R Procter and  
R Wood

### **9 Chair's Opening Remarks**

The Chair welcomed those in attendance to the July meeting of Plans Panel (City Centre).

He particularly welcomed Councillor R Wood who was attending as a substitute for Councillor G Latty.

At the request of the Chair, Mr P Crabtree, Chief Planning Officer commented on the importance of the issues to be discussed at today's meeting and was delighted to witness the growing success of commercial ventures in the city.

### **10 Late Items**

There were no formal late items of business to consider, however the Chair agreed to accept the following as supplementary information:-

- Minutes of the Previous Meeting – 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012 (Agenda Item 6) (Minute 13 refers)

The document was not available at the time of the agenda despatch, but subsequently made available to the public on the Council's website.

### **11 Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests**

The following disclosable pecuniary interest was declared at the meeting:-

- Councillor E Nash in her capacity as receiving a small income from the Co-op and of the fact that there was a small Co-op shop directly located opposite the development which maybe affected by the proposals at Agenda Item 9 (Minute 16 refers)

### **12 Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received on behalf Councillor G Latty.

### **13 Minutes of the Previous meeting**

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012 be confirmed as a correct record.

#### **14 PREAPP/12/00625 - Proposal for New Greenspace at Sovereign Street, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to a proposed development of a new greenspace at Sovereign Street, Leeds.

The following representatives attended and addressed the meeting:-

- Christine Addison, City Development (Applicant)
- Guy Denton, re-form

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme.

The presentation highlighted the following key areas:-

- Sovereign Street – An opportunity
- Audit of greenspace in the City Centre
- South Bank – Urban Design Principles
- Sovereign Street – Development Site Framework
- Synopsis
- Sovereign Street with reference to the Public Realm; key gateways; key connections (east/west); scale; design development around green space, north/south/link and key connections
- Sovereign Street – Introducing water, soft areas to be protected, planting and rain gardens
- Sovereign Street – Design Version 1 (informal) and Design Version 2 (formal)
- Sovereign Square – River Aire

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues and the applicant team duly responded:-

- Clarification as to why water fountains had been omitted from the proposals *(The applicant confirmed that the concept of water would be explored, including water jets)*
- The need for the applicant to look at introducing a water feature that worked *(The applicant confirmed that they would look at a fairly simple quality water feature within the scheme which would be reliable and would be sustainable within the budget)*
- The importance of employing people with the relevant qualifications to maintain water features within the city
- Clarification if discussions had been undertaken with Parks and Countryside with regards to the park and whether those staff who achieved gold status at the Chelsea Flower show had been consulted on the proposals *(The applicant confirmed that discussions had taken place with Parks and Countryside and that officers with the relevant Chelsea experience were on the Project Board)*

- The view expressed that Park Square was an excellent and desirable area for public seating, but that in some thoroughfare areas i.e. Trevelyn Square there was no public seating and of the fact that Leeds should be adopting a 'café culture' in all future city planning applications  
*(The applicant stated that the use of more kiosks in thoroughfare areas was not ruled out and that they would also allow a range of other uses in such public areas)*
- The view expressed that there should be enough greenspace for people to enjoy and that sustainability was the key
- Clarification if wind modelling had been undertaken for recreational spaces  
*(The applicant stated that wind modelling was more applicable around buildings, but tree planting would help to mitigate any potential adverse impact)*
- The need for more greenspace to be evident with less hard standing connectivity and servicing requirements
- The possibility of opening up the route of the goit
- Clarification of how deep the goit would be on a rainy day
- Clarification if the goit was a cut off the River Aire and for this element to be addressed when the application comes back for determination
- A desire for the scheme to be a new greenspace and not a concrete space
- Clarification if Leeds City Council would be taking on the management of the greenspace and the need for a clear accountability procedure to be in place  
*(The applicant confirmed that Leeds City Council would be responsible for the management of the greenspace and would put in appropriate measures to manage the process effectively)*
- Clarification of the timing of the proposals in relation to plot C and that this should be kept as a greenspace and the paths connecting to plot C should not be put in until it was developed
- Clarification of what consultations had been undertaken to date and the need for more people and business users to be provided with a place of tranquility in the city  
*(The applicant confirmed that consultation was undertaken in relation to a planning brief for the site which was adopted last summer and that all the respondents to this would be replied to as part of the comprehensive consultation programme)*
- The need for more work to be undertaken to address the deficiency of greenspace provision in the city centre, particularly in view of the growing residential population
- Clarification of the landscaping design and the need to compliment the structure of the scheme with appropriate planting i.e. pleached trees etc

At this point in the proceedings, the Chair invited a general debate from Members on those matters requiring specific consideration.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The need to re-examine the goit that comes off the River Aire as opposed to an artificial route

- The need to look at architectural planting to mirror the image of the city and not to plant 'lollipop' trees
- The need to encourage more of a café culture in Leeds and to think more like a European culture
- The need to explore the extent of all service routes in order to reduce the impact on the greenspace
- The need for Elected Members to be kept informed throughout the process
- The need to acknowledge that greenspace in relation to surrounding areas was a very important issue
- The need to ensure that there was a proper functioning relationship in place around future equipment maintenance for those bringing forward the formal planning application
- The need for the scheme to be more strategic and to address the future challenges
- The need to plant the appropriate species of tree i.e. hornbeam etc, but not yew trees
- The need to compliment the plans for building plot A and to engage into a dialogue with the people who had been responsible for the design of plot A

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report and pre-application presentation be noted.
- b) That in view of this being an emerging proposal, this Panel confirms' their support for the broad concept for the greenspace and proposals for enhanced connections.

#### **15 PREAPP/12/00581 - Proposal for office development at Sovereign Street, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to the proposed development of a new office building at Sovereign Street, Leeds.

The following representative attended and addressed the meeting:-

Darren Comber, Scott Brownrigg (Architect)

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme.

The presentation highlighted the following key areas:-

- Work in progress
- Site history
- Future development
- Masterplan concept
- Concept – Constraints
- Development Potential
- Urban Context
- Massing
- Floor Layouts
- Sections

- Sovereign Square entrance
- Animated Façade
- From Sovereign Square
- Facade Study
- View from Neville Street Junction

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues and the applicant duly responded:-

- Clarification as to why the building was limited to only four storeys  
*(The architect confirmed that KMPG (the intended occupants) were in agreement with a four storey building and the design suited it's purpose. Also the scale was still considered suitable for its context)*
- Clarification whether the building proposal would be linked to the delivery of the proposed bridge over the River Aire  
*(The architect welcomed the increased connectivity that would be delivered by the proposed bridge, but it did not form part of the remit of this development)*
- Clarification of the delivery process for the bridge  
*(The Chief Planning Officer responded that realising the aspirations for a bridge in this location was dependent upon utilising 3<sup>rd</sup> party land and putting in place the required funding)*
- The need to introduce a water feature, either internally or externally that would tie up with the greenspace proposals  
*(The architect agreed to consider this issue further)*
- Clarification of how many people would be employed in the building; details of the restaurant facilities available and the need for reassurances to be given that the restaurant use would not compete with aspirations for a vibrant square  
*(The architect informed the meeting that 700 people would occupy the building and that the restaurant was necessary to cater for the needs of a 24/7 office function, but it would be an ancillary element to the office use and would not compete with the future use of the greenspace)*
- The need to consider solar panels and for more information to be supplied in this regard  
*(The architect commented that solar panels would not provide sufficient energy for the building and as an alternative he preferred high performance glazing. He agreed to have further discussions on this issue)*
- Clarification if Scott Brownrigg would be the architects on the other two sites  
*(The architect welcomed the opportunity to be involved, subject to the Council protocols)*
- Clarification if the applicant had taken greentravel plans into consideration  
*(The architect confirmed that plans were in place)*
- Concern that there was no mention of the collection of rain/grey water within the outline proposals

*(The architect welcomed this suggestion. Sustainable design was a key consideration for the proposals. If rainwater recycling was beneficial and not energy hungry then it can be considered)*

- The need for the plant on the top of the building to be obscured as much as possible  
*(The architect confirmed that the design team would seek to minimise its visual impact)*

In concluding discussions, the Chair put forward the following specific matters for Members consideration:-

- was the general form of the building acceptable?
- does the building address Sovereign Street and the new greenspace successfully?
- was the rooftop plant resolved successfully within the roof-form of the building?

It was the consensus of the meeting that the above matters were acceptable, subject to screening and reducing the visual impact of the rooftop plant as much as possible.

The Panel were keen for the applicant to work very closely with the Greenspace officers on the details of the scheme and to see sight of the proposals for building plots B and C as soon as possible.

The Panel also stated that should there be any delays with regards to the proposals for building plots B and C, the applicant should take into account a requirement for the land to be grassed over in the meantime.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and pre-application presentation be noted.

(Councillor S Hamilton left the meeting at 3.30pm at the conclusion of this item)

## **16 PREAPP/12/00465 - Office and hotel scheme up to 11 storeys high with ancillary ground floor 'active' uses at Wellington Street, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to a new major mixed use scheme proposed on the vacant former Lumiere development site between Wellington Street and Whitehall Road, Leeds.

The following representatives attended and addressed the meeting:-

- Mike Gardener, Central Square Development Team
- Tim Mc Donald, Central Square Development Team
- Gary Kempston, Central Square Development Team
- Matthew Sheppard, Central Square Development Team

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme.

The presentation highlighted the following key areas:-

- Location
- Listed Properties
- Site heritage
- Prime Office quarter
- Existing Uses – upper floors
- Vehicle movements/Pedestrian routes
- Properties to the north
- Wellington Street/Whitehall Road access
- Predominant features
- The Design Concept
- Form finding exercises
- Massing Development
- Massing View: Along Whitehall Street
- Site Section
- Plan layouts – vehicle paths/arrival strategy
- Public Realm themes/study
- Design Quality
- Technical Aspects

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues and the applicant team duly responded:-

- Clarification of the current temporary bus stops to the frontage on Wellington Street  
*(The applicant confirmed that bus drop off stops were currently being addressed by highways)*
- Clarification of the materials to be used in relation to the public entrance through the building to the proposed public space and concerns expressed about the security issues when accessing the public space at night time  
*(The applicant agreed to look into this)*
- Concerns about the visual impact of the wall around the base of the building and clarification of its purpose  
*(The applicant confirmed that the wall would act as screening in relation to the delivery of goods services. He agreed to consider this issue further)*
- Clarification about which of the two buildings would be erected first and the timescales involved  
*(The applicant confirmed that the proposals were speculative and the intention was to submit details in full for the southern building and outline for the northern building at this present time)*
- Clarification will be needed of the restrictions/conditions relating to operation of the bandstand in the public space to avoid creating a nuisance for adjacent occupiers

At this point in the proceedings, the Chair invited a general debate from Members on those matters requiring specific consideration.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues:-

- The need to address daylight modelling to the proposed square; to retrieve the bus stops and laybys that were lost following the works related to the Lumiere scheme and the importance of incorporating appropriate clauses in the Section 106 to optimise opportunities for jobs and employment training for local people arising from the development

In concluding discussions, the Chair put forward the following specific matters for Members consideration:-

- were the footprints and layout of the buildings acceptable?
- were the scale and massing of the buildings acceptable?
- were the proposed materials and elevational treatments acceptable?
- were the measures employed to protect the amenity of surrounding residents e.g. distances between building facades; angles between building facades; relative heights, sufficient?
- was the provision of the additional open space area supported in this form with the new access points on to Whitehall Road and Wellington Street?

It was the consensus of the meeting that the layout, scale and massing were generally acceptable and that the provision of the open space was supported. However the Panel requested more detail on the proposed materials and elevational treatments and on the measures proposed to protect the amenity of surrounding residents.

**RESOLVED** – That the report and pre-application presentation be noted.

(Councillor E Nash having previously declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item, left the room and took no part in the voting or discussion thereon)

(Councillor M Hamilton left the meeting at 4.05pm at the conclusion of this item)

(Councillor R Procter left the meeting at 4.05pm at the conclusion of this item)

## **17 PREAPP - New Dock (formerly Clarence Dock), South Bank, Leeds**

The report of the Chief Planning Officer introduced a pre-application presentation in relation to proposals for New Dock (formerly Clarence Dock), South Bank, Leeds.

The following representatives attended and addressed the meeting:-

- Michael Ingall, Allied London (Applicant)
- Jonathan Raine, Allied London
- Lucy Whalley, Allied London

Members were shown detailed plans and photographs of the scheme.

The presentation highlighted the following key areas:-

Minutes approved as a correct record at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 2nd August, 2012



- Map shown of the site
- Key words – Clarence Dock
- Case Study: Spinningfields
- Clarence Dock – Location
- Project Objectives
- History
- The Vision – Leeds Southbank/Future
- New Dock – Key areas/Masterplan
- Importance of Public Realm
- Shopping and Café Street proposals
- Restaurant Boardwalk
- Workspace hub
- Water Village
- Events and Management
- Waterfront Festival
- Proposed Programme
- Summary

The Chair then invited questions and comments from Members on the specific proposals of the pre-application.

In summary, specific reference was made to the following issues and the applicant team duly responded:-

- The need to entice people living in Outer Leeds areas and Harrogate to go to the New Dock; the parking problems at the New Dock and whether or not the city had the capacity to take on board more culture and more restaurants  
*(The applicant stated that Clarence Dock was part of the cities heritage and that there was a need to offer people more facilities in this area. Discussions were continuing with British Waterways with regard to car parking charges)*
- The concerns expressed about the relationship with the Royal Armouries and a need for the applicant to work closely with them in the future  
*(The applicant confirmed that a meeting had taken place with representatives from the Royal Armouries and it was hoped that a successful working relationship would be formed arising from the proposals)*
- Clarification if there was a proposed link with the proposals for enhanced flood defences in the area  
*(The Chief Planning Officer responded and confirmed that this issue would be addressed as the application goes forward)*
- Clarification of what decisions were required on this pre-application at today's Plans Panel meeting  
*(The applicant stated that he sought the support of the meeting for the master plan and that various elements of the scheme would require planning approval. He confirmed the willingness to work with planning officers and was delighted to have a large number of stakeholders on board, including British Waterways who had been very supportive to date)*

- The need to congratulate the applicant on the initial concept and for the Panel to acknowledge that the proposals would benefit the city, particularly around the area of Clarence Dock

In concluding discussions, the Chair put forward the following specific matters for Members consideration:-

- was the general approach right for the area?
- does the proposal complement the City's vision for the waterfront, South Bank and the City Centre Park ?

It was the consensus of the meeting that the above matters were acceptable.

The Panel also requested the Chief Planning Officer to look into the implementation of a waterbus/taxi business plan from the railway station to the Royal Armouries. It was also suggested that the Panel would benefit by visiting Manchester Spinningfields prior to Members viewing the Clarence Dock site.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- a) That the report and pre-application presentation be noted.
- b) That the Chief Planning Officer be requested to arrange a Panel visit to Manchester Spinningfields prior to Members viewing the Clarence Dock site.
- c) That the Chief Planning Officer be requested to look into the implementation of a waterbus/taxi business plan from the railway station to the Royal Armouries.

(Councillor R Procter re-joined the meeting at 4.40pm during discussions of this item)

(Councillors P Gruen and E Nash left the meeting at 4.45pm during discussions of this item)

#### **18 Date and time of next meeting**

Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2012 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

(The meeting concluded at 5.30pm)