

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 1ST AUGUST, 2013

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

Councillors M Hamilton, S Hamilton,  
T Leadley, N Walshaw, M Ingham, J Lewis,  
B Anderson, D Congreve, J Harper,  
A McKenna and G Wilkinson

### 26 Election of Chair

In the absence of Councillor Taggart, nominations to chair the meeting were sought

**RESOLVED** – That Councillor J McKenna be asked to Chair the meeting

Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

### 27 Chair's opening remarks

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated that Councillor Taggart was recovering after his recent operation and wished him well on behalf of the Panel

With reference to proposals for the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme and Councillor Taggart's request that a site visit by boat should take place to enable proper consideration to be given to the scheme, the Head of Planning Services stated that this was being arranged and would take in the route from the Leeds Canal Basin in Granary Wharf to Thwaite Mill. Members were asked to consider whether this morning visit should take place on a separate day or be included with other site visits

The view of Members was that this should take place on separate day to other site visits, with a 9.00am start time from the Civic Hall being agreed

### 28 Late Items

There were no late items

### 29 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests, however Councillor Leadley brought to the Panel's attention, as he felt that it was in the public interest to do so, that he was the Chair of the Morley Town Council Planning Committee which had made representations on the proposals for

alterations and extensions to the White Rose Centre and redevelopment of adjacent land for staff parking (minute 37 refers)

### 30 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from:

Councillor P Gruen  
Councillor E Nash  
Councillor J Cummins  
Councillor R Procter  
Councillor G Latty  
Councillor N Taggart  
Councillor D Blackburn

It was noted that the following Members were substituting for their respective colleagues:

Councillor A McKenna  
Councillor J Harper  
Councillor D Congreve  
Councillor B Anderson  
Councillor G Wilkinson  
Councillor J McKenna

### 31 Minutes

**RESOLVED** - i) That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> July be approved

ii) That the minutes of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2013 be approved, subject to the following amendments:

#### Minute 15 – Otley Road, Shaw Lane to Ancaster Road

- ‘that the proposals to close part of Weetwood Lane were not new and that the closure of this road, rather than St Chad’s Road was to provide a better pedestrian environment and an opportunity to support the local shops in this area, although this proposal had been rejected by Highway Officers earlier in the year’ – to be amended to read:
- ‘that the proposals to close part of Weetwood Lane were not new and that the closure of this road, rather than St Chad’s Road was to provide a better pedestrian environment and an opportunity to support the local shops in this area, although the proposal had not proceeded’

#### Minute 15 Southern Section – New Dock to Stourton Park and Ride

- ‘An objector to the scheme raised concerns ...’ – to be amended to read:

- 'Two objectors to the scheme raised concerns ...'

Minute 15 Southern Section – New Dock to Stourton Park and Ride

- 'concern regarding the route of the NGT through Pym Street and associated safety issues' – to be amended to read:
- 'concern regarding the route of the NGT which would pass Pym Street, blocking the end of this street and having an impact on local businesses and associated safety issues'

### **32 Application 11/03655/FU - Alterations and extensions to form two A3 units and construction of 144 bedroom hotel - Merrion Way, Brunswick Terrace and Tower House Street LS2**

Further to minute 47 of the Plans Panel City Centre meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2011, where Panel deferred determination of an application for serviced apartments, two A3 units and extension to casino for further discussions with the applicant on a range of issues, City Plans Panel Members considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer on a revised scheme

Plans, photographs, graphics and artist's impressions were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report and stated that a simplified scheme was now proposed with the massing changed and a taller block adjoining Tower House so that views of the Arena from Merrion Way were kept and not obscured

The proposed materials were grey, black and white cladding with glazing

The public realm would be improved around the site, with this to be delivered in a phased manner. Discussions on this were continuing, with Members being informed that Officers were keen to secure as much public realm as possible early within the development, particularly the hard surfacing around three sides of the site

The receipt of a further letter of representation was reported which had raised concerns about the location of the drop off point for the hotel in respect of potential congestion from the car park when an event was taking place at the Arena. Concerns had been raised about the design detailing on the end of the building and the proposed phasing of the public realm. Members were informed that Officers were satisfied with the drop off point and the design of the scheme

Members commented on the following matters:

- the considerable improvements on the earlier scheme but the need to ensure the quality of the finished development
- the need for some areas of public realm to be provided as quickly as possible and whether a row of trees could be incorporated at the rear of the site to complement the piazza outside the Arena. Officers agreed to raise this with the applicant

- the hotel drop off point and how many spaces would be available. Members were informed that 2-3 spaces would be provided, which Officers were content with

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the specified conditions (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations; public transport contribution (£37,450); travel plan and monitoring fee (£2,835); employment and training initiatives; restriction to serviced apartment use; maintenance of street furniture in Brunswick Terrace; Section 106 management fee (£750)

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

### **33 Application 13/01428/FU - Change of Use of building to form lap dancing club - 68-72 New Briggate LS1**

Plans, photographs and drawings were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which sought permission for a Change of Use of 68-72 New Briggate LS1

Members were informed that the four storey building was currently closed but that the most recent use of the premises had been for bar use on the lower floor, with a lap dancing club on the upper floors. The application before Panel was for a change of use of the whole building for a lap dancing club

There would be few external alterations to the premises, although an external flue would be removed and new bin store created. Consideration could be given to removing the sign, if this was required by Panel

Whilst only one objection to the application had been received, Officers were aware of other concerns around the proposed use. Members were advised that moral objections could be given little weight when considering planning matters

Reference was made to a letter received from Councillor P Gruen on behalf of Councillor Bruce and Rachel Reeves MP, regarding the unfortunate overlap between planning and licensing. For clarity, the Panel's legal adviser stated that these were two separate regimes and that the Panel's decision on this application would not affect any decision reached by the Licensing Authority

Members commented on the following matters:

- that the blank appearance of the building drew attention to itself
- in terms of the building's appearance, whether different standards were being applied, as a criticism of some buildings were that they had a relatively blank, inactive frontage. On this matter the Head of Planning Services advised that there was a difference in this case as unlike, for example, retail areas, there was not heavy footfall in this location

- the need to ensure that people passing could not see into the premises. Members were advised that there was a lobby area with doors beyond that which would prevent views into the premises
- the proximity of the Grand Theatre to the site and whether there were prescribed distances for sexual entertainment venues (SEVs) from family leisure facilities, with Members being informed that the Council's policy on SEVs had not yet been tested in respect of distances
- that the name of the premises on the plans displayed at the meeting differed from its existing name, with concerns being raised about the suitability of this. Members were informed that it would be for the Licensing Authority to consider any name change
- the suitability of the site for a SEV in view of it being on the edge of the City Centre but close enough to be monitored by police patrols
- the need for the signage to be discreet and controlled by condition. Members were informed that a separate application would be required for new signage for the building

Members considered how to proceed

**RESOLVED** – That the application be granted subject to the conditions set out in the submitted report and a further condition requiring the removal of the existing signage at first floor level obscuring an existing window (and any other conditions which might be considered appropriate)

Under Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Wilkinson required it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this matter

Under Council Procedure Rule 16.5, Councillor Walshaw required it to be recorded that the voted against this matter

### **34 Application 13/01872/FU - 128 bedroom hotel with associated landscaping - Whitehall Road LS1**

Further to minute 85 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2013, when Panel received a pre-application presentation on proposals for a hotel on Whitehall Road, Members considered the formal application

Plans, drawings, precedent images and sample materials were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented a report seeking approval for a 128 bedroom hotel and landscaped area. Members were informed that a previous permission for a hotel and office scheme on the whole site had not been implemented and that the applicant was now seeking approval for a smaller development which would also include some temporary landscaping

Some design revisions had been made to the hotel which resulted in a sleeker appearance. In terms of materials, black aluminium panels were proposed for the cladding which was similar to that use on the development at the Doncaster Monkbridge site, further along Whitehall Road

Members welcomed the development which was felt to be an improvement on the previous scheme

**RESOLVED** - To approve the application in principle and to defer and delegate to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to conditions set out in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to cover the following matters:

- contribution to public transport improvements in accordance with SPD5 prior to first occupation - £22,198
- provision of 1 car club space prior to first occupation
- public access around the site
- travel plan implementation and monitoring fee prior to first occupation £2500
- employment and training opportunities for local people in City and Hunslet Ward or any adjoining Ward
- management fee payable within one month of commencement of development £750

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

**35 Application 12/04046/OT - Outline application for residential development - Land off Bagley Lane/Calverley Lane, Farsley**

Plans photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. A Members site visit had taken place earlier in the day

Officers presented the report which related to an application for outline planning permission for a residential development on a 17.8 ha Protected Area of Search (PAS) site at Calverley Lane and Bagley Lane Farsley

As the applicant had lodged an appeal, the Panel could not now determine the application. As it was the view of Officers that the application should not be granted planning permission, the submitted report suggested reasons for refusal for Panel to review and indicate whether it agreed with these reasons, had it been in a position to determine the application

Although the application was in outline only, an indicative masterplan showed approximately 400 dwellings on the site, with access off Calverley Lane, with a central spine of open space being proposed

Officers were of the view that the application was premature and that its suitability needed to be comprehensively reviewed as part of the work on the Site Allocations Plan; there was also concerns about the lack of a safe and direct route for school children and other users and that a signed Section 106 Agreement to cover a range of matters would be required, although it was anticipated that this particular issue might be dealt with before the Public Inquiry took place which had been scheduled for November 2013

Further information was provided on the issue of the 5 year land supply with Members being informed that in its Annual Monitoring Report 2012, Leeds had been able to demonstrate it had a 5.3 year land supply. In view of

this the subject site was not needed to meet the requirements in the area and that other, suitable sites existed

The Transport Development Services Manager outlined the highway proposals as set out in the report before Panel

Members discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- accessibility to the site, concerns that this was poor and there were inadequate safety measures for pedestrians, particularly children
- public transport accessibility to the site which was also considered to be poor
- sustainability issues
- that the application was premature
- the interim policy in relation to development on PAS land
- that more detail could have been expected in the highways comments, particularly about access to local facilities and from Children's Services about the impact of the proposals on local school places

**RESOLVED** – That had the Panel been in a position to determine the application they would have refused permission for the reasons set out in the submitted report

### **36 Victoria Gate - Phase One - Position statements - Victoria Gate - Land bounded by Eastgate, George Street and Millgarth Street LS2**

Further to minute 108 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2013, where Panel received a presentation on the latest proposals for a major mixed-use development for the Eastgate and Harewood Quarter, Members considered a report setting out the current position on the three applications which would form Victoria Gate, the new name for the development

Plans, drawings, graphics and a model of the proposals in the wider context of the City Centre were displayed at the meeting

Officers presented the report and outlined the three applications

In terms of design of the proposals, whilst the 1950s Blomfield-style buildings would be demolished, the replacement block would emulate the characteristics of Blomfield. An analysis of the rhythms of the Blomfield buildings opposite the phase one site had been undertaken which had led to the design of the new block with strong vertical rhythms, pleated brickwork and stone corners

To the George Street façade, there would be a plinth, a strong corner and again, strong rhythms to the façade, with a high level of glazing and use of red brick

The provision of a sub-station would be required and this would be sited to appear as a unit amongst the shop fronts, with an artistic treatment to the doors

In relation to the multi-storey car park (MSCP), this would provide approximately 815 car park spaces, with around 35 disabled parking spaces and some parent and child spaces and cycle parking provision. Space would be required within the car park to accommodate part of the NGT route, which

would require a slot to be cut into the floorplate, with the possibility of introducing some active uses in this location being considered

The John Lewis store would create a statement building, using a strongly ordered diagrid form with diamond shape frames of white terracotta with glazed and terracotta infills. An entrance to the store from George Street, close to the market was proposed and this would be a feature entrance, would be stepped, generous and visible. Two further entrances were proposed from the arcades. Concerning the absence of an entrance into the store from Eastgate, at least in the first phase of the development, Members' comments had been taken on board. What was now proposed was a single entrance in phase 1, with a double width entrance being provided in the second phase. Members views on this proposal were sought

The exterior of the car park would comprise twisted metal fins which would 'ghost' the diamond shape of the John Lewis façade. The base of the car park would be of more solid appearance, with a perforated mesh being likely, rather than the industrial appearance of the higher levels of the car park

Having examined the model of the scheme in detail, Members discussed the application and commented on the following matters:

- the stepped entrance to John Lewis, with concerns about people with mobility difficulties accessing the store. Members were informed that Officers shared these concerns and had raised the matter with the applicant who have their own access officer
- the level of opacity of the windows on the John Lewis store and the need to ensure views were not spoiled by careless positioning of fittings etc. In response, Members were advised that sufficient blank panels existed to ensure that back of house activities were not located within public view
- the loss of car parking spaces due to development now taking place on the Union Street car park and the point at when the MSCP would be built. In respect of this it was stated that the construction of the MSCP was likely to be the last part of the development as much depended upon when West Yorkshire Police were able to vacate to their new premises on Elland Road. In the meantime, better management and promotion of other car parks in the area would be needed and that some surface car parking would still remain on the site of the second phase of the development, with the possibility of that being enhanced, but that discussions on this were continuing
- whether the building now housing Hoagy's Bar, which was original 1950s Blomfield would be demolished. Members were informed that Hoagy's Bar would, and since the 2011 revisions, always had been marked for demolition
- the need to ensure that the sub-station doors were treated to resist graffiti as were the lower levels of the MSCP
- the wind study and the levels used to assess this
- the need to ensure that the pleated brickwork weathered at the same rate. Members were informed that this was to be demonstrated

In response to the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following comments:



- that the design and layout of the proposals were acceptable, however Panel required the full double width pedestrian access from Eastgate to be delivered in the first phase, particularly as it was felt it could help provide better disabled access to the John Lewis store
- that the approach to transport and the provision of the multi-storey car park appeared to be acceptable, although an explanation of the traffic levels around the site at peak times should be provided in the next report to Panel. The Chief Planning Officer stressed that these matters had been settled at the outline application stage and could not be revisited but could be provided for information
- that the public realm and landscaping strategy was considered to be acceptable
- that the demolitions were justified and that the approach to heritage assets was appropriate

**37 Application 13/01640/OT and 13/02684/FU - White Rose Shopping Centre, Dewsbury Road Morley and Land South of White Rose Shopping Centre Dewsbury Road Morley - Position statements**

Further to minute 24 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, where Panel received a pre-application presentation on proposals for the expansion of the White Rose Shopping Centre, Members considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer on the proposals together with details of the current position on a related application for the demolition of existing buildings and re-development of an area of land sited in the Green Belt, for use as a staff car park for the White Rose Centre (WRC)

Plans, photographs and graphics were displayed at the meeting. Members had visited the site prior to the meeting

Officers outlined the proposals for the WRC which were to extend two existing stores, create three new retail units, a multi-screen cinema – up to 12 screens, restaurant units and remove an existing coach park and provide an area of public open space

Whilst the proposals would result in the loss of 670 car parking spaces, the related application was to provide a staff car park and would involve the demolition of the existing buildings and improvements to the appearance of the site, whilst providing improvements to highway safety through the access arrangements proposed

Members were informed of the main issues which were still being considered in respect of the proposals, these being:

- retail and out of centre issues; that a Sequential Test and Impact Analysis had been submitted and were being considered by the Council's independent retail consult
- that objections from the three neighbouring Local Authorities had been received regarding the impact of the proposals on their centres
- that the cumulative impact of the proposals had to be considered in relation to the proposals for introducing retail uses

at Thorpe Park and the impact both of these could have – if approved – on planned development in the City Centre, particularly the Victoria Gate development and the proposals for the second phase of that scheme. The Chief Planning Officer stated that the retail impact assessment would be at the core when it came to assess these proposals in view of the other retail schemes coming forward

- whether extensions to existing stores had a different impact as opposed to the creation of new, separate stores and the introduction of a new offer into the WRC
- highways issues; the proposals for some improvements to the bus station but the need to consider public transport links to the WRC from further afield and for longer hours; the loss of a high level of parking, with no re-provision for shoppers, with the approach being to create an off-site staff car park; the need to make this attractive for staff to use and to understand what further measures would be proposed in the event that the parking proposals were not as successful as envisaged. There would also be a need to link the two proposals by condition to ensure neither element could be brought forward in isolation
- pedestrian access and the need for improved links, particularly from the adjacent office park
- job creation, with around 1,000 new jobs being created through the construction and post-construction phases; that discussions were ongoing with Employment Leeds and the need to ensure local employment was achieved
- that as a Green Belt site the proposal for the staff car park was inappropriate development and therefore the applicant had to demonstrate that 'very special circumstances' existed to outweigh the intrinsic harm to the Green Belt caused by the proposals
- the design of the car park and the need to ensure safety of staff using it, especially late at night

A small number of representations had been received at this stage and whilst there was support for the local jobs and investment the expansion would create, concerns at its impact and the need for the proper tests and analysis to be carried out had been raised

Members discussed the proposals and commented on the following matters:

- the anticipated increase in customers if the scheme was approved and where the expected additional shoppers would be coming from
- the use of public transport and whether people would be likely to use this to travel to the centre, particularly to undertake major shopping
- how it could be ensured that staff were not using the more remote parts of the WRC car park, rather than a dedicated staff car park further away

- whether the proposals would lead to car park charges being implemented at the WRC. Members were informed that there were no proposals to introduce a charge for parking at the WRC
- the need to ensure that, if approved, there was sufficient and safe staff parking during the construction of the WRC extensions, with the possibility of the car park being ready in place before this. On this matter, the Chief Planning Officer stated that whilst it was right for this to be considered, there was currently surplus car parking spaces at the WRC; that the staff car park was proposed on a Green Belt site, which required careful consideration and that it was important to ensure there was no overspill, whilst at the same time ensuring that not too much car parking was being provided too early
- the need for adequate lighting of the staff car park, with Officers advising that there would be a condition requiring the submission of a car park management plan to enable these concerns to be addressed
- that the proposals were for a massive expansion of the floorspace and that the onus was on the developers to show that this would not have an impact, with the view being that this had not been done
- that the concerns of Morley Town Council Planning Committee had not been addressed and that the developer's approach had been to mount a publicity exercise and garner support for the scheme
- the likelihood that the application could be called in by the Secretary of State
- that the proposed leisure uses would bring in more people who would then stay for longer, thereby having a greater impact on the car parks in the WRC
- that at certain times, i.e. weekends, Bank Holidays and close to Christmas, the existing car parks at the centre were full, with queuing traffic then building up on to Dewsbury Road and that even taking into account the creation of a staff car park, the overall level of customer parking at the centre would be less
- the number of buses which ran past the site per hour and that a system could be introduced to enable staff to travel by bus from the more remote car park and access the WRC via the bus station
- that improved evening bus services to the WRC were needed as there were gaps in provision from areas of the city in relative close proximity to the site
- that the siting of a staff car park on a Green Belt site was not too great a concern in this case as the area was particularly degraded, although there were mixed views on the loss of an area of Green Belt
- that the creation of a car park in isolation might help increase trade at the WRC as during peak times, many shoppers drove

away from the centre when it was clear that the car parks were full

- that the development of the WRC had led to the creation of traffic problems in the local area, particularly on the Ring Road to the site and on the A653 and at what point Highways Officers would feel that capacity had been reached
- that the previous proposals for decked car parking should be re-introduced
- that there was a need for the developers to do more to encourage public transport use to the WRC
- the importance of ensuring local employment and to welcome the training initiatives the proposals would bring

The Chief Planning Officer stated that the traffic impact of the proposals would be very carefully assessed and that the jobs; investment; expansion of bus services and training would go hand in hand and was the kernel of the whole judgement of the application

In response to the specific points raised in the report, the Panel provided the following comments:

- regarding the proposal to increase the level of floorspace and introduce a new cinema use at the WRC, the view was expressed that currently the case for this had not been proved, whereas some Members felt this might be acceptable but it would be subject to further retail assessments to understand the impacts and the benefits
- regarding assurances to be sought from the developers in terms of ensuring that the principal elements of the retail proposals were delivered as extensions to the existing large anchor stores and preventing their subdivision in the future in order to protect planned investment in Leeds City Centre and adjoining local authorities, Members required a legal agreement for this
- that more research was needed to satisfy Members there would be no further significant impact on the local highway network as a result of the development, particularly at peak periods, e.g. Christmas and on match days
- that an integrated approach to the development of the bus station to serve the WRC and the neighbouring office park, together with associated improvements to infrastructure and footpath links was supported, however the difficulties this posed when dealing with a de-regulated bus industry had to be realised and there was a need to fully understand the interventions proposed to drive modal changes. Members also supported the provision of improved bus services to local labour market areas with high levels of unemployment, as identified in the South Leeds Investment Strategy, such as Middleton Park, Beeston and Holbeck and Morley and that Churwell also needed to be included
- that the request for further detailed and specific information as set out above was supported and the need for an overall review of all bus services which ran past and through the WRC was called for

- the information and proposals for cyclists should be incorporated
- that it was too early to comment on the parameter plans
- that high quality design was required
- to note the planning obligations set out in the report and that a car sharing plan could be considered as part of the S106 Agreement
- that the developers should provide a financial viability statement in support of their case as to why a decked car park solution was not possible and why Green Belt land needed to be used
- that in terms of restricting the use of the land for car parking to prevent its further development in the future, that this must be tied down tightly to ensure there were no loopholes
- that the provision of a management plan for the car park and pedestrian routes to the centre, setting out measures to encourage its use by staff and ensure their safety and security in using these areas must be provided
- regarding the impact of the proposed car park on the character of the area, Members welcomed the retention of the hedegrows and trees
- in terms of security of the car park and for staff using this area late at night, that more assurances were needed of the measures to be put in place and that consideration should be given to allowing staff to walk through the WRC after it closed to the public, rather than requiring them to walk outside late at night
- to bear in mind that it would be the cinema and restaurants which would be the most important in terms of generating additional traffic and leading to extra pressure on car parking

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

**38 Application 13/02034/FU - Demolition of 14-18 The Calls, 28 The Calls and the Mission Hut building and construction of 77 apartments and bar/restaurant/office space (use classes A3/A4/B1) and laying out of public open space - 14-28 The Calls - Position Statement**

Further to minute 112 of the City Plans Panel meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2013, where Panel considered a pre-application presentation on proposals for a mixed-use riverside development at The Calls, Members considered a further report of the Chief Planning Officer setting out the current position on the proposals

Plans, photographs and graphics, including an historic image of the site were displayed at the meeting

Officers briefly outlined the recent planning history of the site; explained the extent of the proposed demolitions and highlighted the revisions to the scheme since it was last seen by Panel, which included moving away balconies from the corners, reducing the number of balconies and providing a more uniform layout of these across the façade

The main materials proposed would be sandstone for the plinth with variegated brick to the upper elements

In terms of financial viability, the applicant had indicated that currently the scheme was unviable and had requested a clause in the S106 Agreement whereby the requirements of the legal agreement could be reviewed at a later date, with Members' views on this being sought

Panel discussed this matter with the view being expressed that a viability clause should not be inserted in the S106 Agreement, with concerns that if this was agreed to, then other developers would seek such a clause

In response to the specific points raised in the report, Members provided the following comments:

- that the principle of the development, including the proposed mix of uses was acceptable
- that the demolition of all buildings on the site, other than 20-24 The Calls was acceptable, but only at a point when it had been established that the site would definitely be redeveloped
- that the scale and layout of the development and views towards the river were acceptable. In terms of soft landscaping more trees were required within the scheme
- that the overall architectural approach was acceptable as was the revised arrangement of the proposed balconies, with Members welcoming the taking away of balconies from the corners
- that the proposed approach to residential amenity was satisfactory
- that the general approach to access issues was appropriate and that the proposed use of gates was acceptable
- that the proposed package of S106 measures set out in the submitted report was appropriate, although it would not be acceptable for a clause to be inserted in the agreement which enabled a subsequent review of viability to be undertaken
- that flood risk measures in respect of different events should be set out in the final report to be submitted to Panel

**RESOLVED** - To note the report and the comments now made

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

Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> August 2013 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds