

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 24TH MARCH, 2016

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors P Gruen, R Procter,
S Hamilton, G Latty, T Leadley,
N Walshaw, C Campbell, A Khan,
K Ritchie, S McKenna and E Nash

116 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against the refusal of inspection of documents.

117 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED – That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following part of the agenda designated exempt on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as designated as follows:

Appendix A to Agenda Item 10, application number 15/04151/FU, Residential development of 270 houses with associated roads and infrastructure. Under Schedule 12 Local Government Act 1972 and the terms of Access to Information Procedure Rule 10.4 (3) and on the grounds that it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). It is considered that if this information was in the public domain it would be likely to prejudice the affairs of the applicant. Whilst there may be a public interest in disclosure, in all the circumstances of the case, maintaining the exemption is considered to outweigh the public interest in disclosing this information at this time.

118 Late Items

There were no late items submitted to the agenda for consideration. However supplementary information was circulated in relation to Agenda Item 6 "Minutes 3rd March 2016".

119 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

No declarations were made.

120 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ingham, Taylor and Blackburn. In attendance as substitute for Councillor Ingham was Councillor

Nash. In attendance as substitute for Councillor Taylor was Councillor S McKenna.

121 Minutes 3rd March 2016

RESOLVED – The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3rd March 2016 subject to the following amendment:

Minute No 114 Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00627 Demolition of existing shared rugby/cricket stand and replacement shared North/South stand and demolition of existing Southern Terrace and replacement South Stand to Rugby Ground, St Michaels Lane, Headingley Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00660 Residential Development for circa 40 dwellings at land off Weetwood Avenue, Weetwood. Pre-application presentation PREAPP/14/00661 Residential Development, Outline for Circa 170 dwellings at land between Thorpe Lane and Bradford Road, Tingley

From:

“4. Members felt that careful consideration needs to be given to the highways surrounding the stadium but also the impact to highways by building new houses at Tingley and Weetwood”.

To

“4. Members felt that careful consideration needs to be given to the highways surrounding the stadium but also the impact to highways, especially, Junction 28 of the M62, by building new houses at Tingley and Weetwood”.

122 Planning Application 15/05485/OT – Outline application for residential development on land east of Great North Road, Micklefield.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed an outline application for residential development on land east of Great North Road, Micklefield.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item.

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

- That the application was a greenfield agricultural site; and
- That green space would be a feature of the development.

The Panel then heard from Councillor Crossley, Chairman of Micklefield Parish Council, who objected to the proposals. Information put forward included:

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Thursday, 12th May, 2016

- The site was extremely detached from a bus route; and
- The new junction where spine road meets Great North Road would require some form of traffic calming;

Members asked Councillor Crossley about the bus routes and train services through Micklefield.

Members discussed the number of objections against the development compared with previous developments with Councillor Crossley.

The Panel then heard from Jonathan Dunbavin from ID Planning, agent for the applicant. Information put forward included that a speed table could be incorporated into the junction with Great North Road, subject to liaison with highway officers.

Members sought confirmation that the site was not in a flood plain and that the three schemes in Micklefield would be co-ordinated.

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

- That the primary school would need to be expanded and how this would be achieved;
- The lack of local amenities in the village;
- The need for more and better quality affordable housing to form part of the development;
- That consideration would be given to the management of the green space on the development;
- Members wished to have further input on the design of the properties within the development.

RESOLVED – To defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer in order to finalise the conditions and S106 agreement as set out in the submitted report.

123 Planning Application 15/05484/OT – Outline application for residential development on land off Church Lane, Micklefield.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed an outline application for residential development on land off Church Lane, Micklefield.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item.

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

- Access to the site would be from Church Lane and as such better access into and out of Church Lane from the A656 would be provided; and
- An additional objection to the proposal on highway grounds was reported on behalf of the adjoining landowner as additional land was available to improve the situation at the junction of Church Lane and the A656 and the present proposal for a reduced scheme was considered a compromise and would worsen matters.

The Panel then heard from Councillor Crossley, Chairman of Micklefield Parish Council, who objected to the proposals. Information put forward included:

- The potential loss of open views from the footpath if the site was developed with a tree screen on adjoining agricultural land;
- That it would be preferable if trees were spaced out to ensure that views across the open countryside were not lost;
- The need for all the development proposals for Micklefield to have a joined up approach; and
- The need for traffic calming measures on Church Lane.

Members discussed the provision for doctors surgeries in Micklefield and noted that currently the surgery was a “satellite” and not a permanent fixture but that if the development were to be approved the NHS would consider a permanent surgery.

Members also considered the type of landscaping that would be appropriate to ensure views of the countryside were retained.

The Panel then heard from Jonathan Dunbavin from ID Planning, agent for the applicant who noted the request for spaced landscaping and agreed to work with officers to ensure this is achieved.

Mr Dunbavin confirmed that third party land was available to purchase to allow for the straightening of the bend on Church Lane but that it would require the co-operation of all developers to pay for this work.

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

- The preference for all three Micklefield schemes to commence and for a comprehensive scheme of highway improvements to be agreed; Whether straightening the bend in the road at Church Lane would reduce or increase speeding and accidents. Members requested that officers consider this issue;
- The issue of a lack of bus stops near to the proposed development and that it would be desirable for the bus stops in the village to be re-aligned;

- The importance of linking this development to existing and adjoining housing developments in the area;
- That efforts to should be made to save as many existing trees as possible;
- That each house should have a drive to park cars on to ensure the estate road does not get blocked or difficult to navigate; and
- The need to see more detail on the design of the houses and the layout of the development.

Members stressed the importance of co-ordination between the schemes proposed in Micklefield which would ideally help improve the chances for apprenticeships.

RESOLVED – The Panel resolved to

Defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer in order to finalise the conditions and S106 agreement as set out in the submitted report.

124 Planning Application 15/01973/FU – Development of 291 residential dwellings with open space and associated infrastructure on land east of Great North Road, Micklefield.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed an application for the Development of 291 residential dwellings with open space and associated infrastructure on land east of Great North Road, Micklefield.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item.

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

- That there had been an increase in the number of two bedroomed properties and an increase in the variety of properties;
- That all requirements had now been met in relation to space standards;
- The existing tree belt would be retained;
- There would be a CIL contribution of £1.2 million;

The Panel then heard from Councillor Crossley, Chairman of Micklefield Parish Council, who objected to the proposals. Information put forward included:

- That in order to expand the primary school there would need to be encroachment onto the green belt;

- That the development should provide ample parking provision for its future residents;
- The deficiency in green space on the development and how this would be addressed;
- The desire to work with the developers in terms of using appropriate materials; and
- The importance of linking the development with the existing Garden Village development.

The Panel then heard from Paul Butler of PB Planning Ltd, agent for the applicant and Paul Wharam from Barratt Homes. Information put forward included:

- There would be a mix of housing with 15% of the development being affordable housing;
- The development would bring employment opportunities;
- 60-70 units would be built per year;
- The Northern Access road between Garden Village and the site would be widened and that the developer would be happy to work with the Council with regards to upgrading Church Lane; and
- Surface water from the site would be captured and released slowly in order to mitigate against flooding.

A representative from Childrens Services updated the Panel on the situation with the local primary school and that expansion was being considered and could be accommodated.

The Chief Planning Officer commented that in terms of expanding the school it would be possible to encroach on to the green belt as the school's pitches could be moved in to the greenbelt.

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

- The need for a sympathetic approach to the appearance of the development so that it fitted in with existing housing stock in terms of materials. Furthermore that consideration should be given to putting chimneys on the houses where appropriate;
- The Panel agreed that quality and variety of houses was essential;
- That it was reassuring to hear the developer would be prepared to work with the Parish Council with regards to the use of materials for the development; and
- Assurance was sought that each house would have sufficient parking space.

The Head of Planning Services commented that officers would give careful consideration to the design of the homes and ensure Members comments

were incorporated. It was also confirmed to Members that the school issue would be fully considered as would the link of the proposed development to existing housing stock.

RESOLVED – The Panel resolved to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning Officer in order to finalise the conditions and S106 agreement as set out in the submitted report subject to there being an additional link provided to the site from the NE of Garden Village and further consultation with the Parish Council regarding materials and chimneys.

125 APPLICATION NUMBER 15/04151/FU, Residential development of 270 houses with associated roads and infrastructure at Tyersall Lane, Tyersall.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed an application for a residential development of 270 houses with associated roads and infrastructure.

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

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

- The site was very close to the border with Bradford Metropolitan District Council;
- The site was a green field site allocated for employment use in the UDP but a Phase 1 housing site in the Site Allocations Plan; and
- The developer had come back with new proposals following the Panel's refusal of a previous application for the same site;
- A viability report had now been produced for the site;
- Land at the north east of the site is to be offered as green space for the development;
- It was reported that Local Ward Members were supportive of the development; and
- The application proposed more detached and semi-detached houses than it did in the previous application. The road layout had also been modified.

In line with the resolution made at Minute 117. Exempt Information – Possible Exclusion of Press and Public. Members of the public were asked to leave the meeting whilst Members discussed information from the District Valuer regarding the viability submission and evidence.

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

- The green space offered by the developer and who would manage this if the development was approved;

- That the development would provide reasonable quality low cost housing to the area which would be of benefit to the area;
- The need to ensure removal of the existing railway bridge takes place as part of the wider development of the area; and
- The likely profit margin for the developer if the scheme were to be approved.

RESOLVED – The Panel resolved to defer and delegate approval to the Chief Planning officer subject to the conditions and obligations in the section 106 agreement being finalised as set out in the submitted report and asked that the commuted sum to Bradford Council regarding highway works and the bridge be tracked and that the timing of the works be considered. Furthermore that the viability to be reviewed at the provision of the 90th, 180th and 270th houses.

126 Planning Application 15/07300/FU for a residential development of 501 houses, conversion of former hospital administration block, demolition of Villa building, associated infrastructure including two new vehicle access points to A64, public open space and retention of Clock Tower on land at Seacroft Hospital, York Road, Leeds, LS14 6UH

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed an application for a residential development of 501 houses, conversion of former hospital administration block, demolition of Villa building, associated infrastructure including two new vehicle access points to A64, public open space and retention of Clock Tower on land at Seacroft Hospital, York Road, Leeds, LS14 6UH.

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

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

- The Villa building had been discussed at length with officers and the developer and it had been considered better to replace it;
- The Manston block would have a book end feature which related to the existing Victorian administration block;
- The apartment building would form part of the affordable housing mix;
- The development was compliant with the Core Strategy and featured an increase in two bedroomed units;
- Air quality in the area had been considered and addressed; and
- Drainage had been assessed and the existing surface run off was 234 litres per second which through a storage system would be reduced to 120 litres per second.

The Panel heard from Councillor Selby whose comments included:

- A request that if the developer attempted to reduce the amount of affordable housing on site that this should be returned to the Panel for consideration; and
- That consultation with shop owners on York Road should take place due to the extensive highway works which are proposed.
- The Head of Planning Services confirmed that if there was any change to the amount of affordable housing on the site it would be referred to the Panel and that the highway works would be subject to consultation.

The Panel heard from Richard Bickers from Arup on behalf of the developer. Information put forward included:

- The site was a strategically important site allocated for residential development which contributed to the Council's five year land supply;
- The site had the potential to deliver a secondary school and had been carefully designed taking that possibility into account;
- The grade two listed clock tower would be enhanced; and
- That designs had been developed in consultation with council officers, the views of the Panel and of local residents.

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

- That there was a lack of chimneys and that the design didn't reflect previous Panel discussion, particularly the apartment block (block 01). Members also did not like the colour and massing of the beige street scenes in the visualisations and felt that further consideration should be given to the placement of doors on the houses and the possibility of adding bay windows;
- Disappointment at the loss of the villa building by some;
- The design of the apartment building (block 01) and in particular the pyramid roof to the corner tower and the use of render;
- That a condition be inserted to include a repair and maintenance plan for the clock tower;
- Members asked questions about housing for the elderly, the shortage of green space for amenity and also the possible drainage problems caused by the development.

The Panel heard from a representative from Children's Services who updated Members on the possibility of building a secondary school on land set aside next to the development.

The architect for the site addressed the Panel commenting that further work would be done to incorporate chimneys. Members were informed that the turret design of the apartment building reflected the design of the clock tower. The loss of the villa was also addressed in that it did not respond positively to

the development of the site and the clock tower and that removing the villa would create better public open space.

Generally the Panel felt that more work needed to be done to address the concerns raised by Members as set out above. However on balance Members felt it acceptable for the Villa building to be demolished and replaced.

The Chief Planning Officer noted the views of Members and that further work would be done with the architect to ensure Members views were incorporated into the design of the development.

RESOLVED –

To defer the application for further design improvements to the house types and streetscenes and apartment block 01, as set out above and for the application to come back to the Panel for final approval.

127 OUTLINE PROPOSAL FOR MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMPRISING RESIDENTIAL (C3/C4), STUDENT HOUSING (C3/C4), FLEXIBLE RANGE OF SUPPORTING USES A1-A5 (RETAIL, CAFES, RESTAURANTS, BARS, PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AND TAKE AWAY'S, B1 (OFFICE), D1 (NON-RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTION), D2 (ASSEMBLY AND LEISURE), BASEMENT CAR AND CYCLE PARKING, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, RIVER BRIDGE, NEW ACCESS JUNCTION TO KIRKSTALL RD AND HIGHWAYS IMPROVEMENTS AT SITE SOUTH OF KIRKSTALL RD FRONTING THE RIVER AIRE (FORMER YORKS CHEMICALS SITE) APPLICATION REF: 15/06844/OT

The Chief Planning Officer Submitted a report which detailed an outline proposal for mixed use development comprising residential (c3/c4), student housing (c3/c4), flexible range of supporting uses a1-a5 (retail, cafes, restaurants, bars, professional services and take away's, b1 (office), d1 (non-residential institution), d2 (assembly and leisure), basement car and cycle parking, public open space, river bridge, new access junction to Kirkstall Road and highways improvements at site south of Kirkstall Road fronting the river Aire (former Yorkshire Chemicals site).

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

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

- Detailed description of the blocks and massing for the proposed development and its compatibility with existing and planned developments in the vicinity;
- A bridge would link this site to the Otter Island site;

- Vehicular access would be to the North of the site, which would feature a 516 space car park beneath the buildings;
- The whole site has been raised by 1.3 metres to mitigate against possible flooding; and
- A proposal to extend the bus lane to allow access to the site without impeding the flow of traffic on Kirkstall Road.

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

- The need for the scheme to adhere to national space standards;
- That if this scheme were to be developed there would be a need for schools in the area;
- The access to the car park and the possible difficulties this could cause to the flow of traffic on Kirkstall Road; and
- The need to establish a co-ordinated traffic solution that could be used for all developments on Kirkstall Road.

The Transport Development Services Manager commented that signals would be the preferred option for this site. However the scheme could work and be developed without signals on Kirkstall Road.

Officers explained why a school was not being provided in this part of the scheme and that other options were possible for future provision.

In general Members liked the design of the scheme.

RESOLVED – To approve the application in principle and defer and delegate the final decision to the Chief Planning Officer subject to the conditions and finalising the Section 106 agreement with the obligations outlined in the report and the appendix of the report (and such other conditions as he may consider appropriate).

128 16/00176/ADV - One illuminated rooftop sign, 16/00173/ADV - Eight illuminated signs, 16/00177/ADV - One illuminated projecting blade sign.

At: John Lewis, Unit 45 Victoria Gate, Harewood Street, Leeds, LS2 7AR

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed an application for one illuminated rooftop sign, eight illuminated signs, and one illuminated projecting blade sign.

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

Further issues highlighted in relation to the application included confirmation that Leeds Civic Trust had withdrawn their objection to the blade sign but maintained their objection to the rooftop sign.

RESOLVED – To defer and delegate the determination of the applications to the Chief Planning Officer.

129 PRE-APPLICATION PRESENTATION OF THE PROPOSED EXTENSION, RECLADDING AND CHANGE OF USE OF FORMER OFFICES TO FORM HOTEL, NEW YORK ROAD AND BRIDGE STREET, LEEDS 2 (PREAPP/15/00964)

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which detailed a pre-application presentation of the proposed extension, recladding and change of use of former offices to form a hotel, New York Road and Bridge Street, Leeds.

Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application. Members had also attended a site visit prior to discussion of the item.

Mr Liu – Heeton Holdings (owner) and James Hind from Simpson Haugh, the architects addressed the Panel and provided additional information which included:

- The site was a strategic location within walking distance of most of the city centre and close to the A64 Inner Ring Road;
- A new public realm space would be created with a green link which would run East to West; and
- That Phase two of the scheme would include a number of tower blocks on top of the car park.
- That Phase one presented in detail was for the hotel and surface car park and the refurbishment and extension of the existing tower block and podium which was in a poor condition

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

- Members would wish to see samples of the materials and cladding used for the Phase 1 scheme and also give further consideration to the colours used;
- Should any towers be constructed the developer should give consideration to the impact this they would have on wind in the area;
- The impact on Regent Street and how the public realm spaces would look; and
- That this was a noisy part of the city and that this would need to be addressed in the design of the buildings constructed.

Members responded to the questions featured at paragraph 7 of the submitted report:

1. Members considered the proposed use of the existing building as a hotel as acceptable in principle;
2. Members considered that the proposed alterations and extensions in Phase 1, subject to detailed design, were likely to have an acceptable impact upon the appearance of the building and its integration into the wider townscape;
3. Members considered that the proposals for soft landscaping of the site needed to be supplemented and that the eastern third of the site should be laid out as open space in advance of any future phases of development;
4. Members agreed that the pedestrian connections to and from the City Centre need to be improved as part of this phase of development;
5. Members agree that, when submitted, the planning application for the hotel could not be determined on a delegated basis and would need to be determined by Panel;
6. Whereas proposals for future phases will be presented to City Plans Panel at a later date Members initial observations regarding the emerging masterplan for the site were that 39 storeys was too tall and that the full scheme looked over intensive.

RESOLVED – That the comments of the report be noted.

130 Date and Time of Next Meeting

1.30pm Thursday 14th April 2016. (Subsequently Cancelled)