

## **CITY PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 10TH MAY, 2018**

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

Councillors P Gruen, D Blackburn, G Latty,  
T Leadley, N Walshaw, C Campbell,  
A Khan, A Garthwaite and E Nash

A Member's site visit was held in connection with the following proposal: PREAPP/17/00552 – 177 Kirkstall Road, PREAPP/17/00649 – 123 Hunslet Road and PREAPP/18/00067 – 2 Great George Street, Leeds 1 and was attended by the following Councillors: P Gruen, N Walshaw, J McKenna, A Khan, S Hamilton, D Ragan, B Anderson, C Campbell, T Leadley, E Nash and D Blackburn.

### **158 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents**

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

### **159 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public**

There were no items identified where it was considered necessary to exclude the press or public from the meeting due to the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

### **160 Late Items**

There were no late items of business to be considered.

### **161 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interests made at the meeting.

### **162 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **163 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

With reference to Minute No.154 (and the last bullet point on the third page) Councillor Leadley requested that the minute be amended to read as follows:

- Members were informed that once complete up to 10,000 people may occupy the site (7,500 officer workers and 2,500 residents). It was suggested that if a Call Centre was to occupy part of the site, this may increase the level of occupancy and could also include 24 hour working.

**RESOLVED** – That with the inclusion of the above, the minutes of the previous meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2018 be accepted as a true and correct record.

**164 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

Clay Pit Lane Public Realm Improvements – (Minute No.155 referred) –  
Referring to the landscaping works and the types of trees to be planted. Councillor Nash said it had been the view of Members that further consideration should be given to the species of trees to be planted, could Members be informed if such consideration had taken place and what was the outcome.

In responding the City Centre Team Leader said the necessary enquiries would be made and reported back to Members in due course.

**165 Application No. 17/07963/OT - Outline planning application for residential development and associated basement parking at Sweet Street, Holbeck, Leeds LS11 9AA**

With reference to the meeting of 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018 when Members resolved to defer a decision in relation to this outline planning application (with Access and Scale determined) for further discussions with the applicant around the shape/ design and footprint of the development.

The Chief Planning Officer now submitted a further report indicating that the applicant had amended the illustrative scheme and prepared a Design Code for the development, which was intended to provide a statement of intent.

Members were informed that the issues raised and the response by applicants were addressed in the submitted report, which should be read in conjunction with the report presented to this Plans Panel on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018.

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

Members raised the following questions:

- Would the affordable housing provision (5%) be provided on site
- One Member expressed reservations about the design and siting of the blocks and queried if any daylight or sunlight studies had been undertaken
- Was the level of contribution for the public transport requirements considered satisfactory
- On the issue of highways and transportation, reference was made to the previous meeting when it was agreed a report / briefing/ training would be prepared on the Council's strategy for the highways and transportation network. Members sought an update querying when the requested information would be available.

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representative and council officers said:

- The City Centre Team Leader reported that the location and mix of affordable housing would be determined as part of the Reserved Matters Application but would be provided on site
- Members were informed that the outline application before Members sought approval for the scale and access of the development only, in addition the applicants had prepared a Design Code to inform the detailed appearance as a statement of intent which would form part of any outline approval granted. In respect of daylight/ sunlight studies, it was confirmed that such studies had been undertaken by the applicant to demonstrate that the courtyard space met the Building Research Establishment guidelines.
- The applicant confirmed the public transport contribution was acceptable. Members were informed the calculated costs were based on the impact of the development.
- The City Centre Team Leader confirmed that a report/ briefing/ training setting out the Council's strategy for highways and transportation would be made available at the earliest opportunity.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were supportive of the application

In summing up the Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and contributions suggesting Members appeared to be supportive of the application.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- 5% Affordable housing to be provided in accordance with section 10.6 of the report submitted to City Plans Panel on 8<sup>th</sup> March 2018 (Appendix A refers).
- Sustainable travel fund £32,212.50
- Car club contribution £21,000
- Travel plan monitoring fee £3,075
- Public access through the site
- Cooperation with local jobs and skills initiatives

In the event of the Section 106 Agreement having 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.

**166 PREAPP/17/00649 Pre-application proposal for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of 928 flats with ground floor commercial units, car parking and provision of public realm at Former Evans Halshaw, 123-125 Hunslet Road, Hunslet, Leeds LS10 1LD by X1 Developments Ltd.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of a pre-application proposal for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of 928 flats with ground floor commercial units, car parking and provision of public realm at former Evans Halshaw, 123 – 125 Hunslet Road, Hunslet, Leeds, LS10 1LD by X1 Developments Ltd.

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

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

The scheme proposes 928 apartments spread across 5 buildings with associated landscaping. The buildings range in height from 6 stories to 20 stories, each with a raised residents only private courtyard and car parking underneath. The developers are undertaking wind analysis of the scheme. The proposal would feature with a hierarchy of hard and soft amenity spaces with publicly accessible amenity space at ground level, shared residents-only courtyards and private spaces such as balconies and roof terraces. A new main public pedestrian and cycle route would cross the site from east (Black Bull Street) to west (Sayner Road).

The scheme would feature a variety of traditional and modern materials, including brickwork detailing and architectural features that would respond positively to the nearby heritage assets at The Malthouse, Leeds City College Printworks and Leeds UTC/Braime's Pressings. Other buildings within the development would include ceramic cladding and glazed curtain walling to the taller elements of the scheme.

The scheme would be a mix of one, two and three bedroom flats with multi-storey townhouses provided at the ground and first floors of each block to ensure active frontages around the street frontages of the scheme. The mix of accommodation would be as follows:

277 one bed flats (30%)  
431 two bed flats (46%)  
220 three bed flats (24%)  
928 total apartments

The flats would all meet the Nationally Described Space Standards. The developers have committed to providing 5% affordable housing provision on site in accordance with the policy for the area.

At ground floor there would be a number of small scale office, retail, gym and café/bar units, approximately 1300sqm in total, with no more than 200sqm A1 retail.

The raised central podium in the centre of the scheme would be achieved by closing Chadwick Street at the Hunslet Road junction. This would unify the two sites with a feature ramp and steps structure to connect the ground level at Hunslet Road and the raised ground level podium. Access to the site would be taken from the eastern end of Chadwick Street with limited vehicle access taken from existing access points on Black Bull Street and Chadwick Street South. Car parking would be provided at basement level. 320 car parking spaces (30% of the maximum Parking SPD standard for dwellings in this area of the City Centre) would be provided across the scheme with numbers linked to the size of each building. Approximately 20 car parking spaces would be provided above ground along Chadwick Street for visitor parking.

A minimum of 10% energy generation would be developed through on site low carbon energy sources. The scheme would also deliver a reduction of at least 20% on building regulations carbon emissions. The applicant is in discussions with the Council regarding the potential connections to the District Heat Network.

Members raised the following questions:

- The views of the development along Hunslet Road were monotonous
- Referring to the traditional elements of the nearby listed buildings Members queried if more arches could be incorporated into the façade.
- Would all the flats be compliant with the Nationally Described Space Standards
- Could more details of the affordable housing provision be provided
- Would the scheme be able to link into the district heating network
- What was the timescale for the development
- Could more details be provided about connectivity through the scheme
- One Member suggested the glazed tower was “too different” and gave the impression it was too commercial for residential living.
- It was suggested that City Centre living could be lonely for some residents, could consideration be given to the provision of a shared community space (Meeting room) free of charge
- Could safe routes be provided across the highway network, could a safe play space for children be provided and how would taxi pick up and drop offs, refuse collection and delivery arrangements be managed
- Referring to the landscape provision, Members queried what species of tree would be provided

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant’s representatives said:

- It was reported that the arch work element had been considered at length, the intention was to provide a suitable reference to the nearby heritage assets at The Malthouse, Leeds City College Printworks and

the Leeds UTC/ Braime's Pressing. The suggestion that more finesse was required to the elevational treatment to provide a "rhythmic lift" would be considered further to address Members comments on the Hunslet Road elevations.

- The applicant confirmed that all flats were compliant with Nationally Described Space Standards.
- 5% affordable housing would be provided on site in line with the adopted policy but where it would be located still had to be determined
- It was reported that due to the time constraints of the build period phases 1 & 2 would not be incorporated into the district heating network, but it was likely phases 3,4 and 5 would be included.
- In terms of timescale for development, there was a desire to begin on site in December 2018 with an 18 month build programme.
- The applicants confirmed that pedestrian and cycle routes would be provided throughout the scheme, linking to neighbouring pedestrian routes. Car parking would be provided at basement level with 320 car parking spaces and 20 parking spaces would be provided above ground along Chadwick Street for visitor parking.
- The relationship between the glazed tower and adjoining properties was considered to be good and it was intended that sample materials would be provided.
- On the provision of a shared space for residents to use, it was reported that the developers, X1 were keen to promote city centre living and their website provided details about local social events.
- It was reported that a highways consultant had been employed to look at the highway and pedestrian network through the site, the provision of a children's play space would be provided in a suitable location and drop off and pick up access, refuse collection and delivery arrangements would be achieved by drop down barriers controlled by the on-site Management Team
- Members were informed that details of the tree species would be provided

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members welcomed the provision of family housing including townhouses
- It was noted that the proposal was for predominantly residential use contrary to the site's allocation for mixed use with the development plan
- Members were supportive of the emerging design but it was considered that further refinement / finesse was required particularly for the views from Hunslet Road
- The overall scheme was considered to be very good

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion Members provided the following feedback;

- Members were supportive of the principle of the proposed development

- Members were supportive of the emerging design of the buildings and spaces with the understanding that further refinement/ finesse was required
- Members were supportive of the approach to car parking and accessibility

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation

#### **167 PREAPP/18/00067 - Pre Application Proposal for the Partial demolition and rebuilding of the Leonardo Building, the conversion of Thoresby Building and 2 Great George Street for a change of use from offices to a mix of hotel, office, restaurant/café and bar uses and the extension of existing buildings, with a new build hotel on car park site at The Leonardo Building, Thoresby House and 2 Great George Street, Leeds, LS2 8HD**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of a pre-application proposal for the partial demolition and rebuilding of the Leonardo Building, the conversion of Thoresby Building and 2 Great George Street for a change of use from offices to a mix of hotel, office, restaurant/café and bar uses and the extension of existing buildings with a new build hotel on car park site at the Leonardo Building, Thoresby House and 2 Great George Street, Leeds, LS2 8HD.

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

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

The proposals involved the regeneration and extension of the Grade II Listed Thoresby and Leonardo Buildings and 2 Great George Street and the creation of a new third building between the two historic buildings, and the demolition of the 20<sup>th</sup> century section of the Leonardo Building to be replaced by a new built extension to this corner of the site.

The changes to the Thoresby Building would require demolition of the attached 20<sup>th</sup> century Leonardo Building (but not the older part of the Leonardo Building) and the roof of the Listed Thoresby Building. A new extension would be built to replace the removed part of the Leonardo Building as well as a second extension across the top of the retained part of the Leonardo Building and the Thoresby Building. The regenerated set of buildings would be put into use as office space, with ground floor A1 retail, A3 (restaurant and café) and

A4 (bar) uses. A large new entrance point would be created to the east face of the building, to sit between the two existing stone detailed doorways, which would link into the building's retained atrium.

The Listed No 2 Great George Street would be altered internally with the addition of a mezzanine to add in an extra floor space for the creation of a new premium hotel. In addition, the existing 20<sup>th</sup> century entrance portal will be removed and a new entrance to the west face of the building will be created. In addition a new glass extension would be added to the roof top of the building. To the ground floor level a mix of A3 (restaurant and café) and A4 (bar) uses is proposed

On the car park in the middle of the site it is proposed to create a new third building to house a second hotel. This would be a contemporary building which would be scaled and detailed to take account of the site's historic context. At the ground floor level a mix of A3 (restaurant and café) and A4 (bar) uses are proposed with the aim being that users can access any and all of the ground floor uses across the three buildings.

Between the three buildings new publicly accessible open landscaped spaces are to be created. These would be accessed from north south routes through them or from east west routes running through the three buildings.

Members raised the following questions:

- This is a unique site to produce something iconic, why do you think the new building fits in with the existing buildings
- The proposed new extension to the Leonardo Building was not in keeping with the adjoining buildings, could the form of the adjoining Thoresby Building be replicated on the new extension, also the proposed glass roof extension to the replaced Leonardo Building was too dominant and too modern in this historic context
- The proposed "glazed ribbed dome" to 2 Great George Street, how would this operate
- Would the development be carried out in phases

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representatives said:

- The proposed new building (a second hotel) would be contemporary in design and would be scaled and detailed to take account of the sites historic context.
- It was suggested that the Leonardo Building was a closure piece to Millennium Square, the proposed new extension was intended to provide a greater presence by delivering a contemporary design but also fitting in with the historic details of the adjoining buildings.
- It was reported that the proposed "glazed ribbed dome" was intended to provide a calm appearance that helped to screen planted areas and changes in plane to the roof extension, the rib design would control the



area providing passive solar shading, the glazing would also be tinted. The windows could be opened and closed as required.

- Members were informed that all development works would be undertaken at the same time due to construction logistics

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- There was no continuity between the existing and the new build elements
- The proposed new elements were disrespectful to the existing
- In terms of the new build hotel, a number of Members expressed the view that too much was being squeezed onto the site
- The proposed glass roof extension to the Leonardo Building was too dominant and too modern
- Members appeared supportive to the principle of a glazed roof extension to 2 Great George
- One Member suggested the rib design for the glazed roof was too imposing
- Members requested more detail about the infill design and colour of the new build elements
- Members expressed the view that the quality of the proposal should not be lowered

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion Members provided the following feedback;

- Mixed views were expressed about the emerging scale, massing and design of the development, a number of Members were partially supportive others were not
- Members were supportive of the emerging landscape scheme and approach to connectivity
- Members were supportive of the principle of the demolitions and accepted some alterations were required to the listed buildings

In summing up the Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation commenting that this was an important location and it was essential to get the right scheme

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation

#### **168 PREAPP/17/00552 - Pre-application presentation for outline proposal, mixed use scheme comprising residential accommodation with ancillary**

**ground floor 'active' uses at site on the corner of Kirkstall Road and Viaduct Road - Former ThyssenKrupp Industrial site.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of a pre-application presentation for an outline proposal for a mixed use scheme comprising residential accommodation with ancillary ground floor “active” uses at a site on the corner of Kirkstall Road and Viaduct Road – Former ThyssenKrupp Industrial site.

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

The applicant’s representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

The scheme was for the redevelopment of the area occupied by the former industrial building and its associated car park area. The proposals comprised of 4 buildings between 4 and 9 storeys located around a central open space area. One of these is proposed to front Kirkstall Road, relating in scale at one end to the red brick church building and rising in height to address the prominent Kirkstall Road/Viaduct Road corner.

The site access point is on Viaduct Road where the main corner building returns to offer a curved sweeping element which leads vehicles and pedestrians towards the centre of the site. The access road is oriented parallel to Kirkstall Road and gives access to each of the 4 buildings which would all contain under-croft car parking at ground floor level. This is part of the package of measures to counter flood risk on the site.

The buildings sit along the sides and corners of the site to create edges and corners to the central space area. These are terminated and turned to create vistas across the site as well as through to the Viaduct and River Aire beyond. These vistas tie into pedestrian routes and open space areas to provide pedestrian permeability and legibility.

The heights have been designed to relate to those of the surrounding buildings which are to remain, as well as provide emphasis to the Kirkstall Road corner and to provide articulation to the building heights and skyline.

All of the buildings are to contain residential use with the current number of units proposed being 254 with the building fronting Viaduct Road potentially able to accommodate another 40 to 60 units, these are outside the pre-application site area. Three small retail units are proposed at ground floor level in order to animate the lower parts of the building which fronts both Kirkstall Road and the vehicular route into the site.

131 car parking spaces are currently proposed although another 40 are provided for the building fronting Viaduct Road which are also accessed from the same point on Viaduct Road.

Members raised the following questions:

- When was it anticipated work on site would begin
- Would the southern boundary wall be retained
- Would the previous issues of flooding be addressed
- Would the heritage building be cleaned as part of the development
- Could the curved brick boundary wall along Kirkstall Road be retained

In responding to the issues raised, the applicant's representatives said:

- The development would consist of 4 phases, the intention was to submit an outline application as soon as possible with the reserved matters application following in early 2019
- Discussions were ongoing with the owners of the adjacent site to the south to understand its future use. Currently the boundary wall was retained for security reasons
- It was reported that flooding to the site had occurred previously. Members were informed that a flood risk assessment would be undertaken, including any impact from river silt, and it was intended the development would be lifted onto stilts to address any future flooding issues
- The applicant confirmed that the cleaning of the heritage building "would be looked at"
- The applicant confirmed that it was their intention to retain some elements of the curved boundary wall.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were supportive of the scheme
- The retention of the heritage buildings and bringing them back into use was welcomed

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion Members provided the following feedback;

- Members were supportive of the emerging scale and design of the development
- Members were supportive of the emerging approach to public space, car parking and landscaping provision on the site

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation.

## **RESOLVED –**

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
- (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation

**169 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 31<sup>st</sup> May 2018 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.