

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 9TH MAY, 2019

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors N Walshaw, A Khan,
A Garthwaite, E Nash, P Carlill, C Gruen,
J Goddard, B Anderson, D Cohen,
P Wadsworth and A Blackburn

A Members site visit was held in connection with the following applications:
Application No. 18/00147/FU – Land at junction of Park Lane and Belle Vue
Road, Woodhouse, Leeds. PREAPP/18/00092 – 19-20 East Parade and
Jubilee Hotel, The Headrow, Leeds 1 and was attended by the following
Councillors: J McKenna, C Gruen, P Wadsworth, A Blackburn, A Khan, P
Carlill and B Anderson

COUNCILLOR TOM LEADLEY

The Chair paid tribute to Councillor Tom Leadley who had been unsuccessful
in seeking re-election in the recent Municipal Election.

The Chair said Tom had served on the Council for many years particularly on
Plans Panels where his knowledge and experience had become invaluable
and on occasions pointing out omissions in officers reports.

His contributions, particularly at Plans Panel meetings were appreciated and
would be greatly missed.

165 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

166 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 considered.

167 Late Items

There were no late items of business identified.

168 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interests.

169 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor D Blackburn.

Councillor A Blackburn was in attendance as a substitute Member

170 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Thursday, 6th June, 2019

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th April 2019 were submitted for comment / approval.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 18th April 2019 be accepted as a true and correct record.

171 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no issues raised under Matters Arising.

172 APPLICATION NO.18/00147/FU - ERECTION OF 8 STOREY BUILDING PROVIDING STUDENT ACCOMMODATION COMPRISING 88 STUDIO ROOMS AND COMMUNAL FACILITIES; ASSOCIATED VEHICULAR ACCESS, BASEMENT CAR PARKING AND SERVICING, AND LAND AT JUNCTION OF PARK LANE & BELLE VUE ROAD WOODHOUSE, LEEDS LS3 1DP

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application which sought the erection of an 8 storey building providing student accommodation, comprising 88 studio rooms and communal facilities: associated vehicular access, basement car parking and servicing to land at the Junction of Park Lane & Belle Vue Road, Woodhouse, Leeds, LS3 1DP.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting. Site photographs and plans were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

Planning Officers addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site/ location/ context
- The area is mixed use in character including purpose built student accommodation.
- The application site lies on a steep slope
- Traditional housing is located to the north of the site
- The proposal is to construct an 8 storey student housing block consisting of 88 studio rooms, communal facilities including a gym, a common room and laundry located at ground floor level, a sun room is located at the first floor level.
- A pedestrian entrance is located along Park Lane
- The building would be set back from the line of the current stone boundary which would be removed to allow the footway to be doubled in width from its current 1m.
- The elevations will be in brick with recessed full height windows and integrated louvre panels. A vertical metal panel would be used to complete the composition.
- The scale of the proposed new building is in context with the surrounding buildings.

The Panel then heard from Dr Deryck Piper, a local resident who was objecting to the proposal.

Dr Piper said this site had been raised to a level of notoriety due to its planning history, with a number of development proposals being put forward over the years but with no development proceeding on-site. The site has been viewed by local residents as a derelict eyesore for the past 12 years. Dr Piper said the officer report was very comprehensive but he took issue with this being overly focused on interpretation of Core Strategy Policy H6(B)(i) and the controls around Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) suggesting the policy was not being consistently applied. He said this development will not take pressure off HMO's in the Little London and Woodhouse areas but would result in the loss of much-needed residential accommodation and housing suitable for families.

Dr Piper made reference to Policy H6(B) (iii) as being more appropriate: "To avoid excessive concentrations of student accommodation (in a single development or in combination with existing accommodation) which would undermine the balance and wellbeing of communities".

Dr Piper said that the policy was being applied in the Headingley and Hyde Park area which has a large student population and which sought to retain residential development but residential development in the Little London and Woodhouse areas was under threat.

Dr Piper stated that, albeit this is student accommodation, the residential space standards have not been met within this development such as to give adequate living space. In addition, this will bring an increased number of individuals into the area that are not contributing to the community, not paying council tax etc.

The proposed development is in the wrong place, the developer already had permission to build 18 residential flats on this site and he urged panel to dismiss this application and asked that the original scheme be completed.

Members raised the following questions to Dr Piper:

- Were there any car parking or taxi pick up and drop off concerns

In responding Dr Piper said:

- There were major concerns about taxis picking up and dropping off along Burley Road, where often the taxis would park up (sometimes double parking) and the development would add to congestion issues. This was a car free development but students travelling to the city centre on an evening more often used a taxi than walked.

The Chair thanked Dr Piper for his attendance and contributions.

The Panel then heard from Christopher Wickham who was speaking on behalf of the applicant.

Mr Wickham said it was the view of the applicant that this site was suitable for student accommodation, the relevant Core Strategy policy being H6 (B) and it is the criteria of that policy that is being considered. The proposal will assist in meeting continued demand for purpose built student accommodation in Leeds and will reduce pressure on existing family accommodation and HMOs by students. This scheme does not result in the loss of family accommodation. The site is located in a mixed use character area; commercial and residential. The development will make a sustained use of derelict land and would not undermine the community in land use terms.

The site is sustainable with direct links to the city centre and accessible to the university campus. The proposed student accommodation offers a wide mix of studio sizes which is in demand. The proposal provides good separation of building distances to Kendal Walk, with no material considerations about light or overlooking. The overall massing of the building has been reduced following consultation and pre-application discussions with officers. The site has good walking routes to the city centre and there are no highway safety concerns. The scheme is to be car-free and therefore taxi traffic generated would be no more than as would arise with any residential scheme. There will be no vehicle accumulation on the Belle Vue Road side. The scheme will be well landscaped with trees on both sides. Mr Wickham said a management plan had been developed, which would be subject to condition which would address end of term pick up and drop offs.

Members raised the following questions to Mr Wickham:

- Provision of 2 bedroom apartments would be suitable for family accommodation if looking to longer-term and any possibility for later conversion to family accommodation
- What is the likely student demographic envisaged to occupy the development
- Could the use of green walls be considered
- Picking up and dropping off appears to be a concern from local residents
- There is an opportunity to include more carbon reduction measures, renewal energy source (could the use of photovoltaic cells be considered) and take an overall sustainable approach to the scheme's construction

In responding Mr Wickham said

- Regarding possible provision of 2 bedroom apartments there was no communal outside space or such other extra amenity space as would be expected if this was a family-led development, which would mean it may be unsuitable for children.
- A mixed student occupation would be expected but the demographic of possible occupants is not a planning consideration.
- It was confirmed that the use of green walls would be considered, with the landscaping for the site to be dealt with by way of condition.

- There will be a management plan in place for end of term drop off and pick with a rota system to be put into operation. Day to day servicing will be achieved from Park Lane. Taxi pick up and drop off will be in Park Lane, with the footpath to be widened though a Section 278 Agreement and that side of the site notably improved.
- The basement car park is not likely to need to be used by (or attractive for use by) taxis for pick up and drop off, given the limited time that this activity requires.
- It was indicated that the client may be open minded to further carbon reduction measures being introduced and addressed by way of condition.

The Chair thanked Mr Wickham for his attendance and contributions.

The following questions were put to Council Officers:

- 8 of the studio apartments were 19sqm in size – were these apartments in accordance with National Space Standards
- Was it possible to increase the size of these smaller apartments by possibly reducing the width of the footpath or by reducing the number of the smaller apartments from 8 to 7, to avoid setting a precedent that developments with smaller room sizes will be granted permission
- Could a condition be included about the provision of green walls but could further consideration be given to improving this building's sustainable credentials via conditions also
- It was suggested that there will be an excessive amount of student accommodation in this area with many residents not having a stake in the community. Would it be possible to have more mixed housing in the area, as this appears to be too disproportionate in respect of the policy on student housing

In responding to the issues raised, council officers said:

- The City Centre Team Leader said that the Council's space standards did not apply to purpose built student accommodation but officers sought additional space in terms of access to communal facilities
- This approach is similar to that previously adopted in other student accommodation developments considered by City Plans Panel such as the Vita and Unite housing sites
- There were a number of constraints to be taken into account if the smaller apartments were to be increased in size, as overall floor space would be lost and there would need to be some reduction in footpath width at the side of the site facing Park Lane
- Overall the smaller-sized apartments only number 8 out of the total of 88 to be provided on-site
- Highways officers confirmed that they would wish to retain the 2m footpath as this is a minimum standard
- Officers confirmed that there was opportunity to achieve more in terms of carbon reduction measures – draft Condition 24 already addresses

- sustainability and conditions can be utilised to ensure commitment from the developer
- Landscaping is to be secured by way of condition, with there being plenty of opportunity for green walls in particular at the site
 - The Chief Planning Officer said there was a judgement to be made and much is dependent on how the area is defined when determining whether there is a high percentage of student occupation
 - Currently there was not sufficient evidence to suggest that, in general, the purpose built student housing developments in the Burley Road/ Kirkstall Road corridor, which had taken place in the past 15 years had directly led to what is to be regarded as an 'excessive' concentration of student housing which had undermined the balance and wellbeing of the existing community
 - There is no evidence to suggest that the purpose build student housing developments in the corridor have directly led to significant additional harm to existing residents in the Little London Woodhouse area and the likely impact of the development is the key planning consideration in this case
 - The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that officers have applied the correct policies when assessing this application and that officer recommendation is what Members can follow or not as they wish
 - The Chief Planning Officer also reminded Members that they are asked to make a decision on the application before them, rather than any hypothetical situation or hypothetical development that they would like to see on the site

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- In general Members welcomed the redevelopment of this derelict site, one Member remained against the principle of more student housing in this area
- Members were of the view that officers had got the policy balance correct in their assessment of the site and development proposed
- It was noted that the Little London and Woodhouse area is *already* such that there is a proliferation of student accommodation, such that a return to a residential family area is not practicable or feasible
- The majority of Members were of the view that this was a difficult piece of land to develop but the proposed size and massing were acceptable and the development proposed fits well with the surrounding area
- There were some concerns about the size of the smaller apartments
- Mixed views were expressed about reducing the size of the footway to achieve more space for the smaller apartments
- It was suggested that opportunities for more carbon reduction measures including the provision of green walls be pursued.

In summing up the Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and contributions, he suggested that the majority of Members appeared to be supportive of the application but further discussions were required about the size of the smaller apartments, be this via alterations to the internal design

proposed (the preferred approach) or reducing the size of the footway to allow for increased accommodation provision within the smallest apartments. Provision of further carbon reduction measures and landscaping will also be addressed via conditions.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in the Appendix No.1 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to include the following obligations:

- Restriction on occupancy to full-time students only during terms times
- Local Employment Initiatives
- Any other obligations which arise as part of the application process

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.

173 PREAPP/18/00092 - PRE- APPLICATION PROPOSAL FOR A NEW 6 STOREY BUILDING TO HOUSE AN APARTHOTEL WITH COMMERCIAL USES AT GROUND FLOOR AND THE CONVERSION OF A LISTED BUILDING AT 19-20 EAST PARADE AND JUBILEE HOTEL, 161-167 THE HEADROW, LS1 2BH

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application proposal for a new 6 storey building to house an Aparthotel with commercial uses at ground floor and the conversion of a Listed Building at
19-20 East Parade and Jubilee Hotel, 161 – 167, The Headrow, Leeds,
LS1 2BH

Members visited the site prior to the meeting. 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:

- Site / location/ context
- The Jubilee is a former public house and a Grade II Listed Building
- Architectural rich mixed setting
- The proposal is to demolish the existing buildings at 19-20 East Parade and create a new 6 storey corner building connected into and wrapping around the rear of, what would be the converted Jubilee Hotel and create a 38 unit apart-hotel with ground floor reception.
- A new bar/ public house would be created within the former Jubilee Hotel at ground floor level together with other commercial uses; gym, cycle store and bin stores. Raised deck to rear within an enclosed courtyard, proving external amenity space for the apart-hotel users.

- The scale and massing of the new proposal is sympathetic to surrounding buildings
- Materials; predominantly glass with masonry facade with defined glazed base – option of a brick terracotta or stone base being considered as alternatives at ground-floor level on East Parade
- Enhanced public realm
- Sustainable measures to include rainwater harvesting and possible connection to the Leeds district heating system

Members raised the following questions:

- The roof line of the new building does not match that of the former Jubilee Hotel building, could the roof line be altered to create a better flow
- The proposed lighter pallet for the new building is not sympathetic with the existing building
- Picking up and dropping off in front of the building could cause problems and hold ups
- There is no parking proposed for the scheme, so where would aparthotel guests travelling by car, park
- The proposed design of the courtyard area is outstanding, had any consideration been given to the use of green walls on the frontage of the new building
- There was some concern about the impact of the new building on the established building line and on views along East Parade
- Had any consideration been given to the use of balconies on the proposed new building
- Was there any possibility that some of the units within the aparthotel could become long term residential accommodation and / or utilised for purely stag and hen parties, the level of which is already of concern for anti-social behaviour management purposes etc.

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

- The Architect for the development said careful consideration is required for the roof line, as the internal levels also need to be right to accommodate the hotel services and to be suitable for hotel guests
- The Architect suggested that there was a real opportunity to do something different with the extension element, as the intention was that a contrasting design would not compete with the former Jubilee Hotel Building and is more likely respect its setting
- Members were informed that the intention was not to create a wider footpath at this point and to keep within the existing footprint, but to have a management plan in place for drop offs and pick ups (ideally purely on Park Cross Street)
- The development will be staffed 24/7 and such that aparthotel guests will be immediately met as dropped-off, to ensure access and egress

- are appropriately managed, following the format already successfully adopted at Pearl Chambers apart hotel development
- Members were informed that consideration was being given to contract parking for vehicles of apart hotel guests and valet parking
- The Architect said that his knowledge of the use of green walls was limited and had not been previously considered but it may be something that could be explored further
- Members were informed that the building line of the proposed new development matched that of the existing building line but it was difficult to tie in the new development with so many different architectural styles along East Parade, so the intention was to respond to the surrounding mix of styles without overly dominating on the corner of East Parade and The Headrow
- It was noted that consideration could be given to the increased use of stone as part of the palette of materials, which could assist in separating the ‘extension’ element of the development from the former Jubilee Hotel and ensuring the Jubilee building stands well and independently
- The Architect said that no consideration had been given to the use of balconies but the use of recessed balconies would be considered
- Members were informed that the apart hotel was targeted at the “high end” business users/ long stay professionals and was not intended for long term residential accommodation

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were generally supportive of the proposal
- Members welcomed the proposed new build element and the regeneration of the former Jubilee Hotel building
- Further work was required on the design of the new building and its relationship with the former Jubilee Hotel building
- Could further consideration be given to more green features

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

- Members considered the proposed uses to be acceptable
- Members were supportive of the proposed level of demolition
- Members were supportive of the emerging scale and massing of the development but further work was required around the design of the new building and its relationship with the former Jubilee Hotel building.

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation suggesting that Members appeared to be generally supportive of the scheme but further consideration was required around the design of the new building and its relationship with the former Jubilee Hotel building.

RESOLVED –

- (i) To note the details contained in the pre-application presentation
 - (ii) That the developers be thanked for their attendance and presentation
- 174 **Application 18/05017/FU - Removal of condition 50 (MLLR delivery) of approval 16/07938/OT, on land Between Barrowby Lane and Manston Lane, Thorpe Park, Leeds**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which provided an update in respect of an application for the removal of Condition 50 (MLLR delivery) of approval 16/07938/OT on land between Barrowby Lane and Manston Lane, Thorpe Park, Leeds.

Members noted that this report had been submitted as part of the agreement to bring regular updates to Panel regarding the Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR).

It was reported that the current anticipated completion for the MLLR project remained for the end of May 2019. Officers reported that all the main infrastructure was now in place, the only delay to the opening of the road was the completion of safe pedestrian passage. It was understood that work on this was nearing completion and there was a possibility that the road could be open to traffic by Friday, 10th May 2019, subject to all necessary permissions being signed off.

The Chair informed Members that he had spoken to Ward Member, Councillor Peter Gruen, and there was increased discontent regarding the ongoing delay with completion of the MLLR. However, the priority now was simply to ensure that the MLLR would be open as soon as possible.

A number of Members expressed the view that lessons had to be learnt from this project and a similar situation should not be allowed to occur again.

The Chief Planning Officer said there was a need to check that all necessary works had been carried out as required under the issued planning consents, but there was now an expectation that the project would soon be completed and if there is any further slippage in the timeframes for completion of the overall scheme then this will be reported to Panel.

Members requested that a further report be brought back to Panel confirming the project had been completed.

RESOLVED –

- (i) That the contents of the report be noted.
- (ii) To note that revised anticipated completion for the MLLR project remained the end of May 2019 but there was a possibility the MLLR could be open to traffic sooner.

(iii) That a further report be brought back to Panel confirming the project had been completed.

175 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 6th June 2019 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds