

## **CITY PLANS PANEL**

**THURSDAY, 6TH JUNE, 2019**

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

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,  
P Carlill, D Cohen, A Garthwaite, E Nash,  
P Wadsworth and N Walshaw

A Members site visit was held in connection with the following applications:  
Application Nos: 18/07367/FU, 19/01277/LI, 19/01279/LI & 19/01280/LI –  
Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme – Phase 2. PREAPP/19/00037 – Commerce  
House, Wade Lane, Leeds and was attended by the following Councillors: J  
McKenna, D Blackburn, C Campbell, P Carlill, E Nash, P Wadsworth, S  
Hamilton, R Grahame, R Stephenson and J Hesselwood.

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

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

### **2 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.

### **3 Late Items**

There were no late items of business identified.

### **4 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

Although there were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests made  
at the meeting, Councillor R Stephenson required it to be recorded that a  
family Member had submitted a tender for works associated with the  
construction of the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme (Phase 2) – Agenda Item  
No. 8 (Minute No. 8 referred)

### **5 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors; C Gruen, P Gruen A  
Khan and G Latty.

Councillors: R Grahame, S Hamilton, J Heselwood and R Stephenson were in  
attendance as substitute Members.

### **6 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Final Minutes approved at the meeting  
held on Thursday, 27th June, 2019

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> May 2019 were submitted for comment/ approval.

Councillor J Heselwood requested a minor alteration to Minute No. 172, substituting the word “manned” and replacing with “staffed”

## **7 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

Councillor R Grahame said there were a number of references within the minutes to the provision of “green walls”. Could an explanation be provided as to what a green wall was?

In offering an explanation Councillor N Walshaw said living walls or green walls were vertical gardens that are attached to the exterior or interior of a building with an irrigation system.

The Chair thanked Councillor Walshaw for his explanation.

## **8 APPLICATION NO. 18/07367/FU - CONSTRUCTION OF PHASE 2 OF THE LEEDS FLOOD ALLEVIATION SCHEME (FAS) TO LAND ADJACENT TO AND WITHIN THE RIVER AIRE CORRIDOR BETWEEN LEEDS CITY CENTRE (WHITEHALL WATERFRONT) AND CALVERLEY**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application for the construction of phase 2 of the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) to land adjacent to, and within the River Aire corridor between Leeds City Centre (Whitehall Waterfront) and Calverley, Leeds.

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

The Planning Case Officer reported that further representations had been received following publication of the report to Panel:

- Yorkshire Wildlife Trust had confirmed no objections to the proposal
- Councillor A Carter (Calverley & Farsley Ward) had commented there was a strong case for effective action following storm Eva in 2015 and was broadly supportive of the proposals
- Horsforth Town Council were supportive of the proposals
- Kirkstall Valley Nature Reserve had expressed support for the application but welcomed more details about the scheme
- Councillor J Illingworth (Kirkstall) was content for the application to proceed

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

Construction of Phase 2 of the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) including flood storage areas, flow control structure (including plant and

machinery) and defence to include; walls, sheet piling, earth bunds, scour protection and associated access, landscaping, demolition, building and construction works. Listed Building Consent was also sought in respect of the following:

Application No. 19/01277/LI – Construction of a 200mm thick reinforced concrete flood defence wall clad in stone into Wellington Bridge

Application No. 19/01278/LI – Construction of a 200mm thick reinforced concrete flood defence wall clad in stone into Newlay Bridge

Application No. 19/01279/LI – Installation of a control structure tying into Clough House using suitable lime hydraulic mortar and remedial works to Clough House (Kirkstall)

Application No. 19/10280/LI – Construction of flood walls connecting to the Engine Shed on the NW and SE elevations and remedial works to the Engine Shed, comprising the insertion of a floor to ceiling flood defence wall, replacement flood defence door and inserted secondary flood defence glazing (at Armley Mills)

Members raised the following questions:

- Could more details be provided about the works to the Engine Shed
- Referring to paragraph 6.22 and the Council's declaration of a climate emergency, Members queried if the materials to be used on the scheme could be appropriate to meet the Council's ambitions.
- Was any consideration given to using the goits to produce hydro-electricity
- Was a suitable species of tree been used to slow the flow of water
- When would work on the scheme commence
- Would completion of the scheme assist businesses in obtaining flood protection insurance cover

In responding to the issues raised, council officers said:

- Officers reported that a secondary wall and glazing (floor to ceiling) would be inserted behind the existing wall, on a temporary basis until the full remedial works were carried out, once complete the building would be secure and dry.
- Members were informed the intention was to follow natural flood management methods including: the planting of up to two million trees (to delay run off) a reduction in the use of carbon-intensive bricks, steel & concrete and the greater use of modified wood and other plant-based derivatives.
- Members were informed that due consideration had been given to the use of goits to produce hydro-electricity but it was determined to not be commercially viable for this scheme

- Professor Sir John Lawton, speaking on behalf of the Council, said the scheme before Members was the most ambitious flood management scheme in the UK. He said once the trees were established, the tree canopy would create a large surface area and would be effective in slowing the water cause down
- It was reported that phasing of the works was the subject of further discussions with the contractors, it was important not to increase flood risks elsewhere as a consequence of any works
- It was understood that some business in the Kirkstall area struggled in obtaining flood protection insurance, the completion of Phase 1 would provide some reassurance to insurance companies, the completion of Phase 2 would further enhance that reassurance. The Chief Planning Officer said that all new business development in the area should be compliant with current standards around flood risk

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were supportive of the scheme commenting that it was a comprehensive, ambitious plan, impressive in design and sits well within the landscape
- Members were of the view that the river needs to be usable and attractive
- Could the two goits at: Armley Mills and St Anne's Mills be inspected with a view to maintenance/ repair, the flow appears to be restricted
- Could the use of water power at Armley Mills be investigated further

In responding to the latter point the Chair suggested that it may be an appropriate subject to be considered by the new Climate Change Advisory Committee

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

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (i) That Application No. 18/07367/FU 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)
- (ii) That Application Nos; 19/01277/LI, 19/01278/LI, 19/01279/LI and 19/01280/LI be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in the Appendix No. 2 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate)

#### **9 PREAPP/19/00037 - Pre-application presentation of proposed Student Residential Accommodation development on the site of Commerce House, Wade Lane and St Alban's Place, Leeds LS2 8NJ**

Final Minutes approved at the meeting held on Thursday, 27th June, 2019

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application proposal for Student Residential Accommodation development on the site of Commerce House, Wade Lane and St Albans Place, Leeds, LS2 8NJ.

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
- Demolition of the existing office building and the construction of a multi-storey student residential accommodation development
- Located within the tall building cluster
- Key views
- The proposed new development would comprise of two stepped blocks, rising from 18 storey's to 28 storey's in height
- The building would contain 362 studio flats designed for students
- Bicycle/ bin stores and gym located at lower ground floor level
- Main entrance located at ground floor level together with cinema room, general amenity space
- Additional communal space, including study rooms would be located at first floor level
- The studio flats would comprise 21m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace
- Large floor to ceiling windows
- Public realm/ courtyard area/ enhanced pedestrian facilities along Belgrave Street
- Turning head for deliveries, pick up and drop off area
- Landscaping and tree planting (28 new trees)
- The developers aware that a wind assessment requires undertaking

Members raised the following questions:

- The proposal is for studio flats but isn't there a move away from this type of accommodation following concerns about student isolation
- Could the courtyard space be publicly accessible
- The size of the studio flats at 21m<sup>2</sup> was a concern

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

- The Architect suggested there was a need for a mix of student accommodation across the area. In terms of student isolation the developers were aware of such concerns and provided communal facilities and events to address these issues.
- Members were informed that there was a proposal to locate some of the studio flats at ground floor level which had safety concerns for

residents if the courtyard space was not managed. Member's attention was also drawn to the comments proved by West Yorkshire Police (Paragraph 5.9 of the submitted report) which suggested reducing the number of access routes into the site, the provision of gates, access control measures for authorised entry and visitor access being directed through the main reception.

- Members were informed that National Described Space Standards (NDSS) did not specifically apply to student housing. It was also suggested that reasonable standards of general amenity space for occupiers had been met with an area of 638m<sup>2</sup> of communal space been provided. Members were also made aware that other similar schemes had been approved in the area.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- The majority of Members welcomed the modern design of the building
- A number of Members expressed concern about the size of the studio flats suggesting they were too small. Some Members were of the view that a policy was required which specified the minimum requirements for student accommodation
- There was concern from Members about "pure" student accommodation suggesting there was a need for more mixed residential accommodation
- Mixed views were expressed as to whether the courtyard space should be publicly accessible, some Members were of the view that routes through the development should be retained, others welcomed the private space and the management of that space
- Could some rooftop communal space be considered
- Could carbon reduction measures, renewal energy source be considered

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

- Members were of the view that the proposed use of the site for student accommodation was acceptable in principal
- Further details were required as to whether the living conditions within the student accommodation were acceptable
- Members were of the view that the proposed mass and form of the development and its relationship with the surrounding context was acceptable
- Further information was required from the developer as to whether the courtyard space should be publicly accessible
- Members were of the opinion that the development should deliver improvements to the pedestrian environment in the area beyond the immediate periphery of the site

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation suggesting that Members appeared to be generally supportive of the scheme.

Commenting on the public access issue he said a clever / imaginative design of the building may address some of the access concerns but further consideration was required around the size of the studio flats

**RESOLVED –**

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

**10 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).

Officers confirmed that the Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR) opened to traffic on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2019. It was understood that work would continue to complete the entire project (landscaping works) by the end of May.

Members were informed that the Thorpe Park bus service had also diverted off Selby Road onto the MLLR to provide the originally indented route to Crossgates and beyond.

Members welcomed the opening of the Manston Lane Link Road

The Chair thanked officers and developers for their efforts in completing scheme and suggested that the regular reporting of the project to City Plans Panel was no longer required.

**RESOLVED –**

- (i) That the contents of the report be noted and welcomed.
- (ii) To agree that further regular reporting of the project to City Plans Panel was no longer required.

**11 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED –** To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 27<sup>th</sup> June 2019 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

