

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 2019

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, P Carlill,
D Cohen, A Garthwaite, C Gruen, A Khan,
E Nash, P Wadsworth, N Walshaw, G Latty
and P Gruen

A Members site visit was held in connection with the following applications: Application No.19/01666/FU – Residential Development at Kirkstall Hill, Leeds 5, PREAPP/1800636 – Residential Development at the former Yorkshire Post Site, PREEAPP/1800245 – Residential Development at Springwell Road, Leeds 12 and Application No.19/01242/OT – Proposed Adult and Children Services Hospital at the Leeds General Infirmary site, Leeds 1 and was attended by the following Councillors: D Blackburn, G Latty, J McKenna, E Nash and P Wadsworth.

76 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

77 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.

78 Late Items

Although there were no late items the Chair did accept the inclusion of Supplementary Information in respect of Agenda Item No. 9 – Application No. 19/04278/FU - Proposed Student Accommodation Development at Oak House, Park Lane, Leeds 3. The Supplementary Information included a report from the Chief Planning Officer which provided the most up to date position on negotiations with the applicant, there was also representations from the local ward Members. (Minute No.84 referred). There was further Supplementary Information in respect of Agenda Item No.10 – Application No. 19/01666/ FU – Development at Kirkstall Hill, Leeds 5, which included the submission of a Viability Report (Minute No. 85 referred).

79 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

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

80 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor C Campbell

81 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 31st October 2019 were submitted for comment/ approval.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 31st October 2019 be accepted as a true and correct record

82 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Former Marsh Lane Railway Station (Minute No. 71 referred) – With reference to the previous meeting when it was reported that the Chief Planning Officer together with the Chair had sent a joint letter to Network Rail seeking to ascertain what stage had been reached in any ongoing discussions regarding the re-opening of the rail halt at the former Marsh Lane Railway Station.

The Chair was not aware a response had been received and the matter would be followed up with the Chief Planning Officer.

Section 106 Agreements – Reference was made to the general issue of Section 106 Agreements, in particular the 3 month period allocated to finalise such an Agreement. Members were of the view that such a time period was unrealistic and could research be undertaken to identify a more realistic timescale.

The Council's Legal Officer reported that an exercise was currently ongoing, with data on timeframes for Section 106 Agreements over the past 12 months being collected and analysed in order to determine an appropriate benchmark. The findings would be reported to Members at a future date, but indications do show an improvement in the 'turnaround' time from instructions / Panel resolution to completion of Section 106 Agreements in the last 6 months and particularly on the more straightforward Section 106 Agreements completed in-house by Legal & Democratic Services.

83 Application No. 19/01242/OT - Outline planning application including the demolition of the former nurses' home and other buildings and the construction of new adult and children's healthcare facilities, a multi-storey car park, new access and egress points into hospital grounds with landscaping at the Leeds General Infirmary, Great George Street, Leeds, LS1 3EX.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an outline planning application, including the demolition of the former nurses home and other buildings and the construction of new adult and children's healthcare facilities, a multi-storey car park, new access and egress points into hospital grounds with landscaping at the Leeds General Infirmary, Great George Street, Leeds, LS1 3EX.

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
- New upgraded health facility for Leeds and the North of England region
- Creation of a new adult and children's service health facility, linked building, a new multi storey car park, new access and egress points and landscaping scheme.
- Some buildings have historic / architectural merit
- Some buildings being decommissioned for future development
- Off-site highway works
- Vehicular routes
- Drop off areas
- Pedestrian routes
- Massing/ elevations/ materials
- Townscape impact
- Key views

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- The design concept, as demonstrated within the presentation, was it likely to be an accurate representation
- Is the development likely to achieve a BREEAM excellence rating
- Had there been any discussions with WYCA in respect of the pick-up and drop-off areas
- Height differential between the proposed new development and the existing Brotherton Wing
- The proposed new development would be twice the height of the existing Brotherton Wing, therefore a quality design and materials would be very important
- Could some thought be given to the patient experience and assistance in getting around the building, particularly when distances between different hospital departments was likely to be considerable
- What was proposed for the open space/ green space and relaxation areas
- What was the timescale for the development and subsequent opening/ operation of different elements of the new facility
- The Calverley Street/ Portland Way Junction is very busy, are there any plans to upgrade it
- Was there potential for the City's Park & Ride services to access and service the new facility
- Decommissioned buildings/ empty buildings could be unattractive, what was envisaged for these buildings, what was the Masterplan
- One Member expressed concern about the size of the multi storey car park (650 spaces)

- One Member queried whether the provision of secure cycle spaces (100 spaces) was sufficient
- Consideration and monitoring of air quality around the new development, particularly having regard to controlling smoking around main hospital entrances and on the site as a whole

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

- Members were informed that the design was a representation based on the design parameters for the outline application. The internal designs shown on the 'fly-through' were also illustrations of what it is hoped will be achieved. The full design details will be informed by a design brief and competition and will be secured via a procurement process.
- Members were informed that the vision was to push the sustainable design and construction agenda and to meet the requirements of Policies EN1 and EN2.
- The nature of the building's use inevitably means that it has a heightened energy consumption, but there is an aim to ensure the development is sustainable while also meeting all the relevant clinical aims and requirements.
- The aim of the applicant is to ensure that, in both design and sustainability, there is innovation and an ability to respond to future changes and developments within the market. As much remains to be determined in the longer-term as part of the design competition and ongoing development process, the applicant is aware of the need to 'future proof' so that the development can respond to innovation over time.
- Members were informed that that there were currently 6 bus stops in the vicinity of the LGI, there was also a staff shuttle bus service operating between the LGI and St James's Hospital. WYCA had indicated that this was sufficient at this stage, but, it was accepted that further discussions were required with WYCA to understand existing provision and to identify future provision (Possible Park and Ride Facilities).
- The Architect said the new development would be 13 storey's in height, but that there was also a change in levels that accounts for 2-3 storeys. This was a very important building and the developers were keen to deliver a high quality design.
- It is intended the Design Brief which would form part of the design competition would emphasise the importance of these being 'strong' buildings and how important the design is, such that the buildings created would be innovative but also reflect their surroundings. The overall design would return to Panel via the reserved matters approval process.
- The Architect said the main entrance to the building had been centralised, and the new multi storey car park was also located close by. This was intended to strengthen the patient experience and enable increased staff assistance to be provided to patients where required.

- Members were informed that a landscape strategy would come forward in due course. There was an awareness that public realm and greenspace provision surrounding the hospital was currently lacking. While the built-up nature of the site and its City Centre location creates difficulties with this, good public and open space provision is a key driver behind the redevelopment.
- The applicant suggested that the development would be operational by the end of 2025.
- The applicant indicated that the plan was to open both the children's and adult's facilities as one joined hospital in terms of functionality, particularly as there will be a link between the two on upper floors. However, there will be some departments that then open on a staggered basis thereafter.
- The LCC Highway Officer reported that the junction layout would remain the same, but additional crossing points would be created, new signals would also be provided together with changes to lane allocations and Kerb lines. Access would not be brought back to Panel as it was not a reserved matter, but the changes outlined were what the consultants and Highway Officers felt was deliverable within the parameters and restrictions imposed by the site's City Centre location.
- The applicant suggested the surplus estate was a regeneration area, so could possibly incorporate Med Tech Research Facilities and other uses complimenting the hospital. A number of parties could be involved with that (e.g. Universities and other partners) and this was part of long-term and ongoing discussions.
- Previous proposals for the site had included residential use within the decommissioned buildings. This remained a possible part of the overall development proposal / masterplan for the site, but much discussion was still needed in the longer-term about how the surplus 5 hectares on the LGI estate would be used – to ensure a vibrancy of use, but one that was also complimentary to the hospital functions.
- Members were informed that the hospital was a major trauma centre and so would attract patients/ visitors from a wide area, many arriving by car and taxi. The central location of the main entrance, the drop off areas and the multi storey car park would all contribute to easing traffic flow and reducing City Centre congestion, potentially avoiding vehicles circling surrounding roads to secure parking.
- The multi storey car park would be fitted with the number of electric vehicle charging points as required under policy.
- The shuttle bus and travel subsidies are already offered for LGI staff. In addition, there are currently 95 secure cycle spaces – so the number proposed as part of the development was an increase on this. In addition, there would be the creation of a cycle hub, bringing together cycle storage and repair / maintenance facilities.
- There was a delicate balance to be 'struck' between creating somewhere that does not feel like a hospital for long-term patients, but that does meet clinical needs and also satisfies the requirements of short-term or day patients who perhaps require a more clinical and functional space to be provided.

- All NHS sites were designated no smoking. While this becomes hard to enforce, a strengthening of the approach is something that will aim to be addressed via the redevelopment.
- Draft Condition 6 aims to ensure appropriate air quality monitoring and mitigation as part of the redevelopment.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- All Members were supportive of the proposal, suggesting the concept was going in the right direction and once complete would be transformational.
- It was accepted by the majority of Members that a multi storey car park was essential, given this was a major trauma centre.
- Close attention must be paid to ensuring innovative and high-quality design, but that is sympathetic to surrounding buildings and the LGI's place within the wider civic and education quarter. Attention would also need to be paid to preserving historic views and sight-lines.
- A number of Members expressed concern about the Calverley Street/Portland Way junction layout suggesting a further look at the layout was required to provide improved pedestrian crossing facilities. Officers agreed to do this before determination of the application.

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation, commenting that once complete this would be a world class facility. He suggested that Members appeared to be supportive of the application. It was requested that the applicant keeps all Members of the Council fully informed with progress, particularly in view of this coming forward as a leading healthcare facility and important development for the city as a whole.

RESOLVED –

- (i) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to further consideration of the pedestrian crossing arrangements for the Calverley Street/Portland Way junction, the conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he may consider appropriate) and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following obligations:
 - The employment and training of local people
 - The provision of publicly accessible areas
 - A Travel Plan fee of £24,000.00
 - A contribution of £15,000.00 towards any Traffic Regulations Orders found to be required on Calverley Street
- (ii) 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.

84 Application No. 19/04278/FU - Erection of between 3 and 6 storey building providing purpose built student accommodation comprising 188 student rooms in cluster flats and studio format with additional communal facilities and landscaping at Oak House, Park Lane, Leeds, LS3 1EL

With reference to the meeting held on 31st October 2019 and the decision to defer the application for further discussions with the applicant around design, massing, use of materials and the greenspace provision. The Chief Planning Officer now submitted a report indicating that further discussions to address Members' concerns had taken place with the applicant, resulting in further revisions to the scheme.

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
- Members had previously accepted the principle of student housing in this location
- Amended brick detailing, greater layering and depth to reveals, more windows added to the pavilion and all dormers amended to be square headed
- The sub-station repositioned and planted to side, green roof to be incorporated, increase in number of trees, hedges planted at the top of the bank and a living wall on the western elevation
- Landscaping around the perimeter of the site and on the building
- Ground floor room raised above street level, railings and fritted glass to obscure views
- Hanover Avenue to be resurfaced as a pedestrian priority

The Planning Officer reported the receipt of letter of support from a Ward Member, together with a letter of support from Unipol, a Leeds based registered charitable company specialising in student housing.

Members were given the opportunity to view building materials and possible finishes to be used on the development that had been provided by the applicant.

There were no questions raised by Members.

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- The alternative coloured brick created a much improved scheme.
- Some Members expressed a preference for a darker metal cladding.

- The increased green provision and planting, both alongside and integral to the building design, was welcomed.
- All Members were of the view that the proposed revisions created a much improved scheme.

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation, commenting that the earlier scheme had met with some criticism but successful negotiations / discussion with all parties had addressed many of the earlier concerns. Members now appeared to be supportive of the proposals.

RESOLVED –

- (i) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval following the expiry of the period provided for publicity and comments on the revised proposals on Monday 9th December 2019 and subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he may consider appropriate) and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following obligations:
 - Restriction on occupancy to full-time students only during term times
 - Travel Plan Review Fee of £3,528
 - Local Employment & Skills Initiative
- (ii) 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.

85 Application No.19/01666/FU - Demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site for a mixed-use development comprising up to 263 residential units (Use Class C3) and flexible commercial floorspace (Use Class A1, A2 or B1a); together with associated vehicular access, car and cycle parking spaces, bin stores, plant, landscaping, amenity space and associated infrastructure and engineering works on land at Kirkstall Hill, Kirkstall, Leeds LS5 3BH.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out a Position Statement in respect of an application which sought the demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site for a mixed-use development comprising up to 263 residential units (Use Class C3) and flexible commercial floor space (Use Class A1, A2 and B1a) together with associated vehicular access, car and cycle parking spaces, bin stores, plant, landscaping amenity space and associated infrastructure and engineering works, on land at Kirkstall Hill, Kirkstall, Leeds, LS5 3BH.

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
- Site currently occupied by a large retail unit together with some vacant buildings which are in a state of disrepair
- Key issues include: highway implications and viability issues
- The development proposes 263 dwellings: 183 apartments and 80 townhouses (Residential blocks are 3 storey's in height)
- The scheme creates a stepped design responding to the change in levels across the site
- Access into the development to be taken from Beecroft Street via 3 separate access roads
- 231 car parking spaces (Including 16 disabled spaces) and 25 visitor spaces
- Materials: red brick with stone accents to some elevations to provide character, roof material grey slate
- Affordable housing provision
- The area of land identified as Area 5 was outside the red line of the site
- The site would require 20% greenspace provision to be policy compliant (Policy G4), but that that this could not be provided in the way required by policy otherwise this would adversely impact on the viability of the proposal
- An additional highways contribution would be required which had not yet been taken into account as part of the viability calculations. This would potentially be for use on junction improvements (Hot spots), bridge widening, provision of 2 metre-wide footpaths and other highway works. This was likely to be required as part of emerging policy however, so can only be afforded limited weight.
- Controlled parking zone contribution was being sought commensurate with policy requirements
- Sustainability features, first passive design, possible connection to district heating system and electric vehicle charging points
- The site is designated in the Site Allocations Plan for mixed-use development, comprising residential, commercial and with some element of office use. The office-use has not been brought forward as part of the proposals, but there does remain a mixed-use element to the scheme proposed.

The application was being brought to Panel at this stage by way of a Position Statement, such as to allow Planning Officers to present the scheme to Members and for Members to consider and comment on the proposals. Members would therefore be involved in decision-making in respect of the application at a later Panel, but at this stage were to focus on discussion of the matters outlined in the Chief Planning Officer's report.

The Panel then heard from Councillor J Illingworth, local Ward Member who spoke in opposition to the proposed development.

Councillor Illingworth informed Members that at the earlier consultations on the pre-application proposals the local community was informed that the development would meet all necessary planning obligations required by the Core Strategy and as a result received full support from all 3 Ward Members. This latest proposal falls far short and Ward Members are no longer able to support it. It was his view and that of his Ward colleagues that consultation on the scheme should be undertaken again, as what was now presented to Panel comprised an entirely different scheme from that previously submitted. The revised scheme did not comply with the affordable housing requirements; the piece of land identified as Area 5 was in the ownership of the local authority; there was a deficiency in the greenspace provision; the development would create a lot of additional vehicle movements per day adding further congestion to the area; the highway mitigation works and monetary contributions would be insufficient; there was very little public benefit from the scheme proposed, which would be likely to decrease as the scheme progresses and additional costs are incurred; and all the original benefits from the earlier scheme should be restored.

Questions to Councillor J Illingworth:

- Had the local community and Ward Members been consulted on elements such as provision of commercial units, materials and the housing mix
- How do the local community view the revised scheme
- Were there any public transport and air quality problems in the area

In responding Councillor J Illingworth said:

- The local community were supportive of the earlier scheme, the revised scheme does not have that support and they now feel cheated
- The air quality for the area is poor, and there was constant traffic congestion in the area leading to long tailbacks and reduced traffic movements through the traffic lights
- The local community and Ward Members want to ensure that any development on this site is positive, as this is the last major development site in the area and therefore any development proposal here needs to be strong and policy compliant

The Panel then heard from the applicant's representative who spoke in support of the proposed development.

Mr O Freer, Planning Consultant, explained that the developers had been working with the Local Planning Authority for the previous 18 months on this proposal. The attendance at Panel was to ensure that Members' comments could be heard and taken into account in advance of the application coming back to Panel for a decision to be made, with previous comments made by Members at Pre-Application stage already having been received and taken into account. Mr Freer said this was an island site with a difficult topography and, as a consequence, there were some challenges – particularly for the

highway network and in terms of greenspace provision. A lengthy process was currently ongoing to prepare the transport statement, with discussions currently taking place about the cumulative impact policy and how the Council's emerging policy could now be factored into the proposal. Members were informed that "gifted land" would be able to deliver additions to the scheme. Parking for the site was considered sufficient and all spaces to be provided would be enabled as potential electric vehicle charging points. The applicant was aware of, and understands, the concerns of local residents regarding impact on the surrounding highway and parking – such that a contribution to and introduction of controlled parking areas could be considered. However, given this is an island site, it is seen as a low impact site and traffic movements arising from it would be spread across the network and would thereby have a relatively low overall impact. The uses proposed would also be likely to lead to reduced trip-generation compared to that which would have arisen from other uses previously proposed for the site.

Questions to the Developers:

- The proposal includes the provision of commercial units (Shops), why have you included shops when there are already shops in the area.
- With no passing traffic, the likelihood is that these shops will fail
- What would the positives and benefits be from the scheme

In responding to questions the Developer and applicant's representatives said:

- The topography of the site meant that the ground floor areas needed to be built-out, but these would not be suitable for residential occupation – hence it was felt they could be developed as a useable commercial space.
- The inclusion of commercial units will provide the focus to create a community space. The commercial units will be flexible in use, so able to respond to commercial challenges and community needs as required.
- Members were informed the site had been vacant for 15 years, the proposed use was a low impact scheme and would provide links through the site to bring existing neighbourhoods together. The scheme would deliver a strong housing mix and would also create new jobs (both during construction and operation). The design of the scheme also responds well to the wider townscape.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- There is already traffic congestion in the area. The scheme may generate a moderate amount of journeys, but we don't want to add to an already bad situation.
- Previous developments in the surrounding area had been approved on the basis that they would only generate a moderate amount of traffic,

but this had been proved incorrect and already significantly worsened congestion problems.

- Even a small amount of additional traffic could add considerably to journey time, in what was already a finely-balanced traffic situation.
- The site does need redevelopment and the principle of development on the site is already accepted (as reflected in the Site Allocation Plan designation) but this is not the right scheme.
- The District Valuer's Report suggests the scheme is not fully compliant and is deficient on a number of significant issues that are strategic matters, so which need to be addressed.
- The policy on Affordable Housing needs to be maintained.
- The proposal must reflect the approach taken by all Council Panels now to encouraging green design, as well as addressing air quality and climate change issues.
- Attention should be given to how the viability of the commercial units will be ensured, as they are only likely to be successful and viable in the long-term if there is passing trade.
- Further attention should be paid to the materials to be used, as these appear to have changed compared to those presented at the Pre-Application stage. The use of stone should be considered.

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

- While taking into account comments made by the District Valuer in relation to profit margins and viability valuations, Members were of the view that the amount of the affordable housing proposed was not acceptable
- Members expressed the view that the proposal to not provide on-site or in-lieu greenspace due to the viability of the proposal was not acceptable
- The proposed landscaping scheme was insufficient to provide informal space, visual amenity and climate mitigation
- Members were supportive of the proposed parking provision along with the proposed mitigation works
- Members were of the view that more information was required in respect of materials and design
- In terms of the proposals for reducing carbon emissions on the site, Members requested that further information was required
- In addition, Members noted that there also needed to be a focus on air quality issues more widely and a design-first approach in terms of reducing carbon emissions on the site would be welcomed
- Members expressed a preference for more houses and less apartments.
- Further details of the traffic circulation for the area should also be provided.

The Chair thanked the developers and the Ward Member for their attendance and contributions, suggesting there was a lot more discussion required.

RESOLVED –

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

86 PREAPP/18/00636 - Pre application proposal for 2 separate planning applications: (i) Full application for 2 build to rent residential buildings, (approximately 419 units) with ancillary ground floor active uses, small scale retailing, café/restaurant, bars; from 17 up to 23 storeys (ii) Outline application for hotel use from 16 up to 19 storeys (200 bedrooms approximately) at site bounded by Wellington Street and Wellington Bridge Street (Northern part of the former Yorkshire Post Site)

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a Pre Application proposal for 2 separate planning applications:

- (i) Full application for two build to rent residential buildings, (approximately 419 units) with ancillary ground floor active uses, small scale retailing, café/restaurant, bars; from 17 to 23 storey's in height
- (ii) Outline application for hotel use from 16 up to 19 storey's in height (200 bedrooms approximately) at site bounded by Wellington Street and Wellington Bridge Street (Northern part of the former Yorkshire Post site)

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
- Northern part of the former Yorkshire Post site
- Full application – Two build to rent residential buildings, 17 to 23 storey's in height (419 apartments including 5 townhouses)
- Both blocks linked at ground level by a double height glazed residents entrance and reception area. Supporting commercial spaces would be integrated at ground floor to comprise gym, café and retail, alongside plant and bin storage areas
- Affordable Housing Provision would be delivered by commuted sum in lieu of on-site provision in accordance with Policy H5 (iii)
- Outline application - Erection of hotel 16 to 19 storey's in height (200 bedrooms)
- Hotel arrival zone – public space and active frontages
- Hotel to achieve a BREEAM Excellent standard
- New road to be provided to the south

- Emerging proposals for landscaping

Members raised the following questions:

- Welcome the cluster of the buildings, but buildings in close proximity could cause light issues, materials should be light in colour
- The Hotel, what was the intended rating
- Could Members be made aware of the species of trees to be planted

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

- The Architect suggested that further discussions would be taking place with the Planning Authority, but the intention was to use some light colour materials and have overall variety
- The images presented did not necessarily give a good indication in terms of colour palette or distances, as the spaces between and within the buildings actually comprised a considerable square footage for a City Centre scheme
- Members were informed that at this stage no operator could be named but there was good interest. At the outline stage though, the developer was setting the parameter scale to approximately 200-bed
- The applicant confirmed that the species of trees to be used would be made available to Members.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- The majority of Members were supportive of the scheme, commenting that it was a good design and well thought through
- Members welcomed the cluster of the buildings, the light materials to be used and emphasised the need for a lot of greenery
- The intention for the hotel to achieve a BREEAM Excellent standard was welcomed
- Ensure there was enough light between the cluster of buildings
- The Planning Officer report noted that affordable housing was to be provided off-site and this option of off-site provision was accepted by Members as being compliant with policy

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

- Members were of the view that the uses proposed were acceptable
- Members considered the layout, scale and emerging design of the proposed buildings to be acceptable
- Members were supportive of the approach to landscaping around the proposed building but more information about the species of trees to be used was required
- Members were supportive of the proposed level of parking provision
- Members were supportive of the approach to EVCP parking provision currently envisaged as part of the proposal

- Members were supportive of the principle to retain the digital advertising screen, provided this does not adversely impact on amenity or highway safety, and on the basis that this can display the time and temperature – as this has become a welcome and popular ‘feature’ over the years

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

RESOLVED –

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

87 PREAPP/18/00245 - Pre-application presentation for the demolition of the existing building and creation of residential development ("Springwell Gardens II") with 288 apartments and a commercial unit. This is a second phase to the adjacent 'Radius' ("Springwell Gardens I") development (16/05198/FU) at Cartwright House, Springwell Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS12 1EX

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a Pre Application proposal for the demolition of the existing building and creation of residential development (“Springwell Gardens II”) with 288 apartments and a commercial unit. This was the second phase to adjacent Radius (“Springwell Gardens I”) development (16/05198/FU) at Cartwright House, Springwell Road, Holbeck, Leeds, LS12 1EX

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 site lies within the Holbeck Neighbourhood Plan and within the South Bank Regeneration Area
- The proposal is to construct a 24 storey residential building, containing 288 apartments: 72 one bed suits, 80 one bed apartments, 122 two bed apartments and 14 three bed apartments
- All apartments would meet Nationally Described Space Standards
- Active frontage onto Springwell Road
- Secure cycle storage
- Parking for 24 cars
- 11 motorcycle parking spaces
- Communal terrace at first floor level linking in with Phase I

- Rooftop landscaping
- Large balconies
- Affordable Housing 7%, preferred option to provide off-site (Policy H5)
- Key views

Members raised the following questions:

- Would a noise survey be undertaken
- Would all the apartments have a balcony
- Would Affordable Housing provision be provided
- Would any wind studies be undertaken
- Was overlooking of the balconies an issue
- How would the greenery be maintained, especially that incorporated as part of the 'hanging' design on the building's façade

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

- The Applicant confirmed that a full noise assessment would be undertaken. In addition, there was the intention to incorporate high performance glazing and a number of other measures within the design to assist with noise mitigation and ensuring appropriate ventilation.
- Discussions are underway with neighbouring landowners (including Network Rail) and these would continue as the applicant works towards an application submission. However, this is a City Centre scheme and there will inevitably be activities that are associated with a City Centre location that generate some noise impact.
- Members were informed that all apartments would have a balcony
- The Affordable Housing contribution would be delivered at 7%, on-site provision had been considered and it was hoped that this site would be attractive for registered providers, such that it may be possible to have on-site delivery
- Members were informed that a full wind assessment would be undertaken and submitted. The development of Springwell Gardens I had already provided some protection for the application site from prevailing winds, but further mitigation measures would be considered as necessary.
- The Planning Officer confirmed that some overlooking could take place but due to the good separation distance of 25-35 metres, and given that both phases were part of one overall scheme within a high density City landscape, the proposals were seen to be acceptable.
- The maintenance of the greenery was an important factor and further consideration was required, but keeping it adequately maintained would be a priority – particularly given that the greenery on the façade was such a key feature of the design proposal.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- All Members were supportive of the emerging scheme commenting that it was an imaginative, high quality proposal

- Members welcomed the greenery and the inclusion of 3 bedroom flats within the City Centre
- Could a condition be added to address the maintenance of the 'hanging' greenery on the building's façade and that a robust approach for this was secured going forward
- Could more details be provided about the residential amenity, particularly relating to noise impact and adequate ventilation
- Could sample materials be provided, the colour of the materials should better reflect phase 1

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

- Members were supportive with the principle of developing this site for combined residential and commercial use
- Further information was required in respect of the residential use of the building proposed as positioned and designed relative to the adjacent railway sidings
- Members were of the opinion that the tower block proposed would be acceptable in view of wider street scape views, taking account of both the existing and any "future" context (as per already consented schemes)
- The external design of the proposed blocks was considered to be acceptable subject to addressing the comments about materials
- Members were supportive in principle of the emerging designs in respect of the greenery attached to the building
- Members considered the level of car parking to be acceptable in this immediate locality
- In respect of the Council's declaration of the Climate Emergency and the detailed design/ carbon impact, Members expressed the view that the proposals were promising but more details and a commitment to further provisions were required

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

RESOLVED –

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

88 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED - To note that the next meeting will take place on Monday, 6th January 2020 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.

