

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 12TH MARCH, 2020

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,
P Carlill, D Cohen, A Garthwaite, C Gruen,
E Nash, P Wadsworth, N Walshaw,
G Latty, P Gruen, K Ritchie and K Brooks

Plans Panel Members carried out site visits in respect of the following:
PREAPP/19/00477 – Proposed residential development and ancillary commercial uses at former Arla Foods Site, Kirkstall Road, Leeds and
PREAPP/19/00543 – Proposed student residential development and education facility at Brotherton House, Westgate, Leeds and was attended by the following Councillors: D Blackburn, K Brooks, C Campbell, G Latty, E Nash, P Wadsworth and N Walshaw.

128 Election of Chair

In the absence of Councillor J McKenna, Councillor C Gruen was elected Chair for the duration of the meeting.

129 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

130 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.

131 Late Items

Although there were no late items the Chair did accept the inclusion of Supplementary Information in respect of Agenda Item Nos. 9 & 11 – (Application No.19/01666/FU – Mixed use development to land at Kirkstall Hill, Kirkstall, Leeds 5 – Viability Appraisal – Minute No. 136 referred) and (PREAPP/9/00543 – Conversion and extension of existing building to student housing and educational facilities at Brotherton House, Westgate, Leeds 1 – Minute No.138 referred). Members were informed that in both instances the supplementary information was not available at the time of agenda publication/ circulation and it was in the best interests of the Council and other parties concerned that the new information be considered without delay.

132 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

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

133 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A Khan and J McKenna

Councillors: K Brooks and K Ritchie were in attendance as substitute Members.

134 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 20th February 2020 were submitted for comment/ approval.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 20th February 2020 be accepted as a true and correct record.

135 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no issues raised under matters arising.

136 Application No. 18/07433/FU - Erection of 437 dwellings with new roads, open space, landscaping, drainage and associated works at Radial Park, Manston Lane, Leeds, LS15 8ST

With reference to the meeting of 6th January 2020 and the decision to defer consideration to allow further discussions/negotiations with the applicant concerning: Alternative design solutions of the house types; an increase in the provision of photovoltaic cells or adaptability of properties to incorporate cells at a later point, accessible housing provision, unresolved highway issues, incorporation of additional elements linking the development to its former use (and heritage significance of the same).

The Chief Planning Officer now submitted a report indicating that the scheme had been subsequently revised and overall the proposal was in accordance with the Development Plan.

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
- Masterplan
- Provision of accessible housing
- Design and Character/ Heritage
- Sustainability – Provision of solar panels

- The development was in accordance with Strategic Policies SP1 and H1 of the Development Plan and HG2 of the SAP
- Provision of a commuted sum towards off-site playing pitch provision

The Planning Case Officer reported the receipt of one additional representation received after publication of the agenda. The representation raised no new issues and those matters raised were covered in paragraphs 1.4 and 1.8 of the submitted report or earlier reports.

Members raised the following questions to officers/ applicant's representatives

- The roofscape appeared to be very bland, could further consideration be given to make the roofscape more interesting, consider the inclusion of chimneys
- Would there be sufficient electrical supply capacity for adding solar panels in the future

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

- The Planning Officer noted that there was already variety across the site with the inclusion of different roofscapes and levels.
- The architect confirmed that one of the house types from the Strata Development contained chimneys and two house types from the Redrow Development also contained chimneys but further design of the roofscape could be negotiated if deemed necessary
- Members were informed that solar panels could be included as an optional extra and there is sufficient electrical capacity to enable this but it was understood that not all occupiers considered solar panels were a benefit

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- The majority of Members welcomed the application suggesting the scheme was much improved and merits approval but could further refinements be made to the house types and the roofscape in consultation with Ward Members
- Members welcomed the inclusion of some accessible housing units
- Members accepted the viability position on the affordable housing provision
- The retention of the Barnbow Social Club was important to the community, but the additions made to reflect the heritage importance of the site was acknowledged and appreciated

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation, commenting that Members appeared to be supportive of the development

RESOLVED –

- (i) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to a satisfactory Road Safety Audit (Stage 1), final resolution of off-site highway mitigation works, the resolution of replacement playing pitch provision, potential further refinements to some house types and the roofscape (in consultation with Ward Members) the completion of a Section 106 Agreement and subject to the conditions specified in the submitted report. The Section 106 Agreement to secure the following obligations:
- Provision of affordable housing at 7.5%;
 - Commuted sum for replacement sports pitch provision;
 - Provision of bus stops;
 - Off-site highway works;
 - Travel Plan and monitoring provisions;
 - Local employment and skills initiative;
 - Provision of Public Open Space;
 - Commuted sum related to attenuation management; and Community infrastructure payment.
- (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

137 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 sets out details 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 or B1a) together with associated vehicular access, car and cycle parking spaces, bin store, plant, landscaping, amenity space and associated infrastructure and engineering works on land at Kirkstall Hill, Kirkstall, Leeds, LS5 3BH.

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

- Former Super Market site together with a number of vacant buildings in a state of disrepair
- Main access to the site is taken from Beecroft Street
- The proposal 263 dwellings with a mixture of house types: Apartments 183, Townhouses 80
- Residential blocks 3 storey's in height
- Stepped design in response to the level changes across the site.
- Commercial units along Kirkstall Hill/Lane providing active frontage
- The landscaping plan proposes hedge planting, amenity grass, wildflower areas, allotment planters and rain gardens
- Undercroft parking and on-street parking 231 spaces
- Cycle parking 310 spaces
- Materials red brick with stone accents, roof materials grey slate, timber windows reflecting the heritage of the area
- Affordable housing provision 13.6%
- Viability issues

The Panel heard from Councillor J Illingworth (Ward Member) and Mr S Long, a local resident, both were objecting to the proposal.

Councillor Illingworth said that originally Kirkstall Ward Members were supportive of the scheme but engagement with Ward Members and the local community had ceased with a number of outstanding issues still to be addressed. Ward Members now suggested that Panel consider deferral of the application to allow further discussions with the applicant in respect of insufficient affordable housing provision, insufficient on-site greenspace provision and highway safety concerns.

Mr Long said the proposal included a large number of flats, the area did not need any more flats, more family housing was required and the development's design also needed to be considered in more detail. Mr Long said traffic generation continued to be a concern and improvements were required at the junction of Kirkstall Lane and Kirkstall Road as traffic congestion would otherwise be increased. Further, Yorkshire Water have lodged an objection and it is the case that the existing sewerage provision will not be sufficient once the development is complete.

Questions to Councillor J Illingworth

There were no questions to Councillor J Illingworth

Questions to Mr S Long

- What was the view of local residents with regard to this application
- How was it felt that the development would impact on Kirkstall Abbey

In responding Mr S Long said;

- There was resentment in the local area to the application

- Images had not been provided by the developer which indicated how the proposals would 'sit' within the background of Kirkstall Abbey, but there was the potential for it to interfere with historic viewpoints

In response, the Panel heard from Mr C Wilding, applicant's representative who was speaking in support of the proposal.

Mr Wilding said he welcomed the report recommendation which followed a 12 month consultation with the local community (both pre- and post-submission). He said two workshops had been held in the area to explain the proposals and address any concerns raised. He said the development site was challenging with changing levels across the site. The development would deliver some family housing but the proportion of flats was required to maintain a viable scheme and would include affordable housing provision at 13.6% (36 units) now that positive negotiations had taken place with a Housing Association. Technically the proposals met the quantum of Greenspace provision required by the Council's policies although it was recognised that the space was fragmented across the site and in some cases had challenging levels. The parking levels were set to encourage use of more sustainable transport modes in this accessible location. He suggested this site provided an opportunity to create an attractive/innovative design, the developers would also seek to achieve high standards in energy reduction.

Questions to Mr Wilding;

- While the on-screen images provided were small, there appeared to be a lot of red brick, what will be the architectural treatment to avoid a bland appearance
- Could the contribution of £10,000 for off-site greenspace enhancement be increased
- The proposed undercroft parking, was there a potential pollution risk in terms of poor air quality
- Why are more commercial units/shops being proposed, nearby shops already exist
- The existing stone wall on site, could this be retained
- Why were so many flats being proposed
- In terms of viability, had any other models been considered
- Is it appropriate to locate all the affordable housing in two blocks
- Would the external spaces be fully accessible
- Can a bus lane be provided by widening Kirkstall Road
- Had realignment of the scheme been considered to complement the historic neighbouring properties
- The Courtyard and communal space, would these areas be managed and would there be a management fee.
- What discussions had taken place with Ward Councillors
- There would a canyon effect along Kirkstall Road with poor air quality when traffic builds up at the junction with Kirkstall Lane
- Would the pedestrian crossing be improved at nearby junctions

In responding Mr Wilding said:

- The materials would be subject to condition so there was an opportunity for further discussions/negotiations with officers. However it was considered that the detailed treatment of the elevations including the treatment of bays, window reveals and the stepped roofline along the rise of the hill would provide visual interest (with enlarged images shown in the Committee Room being referred to at this stage)
- Due to the viability position and the requirement for other contributions such as affordable housing and CIL it was not possible to increase the off-site greenspace contribution. However the developer was willing to work with the Council to lever in grants towards the enhancement of the adjacent council owned greenspace. The undercroft parking would include the infrastructure for 100% electric charging points and would also be mechanically ventilated
- Due to the levels across the site there was surplus undercroft areas where it was the intention to provide flexible working or commercial space
- Members were informed that it was unlikely the wall would be retained intact in situ due to the need to provide safe working conditions but the stone materials could be reused elsewhere on site
- Members were informed that the intention was to provide a good housing mix across the site but the challenging gradients meant it was more appropriate and viable to provide the majority of the units as flats.
- It was reported that a Build to Rent (BtR) model had been considered, but BtR was less viable in this case and would have resulted in less family accommodation
- The Housing Association that is going to take the affordable units will also be taking the commercial space beneath one of the blocks for their management function and they prefer to see all affordable units located in one place for more efficient management purposes
- The external gradients are challenging and therefore ramps and lifts will need to be provided to provide full accessibility
- An area of land would be provided along Kirkstall Road for road widening purposes which could be used as a bus lane close to the junction with Kirkstall Road if considered necessary
- Members were informed that providing accommodation on the historic alignment across the site had been considered but the view of the architect was that the resulting streets would have been too steep to meet current accessibility requirements
- The communal areas, landscaping and connectivity would be managed by a company that would be funded by a service charge on the accommodation.
- The Ward Councillors were fully consulted prior to submission of the formal application. There were several meetings with ward members, two public meetings and a public web site but there was a “step back” once the application was submitted. If approved the applicant would look to work with Ward Members to discuss greenspace improvements.

- The additional car movements from the development would be small. However, it was important to have robust travel plan measures to encourage people to travel more sustainably and to avoid a worsening of traffic conditions. The Council's Environmental Health Officers had not objected to the proposals on air quality grounds.
- There were existing pedestrian crossings at all the nearby junctions and plans for further improvements for pedestrian connectivity as part of a major highway improvement scheme with the proposed development.

Questions to Officers

- Would there be additional traffic generation as a consequence of this development
- Poor air quality had been raised as a concern
- Were there any bus and cycle interventions proposed

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

- The LCC Highway Officer said this development would not have a significant impact on the highway network, with this being envisaged as less than that which would have been generated if any office or commercial use of the site had come forward
- Any Travel Plan put in place would be reviewed and monitored by Highways on an ongoing basis, which ensures it is robust and appropriately enforced to ensure a sustainable approach to transport is introduced and maintained
- Environmental Studies into air quality had raised no objections
- Members were informed that a wider footpath would ease problems at the bus stop

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- Members were of the view that this was a difficult site to develop but there was a desire to see the site be brought back into use
- Members acknowledged that the proposal could not fix the strategic traffic issues in the area and it would be inappropriate to in any way expect this development to do so, as any measures introduced are required to mitigate the impact of this specific development.
- A number of Members expressed the view that the highway network within the area was already at full capacity and could the issue of highway infrastructure be looked at further.
- There were a lot of positives which would help to regenerate the site
- Members were generally supportive of the proposed architectural design
- One Member raised concerns about the relationship of the affordable housing blocks close to a busy road junction

- A number of Members wanted the affordable housing provision to be increased and “pepper potted” across the site
- A number of Members expressed concern about the perimeter treatment with a need for enhanced planting and green walls to address air quality
- Members noted that the viability assessment contained significant contingency funding and in the event of profit levels exceeding that stated in the viability position then an overage clause should be included in the legal agreement to increase the contributions towards the Section 106 obligations to provide a policy compliant position as far as possible.

Officers advised that the recommendation in the report could be amended to require officers to negotiate provision of enhanced green walls and planting along Beecroft Street and near block E, pursue reuse of the stone wall material and incorporate an overage clause in the Section 106 agreement pursuant to the requested delegated authority.

Following discussion and a vote, the majority of Members were supportive of the officer recommendation as amended above.

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation, commenting that Members were supportive of the application but materials from the existing stone wall should be reused, more greenery and perimeter planting was required and that the inclusion of an overage clause was required in the Section 106 agreement.

RESOLVED –

- (i) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) subject to materials from the existing stone wall being re-used, provision of more greenery and perimeter planting, and inclusion of an overage clause in the Section 106 agreement and following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement.

The Section 106 Agreement to include the following obligations (and any other if considered necessary and appropriate, including the provision noted above):

- Provision for 13.6% affordable housing
- Travel Plan Fund of £131,632 + Travel Plan Monitoring Fee £3978
- Car Club Space £7000
- Off-site Greenspace enhancement of £10,000
- Local employment and skills initiative
- Parking Control Zone

- (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.

138 PREAPP/19/00477 - PRE-APPLICATION PRESENTATION FOR OUTLINE PROPOSAL 'THE TANNERY' - MIXED USE SCHEME COMPRISING BUILD TO RENT (BTR) RESIDENTIAL WITH ANCILLARY GROUND FLOOR MIXED USES INCLUDING SMALL SCALE RETAILING, CAFÉ/RESTAURANTS, BARS AND CRÈCHE ON THE FORMER ARLA FOODS SITE ON THE SOUTHERN SIDE OF KIRKSTALL ROAD AND FRONTING THE RIVER AIRE

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application proposal for an outline proposal “The Tannery” – mixed use scheme comprising build to rent (BtR) residential with ancillary ground floor mixed uses including small scale retailing, café/restaurant bars and crèche on the former Arla food site on the southern side of Kirkstall Road and fronting the River Aire.

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
- Large scale redevelopment of a brown-field site
- Kirkstall Road is located to the north of the site, the River Aire and towpath of the Leeds Liverpool Canal are positioned to the south
- The proposal, build to rent residential development, six blocks on a site which is L-shaped, 7 to 16 storey’s in height delivering 640 residential units
- Surface level car parking (230 spaces) cycle parking to be determined
- Supporting commercial uses on ground floor
- Single point of vehicular access/egress would be provided on Kirkstall Road with an exit only on Washington Street
- Public realm, public open space, landscaping and greenspace proposals
- Pedestrian access/ service arrangements
- Affordable housing 7% (Compliant with Core Strategy Policy H5)
- Energy/ Sustainability Strategy to be provided
- Full wind assessment to be undertaken
- Flood risk assessment to be provided

Members raised the following questions:

- There appeared to be a significant amount of visible car parking, could some of this be hidden

- Does the car parking provision reflect a city centre location
- Would flood alleviation measures be included within the development
- The overall alignment and design of the buildings appears to be “too boxy” and perpendicular to each other, could this be re-visited
- The illustrations provided did not provide a true representation of the development, with better quality images being needed before Members could necessarily be expected to give a clear ‘steer’ regarding design
- Had balconies been considered
- How was it intended that the public realm space proposed would be ‘activated’

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

- The architect stated that the car parking was located in undercroft areas or enclosed by buildings to limit street views as far as possible. He suggested the car parking could be further clustered to free up other areas and more green infrastructure could screen the car parking areas
- The City Centre Team Leader reported that the car parking provision for this development was 37% similar to some other fringe city centre developments where less than the allowable maximum parking levels had been approved, however, it was understood the developers were encouraging less car travel and parking areas would revert back to landscaping if not used at a later date once occupation of the development increased and the extent of active use of car parking facilities had been gauged.
- Members were informed that the proposal would be constructed in line with the requirements and limitations of the FAS2 scheme and would also include a wall 600mm in height, which would be incorporated within the landscaped area. As with other city centre development sites that are within the flood risk zone, this would be developed with the appropriate mitigation measures incorporated as identified through subsequent analysis and evolution of the proposal
- The architect suggested that the proposed arrangement of the buildings presented an opportunity to create large areas of open space and clear pedestrian connections through the site
- The LCC Design Officer suggested the detailed building design was still to be established and Members need to see how the architecture evolves, with the images currently shown being at an early stage and therefore indicative only
- The architect said that balconies were not included within the design brief
- Consideration could be given to development of a riverside park-style element within the development redline

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- The majority of Members welcomed the proposals

- Could significant landscaping/ greenspace provision be incorporated along the Kirkstall Road frontage to mitigate against traffic pollution and provide a buffer to the residential blocks
- There needs to be significant greenspace and permeability throughout the site
- Consider the use of photovoltaic cells and/or green infrastructure to screen surface level parking
- Strong sustainable design and construction measures need to be included in the development, with this site presenting the opportunity for something very innovative to be brought forward
- There appeared to be too much hard surfacing and the use of grasscrete should be considered for the surface parking areas
- More internal communal space was required to encourage people to socialise
- The width of the riverside walkway should be widened at the pinch points

In offering comments on the officer's questions in the submitted report:

- Members were generally supportive of the proposed uses for the site
- Members were supportive of the emerging scale but further refinement and information on the details of the design was required, with a less formulaic design to be considered
- Members were supportive of the emerging approach to public realm but further landscaping/ greenspace provision was suggested and particularly along the Kirkstall Road frontage
- Members were supportive of the connectivity proposals but could further consideration be given to extending the width of the riverside walkway at the pinch points and ensuring greater connectivity to the riverside and east-west
- Further consideration was required around the approach to car parking provision on site including the level of parking that is required in this sustainable location
- Consider innovative and attractive flood alleviation measures
- Members expressed an aspiration for the provision of a river bus/water taxi

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.

139 PREAPP/19/00543 - Pre application proposal for conversion and extension of existing building to student housing and educational facilities at Brotherton House, Westgate, Leeds, LS1 2RS

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application proposal for conversion and extension of existing building to student housing and educational facilities at Brotherton House, Westgate, Leeds, LS1 2RS.

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
- Refurbishment/ conversion of the vacant Brotherton House and the construction of a new 15 storey block for 102 purpose built student housing flats (Providing 350 bedspaces)
- The accommodation would be across both the existing building and the proposed new building; 56 studio flats and 46 cluster flats
- The new block to include communal areas, educational use including lecture theatre and teaching rooms over three lower floors
- External works to existing building including refurbishment of the windows, glazed link connecting the two buildings at ground floor level
- Retention of historic features
- The material for the new building would include white concrete tiles/ panels with clearly defined base, middle and top. Dark bronze window frames would be set within a 200mm deep reveal window. The eastern and western gables would feature a projecting bay of windows framed with dark bronze coloured metal
- Amenity through the building/ public realm/ landscaping
- External roof terraces
- Two disabled car parking spaces, electric vehicle charging points provided on site
- Pick up and drop off, refuse servicing and cycle parking would be from Grace Street/ St Paul's Street and managed by the applicant
- Building to achieve 20% better than the carbon emission target in the 2013 Part L Building Regulations and a minimum of 10% energy generation would be developed through renewable energy sources

Members raised the following questions:

- Members requested if the glazed link connecting the two buildings could be raised to first floor level
- Given the proximity of the Westgate tunnel, was air quality an issue in this area
- What was the approach to the boundary treatment and soft landscaping generally

- Would green walls be incorporated within the development
- The new building was very dominant compared with neighbouring buildings. Was the site in a location identified for tall buildings in the Council's tall building guide
- Can the new building be moved onto the adjacent council land to provide greater separation
- The inclusion of some affordable units as part of the student accommodation proposed would be welcome
- Is the proposed educational use independent or linked to the student use

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

- The architect said that the Leeds Civic Trust had also raised issue with the glass link being included in the position proposed, but the preference was to retain the glass link in its current position to as to ensure a single point of entry at ground floor level.
- The architect suggested that there were many areas on the site where greenery: grass, trees and hedges could be planted to mitigate air quality and provide an enhanced green boundary treatment
- The architect said that at this stage green walls were an aspiration but due consideration to their inclusion would be given
- The City Centre Team Leader stated that the site was located in an identified preferred location for a tall buildings.
- The LCC Design Officer suggested that more consideration should be given to the views of the southern aspect of the development and images of viewpoints could be provided to Members when the application returns to Panel, but it was positive that original materials were being retained and the existing design proposed could be finessed from its early iterations within the parameters of the tall buildings' design guidance
- The architect stated that a number of TPO trees would be affected if the new building was moved on to the Council owned land
- The City Centre Team Leader said currently there was no LCC Policy for developments comprising student accommodation to incorporate affordable units
- The educational space could be used flexibly both by students within the development (such as for study space) and / or let out to universities and other training providers

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- The majority of Members welcomed the development, suggesting Brotherton House had stood empty for many years and it would be nice to see it being brought back into use
- Could the building be designed to take into account night time safety, including the use of active frontages and mitigate against dark or isolated areas.

- Could further consideration be given to the southern aspect of the new building and the new building needs to be shown in the wider context of existing and emerging tall buildings in this area

In offering comments on the officers' questions in the report:

- Members were of the view that the principle of purpose-built student housing with educational use was acceptable at this site
- Members were supportive of the emerging layout and scale of the proposed building, however, further reconsideration of the appearance of the new building in relation to neighbouring buildings was required
- Members expressed the view that the proposed amenity and housing quality was likely to be broadly acceptable for this site
- Subject to the satisfactory resolution of detailed technical matters, Members were of the view that little or no car parking, the servicing provision and accessibility at the site to be acceptable, subject to acceptable pick-up and drop-off arrangements being made (both for taxis and at the start / beginning of academic terms)
- Could the building be designed to take into account night time safety, including the use of active frontages and mitigate against dark or isolated areas.

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

140 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 2nd April 2020 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds