

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 12TH JULY, 2018

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

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

A Member's site visit was held in connection with the following applications:  
Application No.18/02523/FU – Cloberry Street, Leeds, Application No.  
18/01819/FU – Hume House, Tower House Street, Leeds and Application No.  
18/02139/FU – Q1 residence, Wade Lane, Leeds and was attended by the  
following Councillors: J Mckenna, A Khan, A Garthwaite, E Nash, C Gruen,  
R Grahame, C Campbell, B Anderson, P Wadsworth, T Leadley and D  
Blackburn

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

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

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

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

### **25 Late Items**

There were no late items of business to be considered.

### **26 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

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

### **27 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor P Carlill.

Councillor R Grahame was in attendance as a substitute Member

### **28 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018 were submitted for comment / approval.

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2018 be accepted as a true and correct record.

**29 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

There were no issues raised under Matters Arising.

**30 Application No. 18/01819/FU - Demolition of existing building and erection of 37 storey student accommodation building, Hume House, Wade Lane, Merrion Way and Tower House Street, Leeds**

With reference to the meeting of 15<sup>th</sup> February 2018 when Members received a pre-application presentation in respect of this site.

The Chief Planning Officer now submitted a report which set out details of an application which sought the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a 37 storey student accommodation building at Hume House, Wade Lane, Merrion Way and Tower House Street, Leeds 2.

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

Planning Officers together with the applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- The proposal was to demolish the existing building and to construct a 37 storey building in its place. The long axis of the building would align with Wade Lane to the southeast rather than Tower House Street as the present structure. As such, the spine of the building would run south-west to north east. The slender southern elevation of the building would project approximately 11m forward of the existing building towards Merrion Way albeit the lowest two levels above ground primarily around the southern and western frontage would be set some 3m further inboard. The upper body of the building also oversails areas of the lowest levels on the eastern elevation. At its closest point the northern elevation of the building would be 8.5m from the Arena Village tower and the west corner 11m from Arena Point, albeit the orientation of the building to its neighbours is such that distances markedly increase from these positions.
- The building would have two small areas of basement. The ground floor of the student accommodation building would comprise the reception and management offices, a common room including a double-height space around the southern entrance, and other supporting facilities such as the management suite and bicycle storage. Level 1 would contain an additional common room and services including the laundrette, plant room and bin store served by its own lift. Further study rooms are proposed at Level 24 and 35. Excluding the cluster space 546m<sup>2</sup> of internal dedicated amenity space is proposed and an external roof terrace is identified at Level 35 (204m<sup>2</sup>). The

student accommodation comprises a mix of studios (22m<sup>2</sup>) and 4, 5 and 6 bedroom clusters (study cluster bedrooms would typically be 14m<sup>2</sup>). Associated kitchen / living areas would be 21-24m<sup>2</sup> for 4 bedroom clusters; 25-27m<sup>2</sup> for 5 bedroom clusters; and 30-35m<sup>2</sup> for 6 bedroom clusters. In total, 96 studios and 135 clusters (656 bedrooms) are proposed, 752 bedspaces overall.

- Active areas at the lowest two levels of the building would have double-height glazing with a cantilevered soffit height of approximately 7.5m. Above this point the building extrudes vertically to level 25 above which the component fronting Merrion Way checks back and in and terminates with a roof terrace above level 35. On the Wade Lane elevation a full height recess distinguishes the southern component from the longer northern component which continues up to level 37. The arrangement fronting Tower House Street is different as beyond the recess the central section of the building projects out 5 metres for a length of 15m before stepping back to the northern section of the building.
- Above the double height glazed base the main body of the building would be ordered and disciplined, formed of smaller domestic elements of which it would be composed. It is intended that a high-quality off-white artificial stone with a light acid etching is used as the principal building material. Moulded panels may be introduced at the plinth level to add additional texture. Building fenestration and architectural metalwork would contrast with the cladding with a rich anodic bronze coating.
- A new layby would be formed on the east side of Tower House Street to be used for deliveries and student drop-off at the beginning and end of years. It is intended to reduce kerb-levels and to enhance the surface to make Tower House Street more pedestrian-friendly. A new paved surface is proposed to the public realm immediately surrounding the development. Raised planters would be introduced towards the north side of the building, including new street trees, together with totem structures to assist in wind mitigation. Similar totem structures are proposed to the front, southern end, of the building as wind mitigation but also intended to serve the dual purpose of public art. A specimen tree would be planted closer to Merrion Way to replace the existing tree that would need to be removed.
- The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement which considers the impact of the development upon daylight, sunlight and overshadowing; built heritage; townscape and visual impact; and wind microclimate. The application is also supported by an acoustic report; air quality assessment; arboricultural and tree report; archaeological assessment; a design and access statement; an ecology assessment; an energy statement; a flood risk assessment and drainage strategy; a phase I ground conditions report; a lighting impact assessment; a planning statement; a statement of community involvement; a transport

statement; a travel plan; a utilities statement; and a waste management strategy.

Members raised the following questions:

- With reference to the ground floor plan, the overhang, how far would it project out.
- Were the living areas to all the cluster flats the same size.
- Referring to the space at the rear of the proposed development, what was the distance to the neighbouring property (walkable space)
- Was there an evacuation plan for residents occupying the upper floors
- Was there a lighting scheme planned for the development
- Were there any recycling facilities proposed
- Members queried the species of trees to be planted in the public realm area
- How would maintenance of the internal common areas be undertaken
- How would access into and around the building be controlled.
- Had a wind study been undertaken
- It appears there would be a lot of development taking place in the immediate area at the same time, how was the Council managing co-ordination
- How would the arrival of student residents be managed at the start of term time

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

- It was confirmed that the upper floors of the building would project 3 metres beyond the lower two floors.
- Members were informed that the cluster flats would not all have the same living room size; a 4 bed cluster unit would have a 21-24sqm living area, a 5 bed cluster would have a 25-27 sqm living area, a 6 bed cluster unit would have 30-35 sqm living area.
- Members were informed that the distance between the two properties was the width of a footpath (3.5m)
- It was reported that work was ongoing to developed both a fire strategy and also an evacuation strategy, both of which would be signed off by Building Control.
- It was confirmed that a full lighting scheme was currently being developed, a key feature being no dark spots
- Members were informed that both an energy strategy and a waste strategy were being planned for the building including the possible use of recycling shoots
- Members were informed that the types of trees to be used were detailed in paragraph 9.6.1 of the submitted report and would be in accordance with NRWLP policy Land 2.
- It was reported that maintenance of the common areas would be carried out by the management company who would put in place a maintenance routine

- Members were informed that all residents would be issued with a key fob to access the building and the common areas within
- It was confirmed that a wind impact survey had been undertaken and had confirmed the site and adjacent areas would be safe for all users.
- The Central Area Team Leader confirmed that planning conditions would require the agreement of a construction management plan for this proposal plus others in the neighbouring area. It was also understood that discussions were ongoing to use the same building contractor who was involved in a nearby development.
- It was reported that a management plan for the arrival of residents would be developed, each student being allocated with a specific time slot for arrival.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members welcomed the changes that had been made to the application following comments made at the pre application stage
- Members expressed the view that this was now a really good scheme.

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

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

- Accommodation for use solely by students in full-time higher education;
- Travel plan review fee of £3,180;
- Implementation of travel plan;
- Contribution of £430,000 towards Merrion Way highway improvements;
- Local employment and training initiatives;
- Section 106 management fee of £1500.

In the event of the Section 106 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.

**31 Application 18/02139/FU - Erection of a part 11, part 18 storey building for student accommodation including facilities, comprising 98 studios, and the provision of communal facilities in the basement of the adjacent building, a landscaping scheme and all associated works at the site of the Q1 Residence, Wade Lane, Leeds.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application which sought the erection of a part 11, part 18 storey building for student accommodation including facilities, comprising 98 studios and the provision of communal facilities in the basement of the adjacent building, a

landscaping scheme and all associated works at the site of the Q1 Residence, Wade Lane, Leeds 2.

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

Planning Officers together with the applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- The proposed development sought to provide 98 studio dwellings, for occupation by students. These units would be set out such that floors 1 to 10 would each contain 7 studios and floors 11 to 17 would each contain 4 studios.
- The units would be laid out in the following range with regard to the range of internal floorspace:

10 studios of 21 sq metres  
17 studios of 22 sq metres  
37 studios of 23 sq metres  
17 studios of 29 sq metres  
17 studios of 31 sq metres

- The proposal would include a range of high quality communal facilities within some 200 sq. metres at the ground floor of the proposed building, comprising a lounge, reception area, a breakfast room and study rooms/pods. In addition, a plant room and bin store room will be located at the lower ground floor level.
- Further to this the Applicant states that occupiers would also be able to make use of the lower ground floor of the existing Q One building, which will provide a cinema room (c. 30 – 40sqm), a games room (c.80sqm), a storage area for students (c. 30-40sqm) and additional cycle stands. In addition the Developer also states that student occupiers would be given free annual membership of the nearby Pure Gym at the Merrion Centre.

Officers reported the receipt of a late objection on the grounds that the proposed development would be the fourth high rise student building in the area and would increase stress on local amenities.

Addressing the objection it was the view of officers that there would be no detriment to the mixed use character and amenities in the area, traffic would be reduced because there were less cars associated with the site and there was no displacement of housing in this area.

Members were also updated on the submission of a wind report confirming that the proposal in conjunction with the proposed 37 storey building on the opposite side of Wade Lane would not result in unsafe wind conditions and

were advised that there were no outstanding highway and wind impact issues to resolve and the recommendation should be amended accordingly.

Members raised the following questions:

- There appeared to be a significant amount of cycle spaces but would they be used.
- The proposed development was in close proximity to the inner ring road, had the necessary investigations been carried out to ensure there would be no impact on the inner ring road curtain wall.
- If there was an impact on the inner ring curtain wall who would be liable
- Would there be a pedestrian crossing located on Wade Lane.
- Wade Lane was a wide road, could a pedestrian refuge be installed in close proximity to the proposed development
- The windows for each apartment, did they run from floor to ceiling
- When would work begin on site and when would it be completed by.

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

- The Highway Officer confirmed that currently there was no monitoring of purpose built student accommodation (usage of cycle facilities) such information may be provided at a later date
- Officers reported that a technical strategy had been provided, the applicants preferring a cantilever method of construction. The Central Area Team Leader stated that a considerable amount of experience had been obtained for construction near the ring road including agreement of the foundation construction details with the Council's Highways Bridges Section.
- The City Solicitor confirmed that any impact on the inner ring road that was within the "red line" of the development would be the responsibility of the applicant
- Officers confirmed that a signalled crossing was already in place on Wade Lane.
- The Highways Officer confirmed there was insufficient space for an additional pedestrian refuge at this location.
- It was confirmed the windows would run from floor to ceiling
- The applicant suggested that work would begin on site around the end of the year with possible completion by the summer of 2021

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- The suggestion made by Members at the pre application stage that the position of the building be shifted appeared to be a positive contribution
- Members welcomed the proposal suggesting it was a good scheme.

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

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the appendix of the submitted report (and any others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate) and following the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the following obligations:

1. Occupation of the units by students only
2. Employment and training of local people
3. A monitoring and evaluation fee for the Travel Plan of £2500.00
4. Tree loss mitigation
5. A management fee – dependent on the number of obligations

In the event of the Section 106 agreement having not been completed within 3 months of the Panel resolution to grant planning permission, the final determination of the applications shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

**32 Application 18/02523/FU - Construction of a new teaching block including landscaping, access improvements and other associated works at the University of Leeds campus, Cloberry Street, Woodhouse, Leeds.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application which sought the construction of a new teaching block including landscaping, access improvements and other associated works at the University of Leeds campus, Cloberry Street, Woodhouse, Leeds 2.

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

Planning Officers together with the applicant's representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- The proposed development sought to build a 6 storey teaching building as part of an expansion of facilities to meet the growing demand of the University's Business School. The building would house lecture, tutorial and other teaching spaces as well as a ground floor ancillary A3 cafe space. This A3 café would face out on to an existing landscaped area, which was to be retained and enhanced. In addition, the proposal sought to improve pedestrian connectivity through and around the site, with better linkages to the nearby Western campus, and along Cloberry Street back into the main campus. The scheme also aims to improve the setting of the adjacent substation, which cannot be relocated by creating more greenery to effectively screen more of the structure from public view.
- The site was an existing surface car park and landscaped green area to the north west of the University's Estates Services and nursery buildings and was set within the Woodhouse Conservation Area and



more specifically the character area within this wider definition of the Woodhouse Lane-University Precinct Conservation Area. There were a number of listed buildings in close proximity to the site, these being at: Fairbairn House, Clarendon Road and Boundary Wall, properties on Lyddon Terrace, 1-8 Woodsley Terrace and Boundary Wall, Leeds Grammar School and Leeds Grammar School Chapel.

- The wider area was characterised by an eclectic mix of red brick former Victorian terrace houses, and a wide variety of university teaching, support services and halls of residence buildings of different architectural eras, heights and massing.

The Panel then heard from Dr H Hubbard, a local resident who was objecting to the proposal because the proposed development would impact on the parking and access arrangements for the area. Dr Hubbard was also of the view that the building was too high and imposing for the surrounding area and there was a lack of clarity in the University's site plan as to how the proposed development would fit with the future of the temporary Estates Office building.

Questions to the objector - None

The Panel then heard from the University's representative Claire Linley (Planning Agent) who spoke in support of the application.

Members were informed that the University had experienced substantial growth in recent years. The proposed application would assist in the development of the Business School and would also seek to promote access to the existing spaces. There was currently uncontrolled parking in the area and this could be addressed by use of Traffic Regulation Orders.

Questions to the applicant

- Why was this application not presented to the Panel as a pre application proposal
- Members queried the proposed colour of the building due to its location in a red brick setting
- Members expressed concern that views to a nearby Victorian façade would be obscured
- The estates office building, when would temporary planning permission lapse
- Was Cloberry Street in the control of the University
- How many residential car parking places are likely to be displaced
- Had any consultation taken place with local residents
- was the University able to mitigate some of the parking issues
- Could the cobbles on Cloberry Street be retained

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

- Members were informed that prior to submission of the application the scheme had changed and in view of the University's aspirations to deliver the building in a particular time period it was considered not appropriate to present as a pre application proposal (The City Solicitor advised that the submission of a pre application proposal was not a material consideration)
- The proposed colour was chosen to complement some of the existing buildings in the area but the building also had to have its own identity.
- It was suggested that views would be lost for whatever building was erected but it should be noted that some important views would be retained.
- It was reported that the temporary planning for the estates office would lapse in 2021.
- Members were advised that Cloberry Street was likely to be an adopted highway, but clarification around ownership was being sought
- The Highways Agent reported that there was some permit parking but there was a lot of uncontrolled parking in the area. In order to deliver the travel plan the uncontrolled parking had to be addressed and this would ultimately safeguard resident parking.
- Members were informed that a consultation event had taken place, six people had attended.
- It was reported that the existing multi storey car park had spare capacity and the provision of a transport strategy would show there was available car parking
- The Architects for the scheme stated the cobbles would be retained as a condition of planning approval

#### Questions to Council Officers

- Was the provision of three disabled parking bays sufficient
- Why were parking spaces on the public highway being taken away
- Was it proposed that Cloberry Street would be closed
- It was suggested that the submission of a Position Statement may have been useful.

In responding to the issues raised, officers said:

- The Highways officer confirmed the level of disabled parking was in accordance with development standards
- The Highways officer suggested that some carriageway may be lost but not necessarily parking spaces, current parking was uncontrolled
- The Highway officer confirmed that Cloberry Street would be accessible to pedestrians and cycles only
- The Central Area Team Leader suggested that a Position Statement for a development of this size and complexity would normally only be submitted if there were outstanding issues that officers were seeking a steer on from Plans Panel.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- The majority of Members expressed the view that they could not support this application, it was too over dominant and not in keeping with the surrounding area.
- A discussion needs to take place about the retention of the greenspace
- The scale and massing of the development was all wrong
- The computer generated graphics (CGI) gave the impression that the development is a bland grey concrete building, what is required is more interesting use of materials and colour.
- The use of materials need to respect the Conservation Area
- Consideration needs to be given to the future of the temporary Estates Building
- The highway/ residential parking issues had not been satisfactorily addressed
- A fundamental rethink was required, the application should be deferred

In summing up the Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and contributions.

The Chair suggested that from the discussion it was apparent that Members were not supportive of the scheme in its present form and that further consideration around the scale/ massing of the building, the use of materials /colour and the impact on the Conservation Area was required.

**RESOLVED** – That the application be deferred for further consideration around the scale/ massing of the building, the use of materials /colour and the impact on the Conservation Area.

### **33 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2018 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.