

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 15TH NOVEMBER, 2018

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, T Leadley,
N Walshaw, C Campbell, A Khan,
A Garthwaite, E Nash, P Carlill,
B Anderson, D Cohen, P Wadsworth,
K Brooks and R Grahame

A Member's site visit was held in connection with the following applications:
Application No.18/04278/FU – Bingley Street, Leeds and the Wellington Place
Development, Whitehall Road, Leeds and was attended by the following
Councillors: K.Brooks; R.Grahame; J.Mckenna; E.Nash; C.Campbell;
B.Anderson; P.Wadsworth; T.Leadley and D.Blackburn

83 Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair's welcomed to the meeting students from Leeds Beckett University who were studying for a Degree in Journalism. In addressing the group the Chair said he hoped that they would find the proceedings of a Plans Panel meeting interesting and informative.

84 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

85 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.

86 Late Items

There were no late items of business identified.

87 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

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

88 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: C Gruen and J Goddard.

Councillors: K Brooks and R Grahame were in attendance as substitutes.

89 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 25th October 2018 were submitted for comment/ approval.

With reference to Minute No.80, residential development at Lisbon Square, Leeds 1, it was stated that Members had discussed the possible use of platform lifts, in particular for outdoor use, to provide improved access to the building, but this was not reflected within the minutes.

RESOLVED – That with the inclusion of the above, the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25th October 2018 be accepted as a true and correct record.

90 Matters Arising from the Minutes

Pre-application proposal Leeds General Infirmary Site (Minute No.81 referred)
Members sought clarification on the number of new car parking spaces that would be created, the minute suggested that an additional 200 spaces would be created, was this figure correct given that the proposal included a new multi-storey car park.

In responding the City Centre Team Leader said the figure of 200 was correct, as a consequence of the new development some existing parking within the site would be lost but with the provision of a new multi storey car park, overall, an additional 200 spaces would be created.

91 Application No.18/04278/FU - Redevelopment of restaurant site to provide student accommodation up to 11 storeys with ancillary facilities, access and landscaping at 6 Bingley Street, Woodhouse, Leeds LS3 1LX

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application for the redevelopment of a restaurant site to provide student accommodation up to 11 storeys in height with ancillary facilities, access and landscaping at 6 Bingley Street, Woodhouse, Leeds, LS3 1LX.

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 and the applicant's representative responded to Members queries:

- Site/ location/ context
- Nearby premises
- Purpose built student accommodation, part 8 and 11 story's in height
- 90 student flats (29 studio flats and 61 cluster flats)
- Materials; bronze anodic metal cladding with glazed curtain wall
- Communal areas/ Courtyard/ roof top communal space

- Service arrangements/ deliveries
- Pedestrian access
- A minimum of 10% energy generation through the use of a combined heat and power system (CHP) and the use of roof top solar panels (Scheme to achieve BREEAM Excellent for multi- residential buildings)

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- Were the size of the cluster flats considered acceptable
- Could an explanation be provide about the variation in kitchen sizes of the cluster flats
- Had balconies been considered
- Had the necessary statutory consultations taken place
- Would the roof terrace be available to all residents
- How would the internal space be managed and also the roof top space
- Members sought clarification on the colour/ shade of the external materials
- Referring to the size of the cluster bedrooms (13.5sqm) one Member asked if the amount of “unusable space” within the bedroom had been calculated
- One Member queried if the development would generate a CIL Contribution (Community Infrastructure Levy)
- It was noted that 9 new Hornbeam trees were proposed for the courtyard area. One Member expressed the view that only having one species of tree may not be appropriate, suggesting that additional species, birch, for example should also be considered to maximise the potential to provide a long term and robust planting treatment

In responding to the issues raised, the applicants representatives together council officers said:

- The City Centre Team Leader said there were no established space standards for student cluster flats. In this case it was considered that each of the student rooms would provide adequate space for sleeping, studying and bathroom facilities. There would also be sufficient space for communal kitchen and living functions for each cluster flat. The provision of communal space would encourage residents to socialise outside their private accommodation and provide additional amenity space. It was therefore considered that the residents would benefit from acceptable levels of internal amenity.
- Members were informed that there were a number of constraints associated with site; it was on different levels, there were restricted uses to Bingley Street, a full width public footpath would be provided, service vehicles would only use land owned by the developer. It was suggested that all these constraints led to anomalies in the design of the building and the variation in kitchen sizes.
- The applicant suggested the outside social space was generous, neighbouring properties had indicated balconies would not be welcome and there would also be security issue around the use of balconies

- Members were informed that a fire safety strategy had been undertaken
- It was confirmed that the roof terrace would be available to all residents
- The whole of the building would be managed / controlled by the site operator. A management strategy would be prepared and agreed in consultation with the local Planning Authority which would include the use of the roof terrace and the permitted hours of use. This matter would be controlled by a planning condition
- The City Centre Team Leader stated the material sample colour shown at the Panel site visit and also displayed as CGIs (computer generated graphics) in the applicants presentation offered a true representation of the colour to be used
- The architect said the amount of unusable space within the cluster flat had not been calculated. The Chief Planning Officer offered a cautionary note, suggesting it was not appropriate for the Local Planning Authority to go into such miniscule levels of detail in order to determine the application
- Members were informed that the process for collecting and delivering the CIL levy was already operational. The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that the CIL Regulations determine the percentage of CIL that is allocated to strategic infrastructure and to neighbourhoods, with 15% being used for local projects and distributed through the Community Committees where no Neighbourhood Plan is in place 25% is payable to the Parish Council where a Neighbourhood Plan is in place.
- The species of trees to be used would be agreed with the local planning authority pursuant to the landscape condition (No.13)

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were supportive of the proposed development
- Members welcomed the intention by the developers for the scheme to achieve BREEAM Excellent status for multi- residential buildings
- Members considered the impact on neighbouring properties was acceptable
- Could Officers ensure that appropriate species of trees were used in the landscape scheme and agreed by condition
- Could the developer consider using the former restaurant archway as a landscape feature

(On the latter point the applicant confirmed that consideration would be given to the inclusion of the former restaurant archway within the landscape scheme)

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

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

- Restriction on occupancy to full-time students only
- Traffic regulation order contribution £7500
- Off-site tree planting contribution £9180
- Travel plan monitoring fee £2500
- Cooperation with local jobs and skills initiatives

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

92 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 6th December 2018 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.