

## CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 14TH FEBRUARY, 2019

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

Councillors D Blackburn, T Leadley,  
N Walshaw, C Campbell, A Khan,  
A Garthwaite, E Nash, P Carlill, 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.18/04695/OT – Land at 177 Kirkstall Road, Leeds, and PREAPP/18/00583 – College of Technology, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds and was attended by the following Councillors: J Mckenna, A Garthwaite, P Carlill, C Gruen, C Campbell, B Anderson, P Wadsworth, T Leadley and D Blackburn.

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

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

### **131 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.

### **132 Late Items**

There were no late items of business identified.

### **133 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

There were no declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interests.

### **134 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

### **135 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The Minutes of the previous meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2019 were submitted for comment / approval.

**RESOLVED** – That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> January 2019 be accepted as a true and correct record.

### **136 Matters Arising from the Minutes**

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting  
to be held on Thursday, 28th March, 2019

Application No.18/06677/FU (Minute No.125) – With reference to the landscaping treatment Councillor Nash asked if she could be supplied with details of the species of trees to be used.

The City Centre Team Leader confirmed that the requested information would be made available to Councillor Nash.

On the same item one Member queried possible inconsistencies in the public speaking protocol, suggesting that one speaker had spoken twice on the same item which was not permissible under the existing protocol.

In responding the City Centre Team Leader said that during the questioning of another speaker new information came to light which could only be clarified by the previous speaker. It was at the discretion of the Chair that the earlier speaker was permitted to address Panel for a second occasion.

**137 Application No. 18/04695/OT - Outline Application (Access, layout and scale) for residential led scheme for 272 units with ancillary ground floor commercial uses (450 sqm) and undercroft car parking at the corner of Kirkstall Road and Viaduct Road, former Thyssenkrupp Industrial site.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of an application which sought outline planning consent (Access, layout and scale) for a residential led scheme for 272 units with ancillary ground floor commercial uses (450 sqm) and undercroft car parking to land at 177 Kirkstall Road (former Thyssenkrupp Industrial site) corner of Kirkstall Road and Viaduct Road.

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

- Site/ location/ context
- Site layout
- Erection of 4 buildings between 4 and 9 storeys in height
- 272 residential units (127 x 1 bedroom units, 140 x 2 bedroom units and 5 x 3 bedroom units)
- Provision of 3 commercial units
- The site access point is located on Viaduct Road
- Large open space within the site
- Series of pedestrian routes through the site with links to footpaths outside the site
- Landscape proposals/ water features
- Undercroft car parking
- Refuse and cycle storage

- Some sections of the curved boundary wall along Kirkstall Road would be retained

Members raised the following questions:

- The “L” shaped area of land in close proximity to the river, was it in the ownership of the City Council
- Was there connectivity to the river and the canal through the site.
- The Kirkstall Road/ Viaduct Road junction was heavily congested with traffic resulting in poor air quality, could more greenery / hedges be planted near that junction
- How would the car parking at ground level be screened
- It was suggested that some of the pavements appeared narrow and in close proximity to the road, could some of these pavements be widened
- Were Highways Officer’s satisfied with the access onto Viaduct Road
- Were the refuse storage areas large enough to cater for future recycling systems and appropriately orientated within the site
- Would access for refuse vehicles be sufficient

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

- Members were informed that the “L” shaped area of land as identified on the submitted plan was in the ownership of the City Council and it was understood that there were ongoing discussions with Asset Management with regard to its future use.
- Members were informed that access to both the river and the canal was only achieved by Viaduct Road
- Members were informed that part of the retained boundary wall ran along the Kirkstall Road/ Viaduct Road junction, however, it may be possible to include more greenery/ hedges behind the boundary wall
- Members were informed that all residential car parking would be at ground level and under the buildings (Undercroft parking) and would be screened by the use of artistic louvers
- Officers reported that that there may be potential to widen some of the footpaths
- Highways Officer’s confirmed there were no issues with the access point on Viaduct Road and they were satisfied with the proposed arrangements
- The City Centre Team Leader said that servicing requirements and design elements of the development would be considered more in detail at the Reserved Matters stage.
- In offering a comment, the Chief Planning Officer reported that the waste services industry had produced a Guidance Note on Waste Collection Schemes for developers to follow. Combined working with Refuse Services within the Council would also ensure suitable refuse and recycling provision was made.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- It was the general view of Members that this was a good scheme with many positive features
- The majority of Members supported the retention of the curved boundary wall, but queried whether an increase in height to 1.5m (from the proposed 1.2m) could be considered by the applicant.
- There was a desire for more greenery to be incorporated within the scheme
- Could careful consideration be given to the relationship with the Chinese Christian Church and the design of Block D
- Flat sizes should be in accordance with the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS)
- Could further details be provided regarding the number of cycle parking spaces to be provided
- Cycle parking should not be located outside
- Could elements of the scheme reflect some of the design features from the nearby viaduct

In summing up the Chair thanked all parties for their attendance and contributions, he suggested 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 in Appendix 1 of the submitted report (and any others which he might consider appropriate) and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to include the following obligations:

- Provision of 5% of units on-site as affordable housing with standard clause for provision of an off-site commuted sum if required as a fallback position;
- Residential Travel Plan Fund of £67,320 (£20,650 of which is to be expended on a Leeds City Council Car Club free trial membership and usage package);
- Travel Plan Review fee of £4,032;
- Contribution to off-site highway works with possible bus stop upgrade, to be agreed
- £30,000 for amendment to existing TRO's in the area;
- Control over public realm maintenance and 24 hour accessibility;
- Local Employment Initiatives; and
- Any other obligations which arise as part of the application process.

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.

**138 PREAPP/ 18/00525 - Pre Application Presentation for Reserved Matters (Scale, appearance and landscaping) for new Multi Storey Car Park and**

## **impact on extent outline permission at Quarry Hill, Phase 2 (SOYO) Leeds.**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application proposal for Reserved Matters (Scale, appearance and landscaping) for new Multi Storey Car Park and impact on external outline permission at Quarry Hill, Phase 2 (SOYO) Leeds.

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
- City Centre location
- SOYO Masterplan (Caddick Development)
- The appearance, scale and landscaping in relation to the Multi Storey Car Park on phase 2 of the Quarry Hill Development
- Proposed changes to the existing Section 106 Agreement in respect of the operation of the car park( Variation on the use of short stay spaces and removal of post 6.00pm requirements)
- A proposed increase in the number of vehicle spaces from 578 to 610
- Commercial units located at ground level
- Car park façade, diamond motif with natural ventilation
- Plinth element of base (Darker in colour)
- Proposals for public realm / landscaping works
- Lighting scheme – Low level lighting to landscaped areas, security lighting and street lighting

Members raised the following questions:

- Were there any contractual car parking arrangements in place between the West Yorkshire Playhouse and the Victoria Gate multi – storey car park
- Would there be sufficient evening car parking within the Quarry Hill car park given the level of contractual car parking
- How do you discourage work space commuter parking
- The dark coloured base plinth, could this create dark spaces and create areas of unsafety for users and passers-byes
- What would the experience be like for users of the car park generally, particularly considering user safety
- If limitations had previously been placed on the car parking arrangements, why were these deemed to be no longer required
- How had the alterations made to block layout (i.e. folding-plate approach) and internal floorspace altered car parking capacity

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

- Members were informed that there is no contractual link between the West Yorkshire Playhouse and the Victoria Gate multi – storey car park
- The applicant reported that 250 spaces were proposed for contractual car parking, which in their opinion was considered to be sufficient and there was currently no intention to increase that number.
- Members were informed that a full day charge would apply after 5 hours and so punitive charges would be the intended approach to discourage work space commuter parking, which would be monitored over time.
- Members were informed that the base and landscaped areas would be well lit using low level lighting to landscaped areas, security lighting and street lighting. This would be in accordance with acceptable lighting standards.
- It was also reported that CCTV would be operational which required good levels of lighting.
- In offering a comment, the Chief Planning Officer noted that it would always be difficult to control car parking behaviour. However, punitive measures and inclusion of appropriate conditions / s106 obligations could act as a disincentive to commuter parking.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were generally supportive of the application commenting that overall it was a good scheme
- The proposed removal of the post 6.00pm requirements was a concern for the majority of Members

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

- Members considered that the appearance of the Car Park was acceptable
- Members were supportive of the approach to the landscaping around the Multi – Storey Car Park (MSCP)
- Members were supportive of the proposal to increase the number of spaces available in the MSCP
- Members were supportive of the proposed amendments to the short-stay car parking restrictions but were not supportive of the removal of post 6.00pm requirements
- It was the view of Members that the Reserved Matters application for the MSCP, the non-material amendment application and the associated Section 106 Agreement revisions be brought back to Panel for further consideration

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

## 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/18/00583 - Pre-application presentation of proposed Student Residential Accommodation Development with ground floor Commercial Space, site of Leeds College of Technology, Woodhouse Lane, Cookridge Street, and Vernon Street, Leeds LS2 8BL**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application proposal for a student residential accommodation development with ground floor commercial space to site of Leeds College of Technology, Woodhouse Lane, Cookridge Street and Vernon Street, Leeds, LS2 8BL.

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
- City Centre location
- Demolition of existing building and the construction of a 20 storey tower with part 8 and part 6 storey linked elements located to the west.
- Building to contain 458 bed-spaces (379 bedrooms in 4,5,6,7 and 8 bedroom cluster flats and 79 studios)
- Clusters would be 13m<sup>2</sup> with cluster amenity spaces ranging from 23.3m<sup>2</sup> for the four-bedroom clusters to 40.1m<sup>2</sup>. The studios would range in size from 21.6-31.4m<sup>2</sup>, with an average size of 25m<sup>2</sup>. 880m<sup>2</sup> of dedicated amenity space (in addition to the cluster kitchen amenity spaces) would be provided for the students at lower levels of the building.
- Areas for cycle storage, bin storage and plant would be located on the lower levels.
- The 3 inter-linked buildings would create courtyard and public realm areas
- The provision of wider footpaths enhance pedestrian / public realm areas (Public Art with the public realm areas)
- Proposed no parking on Vernon Street
- Materials – Natural stone or reconstituted stone
- Two commercial units along the Woodhouse Lane frontage

Members raised the following questions:

- The size of the apartments appeared to be too small, what were the actual sizes of the living accommodation
- Provision that would be made for communal areas and inclusion of cluster flats vs. studios to combat potential isolation of occupants
- Were there any proposals for the building to be carbon neutral/ achieve BREEAM Excellent standards
- There was a lack of street level greenery, could green walls be considered
- Where would the pick-up and drop off areas be located
- How did the developer intend to work with the Council to ensure the pedestrianisation of Vernon Street and creation of this into an area of public realm provision

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

- Members were informed that the living accommodation for a typical cluster flat was 13m<sup>2</sup> but in addition there was a further 880m<sup>2</sup> of dedicated amenity space for students at the lower levels of the building. Members were informed that there was a push by developers to create more social space to avoid student isolation.
- Members were informed that carbon reduction would be achieved by the use of a central CHP heat recovery system reducing co<sup>2</sup> emissions by up to 30%
- Members were advised that the introduction of green walls within the court yard areas would be considered
- Highways officers reported that an area designated for drop-off/ pick up and loading would be located within the roadway on Cookridge Street

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- Members were generally supportive of the application
- Further details about the size of the living accommodation was required
- Could further consideration be given to the provision of more street level greenery and the use of green walls
- Could further consideration be given to the refuse storage areas, would these areas be large enough to cater for future recycling systems
- Members were of the view that removal of car parking on Vernon Street to create enhanced public realm was important, with the applicant and Council needing to work closely together to ensure this
- Could the stone sets on Vernon street be retained

(With reference to Vernon Street, the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of the "Our Spaces Strategy". Operated by the Regeneration Unit, the scheme receives contributions from developers to fund off-site enhancement works. It may be possible to include Vernon Street as part of that strategy).

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

- Members considered the proposed development of the site for student accommodation was acceptable in principle
- The majority of Members considered the living conditions within the student accommodation to be acceptable. One Member was of the view that the size of the living accommodation was too small
- Members considered that the proposed mass and form of the development and its relationship with the surrounding context to be acceptable
- Members expressed the view that natural stone or reconstituted stone should be used as the primary external building material (having all agreed an amendment to the question put to Members regarding whether natural OR reconstituted stone could be used). A sample panel of the material to be made available for viewing on site.
- Members were supportive of the emerging approach to the public realm, including the aspiration to remove vehicles from Vernon Street

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

**RESOLVED –**

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

**140 Application 18/05017/FU - Removal of Condition 50 (MLLR Delivery) of Approval 16/07938/OT, on land between Barrowby Lane and Manston Lane, Thorpe Park, Leeds - Update Report**

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which provided an update in respect of an application for the removal of Condition 50 (MLLR delivery) of approval 16/07938/OT on land between Barrowby Lane and Manston Lane, Thorpe Park, Leeds.

Members noted that this report had been submitted as part of the agreement to bring regular updates to Panel regarding the Manston Lane Link Road (MLLR).

It was reported that work was currently on schedule with an anticipated completion for the MLLR project of 9<sup>th</sup> April 2019

**RESOLVED –**

- (i) That the contents of the report be noted.

- (ii) To note that the anticipated completion for the MLLR project was 9<sup>th</sup> April 2019

**141 Date and Time of Next Meeting**

**RESOLVED** – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 7<sup>th</sup> March 2019 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.