

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY, 2020

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

Councillors D Blackburn, C Campbell,
P Carlill, D Cohen, A Garthwaite, C Gruen,
A Khan, E Nash, P Wadsworth,
N Walshaw, P Gruen and J Taylor

Application reference 19/03590/FU – residential development at Tower Works, Globe Road, Leeds, Application reference 19/02455/RM –office development at Whitehall Riverside, Whitehall Road, Leeds, Application reference 19/06879/RM – office development at Wellington Place, Whitehall Road, Leeds and Pre application reference PREAPP/19/00563 – Proposed student residential development at former Santander offices, Merrion Street, Leeds and was attended by the following Councillors: D Blackburn, C Campbell, A Garthwaite, P Gruen, A Khan, J McKenna, E Nash, J Taylor and P Wadsworth

116 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

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

117 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.

118 Late Items

Although there were no late items the Chair did accept the inclusion of Supplementary Information in respect of Agenda Item No. 6 (Minutes of the previous meeting held on 30th January 2020). Members were informed that the minutes were not available at the time of agenda publication/ circulation and it was considered to be in the best interests of the Council and other parties concerned that they be considered without delay. (Minute No. 121 referred)

119 Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests

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

120 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor G Latty.

Councillor J Taylor was in attendance as a substitute Member.

121 Minutes - 30th January 2020

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 30th January 2020 were submitted for comment/ approval.

Members recalled that the meeting had been disrupted by protesters and subsequently suspended, could this be reflected within the minutes

RESOLVED – That, with the inclusion of the above, the minutes of the previous meeting held on 30th January 2020 be accepted as a true and correct record.

122 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no issues raised under matters arising.

123 19/03590/FU - PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF STRUCTURES AND THE ERECTION OF TWO BUILDINGS RANGING FROM FIVE TO ELEVEN STOREYS, COMPRISING 245 RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS (USE CLASS C3) WITH FLEXIBLE COMMERCIAL USES AT GROUND FLOOR LEVEL (USE CLASS A1, A2, A3, D2 AND/OR B1), RETENTION AND ALTERATION TO THE WALL FRONTING GLOBE ROAD, HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING, ACCESS, SERVICING AND OTHER ASSOCIATED WORKS. TOWER WORKS GLOBE ROAD HOLBECK LEEDS LS11 5QG

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of an application which sought the partial demolition and the erection of two buildings ranging from 5 to 11 storey's comprising 245 residential apartments with flexible commercial uses at ground floor level (use class A1, A2, A3, D2 and/or B1), hard and soft landscaping and other associated works at Tower Works, Globe Road, Leeds LS11 5QG

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
- Located in the Holbeck Conservation Area – Industrial Heritage including 3 Listed towers and a Listed Engine Shed
- Consented scheme for scale and layout approved 2016
- This application uses same development principles as previous consent

- The importance to retain views of the landmark buildings
- Landscaping, soft planting, semi-formal space, pedestrian links
- Service arrangements, hardstanding for service vehicles
- No car parking except for the provision of 3 disabled bays
- Communal terraces
- All apartments meet space and accessibility standards
- Materials; red brick/ glazing to complement Listed buildings

The City Centre Team Leader reported the receipt of a representation from Councillor A Scopes of Beeston and Holbeck ward who had raised two comments. Firstly he was of the view that the contribution towards off-site affordable housing provision was too low and did not reflect the value of the affordable housing that would be required to be provided on site. Secondly Councillor Scopes stated that insufficient car parking is proposed which would result in increased parking pressure on the surrounding area.

The City Centre Team Leader provided an explanation for Members in responding to these points. The calculation of the off-site affordable housing contribution was based on the difference in value between the units to be provided as affordable housing and the value of those same units as general market housing and reflects the cost that the developer avoids by not providing the affordable units on site. The calculation complies with the approach required by the Council's adopted policy. The Council's parking policies do not require provision of a minimum level of car parking in the city centre provided it can be demonstrated that there would be no adverse impact on highway safety and amenity. In this particular case there are widespread on-street parking controls, the site is with walkable distance of public transport facilities and a wide range of city centre services and the applicant has committed to providing £20,000 for implementing further on street traffic control measures in the event of on-street parking problems arising from the development. As a result the proposals are highly unlikely to cause parking problems in the area.

The Chair requested that a detailed response be provided to the Ward Member concerned.

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

- The landscaping/ outside space, was there sufficient greenery
- More balance was required between the green space and the hardstanding areas
- The Listed Buildings; Engine Shed and 3 towers do they fall within the red line of the site and who will have ongoing responsibility for them
- Some of the Listed Buildings had extensive foundations, how would access be achieved to undertake repair maintenance works
- How would pedestrian movement and the service routes be controlled so as to avoid undue conflict between the two and possible resultant danger to pedestrians from vehicle movements
- Could more 3 bedroom apartments be provided

- The suggestion that there was no demand for 3 bed apartments was wrong, many students now preferred 3 bed apartments
- It was suggested that many city centre developments did not achieve the necessary housing mix, could statistics around the housing mix be provided
- The apartment buildings appeared to be a little bland, could more detail be provided
- Was there a desire to restore and bring back into use the Listed Buildings
- What species of trees were to be planted
- What heating source would be provided within the apartments
- Was pedestrian safety, particularly at night, was designed into the development

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

- The City Centre Team Leader said the outside spaces had to fulfil different functions (vehicle servicing routes, outdoor seating areas to serve the adjacent commercial uses, pedestrian routes as well as greenspaces to dwell). These areas were very large spaces (comparisons were made for Members with Victoria Gardens and Sovereign Square) and although the proportion of soft greenspace was relatively smaller when compared to the hardstanding areas, they would due to their size provide meaningful and useable planting and green amenity spaces.
- The City Centre Team Leader clarified that a certain amount of hard standing did have to be provided for events, servicing, outside seating and pedestrian access
- The applicant's representative confirmed the Listed buildings were outside the red line of the site and were in the ownership of LCC, but discussions were ongoing between the applicant and LCC regarding future proposals for the listed buildings – with the hope that their return to active use could proceed in conjunction with the scheme's development
- Members were informed that access to undertake repair works/ maintenance work to the Listed Buildings would be achieved through a formal agreement between LCC and the land owners, but this was outside the Panel's consideration of planning matters
- It was reported that movement around the site would be managed by the owner/ operator
- LCC policy regarding mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed-units is applied City-wide, with the intention that its application reflects the surrounding area and location. This is such that any requirement for 20% provision of 3-bed units is rarely achieved within the City Centre.
- The applicants representative said that the demand was for 1 & 2 bed apartments in this area and particularly where the Build to Rent approach was being used, with any inclusion of more 3 bed apartments having the potential to raise viability issues

- The applicant suggested that the proposed housing mix reflected the local demand and that more people preferred 1 & 2 bed apartments in the city centre, noting that Panel had been supportive of the proposed mix on this application at pre-application stage and little had changed in relation to the proposed mix since then
- Further explanation was provided to Members by the applicant regarding the apartment mix, clarifying that there would be 15 no. different apartment types available within the development and with a rationalisation to the design having been undertaken since pre-application stage to ensure that all meet the Nationally Described Space Standards
- The Chair requested that the issue of housing mix be referred to the Development Plans Panel
- With regard to the design of the buildings, The City Centre Team Leader said a significant amount of detail had been provided but did not stand out on the CGI's. The detailing and different proportions would add interest, such that the design was not considered to be bland but subtle and elegant
- It was suggested that the balance of soft landscape/ hardstanding proposals would be discussed further with the applicant and that the final details would be brought back to Panel at condition discharge stage.
- The Group Manager, Environment Design, said nothing should be ruled out with regard to future reuse of the historic buildings and the buildings certainly needs to be looked after, but a viable use had to be sought and there was no immediate indication that the buildings were in any way immediately at risk or requiring money to be spent thereon. Any decision on future spending of LCC funds with regards to the listed buildings would need to come from Asset Management and be followed by a decision being made to spend monies at Executive level
- Species of trees would include: hornbeam and silver birch
- The Architect said electric radiators would provide heat to the apartments
- The Architect said the building had been designed to reduce dark spaces, a lighting scheme was also incorporated within the scheme and it was anticipated that the large public realm space would keep the area busy.
- As the area is developed, there will be an increase in natural surveillance that will help to ensure pedestrian safety.

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- The majority of Members welcomed the scheme suggesting it was much improved following the pre-application proposal
- A number of Members expressed the view that the affordable housing provision should be provided on-site, regardless of the housing model being used by the applicant as part of the scheme – as the provision of affordable housing is a core policy that cannot be set aside simply where it creates an adverse impact on applicants' profit margins

- It was the view of all Members that the greenspace / hardstanding mix be revisited, the hardstanding areas appeared to be over dominant and a 'softening' of some areas would be welcomed
- A number of Members expressed the view that more 3 bed properties should be provided, as more diversity was required in the City Centre and provision of appropriate accommodation to encourage families to reside in the City Centre
- A number of Members suggested that the CGI's did not provide a true representation of the design detail and colour of the buildings
- A number of Members expressed a desire to see the Listed Buildings (Engine shed and 3 towers brought back into use) but accepted these buildings were not in the ownership of the applicant
- One Member expressed the general view that Section 106 Agreements should be completed within 3 months

In offering comment the Chair said a report reviewing the time period for the completion of Section 106 Agreements together with a review of policy for housing mix within the City Centre would be considered further at Development Plans Panel.

Commenting on the affordable housing provision, the City Centre Team Leader said that in September 2019 the affordable housing policy for Build to Rent properties changed, such that the proposal to provide an off-site contribution was policy compliant due to affordable housing in instances of Build to Rent developments not specifically being required to be provided on-site.

Following a motion to support the officer recommendation, the majority of Members voted in favour of the proposals with a requirement to reconsider the landscaping balance between greenspace and hardstanding.

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation, commenting that Members appeared to be supportive of the application but the greenspace / hardstanding mix be looked at again.

RESOLVED –

- (i) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in Appendix 2 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:
 - The provision of a commuted sum of £1,679,000 in lieu of on-site affordable housing;
 - £20,000 for implementing traffic control measures to be provided in the event
 - Compliance with agreed Green Travel Plan measures and a review fee of £3,870;
 - 2 car club spaces to be provided on-street outside the site;

- Contribution of £6,000 per pay and display space lost as a result of alterations to the highway outside the site;
- A Residential Travel Plan Fund contribution of £61,311.25 to encourage the use of sustainable travel modes by the residents of the apartments;
- 24 hour public access through the site;
- Local employment and training initiatives;
- Section 106 management fee (£2,250).

(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.

124 19/06879/RM - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR A PART TEN STOREY AND PART ELEVEN STOREY OFFICE (B1A) DEVELOPMENT WITH FLEXIBLE COMMERCIAL GROUND FLOOR (A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/D1/D2/B1A) USES TOGETHER WITH BASEMENT GYM, PARKING AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING WELLINGTON PLACE LEEDS LS1 4AP

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out details of a reserved matters application for a part 10 storey and part 11 storey office (B1A) development with flexible commercial ground floor (A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/D1/D2/B1A) uses together with basement gym, parking and associated landscaping at Wellington Place, Leeds LS1 4AP

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
- The site is within a heritage location
- The development is part of Phase 2 of the Wellington Place scheme (Application No.18/07929/OT)
- The proposal is to construct two buildings, 10 and 11 storey's in height for flexible commercial use
- The buildings are joined together with a glass sided link bridge containing additional office floor space
- Double height entrance
- Materials - bronze metal framing with silver coloured metal linings
- 41 car parking spaces below the building, including 2 disabled and 4 electric charging points, 17 motorcycle spaces at basement level, 22 short stay cycle parking spaces at street level and 142 long stay cycle parking spaces at basement level
- Associated plant, storage, hard and soft landscaping
- Roof top terraces

- Generous public realm areas
- It is intended the buildings would achieve a BREEAM excellent status

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

- Was there an aspiration to bring Park & Ride into the development
- Had changes been made in response to previous concerns raised about disturbance of residential amenity by vehicles on the encircling access road
- Was there an intention for the "lifting tower" to be brought into use
- The building includes a substantial amount of glass, how would the building be cooled

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

- The City Centre Team Leader indicated there was no firm intention to bring Park & Ride within the development Further, the City Centre Team Leader confirmed that the road route comes into the north of the site and then takes vehicles immediately into the basement of the proposed building, such that the road would be very pedestrian-friendly and so as to reduce Members' earlier concerns regarding vehicles travelling in close proximity to residential units
- The applicant said the lifting tower was an important asset and there was a desire for it to be brought back into use, with potential options currently being explored
- The building would have climate-responsive glazing (in excess of minimum standards) and would also have a mechanical ventilation system to cool the building. Shading from Buildings 7 and 8 would also assist in keeping the building cool through the provision of shadow.

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- All Members welcomed the scheme, commenting that the design was dynamic, of a high quality and would make a positive economic impact to the area.
- It was agreed that the lifting tower was an important asset and formed a key part of the overall Wellington Place development

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

RESOLVED – That Application No. 19/06879/RM be approved (Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to original outline planning permission and conditions (Application No. 18/07929/OT).

125 19/02455/RM - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR OFFICE BUILDING PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION 13/02619/OT WHITEHALL RIVERSIDE WHITEHALL ROAD LEEDS,

LS1 4AW

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a reserved matters application for office development, pursuant to outline permission 13/02619/OT for 3 office buildings, multi-storey car park and pavilion unit with ground floor food, drink and gym uses and public realm at Whitehall Riverside, Whitehall Road, Leeds LS1 4AW.

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
- The development is for Phase 3 of the Whitehall Riverside scheme (Application No.13/02619/OT)
- The proposal is to construct an 8 storey office building (B1 office use) the building is identified as No.3 Whitehall Riverside
- Materials – bronze aluminium projecting framework around full height glazing with bronze anodised aluminium vertical panels and a clear glazed ground floor
- Building designed to achieve BREEAM Excellent status, and would generate at least 10% zero carbon energy on-site from roof top solar panels
- 62 car parking spaces, including up to 6 electric vehicle charging points and disabled car parking spaces
- 73 long stay cycle parking spaces, showers, lockers and drying room facilities
- Areas of public realm
- Landscaped pedestrian routes are proposed between all the buildings at the site and the proposal for No. 3 would add to that and complete the central section of the site.
- Hard surfacing would be a mix of natural stone setts, natural stone slabs, and bonded gravel to the riverside walkway.

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

- This application is for phase 3 of the development, why has work not progressed on phases 1 & 2
- There is a derelict area of land next to this site and bordering the River Aire, could anything be done to improve this area of land
- How many public car parking spaces would be available and how many of those within the multi-storey car park would be available for public use

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

- The applicant's representative said that there was a set timescale to bring forward proposals, for instance with the outline planning permission having provided two years within which the reserved matters application had to be progressed and then the reserved matters permission providing a further two years in which work could start on site. The applicant's representative stated that his client was in the process of completing negotiation of a tenancy on the phase 2 building before works could begin. The intention was to start on phase 2 this year. There is a two-year building programme for the multi-storey car park, with time frames for subsequent condition discharge. Following this, building 3 will be able to come forward and will also be progressed in a timely manner
- Members were informed that the derelict area of land was not in the ownership of the applicant. The City Centre Team Leader said inquiries would be made to ascertain responsibility for the space and if the site was or could be maintained
- Members were informed that there were currently 423 spaces in the temporary car park, but this would be reduced by half by the end of 2020 and the permission for use of the space as a temporary car park would (in any event) expire at the end of 2022. This was part of the programme of managed reduction of City Centre temporary car parks and planning permission for use of the space as a temporary car park would not be renewed.
- Once completed the multi-storey car park would have 351 short stay public spaces and 173 spaces serving the 4 office buildings.

In offering comments Members raised the following matters:

- It was important that a serious commitment be made to progress work on the site, so that there is no undue 'stalling' of development and the development does come forward. The applicant's intention for delivery of the development should be recorded as part of this application.

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

RESOLVED – That Application No. 19/02455/RM be approved (Appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to original outline planning permission and conditions (Application No. 13/02619/OT).

126 PREAPP/19/00563 - PROPOSED STUDENT RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION DEVELOPMENT SANTANDER UK PLC MERRION COURT 44 MERRION STREET LEEDS, LS2 8LW

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-allocation proposal for multi-level student residential accommodation development with ground floor commercial space on the site of 44 Merrion Street, Leeds LS2 8LW.

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
- Situated within an emerging cluster of tall buildings in the Arena area
- The existing building is a redundant office block
- The proposal is to demolish the existing building and construct a multi-storey student residential accommodation 33 storey's in height stepping down to 10 and 5 storey's
- A mix of cluster and studio apartments (545 bed spaces)
- Materials – the building podium to utilise an expressed masonry frame, the tower element to be extensively glazed in clear fritted glass
- Double height ground floor frontage with retail space
- Servicing area to be located to the rear of the building, accessed from Merrion Place. Two disabled parking spaces located in same area
- Public realm and connecting corridors, high quality landscaping scheme including green walls and planters.
- Aspiration to reduce dominance of the highway along Merrion Street, potentially narrowing the carriageway; reducing or relocating the taxi rank and decluttering street furniture

Members raised the following questions:

- Members welcomed the tower element of the building but one Member queried the design of the podium section suggesting the masonry frame was not quite right
- In terms of vehicular movements, Merrion Street is very busy, how do you intend to make it safer for pedestrians
- What are the proposals for energy and carbon reduction measures
- What is the rationale for the height of the building
- Had St John's Church been consulted about the proposed development
- Was there any cycle storage included within the scheme
- Regarding the aspiration to improve Merrion Street would this include space for bus and taxi provision
- Where would taxis pick up and drop off, as there was still a need for taxi provision irrespective of any start and end of term 'drop off' provision
- Students need to mix and socialise, what communal facilities are proposed
- When would guidance for student space standards be provided
- How many lifts will be provided within the development and will these stop on each floor
- How will occupants be protected from road noise and pollution, given the proximity to the public highway
- What are the proposals for Merrion Place

- What is proposed for Fairfax House
- How will resident safety be ensured

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

- The architect suggested there needed to be contrast between the different elements of the building through a series of textures and the use of different materials was aimed to achieve this, but unfortunately the textured detailing was not showing-up prominently on the displayed CGIs.
- Hopefully, in the not too distant future, the volume of traffic on Merrion Street may change in light of alterations to traffic flows and routes in other areas of the City Centre. If this is achieved, the carriageway could be narrowed and the taxi rank and pedestrian crossing may be re-located. The applicant is in ongoing discussions with officers on such matters
- The development as a whole is to be "lean, clean and green", with a fabric-first approach being adopted for energy and carbon reduction
- Mechanical and natural ventilation methods will be used, but the architect said there was an intention to connect to Phase 2 of the Leeds Heat Network and photovoltaic cells would be located on the roof
- The height of the building (33 storey's) gives a ratio of 1:4 for height versus footprint, which is the same ratio as St John's Church and therefore seeks to actively reflect its heritage setting by providing a visual counterpoint to the church. Although there was a context of tall buildings immediately to the north the height and location of the tower was also determined by the requirement to not over-dominate the nearby Symons House
- There is the aim to ensure that the development works commercially, but while keeping the footprint tight and not undermining the amenity of use for those at nearby Symons House
- It was reported that St John's Church had been consulted, there were no concerns about the scale and massing but drainage and the potential increase in groundwater had been identified as a potential concern. The Church Trust sees the potential increase in footfall through Merrion Gardens as a positive aspect to counteract anti-social behaviour within the Gardens.
- The applicant expressed its ongoing intention to work actively with St John's Church, understanding the importance of the building, its significant and how it interacts with its surroundings. Meetings were to be held in subsequent weeks with Historic England and Leeds Civic Trust to further this work and understanding.
- It was confirmed that LCC officers had been consulted and involved in relation to the conservation and heritage-impact elements of the scheme throughout the process to date
- It was confirmed that storage space for 145 cycles would be provided
- The applicant confirmed that dialogue was currently ongoing about provision of the current taxi and bus facilities on Merrion Street, with

there being no intention to remove the ranks on Merrion Street entirely but different options also being considered.

- Merrion Place would be the access point to the NE corner of the site which would provide the taxi pick-up and drop-off facility for the development
- Merrion Place is outside the application boundary, but ongoing discussions were underway regarding possibilities to pedestrianise the area and create a useable public space
- There will be 3 no. lifts in the main tower and 2 no. lifts in the podium building, which will go to all floors and be of a good size
- There is a commitment from the applicant to declutter the environment surrounding the building, creating clear pedestrian routes with better lighting and areas of natural surveillance, so as to ensure the space is useable, safe and welcoming
- Air quality and noise reduction for residents to ensure a good standard of amenity is currently being assessed and considered
- The architect said there would be a large number of communal areas including roof gardens, cafés at ground floor level and communal spaces within the upper floors of the buildings.
- It was confirmed that the Council intends to provide supplementary planning guidance on student space standards
- An application has recently been received to convert Fairfax House into residential use pursuant to national permitted development rights.

In offering comments Members raised the following issues:

- The majority of Members welcome the scheme suggesting it was a really strong proposal
- Members were of the view that the height, scale and massing were acceptable
- One Member suggested more work was required on the design of the podium
- Further consideration of the greenspace/ landscaping was required

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

- Members were of the view that the loss of office accommodation and proposed use of the site for student accommodation was acceptable in principle
- Subject to the receipt of detailed proposals, Members were supportive in principle to the approach towards living conditions for student accommodation
- Members were of the view that the proposed mass and form of the development and its relationship with the surrounding context was acceptable

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.

127 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED – To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 12th March 2020 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds