

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 2021

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

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

Councillor Gruen temporarily took the role
of Chair for the meeting while Councillor
McKenna attended to a separate matter.
Councillor McKenna resumed the role of
Chair for consideration of the first
substantive item, being Application No.
19/02081/FU.

59 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

60 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

There were no items which required the exclusion of the press or public.

61 Late Items

There were no late items of business identified.

62 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

63 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: C Campbell and R
Finnigan.

64 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Members considered the minutes of the previous meetings held on 5th August
2021.

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meetings held on 5th August 2021 be
approved as a true and correct record.

65 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no issues raised under matters arising.

66 Application No. 19/02081/FU - Full Planning Application for residential development and ancillary flexible commercial space (use class A1, A2, A3, A4, B1 and D1) on land at Ellerby Road and East Street, Cross Green, Leeds.

With reference to the meeting of 22nd October 2020 when Members deferred consideration of this item to allow further discussions to take place around alternative design solutions, including; the use of different materials, improved appearance of the central parking area and greenspace, provision of increased electric vehicle charging points and more affordable housing. It was also reported that this application had been discussed and views expressed at a Members informal design workshop held on 7th April 2021.

The Chief Planning Officer now submitted a further report stating that the applicant had submitted revised plans in response to the comments received previously, a summary of the amendments was set out in paragraph 1.6 of the submitted report.

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

The Planning Group Manager addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal but with a focus on the elements of the proposal that had been amended or altered since the meeting of October 2020 (as per the Officer report). The Planning Group Manager thereby highlighted the following:

- Site / location / context
- Site identified for housing development in the Local Plan
- Site history
- Nearby Heritage Assets
- Character of the surrounding area
- Views from inside and outside the proposed development
- The proposal - Residential development (345 flats) and ancillary flexible commercial space (use class A1, A2, A3, A4, B1 and D1)
- The inclusion of 2 additional floors
- Revisions to the façade
- Improved relationship with East Street
- Enhanced Courtyard area
- 124 car parking spaces
- 31 electric vehicle charging points with infrastructure to facilitate provision for a further 72 electric vehicles charging points on completion (Total 103 electric vehicle charging points)
- Greenspace provision, 40 new trees
- New pedestrian route from Ellerby Road
- 18 discounted rental flats

- Materials: red brick, with stack bond and corbel detailing, and an alternative light brick façade (More variety less uniformity)
- Ground floor active frontages

The Planning Group Manager reported the receipt of a late objection from a local resident who was of the view that the previous concerns had not been satisfactorily addressed, the design was architecturally uninspiring, the appearance of the car park was not acceptable, there would be a loss of views, daylight and sunlight to adjacent flats, there would be an adverse impact on the setting of St Saviours Church, there had been a lack of consultation from the developer and there was still insufficient affordable housing.

In responding to the matters raised, Members were advised that – although block B would be sited only 10m away from the adjacent apartment development of ‘Public Haus’ and would increase in height by one storey – it would be of a similar height to ‘Public Haus’ due to the lower site levels and would be sited to the north side of ‘Public Haus’, leaving a mostly open westerly aspect to the proposed central courtyard from ‘Public Haus’. As a result, officers are of the view that there will not be an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to the existing residential windows. The loss of uninterrupted views across a vacant allocated development site is not a material planning consideration. The key view from East Street of St. Saviours Church through the site would be retained. Other concerns relating to the appearance of the car park, architecture and affordable housing and viability have been addressed in the report and presentation.

The Planning Group Manager also reported receipt of comments from a Leeds resident who grew up in the area and still had many friends in the area. They want to see the site tidied up and ask that the greenspace contribution was ring fenced to be spent on the Bow Street recreation ground. In response Members were advised that implementation of the development would realise a regeneration of the site and the greenspace contribution will be directed to the local recreation ground.

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- Could the car park be tarmacked, the use of grasscrete could look untidy and is only intended for use where there will be occasional car parking. Another Member commented that, in the winter months, grasscrete could become muddy and suggested more robust paving as an alternative.
- The additional electric vehicle charging infrastructure, how would this be brought into use.
- Could more greenery be introduced around the building, possible green walls

In responding to the issues raised, officers and the scheme architect said:

- The use of grasscrete was intended to soften the car park area. The Architect said the intention was to keep the area green but, alternative materials could be considered
- Members were informed that there had been the commitment at this stage from the developer to provide a minimum number of electric vehicle points. Any need for further electric vehicle points would be monitored and reviewed via the Travel plan obligation
- The Architect suggested it may be possible to reposition the entrance and introduce more planters, but green walls were not in keeping with the design
- Further, any significant alteration to the East Street façade and frontage could lead to loss of accommodation, which was much needed, as part of the proposal
- Surface treatment and provision of surrounding greenery would all come forward as part of the detailed proposals and were to be decided on in future, so the Members' suggestions may be incorporated

In offering comments Members stated the following:

- Members welcomed the proposals suggesting considerable progress had been made.
- It was suggested that this Panel had a number of Members who had extensive knowledge of landscaping and horticulture, developers should note the comments on the appropriateness of grasscrete for the central car park.

In summing up, the Planning Group Manager noted the Member concerns about the use of grasscrete and advised that this will be considered further with the applicant to ensure the surfacing treatment would be robust and appropriate for the car park use.

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion, the Chair suggested there appeared to be a lot of support for this development.

It was moved and seconded that the application be approved in accordance with the report recommendation.

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was passed unanimously.

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 amendment to or addition of any others which he might consider appropriate) and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to include the following obligations:

- Affordable housing provision of 18 discounted rent (80% market rent) flats on-site subject to an overage clause upon practical completion of the development
- On-site publicly accessible greenspace at the northern part of the site
- Off-site greenspace contribution for improvements to Bow Street Recreation Ground £295,635.21
- Mitigation for removal of on-street, car parking space £6000
- Residential Travel Fund £80,580.50
- Enhancement to local TROs if necessary, as a direct result of the development
- Travel plan monitoring fee £4332
- Cooperation with local jobs and skill initiatives

(ii) In the event of the Section 106 Agreement not having 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.

67 Draft Planning Brief for the Temple District, South Bank, Leeds.

Members considered a report by the Chief Planning Officer which invited Panel to comment on the draft Temple District Planning Brief as part of the consultation process.

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

The lead Policy Officer addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following themes within the Draft Planning Brief:

- Development principles: Strategic principles
- Climate ready and nature friendly approach to placemaking
- Green space, Public realm and Open space
- Green and blue infrastructure
- Biodiversity
- Drainage and flood risk
- Sustainable design
- Connectivity and permeability
- Connectivity and communities
- Uses and ground conditions
- Heritage
- Scale and massing
- Design and character
- Delivery
- Guidance for beyond Temple District boundary
- Consultation and engagement
- Next steps

Members raised the following issues

- Would the plan provide detailed guidance on the mix of different uses
- How is this Planning Brief different to current policies, would it define the council's expectations and what development would be acceptable in this area
- There would be a need to build in inclusivity but there were no details on the nature of affordable housing
- How binding is the brief intended to be? What is the level of planning weight to be given to it?
- That the Planning Brief has a strong heritage focus was welcomed; there has been a long aspiration to have a walking route through this area (bottom of Beeston Road into the City Centre)

In responding to the issues raised, Officers said:

- Members were informed that the Site Allocation Plan (SAP) allocates use of land across the city, including in this area, and the SAP encouraged a mixture of uses in the area and that the details of mixed use schemes would be determined through the receipt of planning applications
- The Planning Brief does not alter allocations in the SAP and the SAP would expect to be followed
- Members were informed that a lot of interlocking policies were contained within the development plan for this area. The Planning Brief does not in any way look to 'water down' policies within the development plan, but brings them together in one comprehensive place for this area of the city. This Planning Brief provides an opportunity to focus and clarify that guidance and provides a stepping stone for shaping future development
- It was suggested that the future development of a Masterplan would steer potential developers as to what was expected/ required. There would be a need to reflect on any comments received during the consultation
- Inclusive development and matters such as affordable housing would be delivered through the current adopted policies including those for affordable housing
- Members were informed that the Planning Brief was based on existing policies and would serve as further detailed guidance for developers. It would be a material planning consideration.
- The Planning Brief does not create new policy but is grounded in existing policy. Once approved, it had weight as a form of guidance (distinct from policy), but it remains with Members to determine the weight to be attributed to the Planning Brief in their decision-making
- Members were informed that the brief wanted to support opportunities for improving pedestrian connectivity and the quality of the pedestrian environment, including connections to the south

In offering comments, Members noted the following:

- Members welcomed the concept of the Planning Brief commenting that it was important to see an overall planning framework/masterplan for this part of the city.
- Members appreciated the amount of work that had gone into all stages of the process in developing, writing and consulting on the Planning Brief
- Some anxiety was expressed about the weight to be attached to the guidance and the ability to require developer compliance with the guidance
- Members were concerned that a Planning Brief does not have “teeth” when compared to adopted policy

The Chair thanked Members and officers for their participation and contributions

RESOLVED – To note that, once approved, the draft Temple District Planning Brief would be presented at a future City Plans Panel as an informative note.

68 PREAPP/20/00478 - Pre-application Presentation for a proposed mixed use scheme comprising two student residential accommodation buildings and a multi-use event building on the site of Yorkshire Bank, Merrion Way and land fronting Clay Pit Lane, Leeds LS2 8NZ.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out detail of a pre-application presentation for a proposed mixed-use scheme comprising two student residential accommodation buildings and a multi-use event building on the site of Yorkshire Bank, Merrion Way and land fronting Clay Pit Lane, Leeds LS2 8NZ.

Site photographs, plans, a model and materials were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the application.

The Planning Case Officer and applicant’s representatives addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Site / location / context
- The site is located within an area which was designated as a Prestige Development Area in the 2001 Unitary Development Plan where large scale, landmark, buildings were encouraged at a gateway into the City Centre. The Tall Buildings SPD, adopted in 2010, identified the area in which the site is located as having an opportunity for a cluster of tall buildings.
- Adjacent to Conservation Area (Grade II Listed Buildings located in Queen Square)
- The Yorkshire Bank Building dating from the early 1980’s is clad in granite and embodies the solidity of a bank, symbolising Leeds’ regional commercial position and is considered a non-designated heritage asset.

- The proposal - Redevelopment of Yorkshire Bank offices at 20 Merrion Way and two parcels of land to the north situated between Clay Pit Lane and Leeds Arena. The development would involve the demolition of the existing office building and the construction of a multistorey student residential accommodation development fronting Clay Pit Lane, Merrion Way and Brunswick Terrace; a second student accommodation building located between Clay Pit Lane and Elmwood Close and a multi-use event building abutting Clay Pit Lane to the west of Leeds Arena.
- Block A, would have a singular, symmetrical form comprising 11 angled facets. The building would rise to 38 storeys and contain 728 student bedrooms in a mix of 6-bedroom clusters (59%) and 296 studios (41%). The building would be serviced from Elmwood Close with the principal entrance point on Clay Pit Lane
- Block B, would be U-shaped, rising incrementally from the western 3 storey limb adjacent to Clay Pit Lane, to 7, 12 and 18 storeys along Merrion Way. The building would contain 543 student bedrooms, in a mix of 5 and 6-bedroom clusters (60%) and 216 studios (40%).
- The multi-purpose event building, located to the north of Block B, would have a total floor area of approximately 9,900sqm incorporating a main exhibition area of approximately 3,000sqm; a conference space of circa 1,700sqm; an 800-900 capacity auditorium; pre-function circulation space and bar areas; and supporting ancillary spaces.
- Form of the buildings and its relationship with the Leeds Arena (Views of the main frontage to be retained)
- Landscaping / public realm/ retain public access areas/ increased tree count
- All student accommodation meets emerging space standards
- The development would address climate change proposals and would include air source heat pumps and photovoltaic cells
- Materials - Block A would be planar, faced in polished anodised aluminium with flush panels of clear glazing and ventilation panels. Block B, the external grid of the majority of this building would utilise a white masonry finish, projecting forward and framing the secondary layer of glazing and panelling behind. The central, 12-storey, element would sit a little further back and would employ a tighter grid than neighbouring elements. The lowest limb of the building, facing Clay Pit Lane, would utilise a similar expressed grid but finished in brickwork in response to its relationship with Queen Square.

Members raised the following questions to the developer's representatives:

- Could more details be provided about the low/zero carbon emission proposals.
- Could the area of greenspace at the northern end of the Yorkshire Bank building be retained
- A number of Members expressed concern about Block A's relationship to the Arena building, it was too tall, blocked views, over-shadowed and detracted from the Arena building

- The shimmering effect of the building had the potential to create dazzle

In responding to the issues raised the developer's representatives said:

- The design, construction and operation of the buildings would seek to achieve low/ zero carbon emissions and would include a full electric system, incorporating; air source heat pumps, photovoltaic cells, the inclusion of specific mitigation design features and the procurement of locally-sourced sustainable materials
- The architect confirmed that the area of greenspace at the end of the Yorkshire Bank building would be looked at again
- The architect said that although the footprint of Building A was small, the tall, elegant crystal tower (130m in height) and unique in design would create an important counter point to the Arena whilst also retaining the view of the entrance
- Members were informed that a report on the potential of dazzle would be provided

In offering comments, Members noted the following:

- Members were generally impressed with the design of the crystal tower but expressed concern that the tower was too tall, it would create over-shadow and would detract from the Arena building. This was not the right location for the crystal tower
- One Member suggested that any proposals for the northern development plot that entailed development above 7 storeys would block the views of the arena
- There was a need to see further design details about the multi-use event building
- The quantum of purpose-built student development in this area was a concern, particularly in light of changes to studying plans and arrangements resulting from the Covid-19 pandemic and Leeds is not just to be regarded as a student city. There was a need for strategic consideration of the levels of student accommodation being provided to avoid creating problems for the future
- The loss of greenspace/ trees was a concern, as well as open space for the public congregating in advance of visiting the Arena

In offering comments on the questions poised in the Officer Report:

- Members considered the loss of office accommodation and proposed use of the sites for a multi-use events' building and student accommodation was acceptable in principle. The amount and density of student accommodation in the area was highlighted as a concern.
- Members were supportive of the approach towards living conditions for the student accommodation

- Members did not support the proposed scale and form of Block A and had concerns about the appearance of Block B. Further design details about the multi-use event building were required
- Members considered the development's proposed provisions for transportation and accessibility were acceptable
- Members did not support the approach to green space and landscaping around the development, particularly the loss of trees
- Members were supportive to the approach to sustainable development

The Chair thanked the developers for their attendance and presentation suggesting that Members welcomed iconic designs, but on this occasion the location was not right

RESOLVED –

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

69 PREAPP/20/00483 - Pre-Application Presentation for residential development and ancillary community and commercial uses at Former City Reach 1 & 2 Development Site, Kirkstall Road, Leeds LS3 1LH.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out detail of a pre-application presentation for a Hybrid planning application for a phased development comprising: Demolition of existing buildings and structures and preparatory works; Detailed planning permission for erection of four residential buildings (use class C3) and a student accommodation building with ground floor uses comprising any or all of retail, commercial, community, health and leisure (use classes E, F1 and/or F2) totalling up to 66,232sqm gross external area and associated means of access, parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure works; and Outline planning permission, to be implemented in phases, for mixed use development totalling up to 70,540sqm gross external area comprising residential use (C3) and other uses including all or some of the following: retail, leisure, commercial, health and community uses (use classes E, F1 and/or F2); car parking, new public spaces; hard and soft landscaping; cycle parking; access; servicing and other associated infrastructure and engineering works at Former City Reach 1 & 2 Development Site, Kirkstall Road, Leeds LS3 1LH.

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
- Former Yorkshire Chemicals Works and First Bus Depot site
- Existing consents
- Kirkstall Road Renaissance area
- The emerging proposals - The introduction of 1,437 new homes and 362 student rooms, located across 11 buildings, with approximately 4,247sqm (GEA) of flexible ground floor commercial, leisure, cultural and community floorspace (use classes E, F1 and / or F2).
- The aim of the proposal to be at the heart of the development of a new community within the Kirkstall Road area
- Improvements to the Kikstall Road frontage
- Upgrade the pedestrian crossing and cycleway along the Kirkstall Road frontage
- Public realm
- Green link through the site to the river
- Riverside frontage
- New bridge crossing
- New east / west link
- Landscaping and public realm area provision (approximately 45% of the site area envisaged) – approximately 250 new trees to be planted across site
- The diversity of property type and tenure envisaged
- Central Square envisaged with proposed food court and play areas
- Shared vehicle routes
- 234 car parking spaces
- Swales and rain guards proposed to reduce the surface water run-off alongside a flood defence wall which would be purposefully integrated into the design of the park area so that it is not overly dominant or apparent

Members raised the following questions to the developer's representatives:

- What was the approach to low/zero carbon emissions on site
- How would the community space be managed
- The proposal suggests the delivery of up to 35% affordable housing, is that achievable
- What would be the price of the student accommodation – would it be affordable
- Could the landscaped areas be more adventurous and include informal rather than formal play

In responding to the questions raised the developer's representatives said:

- Members were informed that the applicant proposed the use of air sourced heat pumps, photovoltaic panels and sustainable forms of travel; cycling (dedicated cycle hub) to encourage more walking, and overall had aspirations as a developer to be carbon neutral by 2030

- It was reported that the developers would work with the residents to set up not for profit organisations, the community use areas would be set up to be flexible
- Members were informed the aspiration was to deliver up to a level of 35% affordable housing subject to grant funding.
- It was reported that discussions were still on going with regard to choosing the operator of the student accommodation, but that efforts would be made to ensure this was also affordable
- The Architect confirmed that the intention was to create adventurous play areas/ landscaped areas to be less formal.

In offering comments, Members noted the following:

- Members welcomed the concept and innovative nature of the development, in particular the strong community aspect and the riverside linear park
- Members welcomed the target for affordable housing
- The central square area was promising, but in some areas the proposed greenspaces appeared to be broken up
- The appearance of the residential accommodation blocks were too uniform and corporate, could the blocks be more individual

In offering comments on the questions posed in the Officer Report:

- Members were supportive of the proposed uses on the site, subject to the appropriate sequential tests
- Members were supportive of the emerging layout and scale of the development
- Members were supportive of the emerging approach to Highway improvements and parking
- Members were supportive of the emerging approach to biodiversity and the public realm

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

70 Date and Time of Next Meeting

RESOLVED - To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 30th September 2021 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.