

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 27TH JANUARY, 2022

PRESENT: Councillor J McKenna in the Chair

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

SITE VISITS

Members site visits was held in connection with the following: Application 21/08295/FU - Proposed residential development at former Doncaster Monkbridge site, Whitehall Road, Leeds, Preapp/21/00378 – Plot 9 Wellington Place, Whitehall Road, Leeds, Preapp/21/00311 – Proposed mixed use development at land south of Whitehall Road, Leeds and PREAPP/20/00446 - Proposed mixed use development on land south of Sweet Street, Holbeck, Leeds and was attended by the following Councillors: D. Blackburn, C. Campbell, A.Garthwaite, C.Gruen, G.Latty, J.Mckenna, N.Walshaw and E.Nash (for the first 2 sites).

102 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals against refusal of inspection of documents.

103 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

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

104 Late Items

There were no late items of business identified.

105 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting.

106 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

107 Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Members considered the minutes of the previous meeting held on 25th November 2021

With reference to Minute No.97 (Application No.20/08521/OT) - Members requested if the following wording could be included within the resolution:

- Greater clarity on possible congestion associated with the junction of the A653 and the A650

The minutes of the Consultative Meeting of Members of City Plans Panel held on 21st December 2021 were submitted for information

RESOLVED –

- (i) That, with the inclusion of the above, the minutes of the meetings held on 25th November 2021 be approved as a true and correct record
- (ii) That the minutes of the Consultative Meeting of Members of City Plans Panel held on 21st December 2021 be noted

108 Matters Arising from the Minutes

There were no issues raised under matters arising.

109 Application No. 21/08295/FU - Planning Application for two residential blocks at 26 and 31 storey's high, with car parking, landscaping and associated facilities to land at former Doncaster Monk Bridge Works, Whitehall Road, Leeds, LS12 1BE

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which sets out detail of an application which sought planning consent for two residential blocks at 26 and 31 storey's high, with car parking, landscaping and associated facilities to land at former Doncaster Monk Bridge Works, Whitehall Road, Leeds, LS12 1BE

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

The City Centre Manager addressed the Panel, speaking in detail about the proposal which included the following issues:

- Site/ Location/ Context
- The site is located approximately 1km to the southwest of Leeds City Centre, within the designated City Centre boundary as defined by the Site Allocations Plan (SAP) and forms part of the wide former Doncaster Monk Bridge Works land, to the north of Whitehall Road and measures 0.38 ha in area.
- The site is located to the east of the elevated Leeds – Bradford railway line and west of the River Aire and Leeds – Liverpool Canal.
- There is a Grade II listed viaduct to the north which has not been in use since the 1960s. It is in separate ownership but programmed for redevelopment as a public route and park with access points onto it

from both the CDL Doncaster Monkbridge Site to the north and MEPC Wellington Place site to the east.

- The whole site is identified as being within Flood Zone 2.
- The proposal - Planning permission is sought for two residential towers of 26 and 31 storeys comprising a total of 488 apartments (Mixture of 1,2 and 3 bed units arranged around a central core).
- The two towers would be linked via a double storey height podium level providing rooftop amenity space for residents at 506sqm.
- Parking for 21 cars (all to be Electrical Vehicle Charging Point enabled) and 376 cycles would be located at a ground floor level (418 spaces across the scheme in total with 386 long stay and 32 short stay spaces). Ramped access and egress into the cycle store would be taken from the adjacent north-south axis road between this site and that of the approved Latitude Purple Phase B site to the west.
- Connectivity through the site / strong interface with the north south pedestrian route under the viaduct and onwards north towards the CDL Doncaster Monkbridge development.
Public realm/ public open space
- Land scape proposals including tree lined public realm
- Materials – Two distinct sections of brickwork; vertical and horizontal, floor to ceiling windows, 33 balconies and 164 Juliette balconies

The Panel then heard from Andrew Steer, City Island Management who was objecting to the proposals.

Mr Steer said he was representing the views of 404 leaseholders and 711 residents at the City Island development which was only 80m away. He said the Management company had taken a keen interest in this application and had provided constructive feedback, but despite the lengthy consultation none of our views have been taken in account in the final planning application.

Mr Steer said he had 4 primary concerns:

1. The proposed height of the building, a whopping 31 storeys, which will be head and shoulders above other buildings in the surrounding area. He said you need to travel over 1km to Bridge Water place to find a building of similar height, a building of this magnitude cannot be justified in this area and would present an over-bearing feature when viewed from City Island, he would respectfully request this Panel to limit the height of the building to 26 storeys.
2. The building is out of character with the existing buildings and the Panel, as the decision makers, need to weigh up the potential impact to any Listed Buildings. The Chief Planning Officers reports states that the proposed buildings would cause harm to the Grade II Listed Viaduct. Architecturally the proposal would not sit well with surrounding buildings, the proposed design of these new buildings is a missed opportunity and lacking in creative vision
3. A lack of attempt to integrate with the surrounding area, there is a fundamental lack of facilities associated with this development which will not attract families into the area. There is also no direct access across the canal

included in the final plans and as a result the development will be self-contained.

4. In the Chief Planning Officers report there is a recognition of construction noise and disturbance during construction. Could we therefore respectfully request that a condition be included to restrict construction noise and disturbance to the hours of 9.00am and 6.00pm

Questions to Mr Steer

- Could you tell us what difference it would make to the residents of City Island by reducing the height of the building

In responding Mr Steer said:

- The building would more seamlessly integrate, not just with the existing buildings but with other buildings in the wider area. There is also another development on the other side of the viaduct which would be 21 storeys high and again we would like to see a similar alignment of the buildings

The Chair thanked Mr Steer for his attendance and contributions

The Chair then invited Damien Sharkey (Applicant) to speak in support of the application.

Mr Sharkey explained the proposal was to deliver 488 homes as part of the Latitude Blue development. If planning permission was granted later today the intention was to begin work on the site later this year.

He said over the last 12 months his team had worked closely with Leeds City Council and other partners to draw up proposals for Latitude Blue which had included online and in person consultation events, including presentations to Leeds City Council, Leeds Civic Trust, the Canal and Rivers Trust and Historic England. Members were informed that a significant number of comments/ feedback had been received and amendments to the plans had been made accordingly.

Members were informed that all homes would be energy efficient and fit for future generations (Including the use of over 240 solar panels and a heat recovery system). Over 400 cycle parking spaces would be provided (in line with Leeds City Council's Climate Emergency agenda). Extensive residential amenity space was also being provided, Building No.2 being reconfigured to create additional open space.

In summary, Mr Sharkey said Latitude Blue would bring much needed housing to the city and add to the vibrancy of the area already in transition and bring forward development in a prime brownfield site which has stood derelict since 2005. He said, we believe we have responded positively to all comments and hope Members will support this application.

Questions to the Developers:

- The podium, why was it positioned lower than the viaduct
- Was there any further development works planned for the viaduct
- Could further clarification be provided around security and safety in and around the site
- Could you comment on the objection from City Island Developments about the construction disturbance and noise
- Are there any proposals for formal play areas
- Could clarification on the mix of flat sizes be provided
- How many flats would have access to balconies
- Justification for the level of car parking

In responding the Developers said:

- Members were informed that the podium was positioned to provide views of the canal and not compete with the listed viaduct
- Members were informed that a staircase, lift access and landscaping was being provided but the viaduct was not in the ownership or control of the applicant
- Members were informed that a Management Team would be on-site (24 hours each day). The development would include a CCTV system, outside areas would be well lit, there would be active uses on the ground floor, there would be controlled building access, drop-off and pick-up areas would be well lit at night
- The applicant said we are keen to work with City Island and want a positive relationship and we would be prepared to sign up to city centre working hours
- The applicant suggested the intention was to create informal play space within the public realm avoiding the need for formal gated playground space
- There would be 220 x 1-beds; 223 x 2-beds and 45 x 3-beds.
- 40% of the total flats would have access to an external or “Juliette” type balcony
- The level of car parking reflected the need to encourage people not to use the car; the good level of cycle provision and the relocation of the buildings further away from the canal and the viaduct

The Chair thanked the Developers for their attendance and contributions

Members raised the following questions to officers:

- How large are the balconies (width and depth) and could they be increased in number
- What restrictions would be put on hours of construction, would they be similar to adjacent construction sites
- The proposed housing mix, there is a significant number of one bed accommodation (44.9%) is there evidence to support this demand

- There is a significant amount of cycle parking (418 spaces) – Does more cycle parking spaces mean that more journeys are made using bicycles
- Could the amount of green space be increased

In responding to the issues raised:

- The Architect confirmed the dimensions of the balconies were 2.75m x 1.8m. The City Centre Manager advised that the number of balconies was limited in part by the wind microclimate impact at higher levels of the building
- The City Centre Manager said the hours of construction were often restricted to: 8.00am - 6.00pm on weekdays and Saturday mornings only
- The applicant said a housing needs assessment had been prepared which demonstrated there was a clear demand for 1 bed units from the 18 - 34 age group
- The LCC Highways officer said good cycle parking facilities is likely to encourage greater cycle usage, but there was no direct link to the number of cycle journeys undertaken. (It was pointed out that bicycle sales had increased significantly during the pandemic).
- The City Centre Manager explained that within the city centre the requirement for a minimum level of green space provision only applied to large sites over 0.5 ha in area. For the reasons stated in the report this was effectively a smaller development site. However, the development was providing 1,400 sq.m. of public open space. In addition, future residents would have access to the public assessable space to be provided on the viaduct and other nearby development sites.
- The buildings had already been moved further away from the canal and the viaduct in response to Members comments at pre-application stage. The potential to gain more public realm is limited without a significant redesign of the building proposals.

In offering comments Members provided the following:

- The majority of Members were generally supportive of the application.
- The hours of construction should be the same as the adjacent site
- Some Members considered that more consideration should be given to the appearance of the podium element
- Could further consideration be given to increasing the number of the balconies at the lower levels. One member considered that the useable space provided by the external balconies should be larger
- The space between the canal and the buildings was an important area, would it be possible to reconfigure the blocks to create more public space
- All Members expressed disappointment at the housing mix, in particular the number of family friendly 3 bed units (9.2%) and requested if this figure could be increased to 10%

- One Member suggested the 31storey block was too high, other Members were supportive of the height
- One Member asked for further consideration to be given to providing more facilities for children
- It was important that the right species of trees and hedges were planted

In drawing the discussion to a conclusion, the Chair suggested that the housing mix was a significant concern to Members.

Addressing the applicant's, the Chair asked if they would be willing to increase the number of 3 bed units to 10% (48 apartments). The applicant confirmed the proposal was acceptable.

It was moved and seconded that the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in the submitted report (and additional conditions to control the construction hours and provision of CCTV, external lighting and building access control), subject to an amendment of the housing mix, as described above, further consideration be given to increasing the number of the balconies and consultation on the tree species with Councillor Nash and following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement

Upon being put to the vote, the motion was passed 11 votes in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention

RESOLVED –

- (i) That the application be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval subject to the conditions specified in the submitted report (and additional conditions to control the construction hours and provision of CCTV, external lighting and building access control), subject to an amendment of the housing mix, as described above, further consideration be given to increasing the number of the balconies and consultation on the tree species with Councillor Nash and subject to completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to deliver the following planning obligations:
- Employment and training of local people
 - The provision of publicly accessible areas
 - The provision of on-site affordable 34 units (7% in line with policy)
 - The provision of a travel plan fee of £5822
 - Provision of a Residential Travel Plan Fund of £124,806
 - A contribution for Traffic Regulation Orders to address potential overspill parking of up to £10,000.00
 - A contribution for biodiversity net gain of £16,500
 - Management fee

- (ii) In the event where the Section 106 Agreement has 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.

110 PREAPP/21/00378 - Pre-Application for reserved matters application for Building 9, Wellington Place (Pursuant to outline planning permission 18/07929/OT) to land at Wellington Place, Leeds, LS1 4AP

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out detail of a pre-application presentation for reserved matters application for Building 9, Wellington Place (Pursuant to outline planning permission 18/07929/OT) to land at Wellington Place, Leeds, LS1 4AP.

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
- This site is located to the south-western corner of Wellington Place
- This would be the second building proposed as part of the outline scheme for Wellington Place Phase 2, approved in 2019 (ref. 18/07929/OT).
- The architectural style was similar in character to the existing completed buildings on Wellington Place, with stone elevations and strong fenestration patterns with vertical emphasis towards the top of the buildings, where the roof slopes are a dominant feature. The scale of the existing buildings vary from 4 to 9 storeys.
- The proposal is for a 12 - storey building for office accommodation with retail accommodation on the ground floor. The building is set back at the upper levels
- 85 car parking spaces with electric vehicle charging points (Compliant with Policy EN8), cycle parking and car club spaces
- Materials – Stone, use of exposed structural columns, glazing and a series of framed winter gardens. Vertical shading panels to reduce solar gain
- Expansive public realm with links to Listed Viaduct, useable space in Viaduct Yard
- Landscape proposals
- Wind assessment carried out
- Sustainable measures: net zero carbon operational energy (all electric building) BREEAM outstanding

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

- Of the proposed 86 car parking spaces, 10% would have electric vehicle charging points. Is this figure policy compliant

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

- Members were informed that the number of electric vehicle charging points would be compliant with Policy EN8

In offering comments, Members raised the following issues:

- Members were generally supportive of the proposal; the proposed design was good, and Members welcomed the regeneration of the area.
- Members considered the development would complement the existing heritage assets
- One Member asked if the completed scheme could resemble the images presented in the submitted graphics
- Could further clarification be provided on cycle parking, was the demand there
- Could a list of proposed tree species / hedges be provided

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

- Members were supportive of the proposals in respect of design, scale, form and detailing
- Members supported the proposed approach to landscaping and pedestrian connectivity
- Members were supportive of the proposed approach to climate change and sustainability
- Members were agreeable to the formal application proposals being determined as a delegated decision

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
- (iii) That the formal application proposals being determined as a delegated decision

111 PREAPP/21/21/00311 - Pre-Application Presentation for mixed use development of residential, offices, hotel and Multi Storey car Park

(MSCP) with ancillary leisure and retail uses, to Land Off Whitehall Road, Leeds

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out detail of a pre-application presentation for mixed use development of residential, offices, hotel and Multi Storey car Park (MSCP) with ancillary leisure and retail uses, to Land Off Whitehall Road, 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
- The site is currently used as long stay car parks, 423 car parking spaces in total
- The site is located to the west of the city and to the south of Whitehall Road.
- Office accommodation and residential flats are located to the south west border and eastern boundary with buildings ranging in height from 8 to 11 stories
- Pedestrian links are located to the east and west, linking to the riverside and further a footbridge over the River Aire which leads to the Leeds Liverpool Canal towpath.
- Existing vehicular access to the site is gained from Riverside Way, an additional access point is located further east along Whitehall Road, which serves Premier Inn and No.1 Whitehall Riverside.
- The proposal – Full planning permission would be sought for: one residential building providing up to 532 (Build to Rent) C3 residential units, of 16 and 19 storeys, linked at podium level. Four commercial units (Class E) would be provided at ground floor level to the four corners of the BTR building. The following mix of apartments are proposed: 281x 1 bed flats (53%), 210x 2 bed flats (39%) and 41x 3 bed flats (8%)
- A Hybrid planning permission will be sought for the following development: One Multi Storey Car Park providing 478 spaces, one retail/commercial unit (Class E) would be provided at ground floor level one office building (plot 2) use Class E (g)(i) providing approximately 13210sqm of office space and 584sqm of retail space Class E (a or b), measuring 12 storeys + plant. The following development would be included in outline: one hotel building (C1) providing approximately 5300sqm of hotel space and 140sqm of office accommodation Class E (g)(i), measuring 9 storeys + plant, one office building (plot 9) providing approximately 11268 sqm of office accommodation Class E (g)(i), measuring 14 storeys.
- The development would also feature new Landscaping, public realm, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure throughout. The landscaping would also incorporate new tree planting along Whitehall Road.

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

- Could further consideration be given to the housing mix with fewer 1 bed flats being provided and more 3 bed flats (Minimum 10%)
- With respect to the multi storey car park (MSCP), how would long stay commuter parking be prevented
- The provision of secure cycle parking, was this compliant with policy
- Over 100 semi-mature trees are to be provided, could an indication be given to how large these trees are
- The design of the car park refers to "an oil filter". What is meant by this.
- Referring to climate change and sustainability how would the development meet the requirements of planning policies EN1 and EN2 so that the finished buildings do not need to undergo retrofitting works
- The design of some of build to rent apartments blocks appears to be dark and gloomy (Eastern European in looks), could lighter warmer colours be provided

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

- The applicants' agent confirmed that further consideration would be given to the housing mix
- The applicants' agent confirmed that the MSCP would only provide parking dedicated to the development on the site or for public short-stay visitor parking with pricing used to prevent long stay public commuter car parking
- The applicants confirmed that secure cycle parking provision would be compliant with policy
- Members were informed that semi-mature trees would be approximately 6 – 7m in height and have a 67cm girth
- Members were informed that the design of the car park created natural ventilation, the timber cladding created obscure views into the car park allowing the building to work. The building was not considered ugly in design
- The buildings would be designed to be all electric and deliver net savings in carbon emissions through building construction, longevity of materials and use of renewable energy sources such as Photovoltaic Panels
- Members were informed that the residential block images were not fully rendered. Further consideration needs to be given to the design details and there will be a lot of depth and shadow to the elevations

In offering comments, Members raised the following issues:

- Members were generally supportive of the proposal
- Further consideration was required around the design of the build to rent apartments blocks
- The design of the car park was welcomed
- Could further consideration be given to the housing mix, more 3 bed flats (Minimum 10%)

- Could affordable housing be provided in accordance with existing policy
- There was a need to see and understand the pallet of materials
- Long term car parking should be discouraged, there was a preference for more short-stay car parking

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

- Members were of the view that the proposed use of the site for residential, office, hotel and multi storey car park was appropriate in principle
- Members were supportive of the emerging scale and layout of the development
- Members supported the emerging public pedestrian routes and landscaping throughout the site
- In terms of general public car parking, it was suggested that short- term parking be encouraged through the use of price control mechanisms.

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

112 PREAPP/20/00446 - Pre-Application Presentation for a mixed-use development of 1235 residential units, two office blocks, a clubhouse and a retained public house use, street-level commercial units, car parking and landscaped public realm at land at Sweet Street, Marshall Street, Holbeck, Leeds.

Prior to discussion of this item Members were made aware that Sweet Street may be a potential route for a Highway corridor to accommodate a Mass Transit system. The developers of the site had been made aware of this potential development.

The Chief Planning Officer submitted a report which set out details of a pre-application presentation for proposed mixed-use development of 1235 residential units, two office blocks, a clubhouse and a retained public house use, street-level commercial units, car parking and landscaped public realm at land at Sweet Street, Marshall Street, Holbeck, 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
- Located to the south side of the City Centre, the site is largely cleared and measures a total of 3.05 hectares
- The (vacant) former Commercial Pub, (non-designated heritage asset) is located towards the junction of Sweet Street West and Marshall Street and is within the boundary of the Holbeck Conservation Area.
- The former Holbeck library, a grade II listed building (at the junction of Marshall Street and Nineveh Road), lie outside the site boundary. To the south and south-west of the railway line and Nineveh Road are the residential communities of Holbeck and Beeston. Employment uses predominate (mainly industrial and warehouse) to the east side of Marshall Street. To the north is the Commercial Pub, listed Temple Works and vacant land.
- The proposals sought to create a multi-level development of 1235 residential apartments in blocks, ranging from 10 up to 27 storeys, two office blocks, ranging from 4 to 6 storey's and 5 to 7 storeys, a 3 storey clubhouse and a 2 storey public house/drinking establishment, set within a landscaped area, with surface and undercroft car parking.
- The former Commercial Public House is to be retained and refurbished as a public house/drinking establishment
- 74 car parking spaces are proposed for the Build to Rent apartments, 100 spaces are proposed for the Open Market Housing apartments and 105 spaces are proposed for the office accommodation. The parking numbers for the commercial uses are not yet fixed.
- Cycle and motorcycle parking would be at levels to comply with local planning policy.

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

- Consider changing the names of some streets because it may cause confusion with other similar street names elsewhere in the city. Look to reflect on the history of the area e.g. Mary Gawthorpe, local suffragette
- The former Public Library, had any discussions taken place with the owner to bring the building into the development site
- What was the intended nature of the proposed community building/club house

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

- The applicant's representative said the developers were open to name changes possibly using reference points from Holbeck in the past. Suggestions from the local community would be sought through community consultation
- The applicant's representative confirmed that the owners would be contacted with a view to addressing the approach to public realm around the site.

- The intention was that the community building would be available for all to use which would not only provide a mix of uses to serve local community needs but also create a destination for the area

In offering comments, Members raised the following issues:

- Members were of the opinion that the principle of the development was acceptable
- This is a big strategic site and a high-quality scheme needs to be brought forward, including carbon zero development
- There is a need to create the right urban environment with lots of trees and greenspace that is reflective of the aspirational images presented
- The housing mix for this site is an important element
- There will be a significant number of residents on this site and it is important that the necessary facilities are provided/ available
- It is important to understand how office workers would travel to and from the site. The development needs to take into account aspirations for mass transit travel
- There were mixed views on the proposed 27 storey apartment building with one Member not convinced by the proposed height whilst another was supportive
- The proposed 6 storey office block would be overbearing/ dominate the former Public Library building
- The Commercial Pub is too isolated, needs to be brought more into the development by perhaps facing into the site
- A substantial buffer is required between the railway line and the residential blocks

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

- Members were supportive of the proposed mix of uses
- Members were generally supportive of the emerging design, scale and layout of the development, but further details were required to address the detailed comments above
- Members supported the approach to residential and office car parking provision in this location

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

113 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Draft minutes to be approved at the meeting
to be held on Thursday, 24th February, 2022

RESOLVED - To note that the next meeting will take place on Thursday, 24th February 2022 at 1.30pm in the Civic Hall, Leeds.