

CITY PLANS PANEL

THURSDAY, 19TH MAY, 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,
P Wadsworth, N Walshaw, B Anderson and
S Hamilton

SITE VISITS

Councillors Anderson, Blackburn, Garthwaite, Hamilton, Carlill, Campbell and McKenna attended the site visits prior to the meeting.

144 Appeals Against Refusal of Inspection of Documents

There were no appeals.

145 Exempt Information - Possible Exclusion of Press and Public

There was no exempt information.

146 Late Items

There were no late items.

147 Minutes - 21 April 2022

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 April 2022 be confirmed as a correct record.

148 Application - 20-08521-OT - Land at Capitol Park, Topcliffe Lane, Morley, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a hybrid planning application which comprised of the demolition of existing buildings and structures; earthworks to form development platforms, drainage features, embankments and bunds; strategic landscaping, alteration of existing access road, including works to existing Topcliffe Lane and junction with A653 and construction of new access road, to serve employment development. The outline application comprises the construction of employment floorspace (Use Classes B2 and B8 with ancillary office) and associated servicing and infrastructure including car parking, vehicle, pedestrian and cycle circulation,

landscaping and ecology works, noise mitigation, drainage features and all associated infrastructure at land at Capitol Park, Topcliffe Lane, Morley.

The application had previously been considered by City Plans Panel at the meeting held in November 2021 when it had been deferred for further information and details. Members had visited the site prior to that meeting.

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

The following was highlighted in relation to the application:

- The site was allocated for employment land within the Site Allocation Plan.
- There were no full details for the layout and siting of buildings at this stage of the application. Full details included the proposed earthworks to form the platforms and bunds, drainage and landscaping.
- The site was considered to be of strategic importance for the provision of logistics floorspace to meet both local and national demand and had good access to the motorway network.
- Concern had been expressed with regard to the drainage works for the site as they fell within adjacent greenbelt land. It was reported that these works would be policy compliant as they did not harm or conflict the openness of the greenbelt land.
- Indicative plans were displayed showing different examples of siting the buildings.
- There was some concern regarding the visual impact of buildings on residential properties at Topcliffe Lane. These concerns had been considered during the development of alternative indicative options for the siting of buildings.
- CGI images were displayed showing how the site would be screened by tree planting and how this would mitigate the visual impact of the development.
- It was felt that the separation distances between the proposed buildings along with the landscaping would prevent any significant impact on living conditions for residents.
- There had been concerns regarding the proposed 24-hour operation of the site. This kind of operation was essential for the site and it was felt that due to distances and access arrangements there would not be a significant impact on residents. A condition with regard to hours of work during the construction phase could be imposed.
- Mitigating measures could be used to prevent light pollution from the site.
- There would be improvements to the existing footpath network including links to Morley town centre. There would also be enhancements to the cycle network.
- There had been an increase in proposed tree planting with 7,500 trees to be planted. The landscaping would connect to existing residential

areas and provide a 12.5% biodiversity gain and wildlife and ecology benefits.

- There was a commitment for local employment opportunities at the pre-construction, construction and operational phases of the development and also financial contributions to the local Ahead Partnership and apprenticeship fund.
- In terms of traffic management, the main impact would be on the motorway network and Junction 28 of the M62. A scheme of mitigation was proposed that would be delivered at a cost of £4 million.
- The Panel was informed of additional comments that had been submitted by Ward Councillors and local residents. These included concerns regarding the size of the development, impact on residents, impact on the highways, development in the greenbelt, the proposed 24 hour operation of the site and the lack of public consultation.
- In conclusion it was reported that the proposals would deliver a key employment scheme and was of strategic importance to Leeds and the Leeds City Region. It was a sustainable form of development and it was felt that previous concerns had been addressed. The application was recommended for approval.

The Panel heard from a Ward Councillor and local resident who were speaking in objection to the application. Issues highlighted included the following:

- Main concerns raised at the meeting in November included the proposed 24-hour operation, impact on the greenbelt and size of the development and these had not been adequately addressed.
- The site was currently mainly office use and used between the hours of 09:00 and 17:00. Other businesses on Capitol Park that operated longer hours were situated further away from residents.
- The proposed sizes of the units had not changed and it was unlikely that residents would not suffer from noise and light pollution.
- The applicant had not consulted sufficiently with residents to address their concerns.
- There was little greenbelt left in Morley and the nature conservation area site could not be compared to the one provided by the applicant in Goole as the context was different.
- There would be noise and light pollution for 24 hours a day.
- The application was inappropriate and should be refused.
- There had been an active campaign for local residents and it was believed that this was not the right kind of use of the land at this time. The proposals would be detrimental to the quality of life for local people.
- Residential properties had been in the location before any of the industrial and commercial development at Capitol Park.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- Following the meeting in November there had been a number of changes including the clarity provided on the local employment agreement, contribution to the apprenticeship fund and enhanced landscaping proposals.
- There would be social and ecological benefits including biodiversity net gain.
- The layouts were indicative at this stage and not fixed.
- There would be significant highways contributions including enhanced facilities for pedestrians and cyclists around the motorway junction.
- There had been discussion with the Council, Combined Authority and a major company regarding the use of the development and provision of employment opportunities.
- There would be the launch of a programme along with the Morley Town Deal to connect local people to local jobs. There was a commitment with regard to this application.
- In response to questions, the following was discussed:
 - Improvements to the roundabouts and junctions would enable easier crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.
 - Further to concerns expressed regarding the layouts, including size and massing and servicing arrangements, it was reported that the layouts shown were indicative and there would be further consultation before layouts were submitted at the reserved matters stage.
 - The contribution for apprenticeships would be used to provide support for apprentices. It was proposed to generate 75 apprenticeship places on the scheme.
 - The planting of new trees would be subject to conditions of the land management plan which would require replacements where any trees did not take.
 - It was proposed for the site to be in operation for 24 hours per day.
 - It was proposed to locate the drainage ponds outside the site due to the topography and also to maximise the use of the site.
 - The size of the units would be dependent on the occupier's requirements.
 - The proposed heights of buildings across the sites were subject to different parameters with the highest proposed building being 22 metres.
 - There was not a detailed scheme at this stage as occupiers would usually wait until the outline planning stage before committing.
 - Distances to nearest residential properties was 85 metres.
 - The indicative layouts were to demonstrate the different designs that could be used.
 - The application was for industrial and commercial units with ancillary office space.

In response to questions to officers, the following was discussed:

- The applicant had been demonstrating the way to deliver the requirements within the constraints of the site. Areas of concern that had been raised could be considered further at the reserved matters stage.
- With regards to policy EN1, it was not possible to provide figures as there was no detailed design of the buildings at this stage. Design at reserved matters stage would propose a zero-carbon standard and there was a full commitment for the provision of 10% from renewables. This could be included as a condition.
- Information from the policy team had indicated a need and demand for this kind of development in Leeds.
- The Panel was being asked to consider the maximum heights for the different parcels of land. The highest being 22.4 metres.
- Drainage areas within the red line site would have been appropriate. The applicant had opted for the greenbelt land to maximise the space for employment opportunities and floorspace. It was not considered that the proposals would lead to inappropriate development within the greenbelt.
- Improvements to pedestrian access and cycle routes would include widening and resurfacing. The off-site contributions would include improved access along Dewsbury Road and provision of signalled crossings.
- Pedestrian and cycle routes within the site would be hard surfaced.
- The floor space proposed was 102,890 square metres.
- If this application was approved then that would set out the parameter plans including the maximum heights of buildings. This would form proposals to be brought at reserved matters stage when further consideration could be given to issues such as design and appearance.
- At this stage the Panel was being asked to agree the development of the platforms and not the buildings.

Issues highlighted during Members comments included the following:

- The buildings would be too high and support would not be given to a height of more than 14 metres.
- This is not the type of employment site that should be located in this area.
- The proposal of a 24 hour a day operation with noise and light pollution would not be supported.
- Impact on the greenbelt – the proposal to use the greenbelt site was not appropriate.
- Fundamental changes had not been made since the application was last presented to Panel.
- The local community tolerated current operations at the site which did not disturb outside normal hours.
- There were other sites which were more suitable for this scale of development and 24-hour operation.
- It was the wrong kind of employment site for this location.

- Support can't be given to a development of this scale and with a 24-hour operation in a residential area.
- This site represented employment opportunities that were badly needed.
- There had been significant changes since the November meeting with additional commitments to apprenticeships and extensive landscaping and the recommendations should be supported.
- The site had been agreed for employment under the Site Allocation Plan process and should be available for this.
- There are other sites with buildings larger than those proposed.
- There was no disagreement with the landscaping plans and apprenticeship opportunities.
- There does not seem to be grounds to refuse the development of the drainage works/ ponds in the green belt.
- The developer needs to take account of the issues raised with distances from houses and this should be maximised. Also the issues with the heights of the buildings.
- Was there a way of mitigating the 24-hour operation by locating some areas further away from residents.
- Full details of layouts and distances from residential properties would be needed at the reserved matters stage.
- Although it was an employment site it didn't mean that any kind of employment should be developed there.
- Concern that if this application was agreed at this stage that the Panel could not prevent high buildings too close to residential properties.
- Concern that there was a reluctance to consider further mitigation towards residents.
- Further consideration of the layouts with a preferred option would be helpful.
- Further reassurance was needed for nearby residents and concern regarding heavy goods vehicles using the local area for overnight parking.

The Area Planning Manager summarised the discussion. There were mixed opinions on whether the application should be supported. Members were reminded that this application would deal with the maximum parameters relating to the height and position of the development. The detailed layout and appearance of the buildings could be negotiated further with the applicant at reserved matters stage. There were controls to mitigate the impact of the development on local residents.

Following further discussion, it was confirmed that height parameters were specific to each parcel of land and that the application would have to be reconfigured if there was to be any change.

The officer recommendation was moved and seconded and was voted against.

A motion was made to defer the application with a view to refuse on the grounds of noise and light pollution; impact on residential amenity; concern regarding the massing and height of the units and further concern regarding development in the greenbelt. This motion was voted against.

A further motion was moved and seconded to defer the application due to concern over the height and size of buildings closest to residential properties, noise and light pollution.

RESOLVED – That the application be deferred for further discussion between officers and the applicant regarding the maximum massing and heights of the buildings and concerns regarding noise and light pollution.

149 Applications 21-08693-FU & 21-08694-LI - 24-28 Great George Street, Leeds, LS1 3DL

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a planning application and a listed buildings application for a change of use to provide student accommodation, flexible commercial (Class E) and drinking establishment (Sui Generis) use; the partial demolition of existing buildings; erection of a rear extension to Nos 24-26 Great George Street to provide student accommodation; external alterations; hard and soft landscaping works; and associated works at 24-28 Great George Street, Leeds, LS1 3DL.

Members attended the site prior to the meeting and site plans and photographs were displayed and referred to throughout the discussion of the applications.

Further issues highlighted in relation to the applications included the following:

- There would be student accommodation at first floor level of the Victoria Hotel building with the ground floor to remain as a public house. The building which was used for Shenanigans would be available for commercial use.
- It was proposed to alter the frontage of the Shenanigans building which would be more in line with the original appearance.
- Following the publication of the report there had been a response from Leeds Civic Trust and further information regarding improved cooking facilities in the student accommodation.
- The buildings were Grade II and considered to be of heritage importance.
- There would be some demolition work to the rear of the building to allow for the building of the extension.
- Floor plans were displayed. There would be a total of 67 student apartments.
- Arrangements for student arrival and departure were explained. There would be loading bays and facility for on street parking.
- The extension would be seven storeys and CGI images were displayed showing the design and materials to be used.

- Landscaping – opportunities were limited but there would be some in the courtyards to the rear. The trees to the side of the Shenanigans building would be replaced.
- The economic, social and environmental benefits of the re-use of a listed building.
- The application was recommended for approval.

In response to questions and comments, the following was discussed:

- The existing trees at the side of the buildings would have to be removed to facilitate the building of the extension. They would be replaced with trees of a similar canopy spread.
- The signage on the front of the Victoria Hotel would largely be decided by the operator. It could be retained and restored and example of similar instances were reported.
- The height of the extension was decided on following discussions with officers and Historic England. It was originally planned to be higher. Substantial investment was required to bring the building back into use.
- The division of the room space in the Shenanigans building would be decided on by any incoming tenant but would require listed building consent.
- There were some constraints on room sizes and layouts due to listed building requirements. It had been aimed to achieve at least the minimum room size standard.
- Concern had been raised regarding the blank finish to the gable end of the Shenanigans building. There would be new detailing around the windows and materials would match the extension. It was suggested that some form of artwork may be appropriate.
- Members broadly supported the application and the officer recommendation was moved and seconded and voted on.

RESOLVED – That application 21/08693/FU be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions in the appendix to the report (and any amendment to or addition of others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate) and subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the following:

1. Employment and training of local people.
2. Occupation of the residential units by students only.
3. CAVAT sum for replacement tree requirement of £9,824.00.
4. Off site highways works contribution of £41,000.00 towards nearby bi-directional cycle lanes and improved crossings for both pedestrians and people on bikes.
5. Visitor cycling or e-bikes provision in the vicinity of the development contribution of £10,000.00.
6. Management fee.

In the circumstances where the Section 106 has not been completed within 3 months of the Panel resolution to grant planning permission, the final

determination of the applications shall be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer.

That application 21/08694/LI be deferred and delegated to the Chief Planning Officer for approval, subject to the conditions in the appendix to the report (and any amendment to or addition of others which the Chief Planning Officer considers appropriate)

150 Pre-application 20/00446 - Land at Sweet Street, Marshall Street, Holbeck, Leeds

The report of the Chief Planning Officer presented a 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.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel.

An initial presentation had been brought to Panel in January 2022. There had been a number of design changes since that meeting following Members comments and further public consultation.

The following was highlighted:

- The massing and layout remained largely the same and comments previously made with regard to the office building and library had been taken on board.
- The north east corner would focus on commercial activity with a public square, retention of the Commercial public house and a multi functional pavilion.
- Office accommodation would front on to Marshall Street.
- Following comments at the meeting in January, there would be the provision of 10% three-bedroomed units.
- Public open space had been increased from 23% to 30%.
- There had been further public consultation events that had been largely positive.
- Supermarket provision in Holbeck was poor and there would be provision for retail space.
- Landscaping – there was a need for green open space in this part of the city. Details of the landscaping masterplan were displayed which including the use of roof terraces and also showed pedestrian connectivity throughout the site. There would be different character areas within the site and these would be developed following further public consultation. There would be seating and play features in the central area. There would also be a green route through the centre of the site.
- Details of the residential blocks and the materials to be used.

In response, members welcomed the changes to the plans and the design for a cohesive neighbourhood with provision of greenspace.

One member queried the assertion that supermarket provision locally was poor as there was one quite close to the site.

In response to questions outlined in the report, Members supported the progress made on the design and landscaping of the development.

RESOLVED – That the report and presentation be noted.

151 Pre-application -21-00491 - West Bank, Water Lane, Holbeck Leeds, LS98 3HX

The report of the Chief Planning Officer informed Members of a pre-application presentation for one nine and one eleven storey office building with ground floor retail/leisure units and basement car parking; a 19 storey hotel building providing 210 bedrooms; one eleven and one twelve storey office building with ground floor retail/leisure units and basement car parking.

Members visited the site prior to the meeting.

The applicant's representatives addressed the Panel. The following was highlighted:

- Examples of the applicant's developments elsewhere were displayed.
- The scheme would be occupier led and had a sustainable agenda.
- There would be five buildings on site with four office blocks and a hotel. The office buildings would have other uses at ground floor level and the buildings would centre onto a public open space.
- Connectivity in and around the site including arrangements for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Retail and leisure facilities at ground floor level would promote the use of the public open space.
- Servicing arrangements to keep the open space free of vehicles.
- An initial wind assessment had been carried out and had indicated that there would not be any detrimental effects, and potentially a mitigation of the existing wind speeds around Bridgewater Place.
- There would be roof terraces on the office block buildings.
- There would be landscaping around the perimeter of the site and 60 new trees.
- The design would reflect the industrial heritage of the area.
- Materials to be used.

In response to questions and comments the following was discussed:

- The central square would have active frontages with cafes and bars.
- There had been comments from the conservation officer but not a full view on the design at this stage.
- Members welcomed the introduction of green space to the site.

In response to questions outlined in the report Members considered that the use of the site for offices and a hotel was appropriate; the emerging scale and layout was supported; the emerging pedestrian routes and landscaping was supported and the level of car parking was supported.

RESOLVED – That the report and discussion be noted.

152 Date and Time of Next Meeting

Thursday, 16 June 2022 at 1.30 p.m.