



Bristol City Council

Minutes of Development Control Committee A

Wednesday 8th April 2015 at 6 pm

Members:-

(A) Denotes absence (P) Denotes present

Labour	Liberal Democrat	Conservative	Green
Councillor Breckels (A) Councillor Khan (P) Councillor Milestone (P) Councillor Pearce (P) Councillor C Smith (P)	Councillor Hance (P) Councillor Woodman (P) Councillor Wright (P)	Councillor Eddy (P) Councillor Lucas (P) Councillor Quartley (P)	Councillor Telford (A)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Telford (substitute Councillor Fodor) and Councillor Khan who arrived late.

2. Declarations of interest

Agenda Item 7 (1) Westmoreland House – Councillor Wright stated that he had made his opposition to this application known and would not participate in it. He requested to make a Statement during Public Forum and this was agreed by the Committee.

Agenda Item 7 (1) Westmoreland House - Councillor Milestone stated that she has a studio at nearby Hamilton House but that this was not prejudicial.

Agenda Item 7 (3) 53 Colston Street – Councillor Wright stated that although he has concerns about this application and has been contacted by the traders group, he has an open mind about the application.

Agenda Item 7 (3) 53 Colston Street – Councillor Woodman stated that he had referred the application to the Committee as he was concerned that the views of the small local community would not be properly reflected. He noted that the traders group are in favour of the application and the residents are opposed to it. He has an open mind about the application.

3. Minutes

Resolved - that the Minutes of the Development Control Committee A meeting on the 25th February 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Appeals

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director, Planning (agenda item no. 4) noting appeals lodged, imminent public inquiries and appeals awaiting decision.

Resolved - that the report be noted.

5. Enforcement

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director, Planning (agenda item no. 5) noting any enforcement notices.

Resolved - that the report be noted.

6. Public forum

Members of the Committee received public forum statements in advance of the meeting.

The Statements were heard before the application they related to and were taken fully into consideration by the Committee prior to reaching a decision. (A copy of the public forum statements are held on public record in the Minute Book).

7. Planning and development

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director, Planning (agenda item no. 7) considering the following matter(s) :-

- (1) 14/05930/F & 14/05982/LA Westmoreland House/ Carriageworks, Stokes Croft**
Demolition of Westmoreland House and No.4 Ashley Road (Grade II Listed), partial demolition, alteration and renovation of the Carriageworks building 14/06283/F | Erection of a part 2, 4, 5, 6 and 11 storey building above ground floor level providing a mixed use development including 26 cluster flats, 104 studios, with ancillary facilities and 93sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class A3) with landscaping providing 721 sqm of non-residential accommodation (Use Classes A1/A2/A3/A4/D1/D2/B1) and 118 residential units (Use Class C3) and creation of new public realm, new communal landscape garden areas, bio-diverse living roofs, roof gardens, disabled car parking, servicing and access.

(Councillor Khan arrived during this item and did not participate in it. Councillor Wright did not participate in this item either as he has made a statement on this item and felt that he had prejudged the application. Councillor Milestone declared that she had a studio at nearby Hamilton House but that this was not prejudicial.)

The Service Manager, Development Management introduced the application and advised Members about the issues they could take into consideration.

The Planning Case Officer gave a detailed presentation on the application.

Attention was also drawn to the Amendment Sheet, a copy of which is contained in the Minute Book.

The Planning Obligations Manager explained the Policy concerning Affordable Housing. Affordable Housing must be owned by a social housing organisation. BCC Policy seeks 40% Affordable Housing in the Central Area subject to scheme viability. However anything between 0% and 40% can be acceptable depending on the scheme. The viability has to be assessed to determine the acceptable level of Affordable Housing required. The level varies from site to site. In the case of this scheme, a viability appraisal was submitted which was independently checked for BCC and it was found that the appraisal was reasonable. Refusal of the application could not therefore be recommended on the grounds of insufficient Affordable Housing.

The Planning Case Officer stated that the scheme would not create a gated community and that Conditions are included concerning the use of the public spaces. He added that who lives on the site cannot be considered a ground for refusal.

Members were reminded that the recommendation is to grant the application.

The Committee having considered all the relevant facts derived from the report and the public forum session debated the Application proposal and the following points were clarified/made:

- The application lacks enough Affordable Housing, is overdeveloped and there is a loss of light
- Although there is a desire to see the site developed this is not a popular application; concerns raised have not been addressed; the unredacted viability appraisal was only received the previous day at 4.00 pm
- The site is an eyesore that needs to be developed; Members can only consider the scheme presented to them; there is a desire to see the site redeveloped; the assurances and Conditions relating to a gated community are accepted; urban design issues have been addressed

- Although it is difficult to find reasons to refuse the application, there are a number of concerns about the scheme – the low level of Affordable Housing, the relationship with 108 Stokes Croft, the issue of the loss of light, disabled parking, the lack of permeability of the site, low footfall making the site unsafe
- The interests and aspirations of the community do not appear to have been taken into account
- Condition 27 relates to achieving an operational management plan for the site
- The 5% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions has been set as this is an old building
- There is discretion to reduce the time limit of 3 years for the commencement of the development taking into account other issues
- A Condition concerning locked gates could be included
- Reasons for refusal of the application could include the relationship with 108 Stokes Croft, light and amenity for residents, overlooking and the massing of the development
- Although contributions towards the improvement of the Ashley Road/A38 junction have been requested the Planning Inspector at a previous appeal ruled against this and only an amount of £50,000 would be received
- The Community Vision is a key document and this was made clear to the applicant; it has to be taken seriously and the applicant has done a reasonable job of engaging with the community
- Bus stops adjacent to the site have all been upgraded recently

Councillor Woodman moved the officer recommendation. Councillor Lucas seconded the motion.

On being put to the vote, it was LOST (voting 3 for, 7 against and 0 abstentions).

Councillor Woodman stated that refusal of the application could not be justified. He therefore proposed that a decision on the application be deferred and that Officers be authorised to carry out further work/negotiations with the applicant in relation to the following issues:

- Visitors cycle parking
- Relationship with 108 Stokes Croft
- The scale of development on Ashley Road and the lack of set back
- Lack of S 106 contribution to improve the Ashley Road/A38 Junction
- Condition 27 – greater clarity on the use of the units
- On site renewables (only 5%) – explore the possibility of using other technologies
- Condition on gates and their removal
- Condition 1 – reduce timescale for implementation
- Affordable Housing – consider if the mix within the 8 units can be changed
- Engagement with community groups including the Carriageworks Action Group

Councillor Woodman formally moved this motion and Colin Smith seconded it.

On being put to the vote it was

Resolved - (voting 8 for, 1 against, 1 abstention)

that a decision on the application be deferred and that Officers be authorised to carry out further work/negotiations with applicant in relation to the following issues:

- **The quantity and position of visitors cycle parking**
- **Relationship with 108 Stokes Croft**
- **The scale of development on Ashley Road and the lack of set back**
- **Contributions towards the improvement of the Ashley Road/A38 Junction.**
- **Additional information on the use of the ground floor units including revisions to relevant planning conditions, in particular Condition 27.**

- **On site renewables (only 5%) – explore the possibility of using other technologies.**
- **Additional information on the proposed gates, including consideration of their removal from the scheme.**
- **Consideration to a reduction on timescale for implementation of any permission including a revised condition 1.**
- **Affordable Housing – consider if the mix within the 8 units can be changed.**
- **Engagement with community groups including the Carriageworks Action Group.**

(Councillor Milestone left the Meeting. Councillor Wright re-joined the Meeting.)

**(2) 14/06283/F Former Print Hall, 1 Temple Way
Erection of a part 2, 4, 5, 6 and 11 storey building above ground floor level providing a mixed use development including 26 cluster flats, 104 studios, with ancillary facilities and 93sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class A3) with landscaping and associated works.(Major Application)**

The Planning Case Officer gave a detailed presentation on the application.

Attention was also drawn to the Amendment Sheet, a copy of which is contained in the Minute Book.

Members were reminded that the recommendation is to grant the application.

The Committee having considered all the relevant facts derived from the report and the public forum session debated the Application proposal and the following points were clarified/made:

- Although the application was supported, there were concerns about windows being fixed shut on the lower floors

Councillor Woodman moved that the recommendation be approved except that no windows are to be fixed shut.

Councillor Breckels seconded this motion.

On being put to the vote, it was

Resolved - (voting 11 for, 0 against, 0 abstentions)

that the application be approved in line with Officer recommendation and as set out in the Amendment Sheet, except that no windows are to be fixed shut.

(3) 14/03870/X 53 Colston Street

Variation of Condition 3 and removal of Condition 4; 12/05611/X Proposed extension to hours of operation removal of condition to allow consumption of food and drink on the entrance terrace.

The Planning Case Officer gave a detailed presentation on the application

Members were reminded that the recommendation is to grant the application.

The Committee having considered all the relevant facts derived from the report and the public forum session debated the Application proposal and the following points were clarified/made:

- The reasons for attaching the Condition to the original consent still stand
- There was sympathy for the residents
- 22.00 is already late enough
- There should be encouragement for families to live in the central area of the City

Councillor Woodman moved that both applications be refused on the grounds of residential amenity.

Colin Smith seconded this motion.

On being put to the vote, it was

Resolved – (voting 11 for, 1 against, 0 abstentions)

that both applications be refused on the grounds of residential amenity.

(The meeting ended at 9.45 pm)

CHAIR