



Agenda Item No: 3

## **Bristol City Council**

### **Minutes of Development Control Committee B**

Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> August 2014 at 4pm

---

**Members:-**

*(A) De-notes absence (P) De-notes present*

<b>Labour</b>	<b>Liberal Democrat</b>	<b>Conservative</b>	<b>Green</b>
Councillor Smith (P) Councillor Holland (P) Councillor Payne (P) Councillor Mead (P) Councillor Hickman (P)	Councillor Martin (A) Councillor Woodman (A) Councillor Leaman (A)	Councillor Abraham (P) Councillor Eddy (substitute for Lucas) (P) Councillor Windows (A)	Councillor Fodor (P)

**12. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Councillors Lucas (substituted by Eddy), Martin, Woodman, Leaman and Windows.

**13. Declarations of interest**

No declarations of interest were received.

**14. Minutes – 7<sup>th</sup> July 2014**

**Resolved – that the above minutes be signed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

**15. Appeals**

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director, Planning and Place (Agenda Item No. 4) noting appeals lodged, imminent public inquiries and appeals awaiting decision.

Item 35 – Land to the East of Wesley College, College Park Drive, Bristol City Council

It was noted that the Inspector had given significant weight to the issue of the detrimental impact on the character of the Brentry Conservation Area when he had decided to dismiss this appeal.

**Resolved - that the report be noted.**

**16. Enforcement**

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director, Planning and Place (Agenda Item Number 5) noting any enforcement notices.

**Resolved - that the report be noted.**

**17 Public Forum**

Members of the Committee had received the public forum statements in advance of the meeting (Agenda Item No.6).

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

**18 Planning and Development**

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director, Planning and Place (Agenda Item No. 7) considering the following matters:-

**13/05616/P**

**St Catherines Place Shopping Centre East Street Bedminster**

**Hybrid outline application for demolition of existing buildings on the site and phased redevelopment of site, comprising full application for Phase 1 and outline application for Phase 2. Full details provided for Phase 1 comprising: up to 45 residential units in a ground plus 8 storeys building, with up to 401.9 sq m GIA of flexible commercial floorspace (falling within Use Classes A1 - A5, B1 and D1) at ground floor level and associated space, cycle storage, refuse storage, plant, servicing, ancillary storage, public realm at lower ground floor and ground floor level. Outline details for Phase 2 to comprise up to 143 residential units in a building up to ground plus 15 storeys in height and 203.5 sq m GIA of flexible commercial floorspace (falling within Use Classes A1 – A5, B1 and D1) at ground floor level and associated space for parking, cycle parking, refuse storage, plant, servicing, ancillary storage lower ground floor and ground floor level. Details of access, scale and layout to be determined at the outline stage with details of appearance and landscaping to be determined in Reserved Matters applications.**

The Committee had carried out an Informal Site Inspection earlier in the day.

The representative of the Service Director (Planning) gave a detailed presentation concerning the application during which the following points were made:

- (1) The site was outside but very close to the Bedminster Conservation Area
- (2) This was an area that was not flourishing and did require development

(3) Transport officers had indicated that they believed this was a sustainable location;

(4) The proposed development was of excessive height, scale and massing and would cause harm to the setting of the Conservation Area. With buildings of this size and nature, it is important to take account of the way they are perceived from other parts of the city, as well as the immediate effect in the local area;

(5) Officers had received independent advice on site viability and this was that in its current form the scheme could not provide any affordable housing, when the policy requirement was for 30%. In the event that the scheme was approved, there would need to be a viability review clause to claw back the requirement for affordable housing if the site viability improved. Officers advised, however, that the submitted information had shown that the development was currently not viable and was some distance away from being able to provide any affordable housing.

Committee Members made the following comments in respect of this application:

- (1) The report failed to give sufficient weight to the fact that there was already a high rise building not far away from the site;
- (2) The area needs investment. The development would help to address housing need in the area and had good transport links – it was near the bus route and train station. It would act as a good starting point for new investment in Bedminster
- (3) It was unreasonable to expect this development to solve all the problems from past planning mistakes in the area. As the development progressed, work would be required on how it could take account of the need for affordable housing in the area. One option would be for the Committee to support the outline application on the understanding that Phase 2 will come back for consideration at a future date;
- (4) Whilst the lack of affordable housing in the current scheme was regrettable, if the outline scheme was supported with a requirement for a report back on the rest of it, this would address this issue;
- (5) Although the scale of the building was considerable, this was a run-down part of the city and needed investment to boost the local economy. It was also located in an area with good transport links. The desire for a perfect solution should not prevent a development on this site. Issues such as drainage also needed to be considered;
- (6) The positives of the scheme outweighed the negatives;
- (7) The area surrounding East Street had become very run-down and the character of the area needed to be brought back. However, the scale of the development was very high and massing within a quarter of a mile of the site would be very significant. The development as proposed did not obtain the maximum benefit required, in particular the need for affordable housing which remained a long way off. The scheme as proposed might bring back 1 or 2 bedroom flats for the short term ie not meeting the needs

of the community. The scheme was also not architecturally attractive. A wider brief for the area was required;

- (8) Whilst the location of the development was very good, the design was a concern;
- (9) Negotiations over the design had been taking place over many months and too great a further delay could result in an appeal for non-determination. It was important to identify what the goals of the development were if affordable housing could not be obtained;
- (10) There were potentially further applications for the area which were “in the pipeline”.

Councillor Abraham moved, seconded by Councillor Mead “that the recommendation contained in the report (ie that the application be refused) be approved. Upon being put to the vote, this was **LOST (3 for, 5 against)**.”

Councillor Holland moved that “approval of the scheme is subject to the appropriate conditions in a section 106 agreement to secure transport mitigation and a viability review clause to establish if affordable housing could be provided at future phases of the scheme”. This was not seconded.

Following further discussion, Councillor Abraham moved, seconded by Councillor Smith and, upon being put to the vote, it was

**Resolved (unanimously) – that this application be deferred to allow officers to provide the Committee with further advice on site viability and the potential for the development to deliver affordable housing.**

(The meeting ended at 5.45 pm)

CHAIR