

DISCLAIMER

The attached minutes are DRAFT minutes. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the information, statements and decisions recorded in them, their status will remain that of a draft until such time as they are confirmed as a correct record at the subsequent meeting.

Bristol City Council

**Minutes of an extraordinary meeting of the
Sustainable Development and
Transport Scrutiny Commission
held on 27 March 2014 at 6pm**

- P Councillor Weston (in the Chair)
- P Councillor Green
- A Councillor Khan
- A Councillor Lucas (Councillor Hiscott as substitute)
- P Councillor Martin
- P Councillor Negus
- P Councillor Pearce
- A Councillor Threlfall
- P Councillor Willingham
- P Councillor Wollacott

SDT

74.3/14 Apologies for absence, substitutions and introductions.

Apologies were received from Councillors Lucas and Threlfall. Councillor Hiscott was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Lucas.

SDT

75.3/14 Public Forum.

The Public Forum bundle was circulated to Members in advance of the meeting and a copy placed in the Minute Book.

Agenda item	Subject	Author	PFS27.3.14/
6	Proposals to deal with impact of Cribbs Causeway development	Transport for Greater Bristol Alliance	01

6	Extraordinary circumstances why Henbury Loop should be brought forward	Alison Devonshire	02
---	---	--------------------------	----

**SDT
76.3/14 Declarations of interest.**

There were none.

**SDT
77.3/14 Whipping.**

There was none.

**SDT
78.3/14 Chair's business.**

There was none.

**SDT
79.3/14 Inquiry to consider the impact of the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood on Bristol and make recommendations as necessary to the Cabinet and Mayor**

The commission considered a report of the Service Director, Policy, Strategy and Communication (agenda item no. 6) setting out details of the inquiry to consider the impact of the Cribbs Patchway New Neighbourhood on Bristol.

The Commission then heard from, with support of a presentation, the following City Council officers:-

Colin Chapman, Local Plan Team Manager;
Patrick Goodey, Flood Risk Manager;
Alistair Cox, Service Manager City Transport;
Robin McDowell, Team Manager Economy & Enterprise.

The presentations are appended to these minutes.

A short Question and Answer session took place as follows:-

Q – Chair – Will the final decision on which mitigations are agreed be a collective one or for SGC to make ?

A – We are not at that stage yet.

Q – Cllr Willingham – What predictions are there for individual junction pressures ?

A – BCC's own projections are indicative regarding capacity issues, but there are no worked up schemes to calculate.

Q – If the mitigations are on the City Council's side, can we do our own bus gate /TRO's ?

A – Yes, we can but it would be a sad state of affairs to have to impose and would require due process.

Q – Does the NPPE/ EA predict some development of flooding ?

A – The main threat to the area is from surface water, which is required to be designed into planning proposals.

Q – Can S106 funding for developments in SGC be spent by BCC ?

A – If agreed by SGC as Planning Authority.

Q – Is there a legal agreement in place for bus routes agreed following planning permission today (for the Wyck Beck Road site) ?

A – No. Have agreement to work up some proposals for the A38 side of the A4018 corridor but not yet in place - this is influenced by the wider range of activities including Southmead Hospital.

Q – Is Horfield and Ashley Hill Station part of the business case ?

A – Yes, within Phase II.

Q – What is the time for the build out of SGC ? When do we expect the development to start and will it take 20 years or 8/10 years to complete eg. Patchway Trading Estate at the end of the period. How does this fit in with the Core Strategy ?

A – The Core Strategy runs to 2027. Many issues can affect implementation of the scheme and there are a large number of developers. The SBD triggers when communities are included in

the development and to ensure that infrastructure is in the right place at the right stage.

Q – What would be the impact of on local businesses of a right turn ban at signalised junctions ?

A – There are no clear plans for this in Bristol. Larger cities which have had new developments have done this. Careful thought would always be given to the impact on businesses.

Q – How will you control bus lanes through Bristol ?

A - Bus Gates and fines. People do stop driving where they should not if they realise there is camera enforcement and a fine.

Q – A tweak along the M5 and Crow Lane would mean there were no difficulties in traffic flow and no impact on residents.

Q - Experts had initially said that but now there is a Joint Working Group who see the impacts as far wider. The views of elected members and Residents' Groups have been made clear.

Q – What plans were there for major sewerage to be connected from the development to Kingsweston ? Were there plans for a low energy, high quality build as per the Mayor's plans ?

A – Wessex Water replied that they had been working for 9-12 months on the Charlton Hayes development and the carriage and capacity is available at Kingsweston. There is a two phased approach – Skanska is currently working with us. We have a legal duty to drain and plans need to be within the right timescales. The approximate timing for building is 2015 – 2020. Plans were high level and not concrete and include a new strategic tunnel.

Q – There would be 5700 house with potentially 3 per house which equates to 21,000 – 25, 000 cars. What was all the fuss about, these figures were not that bad – how can the overestimation be justified ?

A – Traffic modelling has demonstrated that there will be traffic impacts from workers who live in Bristol and it is important to mitigate these impacts.

Six focus groups comprising invited stakeholders, Councillors and some members of the public discussed and produced the following recommendations:-

Table 1.

- 1) A contractual agreement be produced for consequent works required in Bristol and funded by SGC. With regards to air quality, SGC will fully indemnify BCC for any fines from the EU imposed because of dormitory development.
- 2) A combined authority so that there is a joined up planning and approval process.
- 3) Early development of infrastructure ie. the electrification of Charlton Hayes.
- 4) Flood risk in Bristol should not be increased and should be indemnified by SGC.
- 5) SGC to be challenged to create more employment for the population living in the area.

Table 2.

- 1) A proper vision be developed for Park & Ride to alleviate trips in Bristol. Clifton Rugby Club and North Filton Railway Station were possible sites.
- 2) The standards of energy regeneration should be far beyond the normal standards.
- 3) Abolish SGC and form an Integrated Transport Authority so that there is better funding and proper engagement with communities.
- 4) The commercial value of rail serving the developments should be a motivation for developers to provide funding.
- 5) Schools should be in place at the right time needed so that habits are not formed to travel elsewhere.

Table 3.

- 1) A summit involving the Mayor and Leader of SGC be held with the aims of producing a high level agreement of resolving issues to mutual satisfaction.
- 2) Legal Officers to assist planners regarding the powers the authority has to delay the start of a development until agreements are reached on sustainability and transport issues.

- 3) There should be more discussion on the impacts of schools – traffic movements.
- 4) There was a need to gather more evidence on the actual impact on movements to work, shops and leisure – assumptions were currently limited.
- 5) Skanska to work with the Environment Agency on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems – and the essential requirement of them be pressed home.

Table 4.

- 1) The good practice of cross-boundary working be presented to senior politicians and the Mayor.
- 2) S106 monies be used to fund non transport infrastructure such as healthcare amenities.
- 3) BCC liaise directly with rather than SGC officers regarding S106 agreements.
- 4) Surface water be used for ponds/ lakes.

Table 5.

- 1) Adequate funding be made available to mitigate development impact.
- 2) A sustainable development, including Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and sustainable energy, be at the heart of its future as a successful neighbourhood.
- 3) Protocols detailing ways of working and cross-boundary member/officer engagement be developed.
- 4) Better communications and not just electronic, be considered.
- 5) BCC and SGC be joint signatories for S106 monies.

Table 6.

- 1) Establish a protocol for joint working, cross/boundary so that current struggles are ironed out.
- 2) Mitigating packages to be mutually agreed.
- 3) Consultation with BCC be included in SGC's Statement of Community Involvement which was currently out for consultation.
- 4) A skills academy to be developed cross-border and S106 monies be used to prioritise local labour.
- 5) Phase 2 of the rail line be brought forward with use of contributions

- 6) Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems to be part of the core of developments and not an add on.

RESOLVED –

A: On Future Large Scale Border Development

The Inquiry highlighted concern that when an authority proposes a major development on the boundary of a neighbouring authority, too often the concerns of the neighbouring authority are either dismissed or taken lightly. This is a wider concern than the current CPNN development and steps should be taken across the West of England to try and remedy this situation. As such the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Establish a protocol between neighbouring authorities for major developments or developments with a major impact in order to facilitate consultation and agreement on local concerns and mitigations. This should be reflected in South Gloucestershire Council's Statement of Community Involvement (currently out for consultation) which should include a clear statement and principles about cross-border consultation on issues like this.
2. This protocol should ensure that when decisions being made on which mitigations are to be funded, from either CIL or S106, that officers of the neighbouring authority are included in the final discussions and decisions. The final say should not be left to the developing authority alone and should be reached by mutual consent on a comprehensive basis, having regard to the impacts of the whole development allocation.
3. A protocol be established in order to ensure that developers and Councils proactively institute early communications with the wider community/relevant stakeholders on up and coming proposals. This should include greater transparency and sharing of factual information and assumptions, including the evidence on which those assumptions are made. Communications should not be solely electronic.
4. Mitigation proposals should be directly communicated between both the developing authority, neighbouring authority and also the developers so that all parties are aware of all concerns.
5. Major developments of this nature should feature on Joint Scrutiny and West of England Partnership agendas.
6. It is noted that the core strategy is agreed with the mutual consent of the neighbouring authority; however, Supplementary Planning Documents, even if cross-border, require no such consent. The

Government should therefore be lobbied for planning regulations to be changed to close this loophole.

B: General Principles of Development

The Inquiry agreed some general principles that should be used to inform planning permissions to be granted on the CPNN - There are several recommendations that it believed should become both the regional standard and be applied to the CPNN. At the moment only outline planning permissions are being submitted and this presents an opportunity for South Gloucestershire to influence the final design. As such Commission makes the following recommendations:

7. Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems are to be of the highest quality and incorporated at the outset of all developments and not bolted on in order to mitigate the risk of flooding in Bristol.
8. Sustainable energy and construction – the quality of construction should be of the highest environmental standard possible and not the minimum required.
9. Apprentices should be factored in to all planning permissions and at every opportunity developers should use local labour. Some developers already have a good reputation in this area, this existing good practice should be encouraged and built upon to up skill the local workforce.
10. Essential services – Proposals for major developments should factor in the impact on essential services such as education and health and these should be provided at the point at which they are needed. Existing trigger points should be under permanent review as the exact nature of the incoming population will not be known until they have arrived. Facilities should be delivered as early as possible to prevent stress on existing services.
11. Bristol City Council as Planning Authority for North Bristol must ensure that it applies the same exacting standards that it wishes South Gloucestershire Council to apply.

C: CPNN Specific Proposals

These are recommendations specifically proposed to be taken into account for the CPNN development:

12. Railways – All funding options be explored for bringing forward MetroWest Phase 2 as soon as possible. This should include the

exploration of developer contributions to help plug any funding shortfall currently anticipated in the schemes finances.

13. Further provision of Park and Ride within the CPNN development should be explored. The transport and traffic impacts on the communities of North Bristol are massive and all steps to offer public transport alternatives should be encouraged.
14. Existing traffic situations that force traffic south onto Bristol roads should be reviewed and where possible removed.
15. Bristol City Council should take legal advice on avenues open to the Council to seek recourse should developments have a detrimental impact on locations/communities in Bristol.

SDT

80.3/14 Date of next meeting.

To be advised.

(The meeting ended at 8.30pm)

CHAIR