

Development Control A Committee Agenda



Date: Wednesday, 15 June 2016

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: The Grace Room - The Bristol Pavilion, The County Ground, Nevil Road, Bristol, BS7 9EJ

Distribution:

Councillors: Lesley Alexander, Stephen Clarke, Harriet Bradley, Fabian Breckels, Steve Pearce, Mike Davies, Kye Dudd, Mark Wright, Olly Mead, Clive Stevens and Chris Windows

Copies to: Jeremy Livitt, Gary Collins, Ron Moss, Zoe Willcox (Service Director - Planning), Catherine Tyrer, Peter Westbury and Lewis Cook

Issued by: Jeremy Livitt, Democratic Services
3rd Floor Deanery Wing, City Hall, college Green BS1 5TR
Tel: 0117 92 23758
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk
Date: Tuesday, 7 June 2016



Agenda

1. Election of Chair 2016/17

To elect a Chair for the Municipal Year 2016/17.

2. Election of Vice-Chair 2016/17

To elect a Vice-Chair for the Municipal Year 2016/17.

3. Membership of the Committee 2016/17

To note the Membership of the Committee for the Municipal Year 2016/17.

4. Terms of Reference

To note the Committee's Terms of Reference as determined by Annual Council on 31st May 2016.

(Pages 6 - 9)

5. Dates and times of Meetings of the Committee 2016/17

To agree and note the following dates and times of the Development Control Committee A Meetings scheduled for 2016/17:

27th July A 6pm

7th September A 2pm

19th October A 6pm

30th November A 2pm

11th January A 6pm

22nd February A 2pm

5th April A 6pm

6. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

7. Declarations of Interest

To note any declarations of interest from the Councillors. They are asked to indicate the relevant agenda item, the nature of the interest and in particular whether it is a **disclosable pecuniary interest**.



Any declarations of interest made at the meeting which is not on the register of interests should be notified to the Monitoring Officer for inclusion.

8. Minutes of the previous meeting

To agree the minutes of the last meeting as a correct record.

(Pages 10 - 18)

9. Appeals

To note appeals lodged, imminent public inquiries, and appeals awaiting decision.

(Pages 19 - 27)

10. Enforcement

To note recent enforcement notices.

(Page 28)

11. Public Forum

Any member of the public or councillor may participate in public forum. The detailed arrangements for so doing are set out in the Public Information Sheet at the back of this agenda. Please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:

Questions:

Written questions must be received three clear working days prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your question(s) must be received at the latest by 5pm on 9th June 2016.

Petitions and statements:

Petitions and statements must be received by noon on the working day prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your submission must be received at the latest by 12.00 noon on 14th June 2016.

The statement should be addressed to the Service Director, Legal Services, c/o The Democratic Services Team, City Hall, 3rd Floor Deanery Wing, College Green,
P O Box 3176, Bristol, BS3 9FS or email - democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

12. Planning and Development

Report of the Service Director Planning

(Pages 29 - 139)

To consider the following applications for Development Control Committee A:



Please note the plans and drawings attached to the reports are for illustrative purposes only. The application drawings are those described in the conditions and advices applied to individual applications.

1 Bishopston and Ashely Down Ward

15/06289/F - Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston
Bristol

15/06290/LA - Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston
Bristol

15/06293/F - Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston
Bristol

2 Southville

15/04726/F - Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of
36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol BS3 1AL

15/04727/LA - Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of
36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol BS3 1AL

15/04731/F - Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear
Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol

15/04732/LA - Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of
36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol

3 Clifton Down

15/01681/F - Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US

13. Supporting Documents to Item 12

Contained in this pack are supporting documentation/drawings

(Pages 140 - 157)



DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEES

Terms of Reference

Arrangements

There are 2 Development Control Committees:

- **Development Control Committee “A”**
- **Development Control Committee “B”**

Each Development Control Committee shall have full authority to deal with all development control matters reserved to a Development Control Committee by virtue of this constitution.

Functions

Full Council has delegated to the Development Control Committees all functions relating to town & country planning and development control as specified in Regulation 2 and Schedule 1 to the Local Authorities (Functions and Responsibilities) (England) Regulations 2000 (as amended) under the following provisions and any related secondary legislation:

1. Power to determine application for planning permission (section 70(1)(a) and (b) and 72 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (c.8)).
2. Power to determine applications to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached (section 73 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990).
3. Power to grant planning permission for development already carried out (section 73(A) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990).
4. Power to decline to determine application for planning permission (section 70A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990).
5. Duties relating to the making of determinations of planning applications (Sections 69, 76 and 92) of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and Articles 8, 10 to 13, 15 to 22 and 25, and 26 of the Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure Order 1995) (S.I. 1995/419 and directions made thereunder).
6. Power to determine application for planning permission made by a local authority, alone, or jointly with another person (section 316 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town & Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (S.I. 1992/1492)).
7. Power to make determinations, give approvals and agree certain other matters relating to the exercise of permitted development rights (Parts 6, 7, 11, 17, 19, 20, 21 to 24, 26, 30 and 31 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995).
8. Power to enter into agreement regulating development or use of land (Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
9. Power to issue a certificate of existing or proposed lawful use or development (Section 191(4) and 192(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
10. Power to serve a completion notice (Section 94(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
11. Power to grant consent for the display of advertisements (Section 220 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 1992).
12. Power to authorise entry onto land (Section 196A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
13. Power to require the discontinuance of a use of land (Section 102 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).

14. Power to serve a planning contravention notice, breach of condition notice or stop notice (Sections 171C, 187A and 183(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
15. Power to issue a temporary stop notice (Section 171 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
16. Power to issue an enforcement notice (Section 172 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
17. Power to apply for an injunction restraining a breach of planning control (Section 187B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
18. Power to determine applications for hazardous substances consent, and related powers (Sections 9(1) and 10 of the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Act 1990 (c.10)).
19. Duty to determine conditions of which old mining permissions, relevant planning permissions relating to dormant sites or active Phase I or II sites or mineral permissions relating to mining sites, as the case may be, are to be subject (paragraph 2(6)(a) of Schedule 2 of the Planning and Compensation Act 1991, paragraph 9(6) of the Schedule 13 of the Environment Act 1995 (c.25) and paragraph 6(5) of Schedule 14 to that Act.
20. Power to require proper maintenance of land (section 215(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
21. Power to determine application for listed building consent, and related powers (sections 16(1) and (2), 17 and 33(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (c.9).
22. Power to determine applications for conservation area consent (section 16(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas Act 1990, as applied by section 74(3) of that Act.)
23. Duties relating to applications for listed building consent and conservation area consent (sections 13(1) and 14(1) and (4) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and regs 3 to 6 and 13 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990 S.I. 1990/1519) and paragraphs 8,15 and 26 of the Department of Environmental, Transport and the Regions circular 01/01).
24. Power to serve a building preservation notice, and related powers (sections 3(1) and 4(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
25. Power to issue enforcement notice in relation to demolition of listed building in conservation area (section 47 and 48 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
26. Powers to acquire a listed building in need of repair and to serve a repairs notice (section 47 and 48 of the Planning (Listed Buildings

- and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
27. Power to apply for an injunction in relation to a listed building (section 44A of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Buildings in Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
 28. Power to execute urgent works (section 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990).
 29. Power to authorise stopping up or diversion of highway (section 247 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
 30. Power to authorise stopping-up or diversion of footpath, bridleway or restricted byway (section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
 31. Power to extinguish public rights of way over land held for planning purposes (Section 258 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990).
 32. Powers relating to the protection of important hedgerows (the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 (S.I. 1997/1160)).
 33. Powers relating to the preservation of trees (sections 197 to 214D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Trees Regulations 1990 (S.I. 1999/1892)).
 34. Powers relating to complaints about high hedges (Part 8 of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003).
 35. Power to include modifications in other orders (Section 53A of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981).
 36. power to revoke or modify planning permission (Section 97 Town and Country Planning Act 1990)

Code of Conduct

The committee must follow the council's Code of Conduct for Councillors and Officers dealing with development control and other appropriate planning matters (in part 5 of the constitution).



Bristol City Council Minutes of Development Control Committee A Wednesday 6th April 2016 at 6.00pm

Members:-

(A) Denotes absent (P) Denotes present

Labour	Liberal Democrat	Conservative	Green
Councillor Hickman (P)	Councillor Hopkins (A)	Councillor Abraham (P) (Chair)	Councillor Clarke (P)
Councillor Holland (P)	Councillor Kent (P)	Councillor Budd (P)	Councillor McMullen (P)
Councillor Khan (P)	Councillor Wright (P)	Councillor Lucas (P)	
Councillor Mead (P)			
Councillor Pearce (A)			
Councillor Phipps (P)			
Councillor Shah (A)			

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Councillor Pearce (Councillor Mead substituting), Councillor Hopkins (Councillor Kent substituting) and Councillor Shah (Councillor Hickman substituting).

2. Declarations of interest

Councillor Tim Kent declared an interest in Application Numbers 15/06069/F and 15/06070/P since he had previously written a letter to other Local Authorities a few years supporting the principle of an Arena.

3. Minutes

Resolved - that the Minutes of the Development Control Committee A meeting on the 2nd March 2016 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.

The Service Director reported that:

- (1) Item Number 4 – 541 to 551 Fishponds Road, Fishponds, Bristol BS16 3AF – The Inquiry was now confirmed for 8th November 2016
- (2) Item Number 32 – Land Located Between Numbers 5 and 11, Bramble Drive, Sneyd Park, Bristol BS9 1RE – This appeal had been allowed but costs had not been awarded against the Council. The Inspector felt that there had been reasonable grounds to pursue costs
- (3) Item Number 33 - Hungerford Gardens – This appeal had been allowed and costs awarded against the Council. The Council had refused the application in accordance with Policy DM21 relating to private gardens on the grounds that this was not a sustainable location. The Inspector did not agree that the technical guidance that the Council had relied upon was appropriate to use and costs were, therefore, awarded. Officers were disappointed with this decision and felt it was harsh.

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 its decisions (A copy of the public forum statements are held on public record in the Minute Book.).

7. Planning and Development

The Committee considered the following reports of the Service Director, Planning (agenda item no. 7) considering the following matter(s), together with a Transport Update report, in addition to an update sheet:

(1) 15/06069/F – Former Diesel Depot Land, Bath Road, Brislington BS4 3DT – Construction of 12,000 Capacity Indoor Arena (Use Class D2). On the South Part of the Site, Creation of Public Plaza In front Of Arena And Landscaping Of the Site; permanent disabled parking (45 spaces) and cycle parking facilities (252) spaces), temporary surface level parking for operational staff and VIPs (200 spaces) for a period of 5 years; pedestrian and vehicular access via

bridge from Cattle Market Road (under construction) and provision of new pedestrian access and steps from Bath Road. Existing vehicular access and steps from Bath Road. Existing vehicular access from Bath Road to be retained as a restricted access – Major Application/ Environmental Statement

(2) 15/06070/P – Former Diesel Depot Land, Bath Road, Brislington BS4 3DT, Outline Application (All Matters Reserved) For Up To 19,000 sqm of mixed use development on Arena Island comprising retail (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4); offices (Use Class B1); leisure (Use Class D2); residential dwellings, including affordable housing (Use Class C30; hotel (Use Class C1) and student accommodation (Sui generis). Provision of associated hard and soft landscaping, including linkages to the plaza and HCA Bridge, Major Application/Environmental Statement.

The Chair reminded the Committee that this application was being reconsidered following a deferral from the meeting on 2nd March 2016 since members had felt that there were key issues which had needed to be addressed.

The Service Manager (Development Management) made the following points:

- (1) The applicant had submitted a Transport Update Report which clarified the work undertaken since November 2015, outlined the measures that would be taken to address key transport issues and explained other transport measures that had been taken such as the Portway Park and Ride;
- (2) The report proposed revised conditions and required that a further update report is provided to the Committee on the Transport Plan, it confirmed that the Energy Centre located at 100 Temple Street will deliver District Heating to the Arena via installation in the Enterprise Zone and also included within proposed Condition 3 plots of land plots of land could not be considered in isolation from the Master Plan for the Outline Application.

The Transport Development Manager gave a presentation and made the following points:

- (1) Key requirements for the proposal which had been requested at the previous Committee were an increased level of rail and bus-based park and ride services to coincide with arena events, restrictive controls to prevent negative impacts caused by visitor parking, safe facilities for pick-up and drop-off movements and safe and convenient access for pedestrians and cyclists to encourage rather than deter walking and cycling;
- (2) Additional detail had been provided concerning pedestrian access and safety, cycle access and cycle parking, park and ride provision, service buses and ferries, taxis and coaches, public drop-off and pick-up points, parking on-site, parking restraint measures, travel planning and programme and funding;
- (3) The following additional information was provided:

- Details of pedestrian access and safety arrangements – including conditions for key elements of this;
 - Details of cycle access and cycle parking;
 - Details of on-site parking ;
 - Details of park and ride provision, including increased provision to coincide with Arena events;
 - Details of Public Transport provision for the site;
 - Details of taxis, coaches, pick-up and drop-off points;
 - Details of disabled access and parking measures;
 - Details of parking restraint measures, including the 20-minute walking isochrone area;
 - Arena Travel and Event Management arrangements
 - Shares for Different modes of travel – including worst-case scenarios
- (4) The appointment of a Travel Plan Co-ordinator is likely to take place in the summer of 2016 – this post would deliver a robust Event Management Plan, including the incentivisation of public transport.

During discussion of the item, Councillors made the following comments:

- (1) Officers should be congratulated on their hard work since the last meeting in providing the additional information;
- (2) The revised proposal was hugely encouraging - it was clear that officers had listened to the concerns expressed by members and responded to them. It was also important that key conditions would be dealt with via reporting back to Committee to ensure appropriate implementation. Proper consultation would be a key element of the scheme;
- (3) The proposal needed to take into account the impact of the sale of Temple Meads, traffic mitigation for the RSPCA Bristol Clinic and Bristol Dogs and Cats Home on Albert Road and ensuring that public consultation was as thorough as possible. Officers confirmed that 2 conditions had been put forward to address the issues raised under Public Forum Statement 6 in relation to the Dogs and Cats Home (Condition 10 and 29 (latter amended)). They also advised that community consultation would be genuine and thorough;
- (4) The model of Leeds Arena should be followed which would allow booking of parking spaces in advance at the Park and Ride location and allow members of the public to see if particular spaces were free. The same principle could also apply in respect of bus tickets. Officers referred to the palate of measures set out in their transport presentation document.
- (5) In response to a question concerning how the parking strategy and cost would operate, officers indicated that Transport Plan would be a key plank of this development – a variety of measures might apply,

including for example double yellow lines in some areas, some other areas operating with parking for residents only and the extension of existing RPZ times for other areas. In relation to the principle that the developer should pay for such costs, officers referred to Advice Note 3 which made clear that the Arena Project would cover the costs, including infrastructure costs;

- (6) It might be impractical to stop members of the public crossing at the Bath Road Three Lamps Junction for an event. Whilst it would not be appropriate for stewards to be in place to ensure the crossing of major highways was avoided, the arrangements as part of the Event Management Strategy would include considerable arrangements for stewarding and signage would be in place along Cattle Market Road and the Three Lamps Junction;
- (7) Consideration should be given to holding a competition for the design of the footbridge at Victor Street. Officers confirmed a separate application had already been submitted for this application. It was a priority to ensure the bridge was operating prior to the opening of the Arena;
- (8) It was disappointing to see that there had been some Public Forum statements questioning the location of the Arena since the central area had always been the favoured location. The application was at an appropriate level for this stage of the development;
- (9) The percentage of estimated cycle usage still needed to be improved and the bus usage also remained very poor. In the case of other core cities which had an Arena (ie Nottingham) many people travelled by bus to the Arena, Nevertheless, it was extremely encouraging to see that Park and Ride would be introduced for Sunday evenings which would be a significant improvement;
- (10) There were genuine concerns about the need to meet the needs of the affected neighbourhoods. It was important to learn from the mistakes during the implementation of the Ashton Gate RPZ. Discussion with Neighbourhood Partnerships would be an important part of this process, as well as the recently approved Old Market Neighbourhood Plan to dovetail with this. Officers confirmed that mitigation would need to take place through conditions and which were a responsibility of the applicant to secure;
- (11) The issue of local labour for the development was important. The Transport Plan needed to ensure that local communities benefitted from it. Officers confirmed that this was a major opportunity to secure local labour and training through Condition 16 – the applicants were very close to signing an arrangement with developers which would provide an exemplary approach to training;
- (12) It was important that Bristol City Council's own Planning Applications should be seen as exemplary;

- (13) It was important that the interests of the people of Bristol should be looked after in this application;
- (14) Details of contingency plans for any anticipated extra provision needed to be clarified. Officers confirmed that details were set out in the report, including monitoring of issues such as this through the Event Management process which would enable issues to be identified and money set aside where required. Members' attention was drawn to Condition 26;
- (15) The lack of a proposal for a bus stop near Bath Road remained a cause for concern – there remained a substantial walk of 10 minutes for the public. This could result in people deciding not to get off at the existing bus stop and remaining on there until the Temple Meads bus stop, thereby aggravating existing congestion in the area. Officers confirmed that options had been looked at for this site but that a Safety Audit for this (and the suggested Three Lamps Junction right turn) had not considered the problems severe enough to merit these suggestions. In addition, the forthcoming Temple Quarter Enterprise Zone Spatial Framework would make a significant impact – officers could carry out modelling at this stage. The Committee was advised that 10 routes that needed improving (including the Bath Road and the Three Lamps Junction) had been identified as part of the Spatial Framework – officers would advise that these suggested improvements needed to be linked to the Bristol Enterprise Zone rather than the Arena, since the Master Plan for the outline application was linked to Arena Island only;
- (16) There was also the issue of a right turn at the Three Lamps Junction which had been requested by a number of residents – whilst there was some difference of opinion about the impact of this, a condition was required to carry out some modelling of various options to assess its feasibility;
- (17) The area marked yellow on the Figure 6 On-Street Parking Control map needed to be clarified on the website ie that it was a 20-minute walking isochrome area rather than a Parking Zone Area, since this was causing some confusion;
- (18) Consideration should be given to ring fencing the impact of the Council's required cuts. In response to this, officers confirmed that certain funding had been set aside by Cabinet for this project and that all funding would come from this amount. The needs of particular communities needed to be met, such as in Barton Hill where many residents spoke English as a second language and through the role of apprenticeships;
- (19) There were some outstanding issues which remained to be resolved. In particular, there remained a concern for residents that the RPZ scheme would operate as other schemes in the city are, by which

residents pay what amounts to a tax each year since the RPZ would not be required in the area if it were not for the increased traffic arising from the Arena. Some Councillors supported the introduction of a condition concerning this, whilst other Councillors felt that this would have implications for other planning applications. In addition, the consultation with local residents on this issue might enable an answer to emerge. Officers stated that there was no direct link between the additional cost of parking and the cost of parking permits and that they could not recommend a condition in this instance – management of parking was a separate issue which would be dealt with through the required parking arrangements for the Arena;

- (20) There remained concerns about the Bath Road and the need to widen the carriageway;
- (21) The arrangements for the district heating plan were encouraging, as well as the reference to the need for a ramp from Bath Road for cyclists as part of the Outline Application. Officers confirmed that condition 3 of the Outline Application set out the requirement for continuous cycle provision;
- (22) This area of the city had been a blot on the landscape for a long time. There now seemed to be sufficient measures in place to address the concerns that the Committee had put forward – the Arena would need to be managed as an asset to residents in the area. Public Transport would be a key element in this process.

Councillor Abraham moved and it was seconded by Councillor Lucas that the recommendations contained in the report for Application Number 15/06069/F be approved.

Councillor Kent moved an amendment to Condition 10 relating to Parking, seconded by Councillor Wright that “full consultation with residents and Councillors over parking restrictions and hours of operation and for charges to be limited to administration costs only (set up costs to be funded by the developer) and agreed through the local Neighbourhood Partnerships”. Upon being put to the vote, this amendment was **LOST (2 for, 9 against, 1 abstention)**.

Upon being put to the vote, the main motion was **CARRIED** and it was:

Resolved (unanimously) – that Planning Application 15/06069/F be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor Abraham moved, seconded by Councillor Lucas and, upon being put to the vote, it was:

Resolved (unanimously) – that Planning Application Number 15/06070/P (Outline) be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report .

(3) 15/06605/F - Southmead Police Station, Southmead Road, Bristol BS10 5DW – Demolition Of The Existing Police Station Buildings and Redevelopment Of The Site To Provide A Care Home (Use Class C2), Associated Access, Car Parking and Landscaping And the Conversion Of An Existing Building Fronting Southmead Road To provide A Single Dwelling (Use Class C3)

The Planning Case Officer gave a presentation on the application and made the following points:

- (1) Details of the application were provided
- (2) 14 written responses had been received – the main issue of concern was the proposed loss of the Wellingtonia tree. 7 trees in 3 groups had been identified for removal and these would be replaced by 23 trees

During discussion of the item, Councillors made the following comments:

- (1) Whilst there was an urgent need for a care home on the site, the loss of the Wellingtonia tree with a Tree Preservation Order was unacceptable. The development would be able to proceed without the removal of the tree – trees should only be removed if they are sick or ill;
- (2) It was disappointing to see the proposal for the removal of the tree – it did not seem as if the applicant had put sufficient effort into finding a solution to avoid this;
- (3) This was a magnificent tree – it would be extremely worrying to lose a big tree which had a Tree Preservation Order. It was disappointing that the developer had not tried to incorporate it into the development;
- (4) In response to a member's question concerning the potential impact of the tree roots on the building, officers confirmed that the roots were fairly shallow and were likely to stop where the roots met the walls. They also confirmed that there had been discussions with the applicant at an earlier stage about repositioning the development to reduce potential contact with the tree roots
- (5) In response to a member's question, officers confirmed that it was uncommon but not unknown to fell a tree with a Tree Preservation Order in a Conservation Area;
- (6) Whilst it was encouraging to see the development of the Care Home, the loss of a tree with a TRO was a cause for concern;
- (7) The developer should have treated the trees as an asset – they are a landmark on the site.

Councillor Abraham moved, seconded by Councillor Wright and, upon being put to the vote, it was:

Resolved (10 for, 0 against, 1 abstention) – that Planning Application 15/06605/F be refused.

8. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that there were no further scheduled meetings for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

(The meeting ended at 9pm)

CHAIR

Agenda item no. 9

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A

15 June 2016

REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR - PLANNING

LIST OF CURRENT APPEALS

Householder appeal

Item	Ward	Address, description and appeal type	Date lodged
1	Bishopsworth	205 Bishopsworth Road Bristol BS13 7LH Retention of works to front boundary wall to extend vehicular access on to a classified road. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	27/04/2016

Informal hearing

Item	Ward	Address, description and appeal type	Date of hearing
2	Cabot	11 - 13 Queens Road Clifton Bristol BS8 1QE Change of use from a retail unit (Use Class A1) to cafe or restaurant (Use Class A3). Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	TBA

Public inquiry

Item	Ward	Address, description and appeal type	Date of inquiry
3	Eastville	541-551 Fishponds Road Fishponds Bristol BS16 3AF Demolition of existing warehouse and erection of a freestanding two storey restaurant with associated basement, drive-thru, car parking and landscaping. Installation of 2 no. customer order display and canopy. Appeal against refusal Committee	08/11/2016

4	Clifton	Trinity House Kensington Place Bristol BS8 3AH Appeal against an Enforcement Notice issued by the City Council on 17 March 2016 for an alleged breach of planning: Without planning permission, the re-modelling of existing dwelling to include basement and rear extension without complying with conditions 4 and 5 of the planning permission number13/01376/H. Appeal against an enforcement notice	TBA
---	---------	--	-----

Written representation

Item	Ward	Address, description and appeal type	Date lodged
5	Lawrence Hill	10 Concorde Street Bristol BS1 3BF 1.no internally illuminated fascia sign, 1.no non-illuminated projecting sign, 1.no internally illuminated crest sign and internally illuminated fluorescent green suspended ribbon signs at first floor level. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	13/04/2015
6	Cabot	BPP House Grove Avenue City Centre Bristol BS1 4QY Installation of new entrance door to provide disabled access. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	19/10/2015
7	Cabot	87 Park Street City Centre Bristol Internal and external alterations to the building to provide ventilation and extraction in association with A3 use. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	15/12/2015
8	Frome Vale	11 Frome Valley Road Bristol BS16 1HF Proposed detached dwelling on land adjoining 11 Frome Valley Road. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	08/01/2016
9	Windmill Hill	1 Cotswold Road North Bristol BS3 4NL Conversion and extension of existing workshop to form 1 x 1 bed flat at upper level and workshop below. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	07/03/2016

10	Cabot	School Of Chemistry University Of Bristol Cantocks Close Bristol BS8 1TS Proposed removal of the existing cryogenic nitrogen storage facility outside the School of Chemistry. The installation of a new cryogenic nitrogen storage facility on the other side of the School of Chemistry. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	09/03/2016
11	Bedminster	209 Luckwell Road Bristol BS3 3HD Proposed 1 no. two storey dwelling. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	09/03/2016
12	Clifton East	9 Pembroke Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3AU Demolition of four garages and paved parking area in rear, to be replaced by 1no new single-storey dwelling in a landscaped courtyard. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	15/03/2016
13	Clifton East	9 Pembroke Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3AU Demolition of four garages and paved parking area in rear, to be replaced by 1no new single-storey dwelling in a landscaped courtyard. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	15/03/2016
14	Westbury-on-Trym	68 Westbury Hill Bristol BS9 3AA Change of use from retail unit (Use Class A1) to a hot food takeaway (Use Class A5); installation of extraction/ventilation equipment and external alterations. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	18/03/2016
15	Clifton	12 The Mall Bristol BS8 4DR Remove three sections of damaged and cracked marble slab located beneath old refrigeration unit and replace with modern butcher's refrigeration unit (retrospective) Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	23/03/2016
16	Frome Vale	46 Field View Drive Bristol BS16 2TT Horse chestnut - Reduce crown by 30%. Removal of deadwood and Ivy. Remove two large branches overhanging the footpath. TPO 379 Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	23/03/2016

17	Southville	1 Lock Lane Bedminster BS3 1BZ Change of use from commercial use to domestic (residential) use. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	30/03/2016
18	Southville	1 Lock Lane Bedminster Bristol BS3 1BZ Appeal against an Enforcement Notice issued by the City Council on 02.03.2016 for an alleged breach of planning: Without the grant of planning permission the change of use of the property from a commercial unit to a residential dwelling Appeal against an enforcement notice	30/03/2016
19	Bishopsworth	1 Spartley Drive Bristol BS13 8DQ 1 No. self-contained dwellinghouse. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	08/04/2016
20	Knowle	36 Wootton Park Bristol BS14 9AQ Application for a Certificate of existing use - two bed independent self-contained dwelling. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	29/04/2016
21	Lawrence Hill	Freshford House Redcliffe Way Bristol BS1 6NL 2x Non-illuminated signs with individual metal letters in vertical format to bay above main entrance on Redcliffe Way and on brickwork to corner on Redcliff Street. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	10/05/2016
22	Cabot	Unit 15 Albion Dockside Estate Hanover Place Bristol BS1 6UT Removal of the existing Trisector flagpole antenna, the installation of a Sami equipment cabinet internal to the existing rooftop cabin, the installation of 3 no. antennas to the existing clock face and associated development thereto. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	10/05/2016
23	Clifton East	27 All Saints Road Bristol BS8 2JL Proposed three storey building with basement, to accommodate 4 no.self contained flats and associated works to existing building including demolition of existing side extension. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	10/05/2016

24	Stockwood	Land To The East Of Bifield Road/Bifield Close Part Stockwood Valley Stables Bristol Prior approval notification for a proposed change of use of an agricultural building to a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) and for associated operational development. Site falls within adjoining local authority boundaries. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	10/05/2016
25	Cabot	Unit 15 Albion Dockside Estate Hanover Place Bristol BS1 6UT Replace existing Trisector flagpole antenna to be replaced for a 12 port alpha Trisector flagpole antenna, the installation of a Sami equipment cabinet internal to the existing rooftop cabin, and associated development thereto. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	10/05/2016
26	Cotham	The Wall Woodbury Lane Bristol BS8 2SE Demolition of existing store building and erection of a detached two storey dwelling, (Change of use from D1 to residential). Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	11/05/2016
27	Bishopsworth	28 Bishopsworth Road Bristol BS13 7JJ Demolition of existing garage/storage building and replacement with a two-bedroom dwelling (plus roof terrace) with integral garage. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	12/05/2016
28	Easton	28 York Road Easton Bristol BS5 6BJ Retention of porch. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	25/05/2016
29	Stoke Bishop	Woodlands Lodge Church Avenue Stoke Bishop Bristol BS9 1LD Proposed two storey side extension. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	26/05/2016
30	Clifton	Avon Gorge Hotel Princes Buildings Sion Hill Bristol BS8 4LD Retention of Pergola. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	02/06/2016

List of appeal decisions

Item	Ward	Address, description and appeal type	Decision and date decided
31	Brislington West	25 Hungerford Gardens Bristol BS4 5HA Proposed dwellinghouse attached to No. 25 Hungerford Gardens. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 10/03/2016 Costs awarded
32	Ashley	39 Ashley Hill Bristol BS6 5JA Copper Beech (T1) - crown reduce by 25% and crown raise to 8m over highway and 6m over property. (Tree protected by Tree Preservation Order 1267). Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 12/04/2016
33	Brislington East	Land Adj To 18 Alderney Avenue Bristol BS4 4SF Erection of 2 No. self-contained dwelling houses with off street parking and private amenity space. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 05/05/2016
34	Henbury	Land Adj To 31 Machin Road Bristol BS10 7HQ Proposed erection of a detached 2-bed house with off street parking. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 07/04/2016
35	Knowle	11 Norton Road Bristol BS4 2EZ Application for a Certificate of Existing Use or Operation for the conversion of the roof space including installation of a dormer roof extension within the rear roof slope and rooflights to the front. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 23/03/2016
36	Cotham	39 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LQ Alterations to front wall in order to widen the vehicular access, including re-location of pillar. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 13/05/2016
37	Avonmouth	130 Nibley Road Bristol BS11 9XN Application to vary conditions 1 and 2 attached to planning permission 12/04833/X - to allow opening times from 17.00 to 23.00 Monday to Sunday and Bank Holidays. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 11/03/2016

38	Cabot	2 Philadelphia Street Bristol BS1 3BZ Proposed Hugo Boss Brand/Logos and Lifestyle Graphics. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 18/03/2016
39	Clifton East	First Floor Flat 1 Bellevue Bristol BS8 1DA Internal works to reconfigure the flat. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 24/03/2016
40	Clifton	Hotwells Post Office 267 Hotwell Road Bristol BS8 4SF Rear extension over existing conservatory at first floor level. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 04/05/2016
41	Clifton	Hotwells Post Office 267 Hotwell Road Bristol BS8 4SF Rear extension over existing conservatory at first floor level. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 04/05/2016
42	Stoke Bishop	5C Julian Road Bristol BS9 1NQ Proposed replacement of existing timber sash windows with period style UPVC sash windows. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 09/03/2016
43	Cabot	Unit 4 (previously Thai Edge) Broad Quay/Marsh Street Bristol BS1 4DA Proposed signage including 2x internally illuminated projecting signs, 2x internally illuminated fascia signs, 1x non illuminated fascia sign and 2x internally illuminated vertical signs. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 27/04/2016
44	Cabot	87 Park Street City Centre Bristol Proposed change of use of ground and lower-ground floors from retail (Class A1) to restaurant (Class A3). Associated internal and external alterations to the building to provide ventilation and extraction. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 23/05/2016
45	Cabot	Land To The West Of Castlemead Lower Castle Street Bristol BS1 3AG Erection of a single sided free standing digital advertisement display unit measuring 3 metres by 6 metres. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 27/04/2016

46	Westbury-on-Trym	Frances Greeves House Henbury Road Henbury Bristol BS10 7FG Replacement of all single glazed timber windows with Rosewood UPVC imitation timber finished double glazed windows. Replace section of timber tongue and groove cladding to rear elevation with Rosewood finished aluminium cladding panels and replace all timber fascias and soffits and replace with brown plastic Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 24/03/2016
47	Windmill Hill	56 St Johns Crescent And Part Of Adj Land Bristol BS3 5ER Outline application for the erection of a detached, self-contained dwelling house (Access, Layout and Scale to be considered). Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 24/03/2016
48	Ashley	39 Ashley Hill Bristol BS6 5JA Copper Beech - Fell TPO 1267 Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 12/04/2016
49	Bishopston	479 Gloucester Road Horfield Bristol BS7 8UA Proposed single dwelling with associated external space, refuse and cycle storage. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 04/04/2016
50	Westbury-on-Trym	108A Coombe Lane Bristol BS9 2AP Construction of detached double garage. Appeal against non-determination	Appeal allowed 07/04/2016
51	St George East	2 Northfield Road Bristol BS5 8PB Proposed two-storey two-bedroom house attached to side. Demolition of existing single storey attached garage & erection of garage in rear garden for new dwelling. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 08/04/2016
52	Redland	16 Linden Road Westbury Park Bristol BS6 7RL New off-road parking space in front garden. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 08/04/2016

53	Ashley	160 Cheltenham Road Bristol BS6 5RE Retrospective application for replacement Kwik Fit signage to new image. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 12/05/2016
54	Bishopston	129B Bishop Road Bristol BS7 8LX Proposed front and rear roof extensions. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 19/05/2016
55	Clifton East	5 Rose Terrace Gordon Road Clifton Bristol BS8 1AW Extension and internal remodelling of existing house, including partial additional storey set back from Gordon Road, and three storey extension into existing rear garden. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 04/05/2016
56	Hengrove	Land To The Side Off 43 Valentine Close Bristol BS14 9ND Development of 2 x lifetime homes and 1 x wheelchair accessible bungalow. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal dismissed 25/05/2016
57	Lockleaze	Pizza Hut Eastgate Centre Eastgate Road Bristol BS5 6XX Consent to display an advertisement(s). Replacement signage comprising of 1no pizza hut pole head, 1no double sided restaurant takeaway sign(pole sign replacement on to existing pole) - red vinyl to sides of existing pizza hut letter x 3 - 1no entrance fascia sign - 1no menu box unit - 1no internal hang sign - vinyl to rear windows - 3no replacement vinyl's to estate signs and soffit illumination by cabochon lights. Appeal against refusal Delegated decision	Appeal allowed 13/05/2016

Agenda item no.10

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A

15/06/2016

REPORT OF THE SERVICE DIRECTOR - PLANNING

LIST OF ENFORCEMENT NOTICES SERVED

No Items Served

Development Control Committee A 15 June 2016

Report of the Service Director - Planning

Index

Planning Applications

Item	Ward	Officer Recommendation	Application No/Address/Description
1	Bishopston & Ashley Down	Grant subject to Legal Agreement	15/06289/F - Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol Development of 92 no. residential units comprising the conversion of the existing listed building (Brunel House) and the erection of a new 4 storey building along with car and cycle parking, landscaping, refuse storage and other associated works. Demolition of modern extensions and 'Barn' building. (major)
		Grant	15/06290/LA - Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol Development of 92 no. residential units comprising the conversion of the existing listed building (Brunel House) and the erection of a new 4 storey building along with car and cycle parking, landscaping, refuse storage and other associated works. Demolition of modern extensions and 'Barn' building.(major)
		Grant	15/06293/F - Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol Application Demolition of modern extensions to Brunel House and 'Barn' building.
		Grant subject to Legal Agreement	15/04726/F - Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol BS3 1AL Change of use of part of Regent House from offices (B1(a) use) to residential (use class C3) (58 units), with 481sq.m of office (Class B1a) use and 351sq.m of existing retail/commercial units retained at ground floor level. Creation of a new mansard roof and associated works. - Major Application
2	Southville	Grant	15/04727/LA - Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol BS3 1AL

Item	Ward	Officer Recommendation	Application No/Address/Description
			offices (B1(a) use) to residential (use class C3) (58 units), with 481sq.m of office (Class B1a) use and 351sq.m of existing retail/commercial units retained at ground floor level. Creation of a new mansard roof and associated works. - Major Application
		Grant subject to Legal Agreement	15/04731/F - Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol Change of use of Regent House and Consort House from offices (use class B1(a)) to residential (use class C3) (80 units) along with external alterations and retained offices (use class B1(a)) accommodation of 481 sq m. Extension of commercial unit in Consort House (use classes A1, A2, A3, D1) of 36sq.m. Construction of new residential blocks (use class C3) (151 units) and associated landscaping and car parking to the rear of Regent House and Consort House. Construction of new residential accommodation (use class C3) (4 units) and ground floor commercial units (use classes A1, A2, A3, D1) of 395.sq.m on land at Lombard Street. Alterations to public realm along Bedminster Parade and Lombard Street. Major Application
		Grant	15/04732/LA - Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol Change of use of Regent House and Consort House from offices (use class B1(a)) to residential (use class C3) (80 units) along with external alterations and retained offices (use class B1(a)) accommodation of 481 sq m. Extension of commercial unit in Consort House (use classes A1, A2, A3, D1) of 36sq.m. Construction of new residential blocks (use class C3) (151 units) and associated landscaping and car parking to the rear of Regent House and Consort House. Construction of new residential accommodation (use class C3) (4 units) and ground floor commercial units (use classes A1, A2, A3, D1) of 395.sq.m on land at Lombard Street. Alterations to public realm along Bedminster Parade and Lombard Street.
3	Clifton Down	Grant subject to Legal Agreement	15/01681/F - Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US Demolition of single storey extension and the conversion of existing building and erection of new accommodation to provide assisted living development for older people comprising apartments integrated with communal and support facilities, car parking and landscape works (Major Application).

WARD: Bishopston & Ashley
Down **CONTACT OFFICER:** Lewis Cook

SITE ADDRESS: Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol

APPLICATION NO: 15/06289/F Full Planning & Listed Building Consent
15/06290/LA &
15/06293/F

EXPIRY DATE: 7 March 2016


Development of 92 no. residential units comprising the conversion of the existing listed building (Brunel House) and the erection of a new 4 storey building along with car and cycle parking, landscaping, refuse storage and other associated works. Demolition of modern extensions and 'Barn' building. (major)

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to Planning Agreement

AGENT: Alder King Planning Consultants **APPLICANT:** Baystar Developments Ltd
Pembroke House C/o Agent
15 Pembroke Road
Clifton
Bristol BS8 3BA

The following plan is for illustrative purposes only, and cannot be guaranteed to be up to date.

LOCATION PLAN:



Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol****SUMMARY**

This report relates to three applications for the conversion of the existing City of Bristol College building (a grade II listed building) to residential use, with the erection of a new build element to the west of the building to provide further flats. The three applications include an application for full planning permission, one for listed building application and a separate application for demolition of existing structures on the site. Overall, the development would provide 92 units of accommodation, including the provision of 60 units in the converted listed building, with 32 flats in the new build. The works on site would involve the demolition of a number of unsympathetic extensions to the listed building. It is also proposed to provide 70 parking spaces on site, as well as cycle storage and refuse storage.

The area around the application site has undergone a high degree of development in recent years, which has included the conversion of a number of the former college buildings (which were originally designed for use as an orphanage), as well the development of the flats at the Gloucestershire County Cricket Ground. It is apparent that there is a significant level of concern in the local area about further residential development placing additional pressure on existing local services, particularly in respect of the local highway infrastructure. This has resulted in a significant level of objections to the proposal.

The application is being reported to committee following a request from former Councillor Radice that the application be considered by committee. The request makes specific reference to the lack of affordable housing in the development, concerns over pedestrian safety, particularly in relation to the close proximity of the school to the local school, and the lack of provision of renewable technologies as part of the application. Notwithstanding the May 2016 election results, given the high level of public interest it is considered that the proposal would merit consideration at committee.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to a site in the Ashley Down area of Bristol, to the north of the city centre. It relates to a building which was originally part of the Muller Orphanages, known as Brunel House, which is grade II listed. This building was previously known as Orphan House No. 2 and was originally constructed in 1857. The Orphanage complex were a group of five mid 19th Century buildings which were originally constructed on open countryside, with the surrounding residential development being more recent. The buildings were used as an orphanage for around 100 years, until they passed to the Bristol Corporation in the 1950s, for the development of the City of Bristol College. The application building is still in the use of the college, although they are due to move out at the end of the academic year. Of the other four college buildings, two are still in use by the college, the other two were converted to residential, with additional residential accommodation surrounding it. The conversion of Muller House occurred in 2007, with Allen House following in 2010.

The building itself is largely three storey, faced in stone, with contrasting stone surrounds on the windows, and slate roof. As originally designed the building was symmetrical, with large barrack like rooms, surrounding a central core. When the building was converted to college use these large spaces were subdivided with long corridors feeding classrooms. In addition, there have been a number of extensions to the building, largely single storey, and the addition of a lift shaft to the south elevation of the building. The western part of the site is subdivided from the original historic curtilage of the building, and accommodates a car parking area and the 'barn', a single storey freestanding building, also in use by the college.

The wider area is a mix of residential, education and sports facilities. As referred to above, of the original Orphanage buildings two are used by the college and two are in residential use. The

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

residential conversion included substantial new build residential in the surrounding area. This is in addition to the more historic housing stock in the surrounding streets, which dates from around 1900. In addition, there is a modern primary school to the north west, and the Gloucestershire County Cricket Ground to the west. Between the Cricket Ground and the application site there is a modern flat development, and a car park in the ownership of the College.

As well as involving a grade II listed building the application site is also located within the Ashley Down Conservation Area. The site also contains one tree covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

RELEVANT HISTORY

The following application relate to the more recent extensions to the existing building:

98/01207/F: Demolition of existing single storey cleaners store and replacement with 3 no. storey extension housing a lift and toilets for use by people with disabilities - Permission granted: 20/07/1998.

06/03027/LA: Development of new engineering workshop extension to Brunel House including ancillary works - Permission granted: 14/11/2006.

06/03028/F: Development of new engineering workshop extension to Brunel House including ancillary works.

The College site was previously subject to a masterplan for redevelopment, which included the conversion of the two college buildings to residential and the new build residential and commercial floorspace. The original permission was as follows:

00/02850/F: Change of use from college to mixed use, including college, residential 367 units, shop, café, restaurant/bar. Conversion of listed buildings. One to three storeys, new build accommodation one to three stories in height - Permission granted: 23/07/2002.

It is noted that in the above application this site is shown as being retained for college use. This application was also subject to a number of alterations, although none that had a significant impact on this application site.

APPLICATION

This report relates to three separate applications, all of which relate to the same development. These are application no. 15/06289/F (the full application for the development), 15/06290/LA (listed building consent application) and 15/06293/F (application for demolition of modern structures on the site). The overall development is for the conversion of the existing college building to residential and the construction of new build flats, to provide a total on 92 residential units.

The existing building has had a number of extensions constructed in connection with the use of the building as a college. These are largely single storey and are positioned at the eastern and western extremities of the building, but also include some small additions along the southern boundary. In addition, there is a free standing building to the west of the site, described as a 'barn' building. The first part of the proposal is to remove these elements. Following this it is proposed to convert the existing building to form 60 flats. This would include 1 studio apartment, 19 one bedroom apartments, 33 two bedroom flats, 5 three bedroom units and 2 four bedroom apartments.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

In addition, it is proposed to construct a new four storey building in the location of the existing barn and car park. This building would be flat roofed, and fronted in grey brick and render. This would provide an undercroft parking area, and an additional 32 flats. These flats would be a mixture of single bedroom and two bedroom units.

As part of the development it is proposed to provide 70 parking spaces. This includes a mixture of 37 existing spaces to the north of College Road, 20 spaces within the direct curtilage of the listed building, and a further 13 spaces in the undercroft area under the new build part of the scheme. These spaces include one space dedicated for car club usage. It is also proposed to provide 158 cycle parking stores in a mixture of external stores for the converted listed building, and internal stores for the new build.

With regard to highway works, College Road is a private road, and not adopted highway. Notwithstanding this, it is proposed to move the existing crossing from immediately to the front of the college to better align with the access path, as well as providing an additional crossing to the west of the site to more directly align with the access to the school.

The proposals have been amended on two occasions during the course of the application. The most substantial changes to the scheme were the reduction in the number of units from 103 to 92, and the increase in the number of parking spaces from 59 to 70. This has largely been achieved through the removal of part of the accommodation on the ground floor of the new build element, and the provision of the additional undercroft car parking in this location. There are also changes to the layout of the proposal, to remove some of the smaller units, particularly in relation to studio accommodation within the listed building and single person units in the new build. The most recent alterations involve changes to the design of the new build block, which involve simplifying the design and the palette of materials proposed.

PRE APPLICATION COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

i) Process

The pre-application consultation that took place in this case involved public presentation/round table events to which stakeholders and local residents were separately invited. A total of 53 stakeholders were invited to the meeting, and some 780 letters sent to neighbours of the site. A total of 39 local residents attended the sessions, plus 6 key stakeholders. Responses were made both verbally and in writing, with 20 written responses received. A summary of the issues raised is as follows:

- o Concerns about the scale, design and appearance of the new build part of the development;
- o Concerns about the lack of provision of affordable housing in the development;
- o Concerns about the sustainability measures proposed;
- o Parking provision for both local residents and college students;
- o Queries relating to the access for fire appliances;
- o Concerns about the loss of mature trees;
- o Concerns regarding the impact of additional traffic on the local road network;
- o Results of overdevelopment of the site, including inadequate bin storage;
- o General support for the conversion of the existing building to residential, and demolition of unsympathetic additions;
- o Comments made regarding site drainage;
- o Further soft landscaping is required for noise attenuation purposes;
- o Concerns regarding the construction phase of the development;
- o Concerns about the local infrastructure, including play space for children, and suggestions for alternative uses at the site;
- o The proposal should provide a mixed community, and concerns about the size and type of

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

- o accommodation proposed;
 - o Concerns regarding the impact on privacy;
- ii) Fundamental Outcomes

Following the consultation the following amendments have been made to the proposal:

- o More car parking has been provided on site, including the provision of space for a car club vehicle;
- o The applicant is supporting the campaign to improve public transport in the area;
- o A travel plan has been prepared to support the proposal;
- o The scale of the new build proposal has been reduced;
- o Larger dwellings have been redesigned to make them more attractive to families;
- o The design of the new building has been amended to better respond to the listed building, including the use of brick rather than render;
- o A green planting strip has been introduced to reduce the impact of noise;
- o A viability assessment has been undertaken in relation to affordable housing;
- o It is proposed to provide 20 new trees on site to mitigate for those lost;
- o It is suggested that the impact on residents during the construction phase is addressed by condition.

The Bristol Neighbourhood Partnership have commented in this case that 'the community involvement has been satisfactory.'

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

A joint consultation exercise was carried out for the three applications, by site notice erected close to the site, by advertisement in a local newspaper and by writing to a total of 350 neighbouring properties. Neighbours were also reconsulted following the submission of amended plans on two occasions. It is noted that concerns were raised during the course of the application about site notices not being erected, or being defaced. As a result three site notices were erected during the course of the application, one following the submission of the first set of amended plans.

Objections and representations have been received in respect of all three applications. As these largely cover issues relevant to both the full application and the listed building application these are all listed below and not separated out.

In respect of the original submission a total of 61 representations were received, 58 of these were objections, two neutral comments and one in support. The issues raised as a result of this are as follows:

Principle of Development (see key issue A):

- o Some support for residential development in the area, particularly the conversion of the existing building;
- o Facilities in the area are already under pressure from the high density of residential development, particularly schools and doctors, and the Council are responsible for ensuring that the infrastructure is adequate;
- o The site should be used for community use/school use rather than residential.

Mix and Density of Development (see key issue B):

- o The area is more suited to houses rather than flats;
- o These types of proposals would discourage families from moving to the area, which would have a detrimental impact on the mix of students at local schools;

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

- o The lack of affordable housing in the proposal is not justified.

Impact on Heritage Assets (see key issue C):

- o The proposed development will be harmful to the setting of the listed building by virtue of the scale and design;
- o The proposed new building would also weaken the visual connections between the former orphanages, and would thus be harmful to the conservation area;
- o There are benefits in the removal of the existing ancillary buildings;
- o The proposal would block views of existing heritage assets;
- o The demolition of elements of the building would detract from its historical interest.

Impact on Residential Amenity (see key issue D):

- o The proposal will overlook neighbouring properties;
- o The proposal would result in additional noise and disturbance, exacerbated by the lack of noise attenuating planting;
- o The proposed accommodation would not meet local or national space standards.

Transport Issues (see key issue E):

- o Inadequate car parking is provided for a development of this scale, the area is already heavily parked and many of the parking spaces proposed for the development are already in use by existing residents;
- o Insufficient public transport is available in the area, particularly in relation to the local train station;
- o Car parking in the area should be further restricted and traffic limited/discouraged from the area;
- o The proposal will result in harm to pedestrian safety, particularly to school children, and consideration should be given to moving the pedestrian crossing;
- o Some support for the provision of additional cycle parking in lieu of car parking;
- o The proposal will exacerbate current issues with traffic flows in the area;
- o The application does not demonstrate how the refuse vehicle will access the bin stores;
- o Consideration needs to be given to extending the RPZ or public transport improvements before allowing the development.

Sustainability Issues (see key issue F):

- o The sustainability of the proposed development could be improved with the addition of renewable technology on the listed building;
- o Air quality in the area is already poor.

Landscaping issues (see key issue G):

- o The proposal should include additional tree planting;
- o The proposal would lead to the loss of existing mature trees.

Planning Obligations (see key issue H):

- o Consideration should be given for providing accommodation for the elderly as part of the development;
- o The proposed social infrastructure contributions are insufficient.

Other issues:

- o Concerns have been raised about the impact of construction on local residents (Officer comment: This is not a material planning issue as it is covered by other legislation);
- o Insufficient consultation has taken place given the widespread impact of the development (Officer comment: the consultation has been carried out in excess of the requirements of the Development Management Procedure Order and therefore officers are satisfied that no parties will be prejudiced by the decision on the application);

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

- o Reservations expressed about the fact that the applicants are inexperienced developers (Officer comment: Planning permission runs with the land and therefore the 'suitability' of the developer is not material to the decision on the application);
- o The information made available at the public consultation was incomplete and responses not included in the Community Involvement Statement. This does not constitute proper consultation (Officer comment: Comments are noted, but this issue does not warrant the refusal of the application);
- o The impact of other potential development in the area, given development opportunities on other sites, needs to be taken into account (Officer comment: Each proposal has to be decided on its individual merits, and therefore this issue does not merit the refusal of the application).

Following reconsultation a further 33 objections have been received. These largely state that previously raised concerns have not been overcome in amended plans, or reiterated points that have been made previously. However, the following additional points are made:

Impact on residential amenity (see key issue D):

- o The proposal will overshadow neighbouring properties.

Transport Issues (see key issue E):

- o The plans are deliberately misleading with regard to the number of parking spaces proposed.

Impact on ecology (see key issue G):

- o The proposal will impact on the bat population currently using the building.

Planning obligations (see key issue H):

- o Additional children play provision should be made in the area.

Other comments:

- o The proposal would devalue neighbouring properties (Officer comment: property values are not a material planning issue, and therefore permission cannot be refused on this basis).

At the time of writing an addition six objections have been received in relation to the final iteration of the plans. Again, these largely refer to the failure of the latest proposals to overcome previous objections, although the following additional issues have been raised:

- o The drains will be unable to cope with the additional requirements (see key issue H).

Ward Members

Whilst objections have not been received from the current Ward Members, an objection was received from former Councillor Radice on the following grounds:

- o The proposal should include the policy minimum requirement of affordable housing;
- o The proposed alterations to car parking will result in additional danger to children walking to school;
- o Provision should be made for renewable energy generation as part of the conversion of the existing building;
- o Given the loss of trees on the site a contribution should be sought for additional tree planting on Arthur Milton Street.

A further objection was received from the former Councillor following the submission of amended plans, which covers the points raised above with the addition of the following:

- o Given the high demand for car parking in the area future residents should be excluded from

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol**

- o and future residents parking scheme;
- o The area should be appropriately Masterplanned to ensure that appropriate standards of placemaking are met. If this is not possible CIL and s106 money should be used for ensuring adequate open space and play space;
- o The changes to the crossing do not fully address the concerns originally raised;
- o At least six new trees should be provided as part of the development.

In addition, an objection has been received from the **Local Liberal Democrat** group raising the following issues:

- o The influx of new residents would exacerbate current strains on local infrastructure, including GP practices and schools;
- o The proposed car parking is inadequate and at least one parking space should be provided for each dwelling;
- o The proposed new building neither respects or is subservient to the Grade II listed building;
- o Provision for affordable housing should be made as part of the development.

OTHER COMMENTS

Two comments have been received from **Bristol Civic Society**, covering the following issues:

The Society welcomes the re-use of Brunel House for residential purposes. There is a reasonable mix of unit sizes but the Society considers that it is important that the Council's policy for affordable housing provision is fulfilled in a development of this size.

Design of the refurbished Brunel House incorporates extensions which blend well with the main building and are subservient to it. The demolition of unattractive additions to the building is welcome. However, the Society has some reservations concerning the proposed Public transport serving the site is not that good. Whilst the Society welcomes designs that discourage unnecessary car use, the implications of the parking provision proposed for the surrounding area should be carefully considered before it is finalised. The Society endorses the suggestion made by another stakeholder at the presentation that opportunities for facilitating the provision once again of a train station at Ashley Down should be fully explored, particularly in view of the work that has commenced on providing four tracks on Filton bank.

In addition, the Society expressed its concerns about the design and massing of the proposed new residential block at the south west end of the site. In the Society's view the mass and design of this part of the proposals neither respected nor were subservient to the Grade II Listed Brunel House. These concerns remain and the Society objects to this part of the overall scheme.

The **Conservation Advisory Panel** has commented as follows:

The Panel objects to the design of this application.

Whilst the Panel supports the re-development and residential use of this site it is felt that the design and materials of the new building are of the lowest common denominator, are bland and devoid of architectural detail. The raison d'etre of this conservation area is the complex of buildings that comprise the former Muller's orphanage and the new building must provide a positive enhancement of the quality of this conservation area. Overall the design and detail of the new building detracts from the significance of this listed building. The size and scale of the proposed new building has a very poor relationship with the adjacent single storey part of the listed building and is considered to be overbearing and overwhelming.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol**

The chair of the **Bristol Tree Forum** has objected to the application on the basis that trees T1 and T2 are B grade trees and every effort should be made to retain them. Mitigation should be seen as a last resort and the trees do not appear to require removal as they will be over the quadrangle.

It is also noted that the tree group G1 has been recently planted. If these were for mitigation of trees previously lost this illustrates lack of future planning, illustrated by the loss of other TPO trees. The loss of the 3 Ginkgos should be mitigated.

The **Bishopston Society** has also commented on the application, as follows:

We are very pleased to see that Brunel House is to be converted into residential use and restored to its former glory. However, the large block of 4-storey flat roof apartments proposed on the former car park at the western end is totally out of keeping with the existing building. The block is described as 'slender' when in fact it is extremely bulky, deep-plan and close to the existing building. Great play is made of the use of 'continental grey bricks' to imitate the Pennant Stone of the existing building, when of course the building should be clad with real stone to match the existing. The form and massing of the new block is domineering in the extreme and would stand out as a sore thumb within this setting.

Our last concerns are firstly regarding the affordable housing content within the proposal. We feel that given the high value location of the site and the huge need for more affordable housing within the Bristol area, the development should include the minimum affordable housing content required by Bristol City Council. Lastly we are concerned that only 54 car parking spaces are proposed for a total of 103 dwellings, partly as a result of building the new apartments on the existing car parking. This low parking ratio will clearly serve to exacerbate the existing parking problems within the local area.

Following the submission of amended plans further comments were received, which confirm that the amendments do not overcome the concerns raised above. A number of detailed suggestions are made regarding the design to better tie in the new build element with the existing building. These include changing the materials to pennant stone with bath stone detailing.

CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Avon Fire & Rescue Service has commented as follows:-

The proposals will have additional Hydrant requirements associated with the proposals. This additional infrastructure is required as a direct result of the developments and so the costs will need to be borne by the developers either through them fitting suitable mains and fire hydrants themselves and at their cost, or through developer contributions.

Importantly, these fire-fighting water supplies must be installed at the same time as each phase of the development is built so that they are immediately available should an incident occur.

Transport Development Management has commented as follows:-

It is noted that the application does not rely on on-street parking provision to accommodate the demand from Brunel House and parking will be wholly contained within the development site, which is acceptable.

Submitted drawings demonstrate that a refuse vehicle can adequately manoeuvre to the proposed refuse collection point located at the western end of the Lane. JMPs response states that a management company will ensure that all bins are presented for collection in the location adjacent to the entrance to Brunel House, which is considered acceptable.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol**

It is considered that a financial contribution of £45,430 towards the upgrading of the two bus stops closest to the development site is reasonable to encourage both residents and their visitors to travel by sustainable modes of transport.

Proposed Cycle Parking is acceptable subject to the provision of secure cycle parking provision for visitors. It is also noted that motor cycle parking can be provided on College Road.

It is considered that the latest revision to the travel plan is acceptable.

A Conditions Survey and Construction Traffic Management Plan should be secured by condition.

Urban Design has commented as follows:-

Comments have been provided by City Design Group to both a pre-application enquiry and initially submitted plans for the current application which highlighted a number of issues requiring resolution. Following these comments, a site visit and a series of meetings, a number of revised plans and D and A Statement Supplement have been submitted seeking to resolve these issues. The collaborative approach by the design team is considered to have positively evolved the scheme.

The main revisions include:

- o Reduction in the number of units from 103 to 92,
- o Revised design to both flank and rear elevations of block C,
- o Material change to block C,

While the revised proposals seek to resolve a number of issues raised previously, some concerns remain:

- o While the revised arrangement of the ground floor has somewhat alleviated the long, utilitarian corridor and number of single aspect units, the use of this space for undercroft parking instead is not ideal. However the need to balance the parking requirements of the site is acknowledged.
- o The constraints of revising the floor plan of Block C to provide a central core is acknowledged.
- o Efforts to reduce the scale and massing of the new build Block C flanks in relation to Brunel House have continued to evolve. The final revisions are considered to have overcome the majority of issues.
- o The material palette as currently presented is considered largely appropriate.
- o It is understood the brick is now proposed for the entire new build, aside from the balcony recesses and 3rd floor circulation colonnade.
- o The brick work is critical to ensure the new build establishes an appropriate relationship with the listed building. As such the European format specified in the DAS, which is noted to be a slimmer format creating a bulkier denser effect in response to the austere and robust Brunel House, is essential.

The proposed revisions are considered to have evolved the scheme to an acceptable design solution.

City Centre Projects (Public Art) has commented as follows:-

The planning submission 15/06289/F is for a development of scale that triggers Policy BCS21 of the Bristol City Council Core Strategy which states Major Developments should deliver high quality urban design and: - enable the delivery of permanent and temporary public art, promoting a multi-disciplinary approach to commissioning artists in the design process (page 124).

The material and documents provided with the full planning application, in Particular the Design and Access Statement (D&AS) does not include a statement on the provision of public art in the scheme and no public art strategy is included.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

It is recommended that the applicant appoints a suitably qualified public art consultant (public art expertise) to prepare a public art strategy for the development for submission to the planning department in pursuance of a planning condition applied at determination stage.

The public art consultant can advise the applicant and the design team to identify opportunities for artists relating to the buildings and the public realm, to identify programme and budget for the development of the public art strategy and a programme of commissioned art works for the site and its environs.

Arboricultural Team has commented as follows:-

The demolition and construction activity associated with this development proposal will impact the current trees on site. Their retention therefore requires considerations and if removal is justified then robust mitigation needs to be agreed prior to the commencement of work on site.

The trees that are proposed for removal are Group 1, Trees 1 and 2.

Group 1 consists of 3 young Ginkgo trees currently located outside of the main entrance of Brunel House; they have been categorised as C grade trees which I agree with.

Trees T1 & T2 form a group canopy at the east end of Brunel House, T2 is covered by Tree preservation order 695, this order was made and confirmed in 1999.

The 2 trees are in reasonable condition with wide open crowns, T1 has a suppressed asymmetric crown due to its proximity to T2. Both trees are located adjacent to a high stone wall, the buttress roots and stem growth has caused minor deformation of the wall which will in time cause further damage.

Both trees are visible from Collage Road and the car park of the City of Bristol College. As mature trees they do have a public amenity value. Further mature and TPO'd trees are located at the end of Collage Road to the rear of the Brunel Centre.

The proposal involves demolition of a number of recent extensions and construction of a 4 storey block where "The Barn" currently stands. The majority of the external changes proposed are located adjacent to T1 & T2; initially the demolition of the structure to the west of the trees and following this the erection of a 4 storey block to the east. Due to these extensive works adjacent to these trees the development pressure and proximity of the work would make retention unrealistic.

20 new trees are proposed within the landscape plan, this sufficiently mitigates the requirements of the Bristol tree replacement standard for the trees proposed for removal.

Contaminated Land Environmental Protection has commented as follows:-

The proposed development will involve new landscaping and new build however the applicants have not submitted any intrusive investigation with the application. Historically the recent developments within the vicinity have required remediation works. Some of this development site may well have been investigated at the same time so if this information is available it should be submitted. Within the drainage strategy reference is made to a ground investigation prepared by Hydrock reference C131383/001 dated 8th October 2015, would it be possible to get a copy of this report?

If this is not possible then we would expect any future consent to be conditioned with standard conditions B11 B12 B13 and C1

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol****Flood Risk Manager** has commented as follows:-

We have no objection to the proposals but ask that if planning permission is given our standard pre-commencement SuDS condition is applied, requiring a detailed design to be submitted and approved in writing prior to commencement of the development.

Nature Conservation Officer has commented as follows:-

The protected species assessment submitted with the planning application recorded roosts of common pipistrelle bats in the soffits at the south-eastern elevation of Brunel House. These bat roosts would be affected by the proposed development works. Bats are a highly protected European Protected Species, a legally protected species and a material planning consideration. Accordingly work must not commence until a Natural England licence has been obtained for the works, an ecological mitigation scheme must be conditioned for bats and the planning case officer must apply the three derogation tests under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) prior to the determination of this planning application.

The following planning condition is therefore required:

Condition: Development shall not commence until details of a scheme for the retention of the bats' roost and the retention of the bats' existing accesses or the provision of alternative new roosts or accesses, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Lighting of the bat roosts should be minimised to prevent bats abandoning the roosts.

Condition: Prior to commence of development, details for any proposed external lighting shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

As recommended in the protected species assessment dated July 2015, if the mature lime trees in the south-west of the site which have moderate potential to support roosting bats are to be removed, as a planning condition climbing bat surveys should be undertaken prior to the removal of the trees.

A swift nest was found in the western gable, therefore no works should take place in this area within the bird nesting season unless supervised by an ecologist. Bat and bird nesting boxes should be secured by condition.

Archaeology Team has commented as follows:-

These proposals are likely to have a beneficial effect overall on this important building, which appears to have been largely unaltered from its original construction. The removal of unsightly modern additions is welcomed although there are some aspects of the proposed conversion upon which the Conservation Officer may wish to comment further. Given that there will be alterations to the building, especially internally, I would recommend that a detailed building survey is undertaken, prior to the commencement of works, secured by standard conditions (B28 and B30). It is unlikely that there was any earlier occupation of the site prior to the construction of the existing buildings and therefore no monitoring of groundworks will be required.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012**Bristol Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011)**

BCS5	Housing Provision
BCS9	Green Infrastructure
BCS10	Transport and Access Improvements
BCS11	Infrastructure and Developer Contributions
BCS12	Community Facilities
BCS13	Climate Change
BCS14	Sustainable Energy
BCS15	Sustainable Design and Construction
BCS16	Flood Risk and Water Management
BCS17	Affordable Housing Provision
BCS18	Housing Type
BCS20	Effective and Efficient Use of Land
BCS21	Quality Urban Design
BCS22	Conservation and the Historic Environment
BCS23	Pollution

Bristol Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014)

DM1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM5	Protection of community facilities
DM14	The health impacts of development
DM17	Development involving existing green infrastructure
DM19	Development and nature conservation
DM23	Transport development management
DM26	Local character and distinctiveness
DM27	Layout and form
DM28	Public realm
DM29	Design of new buildings
DM30	Alterations to existing buildings
DM31	Heritage assets
DM32	Recycling and refuse provision in new development
DM33	Pollution control, air quality and water quality
DM34	Contaminated land
DM35	Noise mitigation

KEY ISSUES

(A) IS THE PROPOSAL ACCEPTABLE IN LAND USE TERMS?

The application site is unallocated in the adopted development plan. However, as the building is in education use it has to be regarded as a community use, and as such falls to be assessed against policy BCS12 of the Core Strategy. This states that existing community uses will be retained, unless it can be 'demonstrated that there is no longer a need to retain the use or where alternative provision is made'. In addition, policy DM5 of the Development Management policies lists the criteria that will be taken into account when considering the loss of community facilities. These are as follows:

- I. The loss of the community facilities would not create a shortfall in such facilities, or where the use has ceased there is no need or demand for a community use that could make use of the building; or
- II. The building is no longer suitable to accommodate the use or is not appropriate for sensitive

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

- adaption to other community use; or
- III. The community use can be retained as part of the redevelopment of the site; or
- IV. Appropriate replacement community facilities are provided in a suitable location.

It is also noted that objections have been received on the basis that the existing building should be retained for a community use.

In this case the building is currently in use, but will be vacated in summer 2016, as part of a planned relocation of college facilities. The facilities currently provided on site will be relocated to purpose built accommodation in Patchway and Hengrove. On this basis it is argued by the applicant that the proposal meets the requirement of part iv of the above policy. Given that the College has a city wide catchment, rather than local catchment, it is acknowledged that there would be no material loss of facilities as a result of the proposals. It is also noted that some education facilities will be retained on site, with two of the original orphanage building still in use by the college.

It should also be noted that the building is a significant heritage asset, and in order to ensure the upkeep of the building it is important that it is kept in use. In assessing the merits of a reuse of a building the impact on heritage assets is also material to the decision on the application, and the existing building represents a large area of floorspace to be used for a community purposes. The impact on heritage assets is considered in key issue C below, however subject to the proposal having an acceptable impact on the listed building given that the facilities lost are being provided elsewhere within the city it is considered that the proposed residential use would be appropriate, and complies with the relevant policies.

It is noted that alternative uses for the building have been suggested by neighbours of the site, including a home for the elderly or a school. However, this application has to be considered on the basis of the merits of the proposal as submitted. As stated above, it is not considered that the proposal warrants refusal on the basis of the loss of the community use, and therefore there is no policy grounds to insist that the site is converted into an alternative community use.

(B) IS THE PROPOSED DENSITY AND HOUSING MIX APPROPRIATE?

The efficient use of land is integral to creating sustainable patterns of development and this is central to the focus on sustainable development in the NPPF. Indeed, the NPPF allows Local Planning Authorities to set their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances. Policy BCS20 of the Core Strategy sets a minimum development density of 50 dwellings per hectare. The density of the proposed development is around 107 dwellings per hectare. This accords with the policy requirements. There are no policies which set a maximum density for residential developments and instead the impact of the density on the character of the area, residential amenity and highway safety have to be considered.

In addition, Policy BCS17 of the adopted Bristol Core Strategy (2011) requires affordable housing to be provided in residential developments of 15 dwellings or more at a percentage target of 40% in the Inner East area. Such residential developments should provide a mix of affordable housing units and reflect identified needs, site suitability and economic viability. Where scheme viability may be affected, developers are expected to provide full development appraisals to demonstrate an alternative affordable housing provision. Policy BCS18 also requires development to contribute to the mix of housing tenures, types and sizes in an area.

As such this development should provide 37 affordable housing units in order to be fully policy compliant. Government policy and guidance is very clear that scheme viability is a key consideration in determining the level of affordable housing that a development can provide, and that Council's should not require a level of affordable housing that would render a development unviable. The government's Planning Practice Guidance states as follows:

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

Where affordable housing contributions are being sought, obligations should not prevent development from going forward. (Para 004 Reference ID: 23b-004-20140306)

In simple terms, a development is considered to be viable if the Residual Land Value (RLV) of the development is greater than the Site Value. The RLV is calculated by ascertaining the value of the completed development, and subtracting from this all the costs involved in bringing the development forward (eg build costs, professional fees, legal costs, financing costs etc) and the developers profit. All inputs are based on present day costs and values.

The applicant has claimed that, to remain viable in planning terms, the proposed scheme is unable to provide the full policy requirement of 40% affordable housing. A detailed viability appraisal and supporting commentary has been submitted in support of this claim. Officers have commissioned BNP Paribas to assess the viability information and advise the Council as to whether the applicants claim is reasonable. BNP Paribas have assessed the values and costs associated with the development, and liaised with the applicant to resolve areas of dispute. They conclude that whilst the scheme could not provide the full 40% affordable housing, it would be able to provide approximately 15% affordable housing (14 dwellings). The information and figures contained below reflect BNP Paribas view of the scheme viability.

The appraisal inputs can be summarised as follows:

Residential sales values	In line with the highest sales values currently being achieved in the Ashley Down / Bishopston area (excluding sales of dwellings overlooking the Gloucestershire County Cricket Ground, which attract a premium compared to other dwellings)
Build Costs	Build Costs are reflective of industry norms (as identified by the Build Cost Information Service (BCIS) for new build apartment blocks and the conversion of existing buildings)
Fees	Reflective of industry norms
Finance costs	Reflective of current returns required by lenders
Developers profit	Reflective of industry norms

Site Value can be calculated by identifying the Existing Use Value of a site and applying a premium (usually 20% on brownfield sites) to incentivise the owner to bring the site forward for development. Alternatively, the price paid for the site can be considered as the Site Value, provided that the purchaser did not pay an overly inflated price.

The Existing Use Value of a non-residential institution such as Brunel House is difficult to ascertain, as such buildings are rarely rented or sold for their existing use. Consequently the applicant has provided a Depreciated Replacement Cost Valuation (this is a valuation of last resort) based on RICS criteria, which gives a value of approximately £2,100,000. BNP Paribas are aware that the site was marketed in 2015, and that a number of bids were received that were in the region of the Depreciated Replacement Cost Valuation. Consequently, BNP Paribas advise that a Site Value of £2,100,000 is reasonable.

When 15% affordable housing is incorporated in the scheme, the viability appraisal results in a RLV that virtually equates to the Site Value. This means that the scheme is viable in planning terms when providing 15% affordable housing, but would not be viable in planning terms if more than 15% was required. Officers consider that given the viability of the proposed scheme, an affordable housing

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol**

provision of 15% is acceptable and that this should be secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement. The 14 units would be split as per Policy BCS17, with 11 being provided for social rent and three for shared ownership.

With regard to the mix of accommodation proposed, the area around the application site is relatively mixed. 2011 census data shows that over 75% of the accommodation in the area is houses rather than flats, and whilst the area immediately around the application site has a higher proportion of flats, particularly given recent development in the area, there are still more houses than flats. The proposal is for a flatted development, which will add to the proportion of flats in the area. However, there is a mix of accommodation within the proposal, including a high number of one and two bedroom units, but also including seven three and four bedroom units. It is noted that the conversion of the existing listed building does limit the scope for delivery of houses on the site. It is noted that an objection has been received which includes a specific concern that the type of family accommodation proposed will have an impact on local schools. This issue will be difficult to quantify, and clearly there is a need for housing across a range of sectors. The proportion of social rented accommodation in this area is significantly below the city wide average, and the provision of affordable housing on site will clearly add to the mix of accommodation. Whilst this may impact on the mix of students at local schools, it is not considered that this could be identified as harm which would warrant the refusal of the application. Given that there is no identified concentration of any particular type of housing in the area, and family housing still makes up the majority of accommodation in the ward, it is not considered that the proposed mix of accommodation is unreasonable, and it would contribute to the mix and balance of accommodation in this area.

(C) WOULD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PRESERVE OR ENHANCE THE HERITAGE ASSETS, INCLUDING THE GRADE II LISTED BUILDING AND THE ASHLEY DOWN CONSERVATION AREA?

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The Authority is also required (under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The case of R (Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks DC [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin) (Forge Field) has made it clear where there is harm to a listed building or a conservation area the decision maker 'must give that harm considerable importance and weight' [48].

Section 12 of the national guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, with any harm or loss requiring clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Further, Para.134 states that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss.

Policy BCS22 of the Core Strategy requires development to safeguard or enhance heritage assets, which includes historic buildings, both nationally and locally listed, and conservation areas.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol****o Impact on the listed building**

The proposal involves the conversion of the existing grade II listed building. This building was originally part of the Muller Orphanage, and was the second of the group of six to be built, being constructed in 1857. It fell into disuse in 1938, and was converted into college use in 1954. As part of that conversion there were significant alterations to the building, although it appears that these were mostly internally, involving subdivision of the large historic rooms to form classrooms. The exterior alterations to the building were relatively unchanged, although since that time there have been a number of small extensions to the building, and the erection of a lift tower to the exterior of the building to the south of the site.

The proposal does involve the removal of a number of these later additions to the property, including single storey additions to the east, south and west of the building, plus the removal of the 'barn' to the west of the building. These proposals are covered separately in application no. 15/06293/F. The extensions are not generally sensitively designed, and do not contribute positively to the setting or appearance of the listed building. On this basis it is considered that the demolition works would better reveal the heritage asset, and would generally be an enhancement to the appearance of the area. Whilst these works cannot be separated from the overall development on this issue it is considered that there is no in principle objection to the removal of the existing extensions to the building.

In terms of new works to the listed building this includes a single storey extension the south west corner of the site. This replaces the existing extension to the building, and it is considered that this has a more sensitive design and has a more appropriate relationship with the historic building. It is also proposed to make a number of internal alterations to the building to revise the layout for residential use. This includes the removal of partition walls, the insertion of new partition walls and mezzanine floors within the taller existing spaces, and changes to the internal floor and ceiling heights and internal cladding to meet relevant insulation and servicing standards.

The City Design Team are supportive of the conversion of the listed building and the benefits this will bring to the repair and upkeep of the building. The conversion to college use has resulted in the loss of much of the original layout of the building, although there is a substantial amount of historic fabric retained, albeit that it cannot necessarily be viewed in its original context. This includes three original staircases, plus various architraves, skirting, cills etc. The strategy for reusing the building is to leave as much of the substantial historic fabric intact, and this approach is supported. Some concerns were raised that it would not be possible to appreciate the original symmetrical layout of the proposal following the alterations. However, following the submission of additional evidence from the applicant it has been agreed that there was little historical justification for the symmetrical corridor approach as this was a more modern imposition. It has also been agreed that the amount of intervention required in respect of raised floor levels or suspended ceilings would be kept to a minimum, and where this resulted in the historic fabric then that fabric will be recorded prior to being concealed or removed. This approach is in line with the conversion of the other former orphanage buildings, and is considered appropriate.

Therefore, whilst the college use has generally been a careful custodian of the building, and large elements of the historic fabric have been retained, the building is in need of some upgrading and repair in order to meet modern standards, and officers are satisfied that this is being approached in a sensitive fashion. Where this is combined with the removal of insensitive additions to the building it is considered that the result will be an enhancement to the heritage asset.

o Impact on the Setting of the Listed Building

In addition to the comments above, the proposed development will also have an impact on the setting of the listed building through two elements. The most significant impact would be from the new build flat element to the west of the building. In addition to this, there also proposed to be changes to the

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

layout of the site which will also impact on the setting.

The new build flats will replace an existing structure and car park to the west of the building. The historic plans of the site suggest that this lies outside of the historic curtilage of the building, the boundary of which appears to have been formed by the wall that currently separates the 'barn' from the original building. Given the existing structures there is some justification for new build structures on this part of the site. However, the proposal does represent a significant increase in scale on the existing building. In this case, there is a difficult balance to draw between achieving a building on this site which responds to the design context (large blocks) and being sensitive to the setting adjacent to the listed building. Further consideration is given to the design qualities of the proposal below, however, given the scale of the proposal it is clear that the new building will impact on the historic setting of the building, not least on the basis that it will impact on the appreciation on the relationship between the original orphanage buildings. Whilst some of this relationship has been lost because of other developments in the area, it is still apparent when viewed on site.

It is noted that a number of objections have been received on the basis that the design of the proposal is not in keeping with the listed building, with comparison drawn between this proposal and the extension to Allen House. Whilst this proposal has a very close relationship to the existing building it is not an extension, and would not be positioned within the historic curtilage of the building. As such, it is considered reasonable and justified to take a different design approach, albeit one that is sensitive to the historic structures. Many of the buildings in the area are formed by relatively large blocks, and in this case the proposal would form one of three blocks surrounding a car park. Notwithstanding any concerns with the impact on the setting of the heritage assets this would normally be regarded as an appropriate design solution. The scale of the proposal has been designed to reflect the original blocks, and in negotiations on the proposal the height of the building has been reduced, so as to not dominate the historic building.

There has been a significant degree of negotiation on the detailed design of the proposal in order to achieve the current iteration of the scheme. There have previously been concerns about the junction between the listed building and the proposal, as well as the mixture of materials proposed conflicting with the appearance of the listed building. As a result of this the element which is directly adjacent to the listed building has been reduced in height, and the design simplified. This is particularly apparent with the palette of materials, with grey bricks chosen to reflect the tone and appearance of the listed building, without seeking to copy or pastiche it. The fenestration has also been revised to better reflect the vertical emphasis of the windows in the historic building. This has resulted in a robust design, with punched out windows and a sensitive palette of materials. Whilst the quality of the finished scheme will depend largely on the quality of the detailing, it is considered that this quality can be achieved through appropriate conditions. Therefore, if it is considered that a building of this scale is justified through the benefits it will bring the design revisions will result in a building which is appropriately designed given the context.

As stated above, in addition to the new build flats it is also proposed to include a number of interventions into the historic curtilage of the property. This includes additional car parking to the north of the site, and a new access road and car parking to the rear of the site. It is noted that the works to the rear of the building do replace hardstanding and the unsympathetic extensions referred to above, although the parking to the front of the site is a new element, which will impact on the 'set piece' nature of the views of the existing building. It is acknowledged that the landscape officer does support the formal landscaping proposals, but it is considered that the insertion of the car parking would have some impact on the setting of the heritage asset.

It is concluded on this issue that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the setting of the existing listed building, but as a result of amendments to the design of the proposal officers are satisfied that the proposal would result in less than significant harm. As such, in order to grant planning permission for the proposed development it is necessary to demonstrate that there are

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

public benefits delivered as part of the proposal, which could not otherwise be delivered. This issue is discussed in more detail below.

o Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

It should be noted that as well as the policies listed above the following policies are considered relevant to the consideration of the design of the proposal: Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy promotes high quality design, requiring development to contribute positively to an area's character, promote accessibility and permeability, promote legibility, clearly define public and private space, deliver a safe, healthy and attractive environment and public realm, deliver public art, safeguard the amenity of existing development and future occupiers, promote diversity through the delivery of mixed developments and create buildings and spaces that are adaptable to change. The adopted development management policies reinforce this requirement, with reference to Local Character and Distinctiveness (DM26), Layout and Form (DM27), Public Realm (DM28) and the Design of New Buildings (DM29).

The Ashley Down Conservation Area is largely based around the original orphanage buildings. Therefore, any new development which impacts on the visual connection between the orphanage will have some impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Indeed, given the fact that the proposal is considered to result in some harm to the setting of the listed building it is not possible to conclude that the proposal will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Notwithstanding this, the impact of the new build element is mitigated somewhat by the fact that there is an existing building in this location. In addition, it is considered that the proposed new build element is of an appropriate design, for the reasons given above. Therefore, similarly to the impact on the setting of the listed building it is considered that the proposal would result in less than significant harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

o Benefits of development

Given that the new build element is considered to result in less than significant harm to the setting of the listed building and the conservation area this has to be balanced against the public benefit of the development. As stated above there is clearly a benefit in maintaining occupation of the listed building, and the sensitive conversion to residential will facilitate the continuing and long term maintenance of the building. In addition, the removal of the less sensitive existing extensions to the building will also be of benefit. Whilst it is unfortunate that it is not possible to remove all of the unsympathetic extensions, notably the lift tower would need to be retained to allow appropriate access, it is noted that the application does include proposals for a more sensitive treatment of the lift tower.

The policy does also allow for other public benefits to be taken into account when balancing the impact of the proposal. In this respect, it is noted that the proposal would provide for additional housing in a sustainable location, which would contribute positively to meeting the city's housing targets. The applicant also argues that the proposal would result in significant improvements in terms of the sustainability of the building, and therefore its contribution to climate change. This is discussed further in the key issues below. In addition, as referred to above, the proposal would provide a significant element of affordable housing on site. The viability evidence submitted with the application does suggest that whilst the scheme could be constructed with a smaller new build element this would result in less profitability, and subsequently a lower proportion of affordable housing. Ultimately, it appears that it would be possible to design a scheme which overall would have a neutral impact on the setting of the listed building and the conservation area, but this would not deliver affordable housing. Given the need for affordable housing it is considered that this is a significant benefit. On the basis that it would not be possible to achieve these benefits without some harm to the heritage assets, it is considered that this harm is justified by the benefits of the development.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol**

- (D) WOULD THE PROPOSAL UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE AMENITY OF THE AREA AND WOULD IT CREATE AN ACCEPTABLE ENVIRONMENT FOR THE PROPOSED RESIDENTS?

Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy, as well as requiring development to be of a high quality design, also requires new development to safeguard the amenities of existing residents. In addition, policy BCS23 also requires development to be designed so as not to have a detrimental impact on the surrounding environment. Included within this is the requirement that development should not impact on the viability of surrounding uses through its sensitivity to noise or other pollution.

It should also be noted that policy BCS18 of the Core Strategy requires residential development to provide sufficient space for everyday activities, and following the publications of the Government's Nationally Described Space Standards, these are being applied to new developments within Bristol.

o Existing Residents

In terms of existing residents in the area, the immediate surroundings of the site are of mixed character, although following recent developments at the Gloucestershire County Cricket Ground and the former orphanage buildings to the north, there is a substantial residential presence in the area currently.

Firstly it should be noted that there are no changes to the historic building which would impact on neighbours of the site in terms of visual amenity or loss of daylight. However, local residents have raised concerns that the new build element would have a harmful impact, given its scale and design. The closest relationship of the new build to an existing residential property is around 17.5 metres to the flat block at the corner of Arthur Milton Street and College Road. The proposed building would be a maximum of around 12.5 metres tall. This property is almost directly to the north of the new build element, and given this relationship there would be some impact on the access to daylight, but this impact would only be in mid winter, and for much of the year there would be no direct impact on access to daylight at this property. Other neighbouring residential properties are over 40 metres away, and as such there would be no impact on amenity as a result of overshadowing from the new build element.

In terms of impact on privacy, a distance of around 21 metres has long been accepted as a reasonable distance to achieve an acceptable level of privacy between windows to habitable rooms, although this has to be adjusted for significant changes in levels or constrained views. The main outlook from the new build proposal would be to west, to the flats at the Cricket Ground. These flats are around 47 metres from the site, and at this distance there would be no material impact on privacy. However, in addition, the change in nature of the existing building would result in some potential impact on privacy. The existing properties to the east of the application site would be around 22 metres from the proposal, and as such are considered to be an acceptable separation distance. Therefore, the elements that would not achieve at least a 21 metre separation distance are those properties to the north and south of the application site.

The arrangement of buildings to the north of the site is such the existing residential accommodation is not directly opposite the three storey parts of the building. Therefore, the minimum separation distance of around 17.5 metres would either be from a single storey element of the converted building, or would be from windows at an angle. With regards to the building to the south, the main outlook from this property would be to the east and west, and as such this only has secondary windows facing the application site. Therefore, whilst this does not meet the normally accepted separation distance the types of relationship involved are not considered to merit the refusal of the application.

Neighbours of the site have also raised concerns regarding noise and disturbance as a result of the proposed development. Rather than this resulting from the noise generating activity at the application

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol**

site this appears to stem primarily from the lack of landscaping between the proposed new build element and the Cricket Club flats to the west, which would result in noise bouncing between properties. Given the location of a car park between the sites it is likely that properties in this area do suffer from some vehicle noise. However, having discussed this with the Council's Pollution Control team, they are satisfied that there is no significant noise generating activity in this area, and as such the proposal would not merit refusal on this basis.

With regard to other uses in the area, the other primary land uses in the area are the Cricket Club and the College. Both of these uses have been operating closely adjacent to residential uses. Whilst the introduction of noise sensitive uses can result in restrictions being placed on existing uses, given the existing character of the area it is not considered that the proposal would result in additional impacts on the viability of neighbouring community uses. As such, the impact on existing amenities is considered acceptable, and is in accordance with the relevant policies.

o Proposed Residents

As referred to above, the quality of the proposed residential accommodation has to be assessed against the Nationally Described Space Standards, which sets out minimum standards for the size of proposed flats. It is noted that policy BG18 also requires residential accommodation to be flexible and adaptable, which normally discourages the provision of bed sits and single person accommodation, as this would not provide the level of flexibility that is required by the policy. However, it must also be recognised that the conversion of a listed building has to work with the existing fabric of the building, and this does not always convert to modern space requirements.

Therefore, all of the accommodation in the new build element has space for at least two persons, and meets the relevant space standards. However, 11 of the flats in the converted building are described as single person flats or bedsits. It is acknowledged that all of these units meet the space standards for a single person flat (39 square metres), although would not offer the level of flexibility which would normally be required in a new build development. However, the layout of the flats has been designed taking account of the constraints of the building. Following negotiations with officers the number of bedsit type units has been reduced by incorporating some of the smaller units of accommodation into larger flats. The layout of the flats does allow direct outlook from all of the habitable rooms to a good standard, apart from one bedroom in the new build element, which has a more constrained outlook. All of the flats have access to some communal outdoor space, albeit none of the flats have private gardens. In addition, St. Andrews Park is less than 800 metres walking distance from the application site. Therefore, given the constraints of redeveloping a listed building it is considered that proposal would provide a reasonable standard of accommodation, and as such the proposal is considered acceptable on these grounds.

(E) WOULD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SATISFACTORILY ADDRESS TRANSPORT AND MOVEMENT ISSUES?

Development Plan policies are designed to promote schemes that reflect the list of transport user priorities outlined in the Joint Local Transport Plan, which includes pedestrian as the highest priority and private cars as the lowest (BCS10). In addition, policy DM23 requires development to provide safe and adequate access to new developments.

As referred to above the site is considered to be in a reasonably sustainable location, with a local shop and bus stops providing inbound and outbound services within easy walking distance. In addition, the Gloucester Road Local Centre is around 800 metres from the site, and as such it is possible to live in this location without the use of a private car. Notwithstanding this, car parking in this area is a significant issue, as the availability of on site car parking is limited. This results in there being a high demand for on street car parking, and this has been the subject of a substantial proportion of the objections to the proposal. In this case this is exacerbated by the fact that there are a number of

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road Bishopston Bristol**

existing car parking spaces which are in the ownership of the college, and these are used by existing residents when not in use by the college. This includes the 37 spaces running along College Road. These parking spaces are on private land, and in private ownership, but it is apparent that they are publically used currently. Whilst other developments in the area have been policy compliant in respect of car parking it does appear that the current usage is above that which is allocated for those developments. Notwithstanding this, these parking spaces are on private land, and the land owners are able to remove any access rights to the spaces.

With regard to the proposed parking provision for the development, the revised proposal includes 70 on site spaces (including the 37 spaces referred to above). Essentially, this will be arranged on the basis that all two, three and four bedroom flats will be allocated a space, the wheelchair accessible flat will be allocated a space and a space made available for a local car club. The remaining 18 will remain unallocated. A similar arrangement of car parking was approved at the Cricket Club flats. The Transport Development Management Team are satisfied that this will accommodate the parking needs for the development, and a refusal on parking grounds would not be justified.

In terms of impact on the current highway network, it is noted that the roads around the site are currently very busy. However, the existing use of the site does contribute to traffic movements in the area. The impact on the network has been assessed on the basis of the TRICs database, which suggests that the proposed use would actually result in a reduction in individual journeys on the network, and the Transport Team have raised no objections on these grounds.

The other concern raised by local residents relates to highway safety, particularly in relation to access to the nearby school. It appears that there are two primary concerns in this respect, firstly that cars currently park on the pavement on the southern side of College Road, and secondly that there is an access route through the car park to the west of the site which is currently used to access the school. On the first point, the car parking on the southern side of College Road will be formalised, which will prevent manouevring on the footpath. It is also proposed to move the crossing in this location to allow for a safer crossing point. On the second issue, whilst access through the car park will be lost, there is a footpath proposed around the new flats, and an additional crossing point on College Road. It is noted that College Road is not an adopted highway, and therefore the proposed crossings would not be covered by the same legislation as works to the adopted highway, but notwithstanding this it is considered that these would result in improvements to pedestrian safety, and as such a refusal on these grounds is not considered to be justified.

Provision has been made as part of the proposal for cycle storage and bin storage in convenient locations within the site. Concerns have been raised by officers about the access to the bin stores, but it has been clarified that it is not intended for refuse trucks to enter the site, but instead for refuse to be transported to the access point. This will require a management agreement, but on this basis the highways team are satisfied for with the arrangements for refuse and cycling.

Given the level of car parking at the site it is considered that future residents would be at least partly reliant on public transport routes. Whilst there are bus routes close to the site it is considered that the local bus stops are in need of upgrading. On this basis the Transport Development Management Team have requested a contribution of £45,430 for upgrading the two local bus stops, one in bound and one out bound. This is currently under negotiation, but subject to this issue being resolved it is considered that there is no objection to the development on highway grounds.

(F) WILL THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT MAKE AN ADEQUATE CONTRIBUTION TO THE SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE GOALS OF ADOPTED PLANNING POLICIES?

Policies BCS13, BCS14, BCS15 and BCS16 of the adopted Core Strategy give guidance on sustainability standards to be achieved in any development, and what measures to be included to ensure that development meets the climate change goals of the development plan. Applicants are

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

expected to demonstrate that a development would meet those standards by means of a sustainability statement. A sustainability statement has been submitted with this application, which includes a number of measures to improve the environmental performance of the buildings.

In terms of the sustainability strategy a distinction is drawn between the conversion of the listed building, and the new build element. For the new build the strategy involves the provision of a mixture of Photovoltaic and Solar panels on the roof. The analysis suggests that all of the flats in Block C will meet the part L requirement, with some of the flats having an improved performance. The provision of PV panels would result in an improvement in performance for the ground, first and second floor flats by at least 20%. The third floor flats would also have access to solar thermal panels, and hence the performance of these flat would be even better.

For the listed building the options for improving the performance are more limited. It is proposed to improve the fabric of the building and provide a central gas-fired boiler, but no renewables are proposed for this building. This has been subject to an objection on the grounds that the application should include renewable energy generation. The options for delivering renewables in the existing building have been discussed with the applicant, and it is apparent that any proposals would result in the loss of historic fabric. This has to be weighed against the benefits of the proposed alterations. Whilst it would be possible to provide some benefits, through for example the provision of PVs on discreet parts of the roof, the impact on the CO2 emissions is likely to be relatively marginal, and therefore would not outweigh the impact on the fabric lost. Therefore, when the performance of the new build element is taken into account, it is considered that the overall performance of the development is reasonable, and would not merit the refusal of the application.

Concerns have been raised by local residents that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the already poor air quality in the area. The site is located outside of the City's Air Quality Management Area, and therefore it is not considered that the existing air quality warrants significant improvement. The reduction in vehicle movements identified in the transport statement also means that there would be no worsening of the existing air quality, and therefore it is not considered that there is an harm arising in this respect.

With regards to surface water drainage it is noted that the proposal would not result in any significant change to the surface water outflow and no changes to the impermeable areas. It is proposed, therefore, to connect the proposal to the existing Wessex Water Infrastructure, via an attenuation tank, and this approach has been agreed with the Council's flood drainage team. As such, subject to a relevant condition there is no objection to the development on these grounds.

(G) WILL THE PROPOSAL HAVE A HARMFUL IMPACT ON TREES, WILDLIFE AND ECOLOGY IN THE SURROUNDING AREA?

Policy BCS9 of the Core Strategy states that 'Individual green assets should be retained wherever possible and integrated into new development'. It also states that 'Development should incorporate new and/or enhanced green infrastructure of an appropriate type, standard and size. Where on-site provision of green infrastructure is not possible, contributions will be sought to make appropriate provision for green infrastructure off site.'

The proposal involves the removal of one group and two individual trees, one of which is covered by a tree preservation order. These trees do clearly have amenity value, although the group of three Ginkgo trees located outside of the main entrance to the college are considered to be C grade trees. The other trees identified for removal, Common Limes, are considered to be of higher value, although they are located adjacent to a high wall, which is part of the listing for the building, and the buttress roots and stem growth are causing some minor deformation of the wall. This is only likely to get worse, particularly if further development is accommodated on the car park area to the west of the site. On this basis it is considered that the long term retention of these trees is unrealistic. It is

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

calculated that 10 replacement trees would be required to mitigate for the trees lost. The proposed landscaping plans indicate the provision of 20 replacement trees. There are some concerns about the suitability of some of the trees proposed, although it is clear that adequate replacement planting can be accommodated on the site, and therefore it is not considered that the application warrants refusal on these grounds.

In respect of ecology, an ecological assessment has been submitted with the application. This identifies that the site is a sensitive site in respect of ecology, with bats and nesting birds using the site. Bats have been recorded using the south eastern elevation of Brunel House, and therefore work must not commence until a licence has been granted by Natural England for the works. In addition, the following derogation tests under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations must be considered in the assessment of any proposal:

1. There is "no satisfactory alternative"

This test has been met by the fact the proposal relates to a listed building. The 'do nothing' scenario or maintaining the status quo would result in the further degeneration in the condition of the listed building and the asset would be lost, both in terms of heritage benefit, and for wildlife conservation purposes.

2. The proposal would "not be detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range"

This test has been met by the provision of mitigation as part of the proposal. This involves the provision of bat roosting boxes on nearby trees and the provision of two in-built bat boxes or bat tubes to allow access to the building. Given the population of bats involved this is considered a reasonable response.

3. The proposal is "in the interests of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment"

This test has been met by virtue of the proposal complying with the relevant planning policies. The development would deliver housing, including affordable house, which are policy and corporate aims. Given, the mitigation can be secured by condition it is considered that the benefits of the development do outweigh the risks to protected bats.

Given the potential of the site to accommodate nesting birds it is also recommended that bird nesting boxes are secured by condition. As such, the impact of the development on protected species and habitats can be successfully mitigated, and the development is considered acceptable in this regard.

(H) DOES THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SECURE A PACKAGE OF PLANNING OBLIGATIONS TO OFFSET THE IMPACT OF THE DEVELOPMENT ON THE LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE?

Policy BCS11 of the Core Strategy requires that planning obligations should be secured through the planning process in order to offset the impact of the proposed development on the local infrastructure. With the exception of site specific requires this policy is met through the application of the Community Infrastructure Levy, and in this case the CIL requirement for this proposal is £130,578.13. 80% of the money received through CIL would be spent on those items identified in the Regulation 123 list, which includes identified public transport projects, parks and green spaces and school projects. 15% is also delegated to the Neighbourhood Partnership who can then spend it on local priorities. Concerns have been raised regarding access to Doctors in the local area, which could potentially be picked up through the planning obligations regime, although Doctors are funded through alternative

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

mechanisms, and as such it is not considered to be justified to secure contributions in this way.

It is noted that Avon Fire and Rescue have requested a contribution to the provision of additional fire hydrants close to development site. The Council's guidance on planning obligations states that the Local Planning Authority will seek the provision of fire hydrants where sites are not within 100 metres of an existing hydrant. The applicants have confirmed that they are willing to provide the fire hydrants themselves, and this will need to be secured by condition.

The other planning obligations that are being sought in relation to the application are the contributions to bus stops and affordable housing, which are referred to above.

CONCLUSION

The application involves the conversion of the existing listed building, and the construction of a new build to provide a total of 92 flats on the site. In this case, a balance needs to be drawn between a relatively intensive development of the site, which would have an impact on the heritage assets in the area, and the benefits that the development brings. It is considered that the principle of the development is acceptable, and the development of housing in this area, specifically affordable housing, would deliver significant benefits. In addition, it is not considered that a refusal is justified on either amenity grounds or highway safety grounds. The design of the proposals has been subject to significant negotiation which has resulted in a reduction to the impact. On this basis officer are of the view that the benefits outweigh the less than significant harm to the heritage assets. There are no other issues that warrant the refusal of the application, and as such, the proposals are considered to be in accordance with the relevant planning policies, and are recommended for approval.

Application A - 15/06289/F**RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to Planning Agreement**

- (A) That the applicant be advised that the Local Planning Authority is disposed to grant planning permission, subject to the completion, within a period of six months from the date of this committee, or any other time as may be reasonably agreed with the Service Director, Planning and Sustainable Development and at the applicant's expense, of a planning agreement made under the terms of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), entered into by the applicant, Bristol City Council and any other interested parties to cover the following matters:
- i) The provision of 14 affordable housing units to be provided on site (final details to be agreed)
 - ii) The provision of a financial contribution to the upgrading of bus stops at Osbourne Avenue and Sefton Park Road (figures to be agreed).
- (B) That the Head of Legal Services be authorised to conclude the Planning Agreement to cover matters in recommendation (A).
- (C) That on completion of the Section 106 Agreement, planning permission be granted, subject to the following conditions:

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

Condition(s)**Time limit for commencement of development**

1. Full Planning Permission

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Pre commencement condition(s)

2. Approval of road works necessary

No development shall take place until details of the following works to the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

1. Changes to the footway, including curbs and new parking layout;
2. New and altered pedestrian crossings;
3. Location and details of fire hydrants.

The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until these works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that all road works associated with the proposed development are planned and approved in good time to a standard approved by the Local Planning Authority and are completed before occupation.

3. Construction management plan

No development shall take place including any works of demolition until a construction management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The statement shall provide for:

Parking of vehicle of site operatives and visitors
 routes for construction traffic
 hours of operation
 method of prevention of mud being carried onto highway
 pedestrian and cyclist protection
 proposed temporary traffic restrictions
 arrangements for turning vehicles

Reason: In the interests of safe operation of the highway in the lead into development both during the demolition and construction phase of the development.

4. Land affected by contamination - Site Characterisation

No development shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, and has been completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

(i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;

(ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:

* human health,

* property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,

* adjoining land,

* groundwaters and surface waters,

* ecological systems,

* archaeological sites and ancient monuments;

(iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination is understood prior to works on site both during the construction phase to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors

5. Land affected by contamination - Submission of Remediation Scheme

No development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment has been prepared, submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination is understood prior to works on site both during the construction phase to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

6. Land affected by contamination - Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

In the event that contamination is found, no development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation shall take place until the approved remediation scheme has been carried out in accordance with its terms. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and be approved in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination both during the construction phase and to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

7. Further details before relevant element started

Detailed drawings at the scale of 1 to 10 (or other as approved) of the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.

- a) Typical window and door details of each type proposed, to include unit profile, reveals, jambs, headers and cills.
- b) Railing details to the car park entrance and undercroft area, to include typical dimensions and arrangement, fixings, reveals, headers and cills.
- c) Railing details defining the site boundary adjacent to the new build element, to include typical dimensions, arrangement and fixings.
- d) Proposed living roofs, including cross sections showing the construction of the roof.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the character of the area.

8. Sample panels before specified elements started

Sample panels of the external materials for the new build, plus any extensions to the historic building, including brick, stone, window frames, cladding and rainwater goods, demonstrating the colour, texture, face bond and pointing are to be erected on site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant parts of the work are commenced. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the building is occupied.

Reason: In order that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.

9. To ensure implementation of a programme of archaeological works

No development shall take place within the area indicated on plan number 3520 0103 F until the applicant/developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the developer and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded prior to their destruction.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

10. To secure the recording of the fabric of buildings of historic or architectural importance

No redevelopment or refurbishment of the existing building (Brunel House) shall take place until the applicant/developer has recorded those parts of the building which are likely to be disturbed or concealed in the course of redevelopment or refurbishment. The recording must be carried out by an archaeologist or archaeological organisation approved by the Local Planning Authority and submitted to the Historic Environment Record (HER), the archive should then be submitted to Bristol City Museum and a hard copy to Bristol Record Office.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological or architectural importance within a building are recorded before their destruction or concealment.

11. Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS)

The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Sustainable Drainage Strategy and associated detailed design, management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site using SuDS methods has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Sustainable Drainage Strategy prior to the use of the building commencing and maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal is incorporated into the design and the build and that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and maintained for the lifetime of the proposal.

12. Bat Roosts

Development shall not commence until details of a scheme for the retention of the bats' roost and the retention of the bats' existing accesses or the provision of alternative new roosts or accesses, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The scheme shall include a programme for the implementation of the development which minimises any impacts on bats including the provision of suitable voids or crevices for bats, bat boxes, bricks or similar, 'soft strip' demolition methods and measures to minimise light pollution. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme or any amendment to the scheme as approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: to enable the local planning authority to retain control over development in order to safeguard bats and their roosts which are specially protected by law.

13. Bats in Trees

The mature lime trees shall not be removed from the site until a survey for bats by a qualified ecologist shall be undertaken, recommendations made for mitigation for any impact on protected species, and those recommendations being approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with those recommendations.

Reason: to enable the local planning authority to retain control over development in order to safeguard bats and their roosts which are specially protected by law.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

14. Nesting Birds

No clearance of vegetation or structures suitable for nesting birds, shall take place between 1st March and 30th September inclusive in any year without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. The authority will require evidence provided by a suitably qualified ecologist that no breeding birds would be adversely affected before giving any approval under this condition.

Reason: To ensure that wild birds, building or using their nests are protected.

15. Bird and Bat Boxes

Prior to commencement of development details shall be submitted providing the specification, orientation, height and location for built-in bird nesting and bat roosting opportunities. This shall include ten swift boxes or bricks and four built-in bat boxes or bat tubes in addition to those required by the bat mitigation scheme. The boxes shall be erected prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To help conserve legally protected bats and birds which include priority species.

16. Highway Condition Survey

A Condition Survey of the existing public highway will need to be carried out and agreed with the Highway Authority prior to any works commencing on site, and any damage to the highway occurring as a result of this development is to be remedied by the developer to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority once all works have been completed on site.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the existing road corridor.

17. Public Art

Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a Public Art Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall also contain a timetable for delivery and details of future maintenance responsibilities and requirements. All public art works shall be completed in accordance with the agreed scheme and thereafter retained as part of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that public art is integrated into the design and build of the development.

Pre occupation condition(s)

18. Land affected by contamination - Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Condition 3 and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Condition 4, which is to be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 5.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

19. Implementation/Installation of Refuse Storage and Recycling Facilities - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the refuse store, and area/facilities allocated for storing of recyclable materials, as shown on the approved plans have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter, all refuse and recyclable materials associated with the development shall either be stored within this dedicated store/area, as shown on the approved plans, or internally within the building(s) that form part of the application site. No refuse or recycling material shall be stored or placed for collection on the public highway or pavement, except on the day of collection.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining premises, protect the general environment, and prevent obstruction to pedestrian movement, and to ensure that there are adequate facilities for the storage and recycling of recoverable materials.

20. Completion of Vehicular Access - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the means of vehicular access has been constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans and the said means of vehicular access shall thereafter be retained for access purposes only.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

21. Completion and Maintenance of Car/Vehicle Parking - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the car/vehicle parking area shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, the area shall be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of vehicles associated with the development

Reason: To ensure that there are adequate parking facilities to serve the development.

22. Completion and Maintenance of Cycle Provision - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the cycle parking provision shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only.

Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of adequate cycle parking.

23. New works to match - Listed Building

All new external and internal works and finishes, and any works of making good, shall match the existing original fabric in respect of using materials of a matching form, composition and consistency, detailed execution and finished appearance, except where indicated otherwise on the drawings hereby approved.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

Reason: In order that the special architectural and historic interest of this Listed Building is safeguarded.

24. Partitions - Listed Building

All new partitions shall be scribed around the existing ornamental plaster mouldings.

Reason: To ensure that the character, appearance and integrity of the building is not prejudiced, thereby preserving its special architectural or historic interest.

25. Submission and Approval of Landscaping Scheme

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection, in the course of development. The approved scheme shall be implemented so that planting is carried out no later than the first planting season following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. All planted materials shall be maintained for five years and any trees or plants removed, dying, being damaged or becoming diseased within that period shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the council gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect and enhance the character of the site and the area, and to ensure its appearance is satisfactory.

26. Artificial Lighting (external)

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or use commenced until a report detailing the lighting scheme and predicted light levels at neighbouring residential properties has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include a lux level contour plan, and should seek to ensure no light spill outside of the site boundaries. The lux contour plan should extend outwards to incremental levels of zero lux.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers and in order to avoid harm to nocturnal animals.

27. Sustainability

The development hereby approved shall only be carried out in accordance with the Energy and Sustainability Statement submitted by Hydrock in support of the application (ref. C15/1383/R/002 Rev. A). All measures referred to in the statement, including the Photovoltaic Panels and Solar Thermal Heating, shall be implemented in accordance with the statement and be operations prior to the occupation of the relevant dwellings.

Reason: To meet the sustainability goals of the development plan and to off set the impact of the development on climate change.

28. Travel Plans - Not submitted

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until a Travel Plan comprising immediate, continuing and long-term measures to promote and encourage alternatives to single-occupancy car use has been prepared, submitted to and been approved

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/06289/F, 15/06290/LA and 15/06293/F: Brunel House City Of Bristol College
College Road Bishopston Bristol**

in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall then be implemented, monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed travel Plan Targets to the satisfaction of the council.

Reason: In order to deliver sustainable transport objectives including a reduction in single occupancy car journeys and the increased use of public transport, walking & cycling.

List of approved plans

29. List of approved plans and drawings

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Application B - 15/06290/LA

RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to condition(s)

Conditions to follow

Application C - 15/06293/LA

RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to condition(s)

Conditions to follow

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Avon Fire & Rescue Service	4 January 2016
Transport Development Management	31 May 2016
Conservation Section	29 January 2016
Urban Design	18 January 2016
City Centre Projects (Public Art)	16 February 2016
Landscape	6 January 2016
Arboricultural Team	25 February 2016
Bristol Civic Society	30 December 2015
Contaminated Land Environmental Protection	1 February 2016
Flood Risk Manager	12 January 2016
Nature Conservation Officer	24 December 2015
Archaeology Team	20 January 2016

WARD: Southville **CONTACT OFFICER:** Catherine Tyrer

SITE ADDRESS: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol

APPLICATION NO: 15/04731/F Full Planning & Listed Building Consent
15/04732/LA
15/04726/F &
15/04727/LA

EXPIRY DATE: 16 December 2015

Change of use of Regent House and Consort House from offices (use class B1(a)) to residential (use class C3) (80 units) along with external alterations and retained offices (use class B1(a)) accommodation of 481sq m. Extension of commercial unit in Consort House (use classes A1, A2, A3, D1) of 36sq.m. Construction of new residential blocks (use class C3) (151 units) and associated landscaping and car parking to the rear of Regent House and Consort House. Construction of new residential accommodation (use class C3) (4 units) and ground floor commercial units (use classes A1, A2, A3, D1) of 395.sq.m on land at Lombard Street. Alterations to public realm along Bedminster Parade and Lombard Street. Major Application


RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to Planning Agreement

AGENT: JLL
40 Berkeley Square
Bristol
BS8 1HU

APPLICANT: City & Country Bedminster Ltd
Bentfield Place
Bentfield Road
Stansted
Essex
CM24 8HL

The following plan is for illustrative purposes only, and cannot be guaranteed to be up to date.

LOCATION PLAN:



Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol****SUMMARY**

These applications are brought to Committee on account of the scale of development proposed. There has been no member referral.

A formal pre-application enquiry was submitted to the LPA in April 2015 and early discussions were held with officers regarding a number of principle issues, including the principle of development, the layout, scale, massing, design and heritage issues (primarily the impact on the listed buildings and the conservation area).

Two interlinked planning applications and associated listed building consent applications have been submitted. These are referred to as the “**core scheme**” and the “**supplementary scheme**”. The supplementary scheme has been submitted as a variation to the Core Scheme, and we understand that it is not the intention (should planning permission be forthcoming for either or both applications), that the Supplementary Scheme would be implemented as a free standing scheme. It has been made clear to the applicant, that should planning permission be granted for the Supplementary Scheme, a condition would be attached to tie it to the implementation of the Core Scheme.

The following development is proposed:

- Core scheme: change of use of Regent House and Consort House from offices to residential use and the erection of new blocks of residential accommodation. The scheme proposes the erection of 235 residential units (80 of which will be located within the converted building, 151 within new blocks on the main site and 4 units on Lombard Street). An area of office floorspace will be retained within Regent House (481sq.m GEA). Alterations and improvements are proposed to the Imperial Arcade walkway along with a 36sq.m extension to the existing commercial floorspace (use classes A1, A2, A3 or D1) to provide a new unit. Ground floor commercial units (use classes A1, A2, A3 or D1), of 395sq.m, are also proposed at ground floor level on Lombard Street. [planning application ref: 15/04732/F and listed building consent application ref: 15/04731/LA]
- Supplementary scheme: the conversion of Regent House to residential accommodation and the erection of a mansard roof extension. Part of the ground floor will be retained as office/commercial floorspace. Imperial Parade is retained as existing. [planning application ref: 15/04732/F and listed building consent application ref: 15/04731/LA]

Combined Core and Supplementary schemes: if both the Core and Supplementary Schemes were implemented together, the combined development would deliver a total of 247 residential units.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The 1.214 ha site is located within South Bristol, within Bedminster Town Centre. It comprises the site of Regent House and Consort House, with Imperial Arcade at the ground floor of Consort House and a car park area (with parking for around 197 cars) to the rear. The existing buildings form an “L” shape fronting Bedminster Parade and the pedestrianized Lombard Street. Vehicular access to the rear car park is obtained from St John’s Road, which is also used as the service/deliveries access to the units within Imperial Arcade.

The site also includes a separate parcel of land located on the opposite side of Lombard Street, on the corner with Catherine Mead Street. It is currently occupied by a car park area. The site is bounded by commercial units on two sides.

The ground floor of Consort House is made up of Imperial Arcade, a parade of nine retail units. The

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

covered area in front of the units acts as the primary pedestrian thoroughfare on this side of Bedminster Parade.

There are a number of trees on the site (with a total of 43 trees identified), two of which were identified as medium quality (grade B) and the remainder being low quality (grade C or U trees).

The northern boundary comprises the flank wall of the Asda Superstore.

Commercial units are located on the opposite side of Lombard Street and Bedminster Parade, typical of the site's town centre location. To the west, the area predominantly comprises residential properties.

The Bedminster Parade frontage and the small parcel of land on Lombard Street are located within the designated Primary Shopping Area. Regent House and Consort House are Grade II listed and the site is located within the Bedminster Conservation Area.

Part of the site is located within flood zone 3, including the existing buildings and land along St John's Road and Lombard Street. The remainder of the site is located within flood zone 2. The site is located within a Coal Authority Low Risk Area.

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

The proposals relate to two separate, but inherently linked applications for the redevelopment of the site, referred to as the "core scheme" and the "supplementary scheme". Both applications are also accompanied by applications for listed building consent.

Core Scheme

(Planning application 15/04731/F and Listed Building Consent application 15/04732/LA)

The Core Scheme proposes the erection of 235 residential units through a combination of conversion of the existing buildings and new build. The retention of 481sq.m (GEA) of office accommodation within Regent House, alterations and improvements to Imperial Arcade and the construction of car parking and landscaping within the existing car park are also proposed. The scheme also includes the provision of 431sq.m (GEA) of commercial floorspace (use classes A1, A2, A3, D1) to be provided by means of a small extension to Imperial Arcade and within ground floor units of the proposed new block on Lombard Street.

Consort House

The conversion and alteration of the first and second floors and existing roof space to provide 34 apartments. The works at this level have been designed to avoid alteration to the existing roof slope to East Street/Bedminster Parade. New dormer windows are proposed within the side and rear elevations.

The currently split pitch of the rear roof slopes will be re-set and the roof coverings reinstated utilising the existing natural slate. Amendments are proposed to a number of the existing openings in the rear, courtyard façade to form balconies serving the apartments.

The existing 1980s windows will be replaced with traditional painted timber 1/1 sliding sashes in the existing openings.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

At the northern end of Consort House, the creation of an additional retail space (36sq.m) is proposed at the northern end of the arcade, adjacent to Asda. This will include the installation of a new glazed shop front.

Regent House

The conversion and alteration of part of the existing ground floor office space to provide a separately accessed cluster of creative workspaces. The upper floors will be converted to provide residential units, consisting of a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments. A number of the existing openings in the rear, courtyard façade will be altered to form balconies serving the apartments. The surrounding masonry will be made good to match existing.

New Build Blocks

Blocks 1 and 3: These two blocks were originally of an identical scale, but subsequent amendments has reduced the height of Block 1 to four storeys, with Block 3 maintained at seven storeys. A brickwork plinth would extend from Block 1 to provide a base for the elevated courtyard landscaped areas within which Blocks 2 and 3 are also situated. Below the podium landscaped areas, car parking, refuse storage and bike storage would be accommodated. A mix of 1 and 2 bedroom units are proposed within these blocks.

Block 2: Ranges in height from 4 to 6 residential storeys (including the podium), with a stepped profile. It proposes 35 residential units, consisting of a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments.

Block 4: Running parallel with St John's Road, the block rises to five storeys (including the podium level). It would provide 43 residential units, consisting of a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed apartments.

Block 5: also runs parallel with St John's Road, rising up to 5.5 storeys in height. It proposes 3 duplex units, accessed from the ground floor (providing 1 x 2-bed and 2 x 3-bed family apartments with private gardens). The remaining 20 units comprise a mix of 1 and 2 bed apartments.

Lombard Street

A new building is proposed fronting onto Lombard Street, which would provide two ground floor commercial units (use classes A1, A2, A3, D1), with four duplex 3-bed apartments above.

Imperial Arcade

The existing retail units within Imperial Arcade will be retained. Alterations are proposed to the existing 1980s arcade, including the lowering of the existing sills to achieve increased visual and pedestrian permeability. These units would continue to be serviced from rear through the undercroft car park.

Scheme Amendments: during the course of the application, following feedback from officers, there have been a number of amendments made to the application, most notable being the removal of three storeys from Block 1 (that closest to Consort House) and an additional storey added to Block 2. Other amendments include:

1. Lombard Street block: Vertical recesses in the façade (to accommodate downpipes) introduced to break up the Lombard Street elevation of the new block and increased the number of openings on the first and second floor St Johns Road elevation. A mansard roof and dormer window included at the short elevation
2. Landscaping and planting plan amended
3. The Heritage Impact Assessment was revised as submitted version did not adequately meet the requirements of the NPPF.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

4. A balustrade/parapet added to the terrace above the corner retail unit.

Supplementary Scheme

(Planning application 15/04726/F and Listed Building Consent application 15/04727/LA)

The supplementary scheme proposes the conversion of Regent House to achieve 58 residential units (providing a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bed units) and retains 481sq.m of office floorspace. The existing retail/commercial units are retained. A new natural slate mansard roof extension with dormer windows formed in lead is proposed to add an additional storey.

Scheme Amendments: extent of the proposed roof extension reduced and set back from the cupola. It was originally proposed to convert part of the ground floor of Regent House into residential accommodation, but the applicant has agreed to retain part of the ground floor within commercial use (as per the Core Application).

The Heritage Impact Assessment was revised as the submitted version did not adequately meet the requirements of the NPPF.

Combined Schemes

The applicant's intention is that both schemes would be implemented together (and a condition is attached to the supplementary scheme which would prevent it being implemented separately). The implementation of both the Core and Supplementary Schemes would achieve a total of 247 residential units along with car parking, landscaping, public realm improvements and all other works.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

A Screening Opinion request was submitted to Bristol City Council on 15 June 2015. The Council issued its formal Screening Opinion on 8 July 2015 confirming that an Environmental Statement was not required (ref 15/03155/SCR).

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

A Report of Community Involvement was submitted with the planning application. It sets out details of the engagement and consultation programme undertaken prior to the submission of the application.

It states that public consultation was undertaken and a public exhibition was held on site on 21 April 2015, with invitations sent to key stakeholders, ward/neighbouring ward Councillors and a wide catchment area of local residential properties. A second public exhibition was held on 4 June 2015, with the exhibition then set up on in the foyer of the Windmill Hill City Farm until 19 June 2015.

Meetings were also arranged with the planning committee of the BS3 Group (the local amenity group for the area). Presentations were also given to the Bristol Urban Design Forum and the Conservation Advisory Panel in June 2015.

In response to the consultation process, the Report of Community Involvement identifies the key scheme changes made in response to comments raised.

A comment was received from the Neighbourhood Planning Network stating that "the community involvement has been excellent".

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol

PLANNING HISTORY

There are a number of planning applications relating to the former use of the site, but none of which are relevant to the application proposals.

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

The application was advertised by way of site and press notice. 135 local residents were consulted in October 2015 by individual letter notifying them of the applications submitted. A further 14 day consultation was undertaken in March 2015 notifying local residents of amended plans received.

Two comments were received, from a local resident and a local business operator:

1. Cumulative impact of proposed development and others on infrastructure (i.e. GP surgeries, capacity of public transport, local schools, utilities). Particular concerns regarding lack of forward planning in respect of school places. CIL contributions not sufficient. [Officer response: development will be liable for CIL payment which will go some way to mitigate this. The requirement for further contributions was assessed, and in this case was not considered the meet the relevant tests of what would be considered to be relevant or reasonable]
2. Not clear whether residents would qualify for Bedminster East RPZ. Impact of increased parking on local roads. [Officer's response: Transport Development Management Officer has advised that residents of the proposed development would not be eligible for parking permits]
3. Too high and too dense and impact on city wide views, particularly across the conservation area
4. Lack of affordable housing
5. Out of character with historic buildings and conservation area
6. Object to provision of additional retail unit as removal of pathway negatively impacts on heritage asset and loss of light to other retail units (specifically number 9).
7. Insertion of lift within unit 4 will damage historic fabric and lease does not allow for this [Officer comment: addressed within Key Issue C. Lease issues are a legal matter between the lessee and the freeholder]

Bristol Tree Forum: Loss of 42 trees out of 43, including a B grade tree lost. Complete site clearance in contravention of BCS9 para 2 part 1. Noted BTRS (86 trees) is complied with on site. Adequate provision should be made for watering trees within car park deck and a condition requiring replacement should a tree die within 10 years. [addressed in Key Issue F]

BS3 Planning Group:

1. Difficult to obtain a "single view" of what is proposed. BCC website and splitting the application into alternatives does not assist. [Officer response: while it is noted that a single application would have been more straight forward, the approach taken has allowed Officers and consultees (including neighbours) to assess separate elements on their own merits and has not prejudiced consideration of the applications]
2. Insufficient pre-application engagement [Officer response: community engagement prior to the submission of the application considered to be acceptable. NPN has described it as "excellent".
3. Loss of employment use and lack of transparency of marketing.[addressed in key issue A]
4. Impact on local parking and whether residents would qualify for parking permits [addressed in key issue E and residents would not be eligible for parking permit]
5. Insufficient information on views [Officer response: updated views information submitted during the course of the application]
6. Cumulative impact of this and other developments on infrastructure (schools, GPs, telephony/broadband infrastructure, public transport) [Officer response: development will be

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

- liable for CIL payment which will go some way to mitigate this]
7. Site would be ideally suited to educational/institutional use [Officer response: application does not propose an education/institutional use and therefore this has not been considered]
 8. Lack of affordable housing; developers were aware of BCC affordable housing requirements when purchased the site [See Key Issue B]
 9. Application should be viewed cumulatively [Officer response: application has been judged on its merits]
 10. Scheme is too intense and too high [See Key Issues A and C]

Following scheme amendments: a further comment was received advising that amendments do not alleviate concerns.

Bristol Civic Society:

The Society is pleased to note that the developer has revised important aspects of the design following comment from among others, the Society, and after discussion with Council planning officers. The Society supports the direction of travel of the revisions.

Bedminster Town Team: Supports the application for the following reasons:

1. Potential to create much needed “sense of place”
2. Kick start investment and development in the area
3. Regenerative effect on nearby sites, to economic and physical benefit of the area
4. Support for enhanced pedestrian route through the site and area open to the public
5. Quality of architecture
6. Provision of much needed housing is sustainable location

OTHER COMMENTS

A summary of the comments provided by relevant internal and external consultees are set out below. A copy of the full comments received is available on the application file and website.

The Environment Agency has commented on the applications:

The Environment Agency raises no objection to the proposal, subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions. Likewise, it commented that on the basis that a sequential approach is being taken with the development, whereby the more vulnerable uses are located at a higher level where the flood risk is such that it is not safe to have them at ground floor, the Agency has no objection to the proposed development relating to flood risk.

Conditions required relate to: compliance with approved Flood Risk Assessment; submission of flood resilience measures; submission of details regarding contamination; unexpected contamination encountered during construction; details of flood warning and evacuation plan for future occupants.

Historic England has commented on the application:

Significant concerns raised to the original scheme. Whilst there have been some amendments to the heights of the rear blocks, ostensibly to reduce their prominence when viewed from East Street, this fails to address the fundamental concerns with scale of development and its harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Bedminster Conservation Area. Those amendments also fail to address the concerns expressed regarding the impact of the proposals on longer views.

The amendments to the roof extension of the listed building are an unconvincing response to the concerns raised regarding the impact of that element. No further information has been provided regarding the internal works to the listed buildings, or to address the inadequacies of the Heritage

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

Impact Assessment.

As per previous advice, the proposals would cause considerable harm to the Bedminster Conservation Area, and the settings of the listed buildings. Based on the information provided it is likely that they would also cause harm to the significance of the listed buildings as well. The proposals are contrary to the advice contained in Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and the general tenor of advice in the Bedminster Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2013 which identifies over-scaled buildings as a negative feature of the Conservation Area and its setting.

Following a subsequent meeting with CDG and Historic England and receipt of additional information, it is understood that an updated response would be submitted. At the time of writing this has not been received and the above comments still stand.

Air Quality Officer has commented as follows:

Potential for dust from construction activities has been determined to be negligible when taking into account implementation of a range of mitigation measures. These mitigation measures should be included within a Construction Environmental Plan (required by condition).

This is a concern along the façade of East Street where monitoring data at the façade of Consort House shows that the annual objective for nitrogen dioxide is exceeded by a considerable margin. This is due to a combination of high numbers of vehicle movements along this road combined with the ‘canyon’ street layout here which inhibits the dispersion of pollution. Air quality on many of the roads surrounding the development site is in breach of the annual objective for NO₂ so it is important that the potential slight worsening of air quality is minimised. The level of electric charge points should be 20%.

As an exceedance of the annual air quality objective for nitrogen dioxide is likely to be experienced from the first to third floors at the facades of Consort House and Regent House closest to Bedminster Parade, a condition is attached requiring windows serving these units to be fixed shut windows and mechanical ventilation incorporated.

There were a number of queries raised regarding the potential connection to a gas fired district heating network and any associated air quality issues. [Officer response: this would be assessed as part of any planning application for the district heating network itself].

Arboricultural Officer has commented as follows:

Following discussions with the applicant the landscaping scheme has been amended and is considered to be acceptable.

City Design Group (CDG) has commented a number of times on the application proposals and extensive feedback was provided to the applicant. A brief summary of CDG comments to the original scheme is set out below:

1. Significant opportunity of site to provide a valuable scheme for the growth and vibrancy of the area noted.
2. Heritage Impact Assessment inadequate and failed to meet requirements of NPPF, this led to significant concern regarding the proposed scheme as the application was not supported with any clear or convincing justification or options appraisal.
3. Particular areas of concern included the roof top extension to Regent House and its impact on the architectural integrity of Regent House and the cupola.
4. Ground floor of Regent House, especially the part that addresses the pedestrianized area of Lombard Street not considered suitable for residential use.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

5. Omission of the bank of dormer windows proposed at pre-application stage within the roof facing Bedminster Parade is welcomed. Subject to appropriate justification and assessment of harm, some roof level alteration to Consort House considered acceptable.
6. Modification by removal of sills to Imperial Arcade welcomed and supported in principle. Consideration will need to be given to flooring, walls, lighting and public art.
7. Benefit of a new shop unit is likely to outweigh any harm.
8. Additional views analysis required to properly assess the impact on local and wider views
9. Height, scale and massing of new blocks was a particular concern
10. Architecture and aesthetics of the tower clocks is acceptable, but detailed aspects require further work/clarification
11. Distance between blocks of amenity concern
12. Access and circulation core being through the undercroft car park is of significant concern. Challenging to design the confined space to serve pedestrians and cyclists while retaining its primary function as a car park and delivery/serving access.
13. There is a clear desire route through the site. Current design does not retain the potential for a suitable access arrangement to be delivered in the future which is of concern.
14. Public art strategy to be further developed through relevant conditions

Following an initial amendment, removing only one storey from Block 1, CDG commented as follows:

Core application:

1. The impact of Block 1 (the block closest to Consort House) remains a major concern as it rises 3+ storeys above the ridge level of Consort House and has a significantly detrimental impact on immediate setting of the Grade II listed Consort House, and on the character and appearance of the Bedminster Conservation Area. Unless the height of block 1 can be reduced by 3 storeys (1 currently being offered and 2 additional), the scheme will cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the Bedminster Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II listed buildings, undermining their contribution to the surrounding townscape, and cannot be supported.
2. While the other two blocks will have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building, as well as on views from the Bedminster and City Docks Conservation Areas. However, the impact of these blocks and the context in which they stand is considered to be less than substantial. While they will certainly be visible, they will not have such a detrimental impact on the local townscape nor on the roof line of the listed buildings. There may be scope for a partial storey to be filled in on the middle block to recoup the loss of residential floor space but this should be subjected to appropriate views analysis and testing.
3. Ground floor entry points on the main range of the St John's Road elevation as there is concern that the development will result in an inactive and dead frontage.
4. The Lombard Street terrace would benefit from material detailing to emphasise its vertical subdivision, to break up its composition and introduce a form more consistent with the East Street terraces. Also the gable design of the gable end facing onto the bend of the road need to present active and attractive frontage.
5. Arcade remodelling – supported in principle and full details will be required at an early stage (to be dealt with by condition).
6. Under croft parking - The precedents provided for the under croft car parking are not comparable or unsatisfactory. Full resolution/details will be required at an early stage (to be dealt with by condition).

Supplementary Application:

1. The revision to the supplementary application is welcomed. Whilst there is some harm to the Grade II listed building through the introduction of an attic storey, this harm is considered to be less than substantial and outweighed by the wider public benefit of upgrading the fabric of the building and securing its use for the longer term. The roof extension will be visible from some locations in the context of the Bedminster Conservation Area, however, being set further back

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

away from the prominent cupola feature and presumably the parapet will not detrimentally impact on the landmark quality of the building. Overall, the character and appearance of the Bedminster Conservation Area will be preserved.

2. Proposed revision to retain it part of the ground floor as a commercial/community space is welcomed.

Following detailed discussions with the applicant a series of further amendments were submitted. CDG has verbally advised that while there are a number of areas which would benefit from further work, the proposed scheme as amended is, on balance, considered to be acceptable.

Archaeology: indications that construction of the tobacco factory and subsequent extensions had caused disturbance to archaeological structures. Additional investigation required and a full record made of the buildings.

Contaminated Land Officer has commented as follows:

EA comments confusing as they recommend discharge of planning conditions when none are yet applied to the proposed scheme. Presume EA does not require the previously requested planning condition as it is satisfied with respect to controlled waters (looking at the results BCC would concur with this).

The phase two report is satisfactory.

The site has been found to be underlain by made ground, alluvium and sandstone. Groundwater at the site is thought to be tidally influenced from the new cut. Arsenic and lead were identified as being above the screening criterion for residential end use, however the results were below the public open space residential criteria. Asbestos lagging was encountered in HP02 and TP10.

The UXO report submitted with the Desk Study has identified the potential presence of an unexploded bomb at a depth of approximately 8 metres below ground level. Further specialist advice will be required. We concur with the requirement for further specialist advice with respect to the unexploded ordnance on site, particularly with respect to the potential risks from piling.

A range of mitigation measures are advised for the proposed development mainly with respect to the presence of asbestos and soft landscaped areas, therefore we would recommend a number of conditions are applied to any planning consent.

Crime Prevention Design Officer has commented as follows:

No concerns regarding the proposed development. Avon and Somerset Constabulary operates the Secured by Design initiative, which is scheme which promotes the inclusion of architectural crime prevention measures into new projects. I would suggest that consideration should be given to applying for Secured by Design (SBD) certification as this would ensure minimum standards of physical security. Implementing Secured by Design has proved to reduce the number of burglaries where it has been implemented.

Flood Risk Manager has commented as follows:

The surface water drainage strategy proposed is acceptable for this development.

Nature Conservation Officer has commented as follows:

Landscaping of the site should predominantly employ native species of local provenance including berry and fruit-bearing tree, hedgerow and shrub species for birds and nectar-rich flowering plants for

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

invertebrates. The provision of living (green/brown) roofs is recommended to provide habitat for wildlife.

A number of conditions recommended, relating to: inclusion of bird/bat boxes; landscaping scheme and the protection of nesting birds.

Transport Development Management has commented as follows:

A financial contribution towards enhanced cycle facilities at Bedminster Bridges, pedestrian crossing facilities and public transport enhancements was originally requested. Following information submitted by the applicant regarding the baseline permission (if the existing office was bought into use), it has been agreed that it would be unreasonable to request such contributions.

Pedestrian and cycle accessibility is considered to be good in terms of the location of the development site and the surrounding footway network and cycle facilities.

Public transport accessibility is considered to be good in terms of the location of the development site and the surrounding public transport facilities. The existing public transport stops closest to the development site, Catherine Mead Street (eastbound) and Catherine Mead Street (westbound) are not on the MetroBus route

Transport Assessment / Trip Generation: We note that the junction visibility splay is contained entirely within the red line or within the extent of the adopted public highway, which is acceptable

Transport Assessment demonstrates that the refuse vehicle can access all bin stores, and confirms that a 7.5t box van would be the largest delivery vehicle, with swept path analysis demonstrating that suitable access is achievable. All future loading and servicing activities associated with the proposed development will take place within the curtilage of the development site, which is acceptable

The applicant should be requested to provide amended car parking plans that indicate the minimum of two car-club facilities requested at pre-application stage, standard car parking spaces, the spaces for the dedicated use of blue badge holders, the spaces that will have electricity charging point; and the car-club facilities. The revised plan is required in order to demonstrate that the above facilities can be adequately accommodated within the development site.

A **Sustainability Officer** has commented as follows:

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate compliance with sustainability policies BCS13-16. Further information is required, much of which could be secured by condition.

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012**Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011)**

BCS1	South Bristol City Council
BCS5	Housing Provision
BCS7	Centres and Retailing
BCS8	Delivering a Thriving Economy
BCS9	Green Infrastructure
BCS10	Transport and Access Improvements
BCS11	Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol

BCS13	Climate Change
BCS14	Sustainable Energy
BCS15	Sustainable Design and Construction
BCS16	Flood risk and Water Management
BCS17	Affordable Housing Provision
BCS18	Housing Type
BCS20	Effective and Efficient Use of Land
BCS21	Quality Urban Design
BCS22	Conservation and the Historic Environment
BCS23	Pollution

Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014)

DM1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM4	Wheelchair Accessible Housing
DM7	Town Centre Uses
DM8	Shopping Areas and Frontages
DM12	Retaining Valuable Employment Sites
DM14	The health impacts of development
DM15	Green Infrastructure Provision
DM17	Development Involving Existing Green Infrastructure
DM19	Development and Nature Conservation
DM23	Transport development management
DM25	Greenways
DM26	Local Character and Distinctiveness
DM27	Layout and Form
DM28	Public Realm
DM29	Design and New Buildings
DM30	Alterations to Existing Buildings
DM31	Heritage Assets
DM32	Recycling and Refuse Provision in New Development
DM33	Pollution control, Air Quality and Water Quality
DM34	Contaminated Land
DM35	Noise Mitigation
SA1	Site Allocations

KEY ISSUES**(A) IS THE PROPOSAL AND MIX OF USES ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE?**

Policy BCS1 identifies South Bristol as the priority focus for development and comprehensive regeneration for the next 15 to 20 years, including the provision of around 8,000 new homes of a mix of type, size and tenure. It also states that development will be directed to previously developed land.

Sustainable Development

The site comprises previously developed land and is in a sustainable location, located within Bedminster Town Centre, close to the City Centre and with good access to a various public transport options. Bringing the site back into beneficial use is supported and the principle of its redevelopment to provide a mix of commercial floorspace and new housing is supported.

Employment floorspace

The existing Regent House and Consort House buildings comprise approximately 7,570sq.m of office (Class B1a) floorspace. The premises have been vacant since Lloyds Bank vacated the premises in

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

2012.

The existing retail units at ground floor level within Imperial Arcade will be retained as part of the development proposals. While an element of commercial floorspace will be retained at ground floor level within Regent House, it is proposed that most of the existing office floorspace will be converted to residential accommodation.

Core Strategy policy BCS8 and SA&DM policy DM12 support the retention of employment land, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for employment uses, for example if the site has remained empty or vacant for a period of time and has been marketed for alternative employment use.

An Economic Statement was submitted to accompany the planning applications, which advises that DMA Property and Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) have undertaken marketing of the site for a period of over 34 months (since late 2011/early 2012). A summary of this (taken from the Economic Statement) is set out below:

1. Initial marketing resulted in seven viewings and four expressions of interest, all from proven mixed use developers in the local market. There was no interest generally for its existing use.
2. Between March 2012 and October 2014 a number of offers were progressed with the landowner, but none resulted in satisfactory conclusion (for reasons including failure to raise necessary finance).
3. LSH retained the property details on website. All enquiries received were from developers assessing opportunity for redevelopment/refurbishment for residential uses.
4. Property was placed in Allsop property auction on 21 October 2014, resulting in around fifteen enquiries all related to the conversion of existing buildings to residential use.

The Economic Statement contends that the lack of demand for the existing office space within Regent and Consort House is likely to be due to the scale of the space, availability of second hand stock elsewhere within the City, its location outside the City Centre and the proximity to Temple Quarter Enterprise Area.

It is also noted that the existing retail units at ground floor level within Imperial Arcade will be retained. The proposed development will have no adverse impact on the jobs generated by those units. Based on the evidence provided and the fact that the premises have been vacant for a number of years, the loss of the existing office use is considered to be acceptable.

Density

The provision of up to 247 new residential units complies with Core Strategy policy BCS1, which sets out a requirement to provide around 8,000 new homes in south Bristol, with development focussed on brownfield sites. Policy BCS20 seeks to maximise previously developed land and achieve densities of at least 50 dwellings per hectare.

The development achieves a density of around 200 dwellings per hectare. This is a high density scheme, but is considered to represent an appropriate density which responds to the characteristics of the site, the site's location (in a Town Centre and close to the City Centre) and the requirement to achieve a high quality and well-designed environment, in accordance with the relevant policies.

Mixed and Balanced Communities

Bristol Core Strategy BCS18 seeks to ensure that new residential development should maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

The scheme proposes mainly 1 and 2 bed apartments, but also a number of larger 2 bed units and some larger 3 and 4 bed units, which include duplexes and “townhouses” that would be suitable for families and larger households. The mix and range of unit types and sizes is considered to be appropriate and will contribute to the mix of housing across the wider area in accordance with Core Strategy policy BCS18.

Mix of uses

As mentioned above, the principle of residential accommodation in this location is considered to be acceptable.

The application site is located with Bedminster Town Centre with the Bedminster Parade and Lombard Street frontages located within the designated Secondary Shopping Frontage.

The existing retail/commercial units contained within Imperial Parade do not form part of the application and will be retained as existing. A new commercial unit (use class A1, A2, A3 or D1) is proposed at the northern end of Imperial Parade, adjacent to the Asda Unit, an element of office (class B1a) floorspace will be retained within part of the ground floor of Regent House and additional units of commercial floorspace (use class A1, A2, A3 or D1) are also proposed on the Lombard Street site. Whilst it was originally proposed as part of the supplementary application to convert the entire ground floor of Regent House to residential accommodation, the scheme has been amended to retain an element of commercial floorspace and this is welcomed (as discussed in more detail within Key Issue C below). These uses are acceptable within the Town Centre and it is considered that these will complement and help to maintain and enhance existing Town Centre uses, in accordance with SA&DM policies DM7 and DM8.

(B) IS THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT VIABLE, AND DOES IT PROVIDE AN APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

The proposed development falls within Use Class C3 of the Use Classes Order, meaning that it is required to address the Council’s Affordable Housing Policies. It comprises 235 dwellings (Core Scheme) or 247 dwellings (Combined Scheme) and therefore it is required to comply with Core Strategy Policy BCS17, which requires the provision of up to 30% affordable housing subject to scheme viability.

Government policy and guidance is very clear that scheme viability is a key consideration in determining the level of affordable housing that a development can provide, and that Council’s should not require a level of affordable housing that would render a development unviable. The government’s Planning Practice Guidance states as follows:

Where affordable housing contributions are being sought, obligations should not prevent development from going forward. (Para 004 Reference ID: 23b-004-20140306)

In simple terms, a development is considered to be viable if the Residual Land Value (RLV) of the development is greater than the Site Value.

The RLV is calculated by ascertaining the value of the completed development, and subtracting from this all the costs involved in bringing the development forward (eg build costs, professional fees, legal costs, financing costs etc) and the developers profit. All inputs are based on present day costs and values.

The applicant has claimed that, to remain viable in planning terms, neither the Core nor the Combined schemes are able to make an affordable housing contribution. A detailed viability appraisal and supporting commentary has been submitted in support of this claim.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

Officers have commissioned DVS (the property arm of the Valuation Agency) to assess the viability information and advise the Council as to whether the applicants claim is reasonable. Having assessed the values and costs associated with the development, and undertaken their own appraisal, DVS conclude that both the Core and Combined schemes are unviable in planning terms and therefore would not be able to make an affordable housing contribution.

However, DVS did not agree with the applicants base build costs, which they considered to be overly high. The applicant has subsequently agreed to the DVS base build costs being incorporated. The information and figures contained below reflect the agreed viability position.

The appraisal inputs can be summarised as follows:

Residential sales values	In excess of the highest sales values currently being achieved in Bedminster
Build Costs	Base Build Costs are reflective of industry norms. Significant abnormal build costs of approximately £5,000,000 due to costs associated with the basement car park and the need for additional piling to provide adequate foundations for the new build blocks
Fees	Reflective of industry norms
Finance costs	Reflective of current returns required by lenders
Developers profit	Reflective of industry norms

The appraisal results in a RLV for the Core Scheme of approximately £2,700,000 and for the Combined Scheme of approximately £3,200,000.

Site Value can be calculated by identifying the Existing Use Value of a site and applying a premium (usually 20% on brownfield sites) to incentivise the owner to bring the site forward for development. Alternatively, the price paid for the site can be considered as the Site Value, provided that the purchaser did not pay an overly inflated price.

In the case of the application site, the applicant has stated that the Site Value should be £4,000,000. Officers are aware of the most recent rental values and yields for the site. These result in an Existing Use Value (excluding a premium) of approximately £5,000,000. Consequently, DVS agree that £4,000,000 is a reasonable Site Value.

As the Site Value is approximately £1,300,000 higher than the RLV of the Core Scheme and £800,000 higher than the RLV of the Combined Scheme, officers are satisfied that the schemes are unviable in planning terms and therefore unable to make an affordable housing contribution. The RICS “Financial Viability in Planning” guidance is clear that whilst viability reviews are not appropriate for single phase schemes they are suited to phased schemes that are to be delivered over a number of years. Both the Core and Combined Schemes fall into this category.

The applicant proposes to deliver the new build elements of the scheme first, followed by the conversion of Regent and Consort House. They indicate that the conversion will commence approximately three years after the new build element. Consequently, officers consider that viability reviews should be undertaken at the following times:

- One year after the granting of planning consent IF development has not commenced; and
- three years after commencement of the development.

The reviews will be based on comparing current sales values and build costs with increases in the House Prices and Build Cost Indices at the time of the review. Should the reviews result in the RLV of whichever of the Core or Combined schemes is being delivered, being greater than the Site Value, then an affordable housing contribution would be required.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

In summary, officers, on the basis of advice from DVS, conclude that neither the Core nor the Combined Scheme is viable in planning terms at present, and therefore recommend that the scheme be granted a planning permission with no requirement for an affordable housing contribution. However viability reviews should be required and secured via a Section 106 Agreement, to reassess the scheme viability as set out above.

In addition, an advice note would be added to any planning permission advising the applicant that should any subsequent planning applications be submitted to amend the mix of uses (particularly if additional residential units are proposed), a further viability assessment would be required to accompany any such application.

(C) IS THE DESIGN AND LAYOUT ACCEPTABLE AND IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HERITAGE ASSETS ADEQUATELY PRESERVED?

Core Strategy policies BCS20 and BCS21 and SA&DM policies DM26 to 29 set out the relevant design policies. Specifically policy BCS21 requires new development to contribute positively to an area's character and identify, promote accessible and permeable places and deliver safe, attractive and well managed environments which comprise high quality inclusive buildings and spaces that integrate with green infrastructure. Policy DM26 requires development to respond appropriately to local patterns of movement, and the scale, character and function of streets. Policy DM26 expects development to contribute towards local distinctiveness and policy DM27 requires the creation of quality urban design.

The existing buildings are Grade II listed and the site is located within the Bedminster Conservation Area. Policies BCS22 and DM31 require that proposals do not have an adverse impact on elements which contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of these heritage assets.

From the outset, a significant concern of the original scheme was the impact of Block 1 (the block closest to Consort House). As originally proposed, the block would have risen three or more storeys above the ridge level of Consort House having a significantly detrimental impact on the immediate setting of the Grade II listed Consort House, and on the character and appearance of the Bedminster Conservation Area, undermining the surrounding townscape and causing substantial harm. Following discussions with Officers, the scheme was amended, reducing Block 1 by three storeys. Views analysis was submitted to demonstrate that the amended block would sit behind the roof line of Consort House and that CDG Officers have confirmed that these amendments have overcome original concerns.

To compensate the loss of the three storeys from Block 1, a further amendment included the provision of an additional storey to Block B (the middle block), which was undertaken in discussion with Officers. This was on the basis that while it is recognised that the blocks to the rear will have a harmful impact on the setting of the listed building and nearby conservation areas, the impact of these blocks and the context in which they stand is considered to be less than substantial. While they will certainly be visible, on balance, they will not have such a detrimental impact on the local townscape nor on the roof line of the listed buildings and are considered to be acceptable. This has been confirmed through the submission of views analysis.

In respect of the supplementary scheme, the proposed roof extension above Regent House was reviewed in detail. When viewed from the Bedminster Conservation Area, and wider city views, including the City Docks Conservation Area, the slate roof and turret and cupola features of Regent House are focal points of interest that add value to views south from Bathurst Basin and Cumberland Road. In response to officer concerns, the original full width roof extension was amended to reduce the scale of the proposed roof over Regent House and set it away from the cupola. Whilst it is recognised that there is some harm to the Grade II listed building through the introduction of an attic storey, this harm is considered to be less than substantial and outweighed by the wider public benefit

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

of upgrading the fabric of the building and securing its use for the longer term. The roof extension will be visible from some locations in the context of the Bedminster Conservation Area, however, as it is now set further back, away from the prominent cupola feature and parapet, it will not detrimentally impact on the landmark quality of the building. Overall, the character and appearance of the Bedminster Conservation Area will be preserved.

A public route through the site was sought and would have been desirable, but unfortunately, the applicant has advised that due to land ownership issues, this has not been possible. However, the applicant has advised that public access will be made available to the landscaped communal areas during the day time.

The retention of an element of commercial space on the ground floor of Regent House, on Lombard Street (which formed part of the amendments to the supplementary scheme) is supported. It will provide an active frontage on Lombard Street and will avoid potential privacy concerns which would arise if residential accommodation was proposed in this location. It will also open up the opportunity and potential for the ground floor of a locally important listed building to be accessible to wider audience.

A request was made by officers to incorporate additional ground floor entry points along St Johns Road to create more of an active frontage. In response, the applicant advised that although this had been reconsidered, due to flood risk constraints it was not possible to provide openings at this level. The applicant also contends that the proposed design will increase the activity from the existing situation, which is a solid brick wall, through the inclusion of windows at first floor level and above. Again, while this would have been desirable, overall it is considered that the St John's frontage as it stands is acceptable.

A Public Art Strategy was submitted with the application, and the approach will require a simple and robust treatment to the public realm. Conditions have been attached requiring further details to be submitted relating to these elements.

Historic England has raised some concerns regarding the proposed scheme, but following discussions with Officers and upon receipt of the updated views analysis, it was understood that Historic England would be reviewing its response. At the time of writing, an updated response had not been received and therefore it is assumed that Historic England's concerns remain.

The remodelling of Imperial Arcade is supported, and will provide the opportunity to improve the public experience and reduce anti-social activity. It is considered that the public benefit of the works to this area will outweigh the harm caused to the listed buildings.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed scheme complies with the relevant design and heritage policies identified above.

(D) DOES THE PROPOSAL RAISE ANY RESIDENTIAL AMENITY ISSUES?

Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy seeks to ensure that the amenity of existing development is safeguarded and to create a high quality environment for future occupiers.

The site has no immediately adjoining residential neighbours. The closest residential property is that on the corner with St Johns Road and Brook road, which would be around 12m from the St Johns elevation of the proposed development. While a greater separation distance would have been preferable, the relationship is not dissimilar to that which exists in residential areas throughout the city and St Johns Road would provide a further barrier between the units. It is considered that, on balance, the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the occupants of that property and is therefore acceptable.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

Other properties, including those which front onto Dean Crescent and St Paul's Road, are also close to the site, but these properties have a greater separation distance of more than 20m and would not therefore be adversely impacted by the proposed scheme. There are also residential units on the upper floors of properties fronting onto East Street, but the relationship with these units and the existing building (which could be bought back into use as an office) is long established.

As the application was received prior to October 2015, the application is assessed against the Council's adopted floorspace standards (replaced in October 2015 by the National Technical Standards). All of the units exceed the Council's minimum floorspace standards, with several units exceeding the upper range (by more than 80sq.m in some instances). It is also noted that the vast majority of units also comply with, and often exceed the National Technical Standards, with less than 5% falling marginally below (i.e. 0.5-1sq.m) these standards. The proposed unit would provide a high standard of living accommodation and the proposed landscaping will provide some amenity space for occupants, with balconies and roof terraces adding to this.

Queries were raised by Officers regarding the distances between certain blocks within the development proposed, particularly between the rear of Consort House and Block 1 which has a separation distance of around 9.5m. In response to these concerns the applicant submitted additional information to demonstrate that the tight urban grain proposed was characteristic of this part of Bristol and the historic use of the site. Evidence was also submitted to demonstrate similar schemes elsewhere (such as The General), where distances of 5.8m – 8.4m were accepted. In addition to this, translucent glass will be used on the lower levels of windows to restrict views upwards and prevent any direct overlooking. The internal layout is considered to be acceptable and will achieve acceptable levels of amenity for future occupiers.

Overall it is considered that the proposed residential units will achieve a good quality of living accommodation for future occupants and will not adversely impact on the amenity of nearby existing residents, in accordance with Core Strategy policy BCS21.

(E) DOES THE PROPOSAL RAISE ANY TRANSPORT AND MOVEMENT ISSUES?

The site is located within Bedminster Town Centre and close to the City Centre. It is located within a sustainable location with good pedestrian/cycle and public transport accessibility.

The existing retail/commercial units on Imperial Parade will continue to be serviced from the rear, from the undercroft car parking area. The Transport Assessment submitted with the application demonstrates that a refuse vehicle can access the bin stores proposed and swept path analysis demonstrates that the largest delivery vehicle (a 7.5t box van) can obtain suitable access. The applicant has confirmed that all future loading and servicing activities associated with the proposed development would occur within the curtilage of the development site.

Car parking for 146 cars (including 7 disabled parking spaces) and 4 motorcycles is proposed. The submission of details relating to electric vehicle charging points and car club spaces is required by condition. The site is located within a sustainable location and would therefore be appropriate for a car free development. The level of car parking proposed complies with the Council's standards and is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with policy DM23.

Secure cycle parking is proposed for 468 bicycles within the undercroft car park area. This accords with the Council's minimum cycle parking standards. Likewise, acceptable provision has been made for refuse and recycling storage.

A number of conditions are attached relating to highways and highway safety. These include the requirement to submit a Travel Plan (to include soft and hard measures to promote sustainable travel and safeguards by which to measure the success of the plan) and the submission of a construction

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

traffic management plan (to safeguard the existing adopted highway and its users during construction).

Overall, subject to relevant conditions, the proposed development will comply with SA&DM policy DM23.

(F) DOES THE PROPOSAL RAISE ANY NATURE CONSERVATION OR TREE ISSUES?

The proposed development is a brownfield site which is largely developed, covered by buildings or areas of hardstanding/car parking. An Ecological Appraisal was submitted with the application which identified the site as having negligible potential to support roosting bats. Habitat loss is restricted to habitats of low ecological value.

The application proposes a number of ecological enhancements, including soft landscaped areas, increased greening at roof level, and incorporation of bat roosting and bird nesting opportunities. These elements will be conditioned.

Following Officer comments that the originally proposed planting plan was overly planted and considered to be unrealistic, an amended scheme was submitted which rationalised the planting and proposed more appropriate trees in certain areas. The proposed development would result in the removal of 42 trees. The Bristol Tree Replacement Standard (BTRS) requires that 86 replacement trees are planted. The landscaping proposals indicate the planting of 86 new trees within the site, therefore meeting the BTRS. While additional trees had been shown outside the site, the applicant has advised that it has not been possible to substantiate ownership so these trees are unlikely to be delivered, but this does not affect compliance with policy DM17.

Overall, the proposed development therefore accords with SA&DM policies DM17 and DM19.

(G) DOES THE PROPOSAL RAISE ANY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE ISSUES?

Policies BCS13 to BCS15 of the Bristol Core Strategy set out the sustainability requirements. Policy BCS13 requires development to take into account the impact of climate change, mitigating its own and impact on climate change and adapting to the effects of climate change. Policy BCS14 sets out the requirement for proposals for renewable and low carbon sources of energy, including encouraging the use of CHP and district heating systems. Policy BCS15 relates to sustainable design and construction and encourages a sustainability statement to be submitted for new development.

A Sustainability Statement and Energy Strategy accompany the planning application.

These documents confirm that energy demand will be limited from the outset through the use of a largely passive design to reduce the energy consumption (i.e. improved insulation and air permeability standards, use of natural ventilation, improved daylighting within space, good area to volume ratio). In addition to this, efficient building services and high performance appliances are proposed, including energy efficient lighting, demand controlled ventilation, ventilation heat recovery devices and building management systems.

At present there is no existing district heat network available to serve the development. However, we understand that connection to the future proposed Bedminster Green District Heating Network is being explored and a route will be safeguarded within the development to provide this if it becomes possible.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

The calculations within the energy statement relate only to the new buildings and do not appear to identify energy demands and CO2 emissions associated with the conversion of existing buildings. A revised energy statement is required identifying existing CO2 emissions associated with the existing building and how this will be reduced by improvements to fabric (where appropriate) and renewable energy. It is recognised that it may be challenging to achieve the 20% reduction in CO2 emission through renewable energy, but CO2 emissions reduction should be maximised nevertheless. A second energy table for the conversion building should be included in the revised energy statement. A condition has been attached requiring the submission and approval of a revised Energy Strategy in order to assess compliance with the relevant policies.

Flood Risk

The site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, with the fluvial / tidal flood risk posed to the site from The Malago / River Avon considered representative of the 'worst case' flooding scenario for the site. The Council accepted a "site specific Sequential Test" was appropriate. A series of flood resistance and resilience measures have been outlined to ensure that the proposed development and occupants will be safe and to ensure that flood risk will not be increased elsewhere. The site lies within a Flood Warning area and conditions are attached which require the submission of a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan for approval.

Surface water drainage is proposed which includes on-site attenuation with a reduced discharge rate (of at least 30%) to the existing Wessex Water sewer system. The development also results in a small decrease, of 2.3% of the impermeable area. Flow rates and volumes will be reduced by the proposed development.

The Council's Flood Risk Manager was consulted on this application and has confirmed that the surface water drainage strategy proposed is acceptable for this development. The proposed development therefore complies with Core Strategy policy BCS16.

(H) IS THE DEVELOPMENT CIL LIABLE?

The CIL liability for this development is as follows:

Core Scheme: £914,074.53

Combined Core and Supplementary Scheme: £973,597.31

RECOMMENDATIONS**(A) Planning application 15/04731/F (Core Scheme)****GRANT subject to Planning Agreement and the following conditions:**

The completion, within a period of six months from the date of this committee, or any other time as may be reasonably agreed with the Service Director, Planning and Sustainable Development and at the applicant's expense, of a planning agreement made under the terms of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), entered into by the applicant, Bristol City Council and any other interested parties to cover up to two viability reviews.

RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to Planning Agreement**Time limit for commencement of development**

1. Full Planning Permission

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Pre commencement condition(s)

2. Approval of road works necessary

Prior to the commencement of works on the site access and related works to the adopted carriageway, details of the access arrangements (including any works to the adopted carriageway) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until these works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that all road works associated with the proposed development are planned and approved in good time to include any Highways Orders, and to a standard approved by the Local Planning Authority and are completed before occupation.

3. Site Specific Construction Environmental Management Plan

No development shall take place until a site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Council. The plan must demonstrate the adoption and use of the best practicable means to reduce the effects of noise, vibration, dust and site lighting. The plan should include, but not be limited to:

- * Procedures for maintaining good public relations including complaint management, public consultation and liaison
- * Arrangements for liaison with the Council's Pollution Control Team
- * All works and ancillary operations which are audible at the site boundary, or at such other place as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, shall be carried out only between the following hours:
08 00 Hours and 18 00 Hours on Mondays to Fridays and 08 00 and 13 00 Hours on Saturdays and; at no time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.
- * Deliveries to and removal of plant, equipment, machinery and waste from the site must only take place within the permitted hours detailed above.
- * Mitigation measures as defined in BS 5528: Parts 1 and 2 : 2009 Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites shall be used to minimise noise disturbance from construction works.
- * Procedures for emergency deviation of the agreed working hours.
- * Bristol City Council encourages all contractors to be 'Considerate Contractors' when working in the city by being aware of the needs of neighbours and the environment.
- * Control measures for dust and other air-borne pollutants. This must also take into account the need to protect any local resident who may have a particular susceptibility to air-borne pollutants.
- * Measures for controlling the use of site lighting whether required for safe working or for security purposes.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of surrounding occupiers during the construction of the development.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

4. Road Condition Survey

A Condition Survey of the existing public highway will need to be carried out and agreed with the Highway Authority prior to any works commencing on site, and any damage to the highway occurring as a result of this development is to be remedied by the developer to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority once all works have been completed on site.

Reason: In the interests of safeguarding the existing road corridor.

5. Car Club and Electric Vehicle Charging points

Detailed drawings of the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.

- a) Car Club parking provision
- b) Electric vehicle charging point provision

Reason: In the interests of ensuring that adequate provision is made within the development to ensure that sustainable modes of transport are available.

6. Unexploded Ordnance

Prior to commencement of development further specialist advice must be sought, taking into account the findings of the Unexploded Ordnance report included within the Desk Study and details of proposed mitigation measures shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval. The development shall be undertaken in full accordance with any approved mitigation measures.

Reason: to protect the health and safety of construction workers and occupiers of adjacent sites during the development process.

7. Construction Traffic Management Plan

No development shall take place including any works of demolition until a construction management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The statement shall provide for:

- Parking of vehicle of site operatives and visitors
- Routes for construction traffic
- Hours of operation
- Method of prevention of mud being carried onto highway
- Pedestrian and cyclist protection
- Proposed temporary traffic restrictions
- Arrangements for turning vehicles

Reason: In the interests of safe operation of the highway in the lead into development both during the demolition and construction phase of the development.

8. Land affected by contamination - Submission of Remediation Scheme

No development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health,

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment has been prepared, submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination is understood prior to works on site both during the construction phase to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

9. Land affected by contamination - Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

In the event that contamination is found, no development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation shall take place until the approved remediation scheme has been carried out in accordance with its terms. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and be approved in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination both during the construction phase and to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

10. To ensure implementation of a programme of archaeological works

No development shall take place until the applicant/developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the developer and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded prior to their destruction.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

11. To secure the recording of the fabric of buildings of historic or architectural importance

No redevelopment or refurbishment of Regent House or Consort House shall take place until the applicant/developer has recorded those parts of the building which are likely to be disturbed or concealed in the course of redevelopment or refurbishment. The recording must be carried out by an archaeologist or archaeological organisation approved by the Local Planning Authority and submitted to the Historic Environment Record (HER), the archive should then be submitted to Bristol City Museum and a hard copy to Bristol Record Office.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological or architectural importance within a building are recorded before their destruction or concealment.

12. Bird and Bat Nesting

Prior to the commencement of above ground works, details shall be submitted providing the specification, orientation, height and location for built-in bird nesting and bat roosting opportunities. This shall include ten built-in swift boxes and at least five house sparrow nest boxes (not terraces) and five built-in bat boxes or bricks unless otherwise agreed in writing. Such provision shall be incorporated as approved and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To help conserve legally protected bats and birds which include priority species.

13. Vegetation clearance - nesting birds

No clearance of vegetation or structures suitable for nesting birds, shall take place between 1st March and 30th September inclusive in any year without the prior written approval of the local planning authority. The authority will require evidence provided by a suitably qualified ecologist that no breeding birds would be adversely affected before giving any approval under this condition.

Reason: To ensure that wild birds, building or using their nests are protected.

14. Detailed Drawings

Detailed drawings (at a scale of 1:5 or 1: 10) of the following elements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the relevant element.

- a) Design details (plans, elevations and sections) for ground floor shop front, ground floor façade facing Lombard Street/St John's Road and the Imperial Parade remodelling.
- b) Typical details of the upper floor windows reveals, lintels and sills, parapet detail and boundary wall detail for the facades facing the Lombard Street and St John's Road.
- c) Details of the entrance thresholds into the individual buildings including entrance doorways, canopies, porches, surface treatments and landscaping.
- d) Replacement windows on the Lombard Street and Bedminster Parade elevations;
- e) Typical window reveal, Sill and lintel details and typical parapet details for the new blocks.
- f) A detailed design scheme for the under croft parking areas, finishing materials on floor, walls and ceiling, colour, lighting (both natural and artificial).

The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the character of the area and in order that the special architectural and historic interest of this Listed Building is safeguarded.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol

15. Sample Panels

Sample panels of the following elements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the commencement of the relevant element

External materials and finishes for the proposal including;

- a) Sample panel for brickwork (all types)
- b) Painted metal panels
- c) Windows
- d) Rain water goods
- e) Painted metal exposed frames at lintel and coping level.

Reason: In order that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory

16. Public Art

Prior to the commencement of above ground works, the applicant shall submit Art Plans for the public art commissions set out in the Public Art Strategy (prepared by: Foreground Projects, July 2015), which are (A) a public art commission for the Colonnade, and (B) a public art commission for the Landscape (hard/soft) at Lombard Street (as identified on page 13 of the Public Art Strategy), unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that public art is integrated into the design of the development.

17. Energy Strategy

Notwithstanding what is set out within the Energy Statement submitted with the application, prior to the commencement of above ground works, an updated Energy Statement shall be submitted to approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter

Reason: to ensure that a sustainable and energy efficient development is achieved.

Pre occupation condition(s)

18. Land affected by contamination - Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Condition 8, and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Condition 8, which is to be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 9.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

19. Air Quality

Any gas boiler or CHP plant installed as part of the proposed development should, as a minimum, meet the good practice NOX emissions limits as outlined in the Institute of Air Quality Management/ Environmental Protection UK Guidance Document: Land-Use Planning & Development Control: Planning For Air Quality (May 2015) and permanently maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring that the proposed development does not have an adverse impact on air quality.

20. Watching brief - archaeological works

No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 10; and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded and published prior to their destruction.

21. Submission and Approval of Landscaping Scheme

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping (including the areas identified for public art), which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection, in the course of development. The approved scheme shall be implemented so that planting is carried out no later than the first planting season following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. All planted materials shall be maintained for five years and any trees or plants removed, dying, being damaged or becoming diseased within that period shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the council gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect and enhance the character of the site and the area, and to ensure its appearance is satisfactory.

22. Flood Evacuation Plan - Commercial Property

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the applicant has submitted to and had approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan (FEP). This Plan shall include the following information:

- * command & control (decision making process and communications to ensure activation of FEP);
- * training and exercising of personnel on site (H& S records of to whom and when);
- * flood warning procedures (in terms of receipt and transmission of information and to whom);
- * site evacuation procedures and routes; and
- * provision for identified safe refuges (who goes there and resources to sustain them).

The FEP shall be reviewed at intervals not exceeding 3 years, and will form part of the Health & Safety at Work Register maintained by the applicant.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

Reason: To limit the risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of flood management on the site

23. Flood Evacuation Plan - Residential Property

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the applicant has submitted to and had approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan (FEP). This Plan shall include the following information:

During Demolition/Construction Process

- * command & control (decision making process and communications to ensure activation of FEP);
- * training and exercising of personnel on site (H& S records of to whom and when);
- * flood warning procedures (in terms of receipt and transmission of information and to whom);
- * site evacuation procedures and routes; and,
- * provision for identified safe refuges (who goes there and resources to sustain them).

During Occupation of Development

- * occupant awareness of the likely frequency and duration of flood events;
- * safe access to and from the development;
- * subscription details to Environment Agency flood warning system, 'Flood Warning Direct'.

Reason: To limit the risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of flood management on the site.

24. Mechanical ventilation

Prior to occupation of the proposed development, all windows serving residential units within Regent House and Consort house fronting onto Bedminster Parade shall be fixed shut and appropriate mechanical ventilation incorporated within the units. Such measures will be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To mitigate poor air quality in this area and to ensure that occupants are not exposed to harmful levels of nitrogen dioxide.

25. Travel Plans - Not submitted

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until a Travel Plan comprising immediate, continuing and long-term measures to promote and encourage alternatives to single-occupancy car use has been prepared, submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall then be implemented, monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed travel Plan Targets to the satisfaction of the council.

Reason: In order to deliver sustainable transport objectives including a reduction in single occupancy car journeys and the increased use of public transport, walking & cycling.

26. To ensure completion of a programme of archaeological works

No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

Investigation approved under condition and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded and published prior to their destruction.

27. Completion and Maintenance of Car/Vehicle Parking - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the car/vehicle parking area shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, the area shall be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of vehicles associated with the development

Reason: To ensure that there are adequate parking facilities to serve the development.

28. Completion and Maintenance of Cycle Provision - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the cycle parking provision shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only.

Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of adequate cycle parking.

29. Implementation/Installation of Refuse Storage and Recycling Facilities - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the refuse store, and area/facilities allocated for storing of recyclable materials, as shown on the approved plans have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter, all refuse and recyclable materials associated with the development shall either be stored within this dedicated store/area, as shown on the approved plans, or internally within the building(s) that form part of the application site. No refuse or recycling material shall be stored or placed for collection on the public highway or pavement, except on the day of collection.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining premises, protect the general environment, and prevent obstruction to pedestrian movement, and to ensure that there are adequate facilities for the storage and recycling of recoverable materials.

30. Trees on Lombard Street

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of maintenance for the trees proposed on Lombard Street. The trees shall thereafter be maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interest of the amenity of the area.

31. Public Art (Designs)

Following approval of the Public Art Plans for the identified areas by the Local Planning Authority, detailed designs for the public art commission for (A) a public art commission for the Colonnade, and (B) a public art commission for the Landscape (Hard/Soft) at Lombard Street, (as identified on page 13 of the Public Art Strategy) and details of their care and maintenance, shall be submitted for approval prior to the commencing the landscape scheme unless

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

otherwise agreed in writing. All public art works shall be completed in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter retained as part of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure that public art is integrated into the design of the development.

List of approved plans

32. List of approved plans and drawings

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision.

Regent House, Bedminster, Core & Supplementary Application Updated Views Analysis (March 2016)
Regent House, Bedminster, Core Application Updated Views Analysis (March 2016)
Accommodation Schedule in comparison with Bristol City Council Space Standards – Core Scheme (March 2016)
View Analysis Update (13th April 2016)
6532 Before and After Images (LUC)
Additional Planning Info (16th December 2015)
Revised Heritage Impact Assessment – Issue 1 (Core Application) (December 2015)
Archaeological Watching Brief (November 2015)
Ground Investigations (August 2015)
Affordable Housing Statement (September 2015)
Air Quality Assessment (26th June 2015)
Design and Access Statement Issue 1 (September 2015)
Ecological Appraisal (July 2015)
Economic Statement (September 2015)
Flood Risk Assessment (September 2015)
Ground Condition Desk Study (May 2015)
Heritage Impact Assessment Issue 1 (September 2015)
Environmental Noise Report (July 2015)
Planning Obligations Statement
Planning Statement (September 2015)
Art Strategy (July 2015)
Report of Community Engagement (July 2015)
6412-100.01C, Topographical and Arboricultural Survey
6412-100.02C, Tree removal and protection plan
6412_LD_PLN_100_10, Tree Planting Plan
6412-6412.100.03C, Landscape colour master plan
6412_LD_PLN_100_08C, Landscape plan level 05
6412_LD_PLN_100_05C, Landscape plan level 01
6412_LD_PLN_100_07C, Landscape plan level 04
6412_LD_PLN_100_04C, Landscape plan level 00
6412_LD_PLN_100_06C, Landscape plan level 02
6412_LD_PLN_100_09C, Landscape plan level 07
6412-6412.100.11C, Cross section 1 of 3
6412-6412.100.12C, Cross section 2 of 3
6412-6412.100.13C, Cross section 3 of 3
000, Site Location Plan
100, Existing level 00 site plan
101, Existing level 01 site plan
102, Existing level 02 site plan

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

103, Existing level 03 site plan
104, Existing level 04 site plan
105, Existing level 05 site plan
120, Existing Regent House elevation Lombard Street
121, Existing Regent House elevation East Street, east and north
122, Existing Regent House courtyard elevations
123, Existing Regent House extension elevations
124, Existing Consort House East Street elevation
125, Existing Consort House courtyard extension
126, Existing Consort House east and west elevations
130, Existing contextual elevation courtyard – looking north west
131, Existing contextual elevation adjacent store – looking south west
132, Existing street elevation Bedminster Parade
133, Existing street elevation Lombard Street
134, Existing contextual elevation courtyard – looking north east
150, Existing level 00 demolition plan
151, Existing level 01 demolition plan
152, Existing level 02 demolition plan
153, Existing level 03 demolition plan
154, Existing level 04 demolition plan
200C, Proposed level 00 master plan
201B, Proposed level 01 master plan
202B, Proposed level 02 master plan
203A, Proposed level 03 master plan
204C, Proposed level 04 master plan
205D, Proposed level 05 master plan
206D, Proposed level 06 master plan
207D, Proposed level 07 master plan
208D, Proposed level 08 master plan
210A, Proposed block 1 level 00 general arrangement plan
211A, Proposed block 1 level 01 general arrangement plan
212A, Proposed block 1 level 02 general arrangement plan
213A, Proposed block 1 level 03 general arrangement plan
214B, Proposed block 1 level 04 general arrangement plan
220A, Proposed block 2 level 00 general arrangement plan
221A, Proposed block 2 level 01 general arrangement plan
222A, Proposed block 2 level 02 general arrangement plan
223A, Proposed block 2 level 03 general arrangement plan
224B, Proposed block 2 level 04 general arrangement plan
225C, Proposed block 2 level 05 general arrangement plan
226, Proposed block 2 level 06 general arrangement plan
230A, Proposed block 3 level 00 general arrangement plan
231A, Proposed block 3 level 01 general arrangement plan
232A, Proposed block 3 level 02 general arrangement plan
233A, Proposed block 3 level 03 general arrangement plan
234B, Proposed block 3 level 04 general arrangement plan
235B, Proposed block 3 level 05 general arrangement plan
236B, Proposed block 3 level 06 general arrangement plan
237B, Proposed block 3 level 07 general arrangement plan
240A, Proposed block 4 level 00 general arrangement plan
241A, Proposed block 4 level 01 general arrangement plan
242A, Proposed block 4 level 02 general arrangement plan
243A, Proposed block 4 level 03 general arrangement plan
244A, Proposed block 4 level 04 general arrangement plan

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

250A, Proposed block 5 level 00 general arrangement plan
 251A, Proposed block 5 level 01 general arrangement plan
 252A, Proposed block 5 level 02 general arrangement plan
 253A, Proposed block 5 level 03 general arrangement plan
 254A, Proposed block 5 level 04 general arrangement plan
 255A, Proposed block 5 level 05 general arrangement plan
 260B, Proposed Lombard House level 00 general arrangement plan
 261C, Proposed Lombard House level 01 general arrangement plan
 262C, Proposed Lombard House level 02 general arrangement plan
 263B, Proposed Lombard House elevation level 03 general arrangement plan
 270A, Proposed Consort House level 00 general arrangement plan
 271A, Proposed Consort House level 01 general arrangement plan
 272A, Proposed Consort House level 02 general arrangement plan
 273, Proposed Consort House level 03 general arrangement plan
 280A, Proposed Regent House level 00 general arrangement plan (sheet 1 of 2)
 281A, Proposed Regent House level 00 general arrangement plan (sheet 2 of 2)
 282A, Proposed Regent House level 01 general arrangement plan (1 of 2)
 283A, Proposed Regent House level 01 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 284A, Proposed Regent House level 02 general arrangement plan (1 of 2)
 285A, Proposed Regent House level 02 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 286A, Proposed Regent House level 02 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 287A, Proposed Regent House level 03 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 288, Proposed Regent House level 04 general arrangement plan (1 of 2)
 289, Proposed Regent House level 04 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 300C, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard – looking north west
 301C, Proposed contextual elevation through ASDA looking south west
 302C, Proposed street elevation Bedminster Parade
 303C, Proposed Street elevation Lombard Street
 304C, Proposed street elevation St Johns Road
 305C, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard looking north east
 306B, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard through Block 2 – looking west
 307A, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard – looking south west
 308, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard - looking south east
 360C, Lombard Street north east facing long elevation
 361A, Lombard Street north west facing street elevation

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Advices

1. Bird and Bad Box Guidance : Swifts - Internal nest trays or boxes are particularly recommended for swifts. Swift bricks are best provided in pairs or groups (e.g. at least two or three on a building, avoiding windows) at least one metre apart. This is because they are usually colonial nesters. Swift boxes/bricks are best located on north, north-east or east facing walls, at least 5 metres high, so that there is a clear distance (drop) below the swift boxes/bricks of 5 metres or more so that there is space for the swifts to easily fly in and out of the boxes. One of the best designs is those by Schwegler because they are very durable. See below for some websites with examples of swift boxes: http://www.nhbs.com/schwegler_swift_box_16_tefno_173237.html, <http://swift-conservation.org/Shopping!.htm> Further guidance is available at: <http://www.swift-conservation.org/InternalNestTrays.htm>

House sparrows: House sparrow boxes should be grouped together because they nest communally. Please note that the RSPB does not recommend the use of house sparrow

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

terraces in new build projects because they are seldom used by more than one pair of birds. Instead house sparrow nesting boxes should be used which should be located at least 1.5 metres apart. Bird boxes should be installed to face between north and east to avoid direct sunlight and heavy rain. Bird boxes should be erected out of the reach of predators. House sparrow boxes should be erected between two and four metres high. The house sparrow boxes should be positioned high up under the eaves if possible.

Bats: Bat bricks or boxes should face south, between south-east and south-west. Bat boxes should be erected at a height of at least four metres, close to hedges, shrubs or tree-lines and avoid well lit locations.

2. Please note that if a subsequent s73 application is submitted to vary the mix of uses on site, the submission of an updated Viability Assessment is likely to be required.
3. Note that in deciding to grant permission, the Committee/Planning Service Director also decided to recommend to the Council's Executive in its capacity as Traffic Authority in the administration of the existing Controlled Parking Zone of which the development forms part, that the development should be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers ineligible for resident parking permits.
4. Note that in deciding to grant permission, the Committee/Planning Service Director also decided to recommend to the Council's Executive in its capacity as Traffic Authority that on the creation of any Restricted / Controlled Parking Zone area which includes the development, that the development should be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers ineligible for resident permits.

(B) Application for Listed Building Consent 15/04732/LA (Core Scheme)

RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to conditions

Time limit for commencement of development

1. Listed Building Consent

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004.

Pre commencement condition(s)

2. Further details before relevant element started

Detailed drawings of the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.

- a) Design details (plans, elevations and sections) for ground floor shop front, ground floor façade facing Lombard Street/St John's Road and the Imperial Parade remodelling.
- b) Typical details of the upper floor windows reveals, lintels and sills, parapet detail and boundary wall detail for the facades facing Lombard Street.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

- c) Details of the entrance thresholds into the individual buildings including entrance doorways, canopies, porches, surface treatments and landscaping.
- d) Replacement windows on the Lombard Street and Bedminster Parade elevations (at a scale of 1:5);
- e) Details for making good the panelling, and plasterwork in the first floor decorative board rooms following removal of the suspended ceilings and flooring. This should include a detailed plan of areas of repair and materials to be used.

Reason: In order to ensure that the special architectural and historic interest of this Listed Building is safeguarded.

3. To ensure implementation of a programme of archaeological works

No development shall take place until the applicant/developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the developer and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded prior to their destruction.

4. To secure the recording of the fabric of buildings of historic or architectural importance

No redevelopment or refurbishment shall take place to Consort House or Regent House (whichever the works relate) until the applicant/developer has recorded those parts of the building which are likely to be disturbed or concealed in the course of redevelopment or refurbishment to that particular building. The recording must be carried out by an archaeologist or archaeological organisation approved by the Local Planning Authority and submitted to the Historic Environment Record (HER), the archive should then be submitted to Bristol City Museum and a hard copy to Bristol Record Office.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological or architectural importance within a building are recorded before their destruction or concealment.

5. Detailed Drawings

Detailed drawings (at a scale of 1:5 or 1: 10) of the following elements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the relevant element.

- Replacement windows on the Lombard Street and Bedminster Parade elevations;

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

- Details for making good the panelling, and plasterwork in the first floor decorative board rooms following removal of the suspended ceilings and flooring. This should include a detailed plan of areas of repair and materials to be used.

The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In order that the special architectural and historic interest of this Listed Building is safeguarded.

Pre occupation condition(s)

6. Watching brief - archaeological works

No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 3; and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded and published prior to their destruction.

7. To ensure completion of a programme of archaeological works

No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded and published prior to their destruction.

List of approved plans

8. List of approved plans and drawings

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision.

Regent House, Bedminster, Core & Supplementary Application Updated Views Analysis (March 2016)

Regent House, Bedminster, Core Application Updated Views Analysis (March 2016)

View Analysis Update (13th April 2016)

6532 Before and After Images (LUC)

Additional Planning Info (16th December 2015)

Revised Heritage Impact Assessment – Issue 1 (Core Application) (December 2015)

Archaeological Watching Brief (November 2015)

Design and Access Statement Issue 1 (September 2015)

Heritage Impact Assessment Issue 1 (September 2015)

6412-100.01C, Topographical and Arboricultural Survey

6412-100.02C, Tree removal and protection plan

6412_LD_PLN_100_10, Tree Planting Plan

6412-6412.100.03C, Landscape colour master plan

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

6412_LD_PLN_100_08C, Landscape plan level 05
6412_LD_PLN_100_05C, Landscape plan level 01
6412_LD_PLN_100_07C, Landscape plan level 04
6412_LD_PLN_100_04C, Landscape plan level 00
6412_LD_PLN_100_06C, Landscape plan level 02
6412_LD_PLN_100_09C, Landscape plan level 07
6412-6412.100.11C, Cross section 1 of 3
6412-6412.100.12C, Cross section 2 of 3
6412-6412.100.13C, Cross section 3 of 3
000, Site Location Plan
100, Existing level 00 site plan
101, Existing level 01 site plan
102, Existing level 02 site plan
103, Existing level 03 site plan
104, Existing level 04 site plan
105, Existing level 05 site plan
120, Existing Regent House elevation Lombard Street
121, Existing Regent House elevation East Street, east and north
122, Existing Regent House courtyard elevations
123, Existing Regent House extension elevations
124, Existing Consort House East Street elevation
125, Existing Consort House courtyard extension
126, Existing Consort House east and west elevations
130, Existing contextual elevation courtyard – looking north west
131, Existing contextual elevation adjacent store – looking south west
132, Existing street elevation Bedminster Parade
133, Existing street elevation Lombard Street
134, Existing contextual elevation courtyard – looking north east
150, Existing level 00 demolition plan
151, Existing level 01 demolition plan
152, Existing level 02 demolition plan
153, Existing level 03 demolition plan
154, Existing level 04 demolition plan
200C, Proposed level 00 master plan
201B, Proposed level 01 master plan
202B, Proposed level 02 master plan
203A, Proposed level 03 master plan
204C, Proposed level 04 master plan
205D, Proposed level 05 master plan
206D, Proposed level 06 master plan
207D, Proposed level 07 master plan
208D, Proposed level 08 master plan
210A, Proposed block 1 level 00 general arrangement plan
211A, Proposed block 1 level 01 general arrangement plan
212A, Proposed block 1 level 02 general arrangement plan
213A, Proposed block 1 level 03 general arrangement plan
214B, Proposed block 1 level 04 general arrangement plan
220A, Proposed block 2 level 00 general arrangement plan
221A, Proposed block 2 level 01 general arrangement plan
222A, Proposed block 2 level 02 general arrangement plan
223A, Proposed block 2 level 03 general arrangement plan
224B, Proposed block 2 level 04 general arrangement plan
225C, Proposed block 2 level 05 general arrangement plan
226, Proposed block 2 level 06 general arrangement plan

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

230A, Proposed block 3 level 00 general arrangement plan
 231A, Proposed block 3 level 01 general arrangement plan
 232A, Proposed block 3 level 02 general arrangement plan
 233A, Proposed block 3 level 03 general arrangement plan
 234B, Proposed block 3 level 04 general arrangement plan
 235B, Proposed block 3 level 05 general arrangement plan
 236B, Proposed block 3 level 06 general arrangement plan
 237B, Proposed block 3 level 07 general arrangement plan
 240A, Proposed block 4 level 00 general arrangement plan
 241A, Proposed block 4 level 01 general arrangement plan
 242A, Proposed block 4 level 02 general arrangement plan
 243A, Proposed block 4 level 03 general arrangement plan
 244A, Proposed block 4 level 04 general arrangement plan
 250A, Proposed block 5 level 00 general arrangement plan
 251A, Proposed block 5 level 01 general arrangement plan
 252A, Proposed block 5 level 02 general arrangement plan
 253A, Proposed block 5 level 03 general arrangement plan
 254A, Proposed block 5 level 04 general arrangement plan
 255A, Proposed block 5 level 05 general arrangement plan
 260B, Proposed Lombard House level 00 general arrangement plan
 261C, Proposed Lombard House level 01 general arrangement plan
 262C, Proposed Lombard House level 02 general arrangement plan
 263B, Proposed Lombard House elevation level 03 general arrangement plan
 270A, Proposed Consort House level 00 general arrangement plan
 271A, Proposed Consort House level 01 general arrangement plan
 272A, Proposed Consort House level 02 general arrangement plan
 273, Proposed Consort House level 03 general arrangement plan
 280A, Proposed Regent House level 00 general arrangement plan (sheet 1 of 2)
 281A, Proposed Regent House level 00 general arrangement plan (sheet 2 of 2)
 282A, Proposed Regent House level 01 general arrangement plan (1 of 2)
 283A, Proposed Regent House level 01 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 284A, Proposed Regent House level 02 general arrangement plan (1 of 2)
 285A, Proposed Regent House level 02 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 286A, Proposed Regent House level 02 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 287A, Proposed Regent House level 03 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 288, Proposed Regent House level 04 general arrangement plan (1 of 2)
 289, Proposed Regent House level 04 general arrangement plan (2 of 2)
 300C, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard – looking north west
 301C, Proposed contextual elevation through ASDA looking south west
 302C, Proposed street elevation Bedminster Parade
 303C, Proposed Street elevation Lombard Street
 304C, Proposed street elevation St Johns Road
 305C, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard looking north east
 306B, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard through Block 2 – looking west
 307A, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard – looking south west
 308, Proposed contextual elevation courtyard - looking south east
 360C, Lombard Street north east facing long elevation
 361A, Lombard Street north west facing street elevation

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol

(C) Planning application 15/04726/F (Supplementary Scheme)**RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to Planning Agreement and the following conditions:**

The completion, within a period of six months from the date of this committee, or any other time as may be reasonably agreed with the Service Director, Planning and Sustainable Development and at the applicant's expense, of a planning agreement made under the terms of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), entered into by the applicant, Bristol City Council and any other interested parties to cover up to two viability reviews.

1. Full Planning Permission

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Pre commencement condition(s)

2. Link to Core Scheme

The development hereby permitted shall be implemented only in connection with planning permission 15/04731/F and not as a free standing development. It shall be implemented only after the completion of new blocks 1 to 4 of planning permission 15/04731/F (or at an agreed alternative stage of development, details of which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development).

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development achieves an acceptable standard of accommodation (in terms of cycle/refuse storage, landscaping, car parking etc)

3. Detailed Drawings

Detailed drawings (at a scale of 1:5 or 1: 10) of the following elements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the relevant element.

- Design details (plans, elevations and sections) for ground floor shop front and ground floor of façade facing Lombard Street and St John's Road.
- New rooftop extension over Regent House, including its relationship with the retained parapet and materials proposed
- Typical details of the upper floor windows reveals, lintels and sills, parapet detail and boundary wall detail for the facades facing the Lombard Street.
- Replacement windows on the Lombard Street and Bedminster Parade elevations;
- Details of the entrance thresholds into the individual buildings including entrance doorways, canopies, porches, surface treatments and landscaping.

The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval and retained as such thereafter.

4. Energy Strategy

Notwithstanding what is set out within the Energy Statement submitted with the application, prior to the commencement of above ground works, an updated Energy Statement shall be

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

submitted to approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall then be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter

Reason: to ensure that a sustainable and energy efficient development is achieved.

List of approved plans

5. List of approved plans and drawings

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision.

DAS Addendum

Regent House, Bedminster, Core & Supplementary Application Updated Views Analysis (March 2016)

Accommodation Schedule in comparison with Bristol City Council Space Standards – Supplementary Scheme (March 2016)

View Analysis Update (13th April 2016)

Revised Heritage Impact Assessment – Issue 1 (Supplementary Application) (December 2015)

Affordable Housing Statement (September 2015)

Air Quality Assessment (26th June 2015)

Archaeological Assessment (July 2015)

Design and Access Statement Issue 1 (September 2015)

Ecological Survey (July 2015)

Economic Statement (September 2015)

Flood Risk Assessment (September 2015)

Ground Conditions Desk Top Study (May 2015)

Heritage Statement Issue 1 (September 2015)

Noise Impact Assessment (July 2015)

Planning Obligations Statement

Planning Statement (September 2015)

Art Strategy (July 2015)

Report of Community Involvement (July 2015)

Structural Statement (August 2015)

Sustainability Statement (11th September 2015)

Energy Statement (11th September 2015)

Transport Assessment (September 2015)

Travel Plan (September 2015)

Arboricultural Impact Assessment (July 2015)

Tree Constraints Report (April 2015)

Outline Utilities Assessment (August 2015)

6412-100.01C, Topographical and arboricultural survey

6412_LD_PLN_100_10B, Tree planting plan

6412-100.02C, Tree removal and protection plan

001S, Site location plan

106S, Existing level 00 site plan

107S, Existing level 01 site plan

108S, Existing level 02 site plan

109S, Existing level 03 site plan

110S, Existing level 04 site plan

111S, Existing level 05 site plan

127S, Existing Regent House elevation Lombard Street

128S, Existing Regent House elevation East Street and North west elevation

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

129S, Existing Regent House elevation courtyard
 160S A, Demolition plan existing level 00
 161S, Demolition plan existing level 01 supplementary scheme
 162S, Demolition plan existing level 02 supplementary scheme
 163S, Demolition plan existing level 03 supplementary scheme
 164S, Demolition plan existing level 04 supplementary scheme
 316S, Proposed plan level 00 GA part 1 of 1
 317S A, Proposed plan level 00 GA part 2 of 2
 318S, Proposed plan level 01 GA plan 1 of 2
 319S, Proposed plan level 01 GA plan 2 of 2
 320S, Proposed plan level 02 GA plan 1 of 2
 321S, Proposed plan level 02 GA plan 2 of 2
 322S, Proposed plan level 02 GA plan 1 of 2
 323S A, Proposed plan level 02 GA part 2 of 2
 324S, Proposed plan level 04 GA plan 1 of 2
 325S A, Proposed plan level 04 GA plan 2 of 2
 326S, Proposed roof plan level 05 plan 1 of 2
 327S, Proposed roof plan level 05 GA plan 2 of 2
 330S A, Proposed Regent House elevation Lombard Street
 331S A, Proposed Regent House elevation south east and north west
 332S A, Regent House proposed elevation courtyard looking south west
 333S, Regent House proposed section looking south east

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Advices

1. Please note that if a subsequent s73 application is submitted to vary the mix of uses on site, the submission of an updated Viability Assessment is likely to be required.
2. Note that in deciding to grant permission, the Committee/Planning Service Director also decided to recommend to the Council's Executive in its capacity as Traffic Authority in the administration of the existing Controlled Parking Zone of which the development forms part, that the development should be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers ineligible for resident parking permits.
3. Note that in deciding to grant permission, the Committee/Planning Service Director also decided to recommend to the Council's Executive in its capacity as Traffic Authority that on the creation of any Restricted / Controlled Parking Zone area which includes the development, that the development should be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers ineligible for resident permits.

(D) Application for Listed Building Consent 15/04727/LA (Supplementary Scheme)

RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to condition(s)

Time limit for commencement of development

1. Listed Building Consent

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

Reason: As required by Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004.

Pre commencement condition(s)

2. Detailed Drawings

Detailed drawings (at a scale of 1:5 or 1: 10) of the following elements shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the relevant element.

- a) Design details (plans, elevations and sections) for ground floor shop front and ground floor of façade facing Lombard Street and St John's Road.
- b) New rooftop extension over Regent House, including its relationship with the retained parapet and materials proposed
- c) Typical details of the upper floor windows reveals, lintels and sills, parapet detail and boundary wall detail for the facades facing the Lombard Street.
- d) Replacement windows on the Lombard Street and Bedminster Parade elevations;
- e) Details of the entrance thresholds into the individual buildings including entrance doorways, canopies, porches, surface treatments and landscaping.

The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the character of the area and in order that the special architectural and historic interest of this Listed Building is safeguarded.

List of approved plans

3. List of approved plans and drawings

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision.

DAS Addendum

Regent House, Bedminster, Core & Supplementary Application Updated Views Analysis (March 2016)

Accommodation Schedule in comparison with Bristol City Council Space Standards – Supplementary Scheme (March 2016)

View Analysis Update (13th April 2016)

Revised Heritage Impact Assessment – Issue 1 (Supplementary Application) (December 2015)

Affordable Housing Statement (September 2015)

Air Quality Assessment (26th June 2015)

Archaeological Assessment (July 2015)

Design and Access Statement Issue 1 (September 2015)

Ecological Survey (July 2015)

Economic Statement (September 2015)

Flood Risk Assessment (September 2015)

Ground Conditions Desk Top Study (May 2015)

Heritage Statement Issue 1 (September 2015)

Noise Impact Assessment (July 2015)

Planning Obligations Statement

Planning Statement (September 2015)

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol

Art Strategy (July 2015)
 Report of Community Involvement (July 2015)
 Structural Statement (August 2015)
 Sustainability Statement (11th September 2015)
 Energy Statement (11th September 2015)
 Transport Assessment (September 2015)
 Travel Plan (September 2015)
 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (July 2015)
 Tree Constraints Report (April 2015)
 Outline Utilities Assessment (August 2015)
 6412-100.01C, Topographical and arboricultural survey
 6412_LD_PLN_100_10B, Tree planting plan
 6412-100.02C, Tree removal and protection plan
 001S, Site location plan
 106S, Existing level 00 site plan
 107S, Existing level 01 site plan
 108S, Existing level 02 site plan
 109S, Existing level 03 site plan
 110S, Existing level 04 site plan
 111S, Existing level 05 site plan
 127S, Existing Regent House elevation Lombard Street
 128S, Existing Regent House elevation East Street and North west elevation
 129S, Existing Regent House elevation courtyard
 160S A, Demolition plan existing level 00
 161S, Demolition plan existing level 01 supplementary scheme
 162S, Demolition plan existing level 02 supplementary scheme
 163S, Demolition plan existing level 03 supplementary scheme
 164S, Demolition plan existing level 04 supplementary scheme
 316S, Proposed plan level 00 GA part 1 of 1
 317S A, Proposed plan level 00 GA part 2 of 2
 318S, Proposed plan level 01 GA plan 1 of 2
 319S, Proposed plan level 01 GA plan 2 of 2
 320S, Proposed plan level 02 GA plan 1 of 2
 321S, Proposed plan level 02 GA plan 2 of 2
 322S, Proposed plan level 02 GA plan 1 of 2
 323S A, Proposed plan level 02 GA part 2 of 2
 324S, Proposed plan level 04 GA plan 1 of 2
 325S A, Proposed plan level 04 GA plan 2 of 2
 326S, Proposed roof plan level 05 plan 1 of 2
 327S, Proposed roof plan level 05 GA plan 2 of 2
 330S A, Proposed Regent House elevation Lombard Street
 331S A, Proposed Regent House elevation south east and north west
 332S A, Regent House proposed elevation courtyard looking south west
 333S, Regent House proposed section looking south east

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/04731/F, 15/04732/LA, 15/04726/F and 15/04727/LA: Regent House, Consort House, Imperial Arcade And Land Rear Of 36-40 East Street Lombard Street Bristol**

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Bristol Neighbourhood Planning Network	7 March 2016
	6 April 2016
Flood Risk Manager	30 October 2015
	20 April 2016
City Centre Projects (Public Art)	26 October 2015
	23 April 2016
Landscape	14 October 2015
	7 April 2016
Transport Development Management	21 January 2016
Urban Design	30 October 2015
	19 May 2016
Archaeology Team	22 October 2015
Nature Conservation Officer	20 October 2015
Environment Agency (Sustainable Places)	17 November 2015
	8 December 2015
Historic England	12 November 2015
	22 April 2016
Wales & West Utilities	6 October 2015

WARD: Clifton Down CONTACT OFFICER: Peter Westbury
 SITE ADDRESS: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US

APPLICATION NO: 15/01681/F Full Planning
 EXPIRY DATE: 13 July 2015


Demolition of single storey extension and the conversion of existing building and erection of new accommodation to provide assisted living development for older people comprising apartments integrated with communal and support facilities, car parking and landscape works (Major Application).

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT subject to Planning Agreement

AGENT: Pegasus Planning Group
 First Floor South Wing
 Equinox North
 Great Park Road
 Almondsbury
 Bristol BS32 4QL
 APPLICANT: PegasusLife Ltd
 C/o Agent

The following plan is for illustrative purposes only, and cannot be guaranteed to be up to date.

LOCATION PLAN:



Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US****SUMMARY**

This application is brought to committee because of the importance of Queen Victoria House in the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area. In addition there has been a significant number of objections to the proposal, so it is considered to be in the public interest to report the application to committee.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site extends to 1.1 hectares and is located on the southern side of Redland Hill Road close to its junction with Grove Road within the Cotham ward of the City. Beyond Redland Hill Road is the Spire Hospital. To the south of the site is two and three storey residential accommodation on the south side of Grove Road.

Queen Victoria House (QVH) is considered to be an Unlisted Building of Merit. It is a dominant four storey detached property set within landscaped grounds that include car park and lawns. The House dates back to the Victorian era (it was opened by Queen Victoria). It was originally a boys' prep school, but has been a maternity hospital, a convalescent home and most recently offices. The House has a number of twentieth century additions which do not incorporate materials to match the original house.

Within the gardens of QVH is a Grade II listed obelisk commemorating Princess Charlotte of Wales. The property and grounds are enclosed by a brick and stone wall (which is 3m tall along the north eastern boundary closest to the Eco-House).

The site is located within the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area.

APPLICATION DETAILS

This is an application for full planning permission for the redevelopment of QVH and the erection of a five storey apartment block and a four storey apartment block within the curtilage of the House to provide a total of 65 retirement apartments for assisted living and communal facilities.

Following discussion with the applicant and debate, the application proposal is for residential development (C3) with the following features:

- o In support of their application, the applicants indicate that the age of residents will be restricted to people of 60 years and older.
- o There will be a domiciliary care provider on site.
- o There will be non-care assistants permanently on site.
- o There will be 24 hour support staff on site.
- o There will be a minimum care package that each resident will be required to sign up to. As a minimum a range of wellbeing services and facilities will be provided to all residents including a commitment to ensuring that a domiciliary care agency registered for the provision of Personal Care operates at the site providing services to residents.
- o There will be a care need assessment and individual care plan for each resident.
- o The plans indicate that there is a common room.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

- o The plans indicate that there is an exercise room / gym.
- o Emergency care alarms will be fitted.
- o There will be a communal dining room and provision for meals to be served in rooms.
- o There will be arranged recreational facilities.
- o Restrictions will be placed to on-sale to qualifying people.
- o Restrictions will be placed upon residents to prevent modifications being made to their accommodation.
- o Lifetime Homes Design.
- o 20% of the accommodation will be wheelchair accessible.
- o Provision will be made for a hydrotherapy pool, sauna, steam room, yoga studio, restaurant / dining areas, salon and change facilities as well as guest accommodation.

Provision will be made for 66 car parking spaces, including 5 disabled spaces and 2 spaces with electricity hook-up. The car parking will include 32 spaces at surface level and 29 basement spaces.

Provision is made for 30 bicycles and 14 mobility vehicles.

The two new build blocks will be located on part of the site currently occupied by a single storey flat roof extension.

The height of the proposed northern of the two new blocks (closest to QVH) matches the ridge and predominant eaves of the main QVH building, while the south block (the shorter of the two proposed blocks) in the foreground matches the lower eaves. The stringer courses and floor levels of the proposal are aligned with the QVH building. Both proposed blocks incorporate a contemporary roof form of a folded façade which draws its proportion from the QVH building.

The application proposal includes a comprehensive landscaping scheme that includes the creation of a 'memorial garden', pond and southern terrace for QVH.

The Applicants have confirmed that public access to the obelisk commemorating Princess Charlotte of Wales via the Bristol Open Doors days.

STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Applicant has submitted a Statement of Community Involvement which sets out the measures that they have undertaken to involve local residents and amenity groups in the evolution of the proposals for the site. This has included a series of public meetings and exhibitions. The applicants state that responses received concerning the proposal were largely positive.

The Applicants describe the key outcomes of the consultation being as follows:

- More detailed landscaped proposals for both the public Carriageworks space and the communal residential gardens.
- The lowering of the overall height of the new building.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

EQUALITIES ASSESSMENT

During the determination of application due regard has been given to the impact of this scheme in relation to the Equalities Act 2010 in terms of its impact upon key equalities protected characteristics. These characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation with relevant groups) that different groups have or would have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular proposal. Overall, it is considered that refusal of this application would not have any significant adverse impact upon different groups or implications for the Equalities Act 2010.

EIA SCREENING OPINION

On 11 March 2015, the Council wrote to the applicants to provide a formal screening opinion confirming that under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (as amended) that the proposed development would not have an impact on the environment of such significance as to require the submission of an Environmental Statement (Ref: 15/00199/SCR).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

13/04429/COU - Prior approval for the change of use from B1(a) office use to C3 residential. Given 5 November 2013. This was not implemented.

Historic attempts to convert QVH to residential flats have been made. The last attempt was in 2003 when planning permission was refused primarily on the grounds of loss (at that time) of valuable employment space (Application Reference: 03/02930/F).

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

COUNCILLOR NEGUS (COTHAM WARD)

"This proposal is over-development. The new buildings contain too much new accommodation and their mass and scale is inappropriate for the setting of the historic building and site, and the larger context of the conservation area and the nearby houses. In order to achieve this size, the original arboretum has been denuded of several magnificent trees with Tree Preservation Orders, and many other substantial trees and smaller trees which contribute so much to the quality of this special place, which has been accessible to local residents in the past in previous ownerships.

The quality of the design of the new buildings is poor. They are neither subservient nor sensitively considered so as to integrate with or enhance the original building and its setting. Their form, materials and massing (solid: void) are incongruous and their bulk overshadows neighbouring buildings, especially the iconic Eco-House that depends on solar gain to function. The large windows overlook neighbouring houses and appear overbearing, and will cause glare as they catch the sun.

This application has been subject to pre-application consultation by the public and other consultees, where the proposed use was generally supported. As a result of other concerns expressed, the height of the two new blocks has been reduced but not as much as recommended.

It is noteworthy that despite the investment in presentation, the requested visualisations of the proposals from key viewpoints have not been prepared, though the extra cost of such additional explanation would have been minimal.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

The secondary and wider effects of the over-development such as further traffic generation from occupants, visitors and service vehicles will create increased problems for the already overstretched narrow Grove Road, and particularly Redland Hill which is now a problem area with regular queuing and delay. This will affect the Glen Hospital opposite and worsen the air quality from slow-moving vehicles to occupants of the already high density housing nearby.

The proposals shown in this application, if approved, would be a bad neighbour. This is not to reject the overall concept out of hand. There is demand for such living which affords greater wellbeing to people and gives more opportunity for forming friendships in a supportive environment. It also creates the opportunity for more poorly-used houses to come onto the market for families. But this application would have been better supported had the developers focused on and responded to how a scheme for such supported living units could sensitively have been accommodated within the historic setting and the immediate environs rather than maximising returns to shareholders of the developers. Cotham ward is by far the most densely populated in Bristol.

I urge you to reject this application and to press for these points, and the many others raised by interested people, to be better addressed in a more appropriate proposal."

GROVE ROAD COMMUNITY GROUP (GRCG)

GRCG is content with QVH either continuing as an office or being developed into residential housing. However, the group strongly objects to the proposed plans for the construction of two new vast housing and spa blocks. These proposed blocks are completely out of character with the rest of Grove Road and will have significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the current and future residents of Grove Road as well as surrounding streets.

If the proposal is agreed, we feel that the council would be failing in its responsibility to safeguard the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers and in protection of both the Whiteladies Road Conservation Zone and important local landmarks (The Eco House and QVH).

1) Overlooking/ loss of privacy

If built the 2 blocks, from both windows and balconies, would directly look into the living spaces and bedrooms of the houses on Grove Road and the north west flats within the Praedium. This would be a gross invasion of privacy. This would have a significant negative impact on the residential amenity for the residents of Grove Road, contrary to Policy DM29

Concern at the "excessive height" of the proposed blocks (18 and 21m) and the lack of any set back from the boundary- just 1.5m, contrary to Policy DM27

Concern that the south block would likely cause glare from the rebound of sun against the windows onto Grove Road.

Due to the "poor design and overcrowding", the new blocks would also overlook each other and the new residents of QVH, creating even further privacy issues. In addition, a substantial number of the flats, especially those in the north block will lack sufficient daylight. This is particularly true for those north facing blocks without dual aspect. Hence the residential amenity to the new residents will also be impaired by this poor design. This is contrary to policies DM27 and DM29.

2) Design of the proposed new blocks

The proposed new blocks are too high, too large in mass and not in scale with Grove Road.

The section of Grove Road that the new blocks should reference to are almost all 2-3 storey single dwellings or semi-detached, or small blocks of flats containing 6 residences, contrary to policies DM

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

26, DM27 and DM29 and Core Strategy Policy BCS21.

The blocks fail to respect the topography of the road in a southerly and easterly direction against PAN 15. There is a lack of elevations and projections from those aspects to enable those reviewing the planning documentation to fully understand the issue without very thorough knowledge of the plans and site. We would therefore recommend that any person involved in the decision regarding this application do a full visit of the site and surrounding roads.

Concern that the blocks are "ugly".

There is no report regarding the impact of wind funnelling. However, the prevailing wind is from the south west, so this is likely to be a significant issue.

3) Alteration to QVH

The proposed extension to QVH fails to respect the design and character of the host building, particularly regarding the use of balcony.

The proposed balconies would overlook both flats in The Praedium and The Eco House, as well as into the proposed new blocks. This would cause unacceptable loss of privacy.

4) Overshadowing

The proposed new block they will cause a "harmful loss of daylight and sunlight" to the residents of Grove Road, contrary to policy DM27 and Core Strategy policy BCS 21.

Loss of sunlight is particularly acute for The Eco House, as this building is a landmark building within Bristol. It was built to maximise solar gain and therefore uses little else for heating. It was completely ground breaking at the time of building and was featured in many articles and local teaching courses due to this. The proposed new blocks will harm this building through impacting upon its ability to heat through solar gain.

5) Character of the street and Whiteladies Road Conservation Zone.

The houses/ road that the new blocks would be sited on is Grove Road. Therefore the blocks should respect the character, scale, mass, height, shape, form, proportion and set back of this road. However, on every point these blocks fail. Against Core Strategy DM26 and 21, the Conservation Area Enhancement Statement, 1993 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

Development should preserve or enhance local landmarks. Regarding The Eco House this complete opposite would occur. Regarding QVH, the development is not sympathetic to this building, blocking views of this building from Grove Green especially. Against Core Strategy DM31, 2 and 21

5.4 the local obelisk to Princess Charlotte is another key part of the local character and should be open to local residents. Against Core Strategy DM31

5.5 the development is proposed to have an essentially gated community with their own cafe/ restaurant / spa. Against BCS 12.

6). Impact on current green infrastructure

6.1 The gardens of QVH have been used as a community garden for over 20 years, for playing children, sledging, picnicking etc. The proposed development will remove/severely restrict access to this location. The prior use may constitute a legal right to access. Against Core Strategy DM17

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

6.2 we consider that the loss of over 50 trees represents an unacceptable loss of mature, aged/ veteran trees. Against Core Strategy DM17 and 15.

6.3 due to their natural state, the gardens are a haven of wildlife including sparrows, hedgehogs and bats. These are important species which require protection, as it is enshrined within the policy. Against Core Strategy DM19 and 15

6.4 the loss of so many trees is likely to result in increase pollution levels locally, particularly due to the proximity of this area of the suburb to major, congested highways. In addition, trees help to reduce noise pollution, important as Grove Road is on the maximum level of daytime noise at the present level. Against Core Strategy DM33 and 35.

7) Overdevelopment of the area

7.1 the proposed density (approx 65 per hectare) is higher than recommended minimum levels in an area which is already highly populated, and over two and half times more densely populated than the Bristol average. This would have a significant adverse effect on local residential amenity, pollution and existing transport and parking issues within the area. Against Core Strategy DM33, 35, and 23.

7.2 the proposed refuse areas within the development are insufficient for the level of housing proposed. Against Core Strategy DM32.

7.3 the local area already has a significant traffic problem due to heavy traffic on Grove Road at school and nursery times, often creating gridlock, Elm lane rat run, traffic often passing at speed through the no entry sign on Grove road and the heavy traffic on Redland Hill and Whiteladies Road. We believe that this development will result in an increase of traffic in the area due to approx 100 new residents, staff, carers, deliveries and visitors. Certainly this is true currently as the office blocks are not used and the traffic continues to be as bad as it ever was, so the existing traffic problem will be exacerbated. Against Core Strategy DM23.

7.4 there is insufficient cycle parking in the proposal and we believe insufficient car parking. Against Core Strategy DM23.

7.5 the increase in cars will be a danger to the national cycle route 4 that passes both entrances to the development. Against Core Strategy DM23.

7.6 we have concerns regarding the safety to pedestrians from both the servicing of the facilities particularly refuse trucks as the location that refuse bins will be placed for this is not demonstrated within the documents and from the proposed pedestrian entrance onto the unnamed road between Redland Hill and Grove Road. Against Core Strategy DM23."

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION

276 neighbouring properties were consulted and as a result 69 representations were received including the following comments:

Design

- "The enormous mass and scale of the unattractive tower blocks will dominate the skyline and is completely out of keeping with Queen Victoria House and the surrounding residential properties in Grove Road."
- "It would honestly be hard to think of a more inappropriate development on this wonderful site, which has been shamefully neglected for so long. In a properly-run city it would long since

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

- have become a wonderful garden, a resource for the whole area. Are we to be dwarfed by these ugly, out-of-proportion buildings?"
- This proposal is just too large. Too high, especially for a building at the top of a hill. Too close to adjacent properties - this would be oppressive to anyone living nearby.
 - What is proposed does not fit in with the area in any way. It looks to be an imposing and functional plan with no account taken of the area and its history.
 - The two new blocks are not in keeping with the conservation area or the character of Grove Road on the south east side. These will completely dominate (in an unpleasant way) this residential area.
 - "I think that upgrading the large QVH building would be fantastic but to then add 2 very large buildings so close to the eco house and its boundaries is a bit much."
 - Concern that the height and scale of these new blocks is completely out of proportion to the surrounding residential accommodation.
 - ""The mass and scale of the development is excessive, with the building far too tall compared with surrounding structures, especially the original Queen Victoria House which will be lost in the new development. Such tall imposing blocks are not sympathetic to the fact that this is a conservation area."
 - Concern that the proposed buildings are too tall.
 - Concern that the two residential blocks are too close to one another.
 - "The balconies and windows will look directly into many houses removing privacy and producing glare."
 - "Conservation areas must be preserved as such".
 - "The proposed buildings will dwarf even Victoria house and the current houses and trees. This is not an inner city area."
 - "Redland has always been a family community with small shops and businesses, slowly this is being destroyed and being turned into a concrete building site."
 - "I support the concept of supported accommodation for older people but the plans need to be revised so the building does not dominate the area."
 - "The whole of the east end of the site is being built on; the new buildings do not complement QVH architecturally."
 - Concern that the application proposal would be harmful to the character of the area, making it look entirely urban rather than suburban.

Amenity

- Concern that the proposal will lead to the loss of privacy for neighbouring residents because of the "numerous" balconies.
- "Gated community. This is the plan and people in the area will not be able to enjoy the gardens. 50 trees will be cut down - impact on wildlife most importantly the rarefied sparrow.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

Conservation area. This new build not sympathetic to this."

- The buildings are proposed to be 5 and 6 stories high causing local properties to be overlooked, including my own and losing privacy.
- The application proposal "will completely overlook and overshadow the leafy green triangle at the top of Elm Lane which is a wonderful haven from the nearby traffic and commercial buildings - almost like a village green."
- The balconies on our building (facing Redland Hill) that are adjacent to the proposed two towers will be overlooked owing to their enormous scale.
- "It is very obvious what has happened here, because Pegasus are unable to build in the protected garden they have decided to build UP instead with little regard for the surrounding neighbourhood."
- Detrimental impact on the neighbouring Eco House, which "... has many large windows to take advantage of the solar gain. The living accommodation is also arranged on the first floor to capture the light and heat where it is most needed, whilst keeping the bedrooms cool. The proposed new blocks sit around 15 meters from this house and will look directly into it."

Highways/Parking

- "A development of this size should not be allowed in this location as Redland Hill is already a notorious black spot for traffic congestion. Extra traffic related to the high numbers of residents and staff can only worsen atmospheric pollution and increase the threat of associated illness since large numbers of visitors to these properties will be inevitable."
- Concern that the application proposal will attract more traffic and pollution and contribute to poor health.
- Representation from a teacher at the nearby Steiner School: "The whole of the east end of the site is being built on; the new buildings do not complement QVH architecturally."
- "With only 70 parking spaces available it is likely to mean an additional 30 or so vehicles trying to park in an area that is already extremely congested, noisy and polluted."
- I strongly urge our representatives to request a re-design of the development to keep traffic in the Grove Road, Elm Lane and Redland Hill area at/no higher than existing levels.
- "The road and parking in its current form suffers from congestion and a lack of turning space. A further 30 parking spaces will make it substantially worse and would not cater for any medium/large vehicles i.e. bin lorry, ambulance, fire engine. The current bin area sits between the Bungalow and Homes Garden and is used by all properties. With great difficulty, vehicles currently have to reverse around space 1 into an area behind QV (spaces 8 -11 on proposed plan) so that it can turn and exit. It would be impossible for vehicles to use the alternative turning point proposed as they would have to make several 45 degree turns out of a highly congested area. Even accessing the properties/bin area would be difficult with the proposed parking flanking the road leading to my property and making it narrower."

Landscaping/Trees

- Concern about the loss of trees - "Does not protect and conserve enough trees (> 50 trees will be cut down)"

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

Pollution

- Bristol is already one of the worst cities for pollution and this proposal will increase pollution
- Concern that the application proposal makes insufficient provision for refuse storage.
- Concern about noise - Grove Rd is already on limit of daytime noise

Other Comments

- "The development is being planned as a gated community, denying the existing residents of the area access to the gardens and the memorial stone within."
- "Please can contractors consider appropriate working hours"
- I do think this particular build has been proposed with business and profit as the sole considerations. I also cannot believe that these apartments would be attractive to potential inhabitants.
- "I am aware that there is a potentially beautiful garden within the site and am disappointed these will not be accessible to the public."
- Non-planning issue: Concern that the application proposal impinges on the access rights to Harper House.

BRISTOL CIVIC SOCIETY

Bristol Civic Society have looked at the planning application subsequent to our pre-application involvement. The Society welcomes the retention of many of the trees, the repair of the 3m tall perimeter wall, and the new pedestrian gate. The proposed blocks are lower and more acceptable as subservient buildings to the Queen Victoria House. The Society, therefore, supports the proposal.

REDLAND AND COTHAN AMENITIES SOCIETY PLANNING GROUP

"The Society supports in principle the use of this site to provide accommodation for older people. We assume that older in this context means 60 or over, as with other Pegasus Life projects. We believe there is demand for this type of accommodation in the Society's area. We particularly welcome the conversion of Queen Victoria House and retention of the grass and tree area to the south of the site."

RCAS make the following observations on the proposal:

Limited accommodation is provided for staff, with only a "very small bedroom for any overnight staff which is also the guest room.

It is noted that "to justify the assisted living definition we would expect to see distinctly more services than appears to be proposed, and would normally be available in a similar sized conventional residential development with grounds and caretaking services."

More information required to assess the impact on the Conservation Area.

Solar path diagrams to assess the impact on the surrounding development.

"Windows of living rooms in the north east wall of South Block overlook the garden and major windows of the Eco House. The boundary wall would protect the Eco house from overlooking from

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US

ground and possibly 1st floor windows of the apartments but we suggest the overlooking should be omitted on higher floor to protect the householders privacy."

The distance between the north and south blocks appears to be 10m and as result "residents could suffer noise nuisance from open windows".

In terms of the design: "The identical design of these two buildings and the exact repetition of the elevational treatment throughout all the floors emphasises the sheer scale of the new development, and could have an institutional effect. More variation in elevational design should have been tested."

Welcome the "imaginative" re-use of the Queen Victoria building.

Materials: "Welcome the use of buff variegated brick as primary material, with red brick plinth."

Trees: "The detailed survey of existing trees is welcomed as is the retention of virtually all perimeter trees."

Landscaping: "The comprehensive and imaginative landscaping strategy is welcomed, subject to detailed planting plans that fully implement the strategy."

CRIME PREVENTION OFFICER

No concerns about this application, but recommend to consider the Secured by Design principles for all of this development as this and the surrounding are in a 'Hot Spot' area for Burglaries and attempt Burglaries.

BRISTOL TREE FORUM

Concern that the application has ignored comments made at the pre-app stage about the impact on B grade trees. There is no BRTS calculation and there is concern that inadequate trees will be planted to replace those lost.

Officer Note: Subsequent to the receipt of these comments, your Officers have received further information from the Applicant that is set out in the Key Issue below.

FORMER COUNCILLOR GLAZZARD (COTHAM WARD)

"Whilst I welcome the development of Queen Victoria House for the purpose of assisted living residences, I object to the specific plans for the 2 new blocks due to the loss of privacy, light and visual amenity for the building's immediate neighbours.

My primary concern is the height of the proposed new blocks and their proximity to the street boundary they will overshadow the properties on Elm Road and Grove Road and dominate the roofscape. I am particularly concerned about a loss of light to the eco-house at 26 Grove Road, which is designed on the basis of solar gain.

The balconies, overlooking and proximity of the buildings to the street boundary mean that there will be a loss of privacy for existing residents on Elm Road and Grove Road.

I echo RCASs comments: CGI imaging and solar path diagrams would have been useful to demonstrate the impact of the proposed buildings on the character of the area and the shadowing impact, particularly to the eco-house on Grove Road.

Further, the scale and height of the proposed blocks (and the lack of variation in design) are not in-

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

keeping with character of the local area and so go against the guidance in the Bristol Local Plan (DM 26).

I welcome the landscaping of the green space but note that local residents currently use this as a recreational space and if it is gated they will lose an important amenity."

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS**BCC CITY DESIGN GROUP**

The comments of the City Design Group are referred to in Key Issue B. However, the representation receives concludes as follows:

"The scheme presents good quality architecture and design. However, a number of key issues remain unresolved. The negative impact of the proposal on the conservation areas and neighbouring properties are considered to outweigh the potential gains."

A revised scheme which is sufficiently scaled back from the eastern edge (suggest one bay) is required. This serves the purpose of easing the significant pressure the development would put on the existing trees, and allow further opportunity for trees to be planted within the site boundary; softening the impact of development on the conservation area, QVH and the neighbours and achieved a balanced design solution."

Officer Note: In response to these comments the Applicants have made amendments to the scheme to move the proposed blocks away from the boundary closest to the Eco-House.

BCC ARCHAEOLOGY

There has been previous archaeological work in the area of Queen Victoria House as part of an earlier application. This work showed that there had been quarrying in the area that had removed any archaeological material of note. However, no work was carried out in the northern part of the site, where the current proposal is sited. There remains the potential for the Roman road, which runs from Bath to Sea Mills, part of which survives across the Downs and is protected as a Scheduled Ancient Monument, to extend into this area. The previous archaeological evaluation may have been sited too far to the south to pick up the line of the road. However, this application could be sited on its projected line. Therefore standard planning conditions are recommended.

BCC TRANSPORT DM

There is no objection to residential accommodation in this location. The principle of sui-generis accommodation for the active elderly should be supported through an assessment of accessibility to local facilities. This application does not fully address this requirement, and measures to mitigate against barriers to access will be required.

Local Conditions

The site is generally accessible with regards to local facilities nearby. The site sits within the NCN route with facilities for cyclists available nearby. There are good public transport facilities available, with associated accessible bus stops. However, local roads are not easily negotiable for those with mobility impairments.

Obstacles such as narrow footways and lack of dropped kerbs in Grove Road will mean residents are unable to access the local facilities easily by foot and may be more reliant on private cars. Relevant recommended improvements are set out below.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

Trip Generation

With regard to the amount of vehicular traffic arising from the development, the number of trips associated with the site will be significantly reduced from the extant use, and this has been demonstrated within the transport statement.

Access

Access to the site for vehicles is provided from Grove Road and Redland Road. There are no alterations proposed to the Redland Road access. This operates adequately at present and there is no record of accidents associated with this. Visibility is adequate in both directions.

I have some concerns about the interaction between pedestrians and car drivers at the Grove Road shared access, as intervisibility is limited between vehicles pulling in and pedestrians exiting the site. I would recommend that the gate is widened a little further to allow for good intervisibility and to allow a protected area of for emerging pedestrians (See below).

Layout

The internal layout is acceptable. Servicing will take place on site. There is a dedicated service area and additional space available for short term deliveries within the car park. Refuse is stored and accessed from the slip road between Grove Road and Redland Road. This is down a ramp and too far from the roadside for refuse collectors to collect it. This is unacceptable and contrary to current policy and guidance. This must be relocated.

Officer Note: A relevant condition to secure the approval and implementation of road works and refuse provision form part of the recommendation.

Parking and servicing

Parking provision is acceptable. An adequate number of disabled parking spaces are also shown.

Cycle parking is provided to an acceptable level for the sui generis use although some of this is shared with scooter parking.

Recommended conditions

Planning conditions to achieve the following is recommended:

Approval of road works necessary specifying:

Widened vehicular crossover in Grove Road

Build out at the junction of Redland Road with slip road to Grove Road

Dropped kerbs and tactile paving across Grove Road, south of its junction with St Vincent Hill

Construction management plan

Completion of Vehicular Access - Shown

Completion of Pedestrians/Cyclists Access - Shown

Completion and Maintenance of Vehicular Servicing facilities - Shown

Completion and Maintenance of Car/Vehicle Parking - Shown

Travel Plans - Not submitted

Protection of Parking and Servicing Provision

Officer Note: Following the receipt of this representation, the Applicants confirmed that Grove Road will have a separate vehicle and pedestrian entrance and there will therefore be no conflict between

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

vehicles and pedestrians. A new entrance gate is proposed on Grove Road, between vehicle access point and Whiteladies Road, the intention being that most trips on foot will be from Whiteladies Road and will use the gate, bypassing the vehicle entrance entirely. On the basis of this, it is concluded that there is no requirement for the above condition.

BCC POLLUTION CONTROL

Recommend the imposition of standard planning conditions to ensure the submission of sound insulation details for any mechanical ventilation units and acoustic trickle vent specifications for all bedrooms and living rooms exceeding WHO internal noise standards as summarised in the Applicant's Noise Report. These details shall be provided before commencement of development and retained thereafter.

BCC ECOLOGY

The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal dated December 2014 recommends that bat emergence and dawn re-entry surveys (three surveys) and a reptile survey with artificial refugia (seven surveys) are undertaken. These surveys have not been undertaken.

Relevant planning conditions should be applied once the bat and reptile surveys have been undertaken.

BCC ARBORICULTURAL OFFICER

1. The car park area and front of the property to the North West of the Site.

The trees around the periphery of this area are indicated as being retained. There are four trees indicated for removal at the front of the house. The trees are either of low value or are planted too close to the house and therefore is reasonable.

I am concerned at the increase in car parking area at the front of the site. The trees in this area are significant and have considerable amenity value. Considering this any extension in car parking that further erodes the soft rooting area of the trees should be minimal. The majority of the trees in this area already have limited rooting areas as the area is bounded by the Redland Hill road way to the remaining soft planting area is at a premium.

There is scope to make a slight extension to the parking area, but this will be required to be minimal and should follow the line of the North side of the existing roadway and not encroach further than the existing footpath leading to Redland Hill.

2. The Proposed Buildings Area, North East of the Site

There are a considerable amount of trees that are earmarked for removal. Whilst the majority are set back within the site, the significant amount being removed will have an effect on the character of the site as a whole.

Standing outside the site to the north are two large beech trees, there are also several semi mature sycamore and ash trees that have not been recorded on the arboricultural survey. The beech trees are mature specimens approximately 17 and 21m in height and are of significant amenity value. At the eastern corner of the site there are also a group of lime and sycamore trees that give a valuable contribution to the amenity of the area.

The footprint of both buildings is too close to these trees leading to future pressures to remove them or considerably reduce them (destroying their form and value as an amenity) from any future occupants as a result of the trees being in such close proximity and dominating the north of the

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

buildings.

Trees are susceptible to shedding twig litter and autumn leaf fall, blocking drains and gutters. Finally, the tree is likely to shed small branches in windy weather which are likely to fall on to the roof, worrying the occupants. In the case of a larger limb being brought down it will be hard for the council to resist calls for heavy crown reduction - at worst, felling.

To conclude the design is not sympathetic to existing trees on site and an adjusted footprint suited more to the current areas of development and car parking on site would better maintain the character of the rear of the property.

The proximity of the buildings to the beech trees and group of sycamore and lime is too close and is very likely to have a negative impact on their future. The current car parking proposals to the front of the existing building is also excessive and will be detrimental to existing trees of value at the front of the property and is contrary to Policy BCS 9 of the Bristol Development Framework.

Finally tree numbers indicated for removal currently cover both individuals and groups (with no individual measurements or numbers). Under the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard we will require exact numbers of trees agreed for removal together with corresponding replacement numbers based on stem diameter of removed trees.

Officer Note: Subsequent to the receipt of these comments, your Officers have received further information from the Applicants in the form of a detailed Arboricultural Impact Assessment and detailed landscaping proposals plan. Amended plans have also been submitted moved the building further away from existing trees to be retained.

BCC CONTAMINATED LAND OFFICER

No objection is raised to the application subject to the imposition of relevant conditions.

BCC FLOOD RISK MANAGER

No objection. Good use of SuDS and no increase in flows to existing sewer network. Any potential to divert existing flows into proposed pond would be seen as beneficial in reducing local sewer flood risk.

BCC PUBLIC ART OFFICER

The documents provided with the full planning submission do not include a public art strategy or a statement on the provision of public art within the Design and Access Statement. Full comments on public art were provided at pre app stage for this scheme which are attached again for information and for the applicant to respond to.

It is recommended that the applicant appoints a suitably qualified public art consultant (public art expertise) to advise them on the inclusion of public art in their development however at this point the scheme lacks a public art element and does not fulfil the councils public art policy.

Officer Note: A relevant condition to secure appropriate public art is proposed.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012**Bristol Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011)**

BCS5	Housing Provision
BCS9	Green Infrastructure
BCS10	Transport and Access Improvements
BCS13	Climate Change
BCS14	Sustainable Energy
BCS15	Sustainable Design and Construction
BCS16	Flood Risk and Water Management
BCS18	Housing Type
BCS21	Quality Urban Design
BCS22	Conservation and the Historic Environment
BCS23	Pollution

Bristol Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014)

DM2	Residential sub-divisions, shared and specialist housing
DM17	Development involving existing green infrastructure
DM19	Development and nature conservation
DM23	Transport development management
DM26	Local character and distinctiveness
DM27	Layout and form
DM29	Design of new buildings
DM31	Heritage assets
DM32	Recycling and refuse provision in new development

KEY ISSUES

(A) IS THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE?

Policy BCS5 of the Core Strategy establishes that a key policy requirement is the delivery of new homes within the built up area of the city which will contribute towards accommodating a growing number of people and households in the city. Development of new homes will primarily be on previously developed sites across the city. The conversion of QVH together with the development of part of the overall site is consistent with this policy requirement and is therefore acceptable in principle.

The loss of office accommodation is acceptable. In November 2013, prior approval was given for the change of use from B1(a) office use to C3 residential. It is therefore considered that the loss of the vacant employment land is acceptable (13/04429/COU).

(B) IS THE DESIGN OF THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL ACCEPTABLE?

Core Strategy Policy BCS20 states that new development should maximise opportunities to re-use previously developed land. Imaginative design solutions will be encouraged at all sites to ensure optimum efficiency in the use of land is achieved. In the city centre high densities of development will be sought especially in and around the city centre.

Policy BCS21 states that new development should contribute positively to the character and identity of an area, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness. Amongst other things it should deliver a safe, healthy, attractive, usable, durable and well-managed built environment comprising high quality inclusive buildings and spaces that integrate green infrastructure. This is reinforced by Policy DM26

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

which states that development proposals will be expected to contribute towards local character and distinctiveness and Policy DM28 which states that development will be expected to provide for or contribute towards the creation of a safe, attractive, high quality, inclusive and legible public realm.

The new build element of the proposals utilizes the former car parks on the site, in accordance with BCS20.

Many of the representations received objecting to the application identify that the height of the new blocks to the south east of QVH as being of particular concern.

The relationship of the proposed buildings with the Eco-House and properties in Grove Road must be seen in the context of existing surrounding development. The site visit confirmed that Redland Hill is characterised by a mixture of buildings of a variety of heights, including four storey Chapter Walk development which backs onto the northern side of Redland Hill and two and three storey development on the southern side (Bristol Steiner School and existing residential development. In this context the addition of two additional blocks which are four and five storeys is not seen as unacceptable.

Nevertheless in response to the representations received, the proposed blocks have been moved an additional 1.4m further into the site and away from the boundary of the site closest to the Eco-House. As a result, the submitted plans indicate that at its closest point the Eco House would be 18m from the five storey block and 25m from the four storey block. Given the height of the application proposal, this remains close however it is not considered unacceptably so. The application proposal will not have an unacceptably harmful impact on the amenity enjoyed by surrounding residents, including the occupiers of the Eco-House or residents in Grove Road. Furthermore, in mitigation, your Officers note the orientation of the blocks at 90 degrees to the Eco-House, means that they would be orientated away from the Eco-House and with this and the gap between the two blocks, there would be no unacceptable overlooking or loss of light.

The amendment to the position of the proposed blocks also affords the opportunity to increase the landscaping to screen the blocks. There is a relevant condition to secure this. The existing 3m tall boundary wall (closest to the Eco-House) will also be retained.

Having sought the advice of the Council's City Design Group, the Bristol Civic Society and Bristol Urban Design Forum, your Officers conclude that the architectural quality of the proposal is acceptable and responds appropriately to both the Victorian and Georgian buildings in the vicinity of the site and the wider Conservation Area. As is normal practice, as the site is located in a conservation area, samples of the materials to be employed will be required prior to development commencing on the site.

The internal arrangement of the proposed supported living apartments is considered to be acceptable. A typical apartment will have an area of 98 square metres. This exceeds the relevant internal space standards.

Impact on heritage assets

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings. Section 72 of the same Act requires local planning authorities to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The case of *R (Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks DC* [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin) ("*Forge Field*") has made it clear where there is harm to a listed building or a conservation area the decision maker "must give that harm considerable importance and weight." [48].

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012 states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing heritage assets, and the desirability of new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. It also states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, with any harm or loss requiring clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Further, Paragraph 137 states that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance their significance and that proposals which preserve these elements should be treated favourably.

The nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site

- No viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- Conservation by grant-finding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- The harm of loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.
- This site is located within the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area and within the grounds there is a Grade II listed building (the Obelisk). Furthermore the building of QVH can be considered as a non-designated heritage asset.

As discussed above, the design of the refurbishment to QVH is considered to be acceptable and the retention and enhancement of this non-designated heritage asset is welcomed. The existing gardens have been neglected over a long period of time and the comprehensive landscaping proposals will significantly enhance this part of the Conservation Area and will preserve its significance and will also enhance the setting of the listed obelisk. In summary, the new build element would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the conversion of Queen Victoria House and landscaping would have a positive impact on the character of the Conservation Area and on the setting of the listed building. The proposal is therefore also in accordance with policy DM31

The enhancement to the setting of the Listed obelisk, the sensitive conversion of QVH and demolition of existing extension that detracts from both the non-designated heritage asset of the house, and from the conservation area, together with the provision of landscaping and repairs to the site boundary wall that enhances the Conservation Area are all significant heritage benefits. The proposal will not cause harm to the significance of either of these heritage assets, so paragraphs 133 and 134 are not relevant, and as such there are no material heritage considerations to indicate that development should be restricted.

Impact on amenity

In delivering high quality urban design new development should safeguard the amenity of existing development and its occupiers and create a high-quality environment for future occupiers, which is also safe, healthy and useable (Policy BCS21 refers). In addition residential developments should provide sufficient space for everyday activities and enable flexibility and adaptability by meeting appropriate space standards, reference here being given to the standards set by the Homes and Communities Agency (Policy BCS18 refers). Policy BCS23 of the Core Strategy also addresses the issue of noise and amongst other things requires consideration of the impact of new development on the viability of existing uses by reason of its sensitivity to noise or other pollution.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

Consideration has been given to the impact on the amenity of all surrounding residential occupiers, including occupiers of the Eco-House in Grove Road (as described above). In addition, it is considered that the retention of the established trees along the Grove Road boundary means that the application proposal would not give rise to unacceptable overlooking of the residential properties on the opposite side of Grove Road.

The application proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residents of Grove Road for the reasons set out above.

To conclude, the City Design Group together with Officers in Development Management have considered the scheme throughout the pre-application and application process and are satisfied that this application is acceptable in terms of its design, impact on heritage assets and will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity enjoyed by surrounding occupiers. The proposal is consistent with development plan policies and there are therefore not considered to any grounds for refusing this application on these grounds.

(C) DOES THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL ADEQUATELY ADDRESS THE IMPACT ON TREES?

In addition to the height of the building, the representations received indicate that the impact on trees on the site is of particular concern. Trees throughout the site are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders. The comments of the Council's Arboricultural Officer are set out above.

In support of their application, the Applicants have submitted an Arboricultural Statement. This includes a tree protection plan and also provides information on tree loss and replacement. The following report summarizes the outcome of the report:

Trunk diameter of trees to be retained Number of trees removed Bristol Replacement Tree Standard (BRTS)

Trunk diameter of trees to be retained	Number of trees removed	Bristol Replacement Tree Standard (BRTS) Number of replacement trees that should be provided.
<19.9	47	47
20-29.9	17	34
30-39.9	9	24
40-49.9	0	0
50-59.9	3	15
60-69.9	2	12
70-79.9	1	7
>80	0	0
Total	78	139

Although the 78 trees are to be removed, the Applicant has demonstrated in the Arboricultural Statement that the majority of these are lower quality and of only 'minor' significance. The application has also indicated that it is their intention to plant 81 new trees on the site, as part of the landscaping proposals that will enhance the site and Conservation Area. This planting will be secured by way of a relevant condition requiring the submission of a landscaping scheme.

However as set out below, in order to comply with the Bristol Replacement Tree Standard (BRTS), there is still a shortfall of 58 trees (139 minus 81). Therefore, the Applicants have agreed to a financial contribution of £44,382.18 to meet this shortfall. This is calculated on the basis of £765.21 per tree. In order to secure this provision, as part of the recommendation before you, the Applicants are required

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

to enter into a legal agreement to secure compensatory funding for additional tree planting that meets the shortfall in respect of the BRTS. It is considered that this addresses both the comments of the Council's Arboricultural Officer and the Bristol Tree Forum. In addition, prior to the commencement of development on the site, there will be a requirement (secured by relevant conditions) to protect those trees on the site that are to be retained and to provide a detailed landscaping plan for the whole site that includes the position and species of the 81 proposed trees.

(D) ARE TRANSPORT, MOVEMENT AND OTHER HIGHWAY CONCERNS ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED?

Policy BCS10 states that proposals will be determined to reflect the transport user priorities set out in the Joint Local Transport Plan, specifically, putting the pedestrian first followed by the cyclist, public transport, access for commercial vehicles and only then the private car.

Development proposals should be located where sustainable travel patterns can be achieved.

The comments from the Council's Transport Development Management team are set out above and it is noted that the scheme is acceptable subject to the imposition of relevant planning conditions. These form part of the recommendation on the site.

There are no highways grounds on which to refuse this application and it is recognized that this site is in a sustainable location close to shops, services and public transport.

(E) DOES THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL COMPLY WITH THE COUNCIL'S SUSTAINABILITY POLICIES?

NPPF Policy 96 states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should expect new development to comply with adopted Local Plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply, unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development, involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable and to take account of landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping to minimise energy consumption.

Core Strategy Policies BCS13, BCS14, BCS15 and BCS16 set out the Council's key policies towards climate change and sustainable development.

In terms of climate change, Policy BCS13 requires that development should contribute to mitigating and adapting to climate change and meeting targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions through the design and use of resources in buildings, the use of decentralised renewable energy and sustainable patterns of development which encourage walking, cycling and public transport rather than journeys by private car.

Policy BCS14 requires that within heat priority areas, development should incorporate infrastructure for district heating and where feasible low-carbon energy generation and distribution. Development will be expected to provide sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20%.

In support of their application, the Applicants have demonstrated that overall, there will be an improvement in energy efficiency through the design beyond the levels required by building regulations. Design assumptions are set out in the energy statement and a condition to ensure that the development be delivered in accordance with these measures forms part of the recommendation.

The application has demonstrated that overall, there will be an improvement in energy efficiency through the design beyond the levels required by building regulations. Design assumptions are set out in the Energy Statement and a condition to ensure that the development be delivered in accordance with these measures forms part of the recommendation. The measures that have been included are

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

as follows:

- The engineering services serving the building, primarily the heating and domestic hot water system will utilise Combined Heat and Power.
- Energy efficient building design for the proposed new build
- LED-based lighting

This means that the development will reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20%.

Although not referred to directly, the application proposal complies with Policy BCS15, the design incorporates measures that maximise energy efficiency. The Applicants have also provided a BREEAM 2014 Pre-Assessment. Sustainability measures will be secured by condition.

In respect of Policy BCS16, as has been indicated, the site is designated as being within Flood Zone 1 where there is low probability of flooding.

(F) IS THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT VIABLE, AND DOES IT PROVIDE AN APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

The proposed development falls within Use Class C3 of the Use Classes Order, meaning that it is required to address the Council's Affordable Housing Policies. It comprises 65 dwellings and therefore it is required to comply with Core Strategy Policy BCS17, which requires the provision of up to 40% affordable housing subject to scheme viability.

The operational requirements of "retirement village" developments mean that the management of them is inconsistent with that required by a Housing Association, and therefore a financial contribution towards off-site affordable housing provision is sought from such schemes.

Government policy and guidance is very clear that scheme viability is a key consideration in determining the level of affordable housing that a development can provide, and that Council's should not require level of affordable housing that would render a development unviable. The government's Planning Practice Guidance states as follows:

Where affordable housing contributions are being sought, obligations should not prevent development from going forward. (Para 004 Reference ID: 23b-004-20140306)

In simple terms, a development is considered to be viable if the Residual Land Value (RLV) of the development is greater than the Site Value.

The RLV is calculated by ascertaining the value of the completed development, and subtracting from this all the costs involved in bringing the development forward (eg build costs, professional fees, legal costs, financing costs etc) and the developers profit.

The applicant has claimed that, to remain viable in planning terms, the proposed development is unable to make an affordable housing contribution. A detailed viability appraisal and supporting commentary has been submitted in support of this claim.

Officers have commissioned BNP Paribas to assess the viability information and advise the Council as to whether the applicants claim is reasonable. Having assessed the values and costs associated with the development, and undertaken their own appraisal, BNP Paribas conclude that the scheme is unviable in planning terms and therefore would not be able to make an affordable housing contribution. However, BNP Paribas do not agree with a number of the inputs proposed by the applicant, particularly in respect to the proposed sales values of the properties. The information and figures contained below relate to BNP Paribas opinion of viability and not the applicants.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

The appraisal inputs can be summarised as follows:

Residential sales values	Very high reflecting the prime location of the proposed development and the high demand for “retirement village” type schemes
Build Costs	Very high reflecting the high specification of the scheme – but reflective of the average build costs of other schemes currently being constructed by the applicant
Fees	Reflective of industry norms
Finance costs	Reflective of current returns required by lenders
Developers profit	Reflective of industry norms

The appraisal results in a RLV of approximately £2,500,000.

There are a number of ways that Site Value can be derived, and these include:

- o The price paid for the site, provided that the purchaser has not paid an overly inflated sum
- o The existing use value (i.e. what the site is worth for its current use in its current condition) plus a premium of approximately 20% to incentivise the landowner to redevelop the site
- o The alternative use value (i.e. other uses that the site could be developed for without the need for a further planning permission)

In the case of QVH, it is considered that the existing use value is an appropriate method from which to derive the Site Value, as the most recent rental values and yields for the property are known. Based on the existing use value plus a 20% premium, BNP Paribas consider that the Site Value is approximately £3,400,000.

As the Site Value is approximately £900,000 higher than the RLV, officers are satisfied that the scheme is unviable in planning terms and therefore unable to make an affordable housing contribution.

There are two main reasons why the proposed scheme is unable to make any affordable housing contribution.

The first is that office buildings have a high existing use value, and there is little uplift in value when they are redeveloped or converted for other uses.

The second is that "retirement village" type schemes have a very low gross to net ratio. This means that a relatively low proportion of what is built is actually sellable. To put this into context, a scheme comprising solely houses, has a gross to net ratio of 100% because every square metre build is sold.

A standard flatted scheme would normally have a gross to net ratio of between 75 and 85% as communal areas, lift shafts, stairwells, plant rooms, bin rooms etc are not sellable floorspace. In the case of QVH, the developer is building 8,847 square metres but only selling 5,682 square metres, giving a gross to net ratio of only 64%. The remainder of the floorspace comprises communal areas such as an on-site restaurant, spa, health and wellbeing centre, in addition to the expected corridors, lifts, stairwells etc.

Therefore, though the proposed sales values are very high; the high specification of the development, high existing use value and low gross to net ratio, means that the scheme is not considered viable in planning terms and is therefore unable to make a contribution towards off-site affordable housing.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US****CONCLUSION**

There have been significant number of representations received objecting to this application, particularly in terms of the impact of the proposed blocks on the amenity of surrounding residential properties and the impact on trees. In addition, there has been a prolonged debate about the exact use class for the development and following clarification by the Applicant, it is considered that the overall development falls within Use Class C3.

Following amendments being made to the scheme, it has been concluded that the design of the scheme is acceptable. It has been concluded that it will not have a harmful impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers to the extent to support a reason for refusal. Accordingly the application can be recommended for approval by your Officers.

This application has been assessed this application proposal on the basis of Development Plan policy and it has been determined to be compliant. There are not considered to be any planning grounds for resisting this application.

It will preserve and enhance the Conservation Area and will secure the retention of a building of merit. The setting of the Listed obelisk and increase the amount of specialist housing accommodation for older people in the city.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

How much Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will the development be required to pay?

The CIL liability for the scheme is £449,959.38

RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to Planning Agreement to secure the following:

1) Up to £44,382.18 in respect of off-site replacement trees.

Time limit for commencement of development

1. Full Planning Permission

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Pre commencement condition(s)

2. Approval of road works necessary

No development shall take place until details of the following works to the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

1. Widened vehicular crossover in Grove Road
2. Buildout at the junction of Redland Road with slip road to Grove Road
3. Dropped kerbs and tactile paving across Grove Road, south of its junction with St Vincent Hill

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until these works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that all road works associated with the proposed development are planned and approved in good time to include any Highways Orders, and to a standard approved by the Local Planning Authority and are completed before occupation.

3. No development shall take place until measures to protect badgers from being trapped in open excavations and/or pipes and culverts are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Measures shall include cover-plating, chain link fencing or the creation of sloping escape ramps for badgers by edge profiling of trenches/excavations or placing a plank in the bottom of open trenches at the end of each working day to allow any trapped badgers to escape. This is to prevent foraging badgers falling into trenches during the construction phase of the development. Open pipework larger than 150 mm outside diameter should be blanked off at the end of each working day. The development will be carried out in strict accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent harm to legally protected badgers.

4. Site Characterisation - Further Investigation.

Prior to the commencement of development on the site, an intrusive investigation will be required to establish site conditions at the site. The results of this investigation should be considered along with the Desk Study prepared by Hydrock, dated April 2015. A site specific risk assessment should be carried out to assess the nature and extent of the contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced.

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors

5. Land affected by contamination - Submission of Remediation Scheme

No development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment has been prepared, submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination is understood prior to works on site both during the construction phase to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

6. Land affected by contamination - Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

In the event that contamination is found, no development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation shall take place until the approved remediation scheme has been carried out in accordance with its terms. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and be approved in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination both during the construction phase and to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

7. Construction management plan

No development shall take place including any works of demolition until a construction management plan or construction method statement has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The statement shall provide for:

Parking of vehicle of site operatives and visitors
 routes for construction traffic
 hours of operation
 method of prevention of mud being carried onto highway
 pedestrian and cyclist protection
 proposed temporary traffic restrictions
 arrangements for turning vehicles

Reason: In the interests of safe operation of the highway in the lead into development both during the demolition and construction phase of the development.

8. Approval of road works necessary

No development shall take place until details of the following works to the highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

-Build-out at the junction of Redland Road with slip road to Grove Road
 -Dropped kerbs and tactile paving across Grove Road, south of its junction with St Vincent Hill

The building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until these works have been completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that all road works associated with the proposed development are planned and approved in good time to include any Highways Orders, and to a standard approved by the Local Planning Authority and are completed before occupation.

9. To ensure implementation of a programme of archaeological works

No development shall take place within the area indicated on plan number until the applicant/developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work,

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the developer and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording
2. The programme for post investigation assessment
3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording
4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation
5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation
6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded prior to their destruction.

10. Landscaping

No development shall commence until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection, in the course of development. The scheme shall indicate the location and species of at least 81 additional trees to be planted on the site.

The approved scheme shall be implemented so that planting can be carried out during the first planting season following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. All planted materials shall be maintained for five years and any trees of planted removed, dying, being damaged or becoming diseased within that period shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To protect and enhance the character of the site and the area and to ensure its appearance is satisfactory.

11. Sample Panels

Sample panels of all of the external materials. including brickwork, larch boarding, roof tiles and window/door frames, demonstrating the colour, texture, face bond and pointing are to be erected on site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant parts of the work are commenced. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the building is occupied.

Reason: In order that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.

12. BREEAM

No development shall take place until evidence that the development is registered with a BREEAM certification body and a pre-assessment report (or design stage certificate with interim rating if available) has been submitted indicating that the development can achieve the stipulated final BREEAM level. No building shall be occupied until a final Certificate has been issued certifying that BREEAM (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainable

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

building which replaces that scheme) rating Very Good has been achieved for this development unless the Local Planning Authority agrees in writing to an extension of the period by which a Certificate is issued.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves BREEAM rating level Very Good (or any such equivalent national measure of sustainability for building design which replaces that scheme) and assessment and certification shall be carried out by a licensed BREEAM assessor and to ensure that the development contributes to mitigating and adapting to climate change and to meeting targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

13. Details of any external plant or machinery

Details of any external plant or machinery (including to mechanical ventilation systems) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation. The development shall proceed only in accordance with those approved details.

Reason: In the interests of local amenity.

14. Refuse Storage

No development shall take place until details of all refuse storage and its servicing is submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the site.

Reason: In the interests of the proper planning of the site.

Pre occupation condition(s)

15. Sustainable urban drainage system (SUDS)

Prior to the first occupation, a strategy for surface water drainage for the site using sustainable drainage method consisting of a pond as shown on the approved drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved strategy prior to the 40th occupation, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal.

16. Noise sensitive use

Prior to the first occupation, details of the proposed noise mitigation measures, as recommended within the noise report by Hydrock dated June 2015, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details and the measures shall be in place for each unit before it is occupied, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of future occupiers.

17. Artificial lighting (external)

Prior to the first occupation, an external lighting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme before the occupation of the 40th unit and retained thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

18. Sustainability

Prior to the 40th occupation, an additional report shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall include details of the equipment and measures to be implemented in accordance with the Energy Statement dated March 2015, which demonstrates that the proposed savings of CO₂ emissions will be met. The development shall thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved report.

Reason: In the interests of meeting the sustainability and climate change goals of adopted planning policy.

19. Completion of Vehicular Access - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the means of vehicular access has been constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans and the said means of vehicular access shall thereafter be retained for access purposes only.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

20. Completion of Pedestrians/Cyclists Access - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the means of access for pedestrians and/or cyclists have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for access purposes only.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

21. Completion and Maintenance of Vehicular Servicing facilities - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or use commenced until the facilities for loading, unloading, circulation and manoeuvring have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter, these areas shall be kept free of obstruction and available for these uses.

Reason: To ensure that there are adequate servicing facilities within the site in the interests of highway safety.

22. Completion and Maintenance of Car/Vehicle Parking - Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the car/vehicle parking area shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, the area shall be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of vehicles associated with the development

Reason: To ensure that there are adequate parking facilities to serve the development.

23. Staff Travel Plan - Not submitted

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until a Travel Plan comprising immediate, continuing and long-term measures to promote and encourage alternatives to single-occupancy car use has been prepared, submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Travel Plan shall then be

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

implemented, monitored and reviewed in accordance with the agreed travel Plan Targets to the satisfaction of the council.

Reason: In order to deliver sustainable transport objectives including a reduction in single occupancy car journeys and the increased use of public transport, walking & cycling.

24. Land affected by contamination - Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Condition 4 and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Condition 5, which is to be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with Condition 6.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

25. To ensure completion of a programme of archaeological works

No building shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.

Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded and published prior to their destruction.

26. To secure the conduct of a watching brief during development groundworks

The applicant/developer shall ensure that all groundworks, including geotechnical works, are monitored and recorded by an archaeologist or an archaeological organisation to be approved by the council and in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 9.

Reason: To record remains of archaeological interest before destruction.

27. Public Art Plan

Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted, a Public Art Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall set out the detailed design of the public art work for the school building in accordance with the City Council's Public Art Policy and Strategy. The Public Art Plan shall also contain budget allocations, a timetable for delivery and details of future maintenance responsibilities and requirements. The Public Art Plan hereby approved shall be undertaken in accordance with that approval prior to the commencement of use and the public art shall be thereafter retained as part of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

Reason: In order to secure public art as part of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.

28. Ecology

The development hereby approved shall only be constructed in accordance with recommendations outlined in section 7.4 of the Further Bat Surveys prepared by Clarkson and Woods, dated July 2015, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Should the development not be implemented within 1 year of the date of this planning permission an additional survey for bat activity shall be carried out, which will be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved recommendations of that report.

Reason: To ensure the ecological value of the site is maintained and any impact is appropriately mitigated.

Post occupation management

29. Protection of parking and servicing provision

The areas allocated for vehicle parking, loading and unloading, circulation and manoeuvring on the approved plans shall only be used for the said purpose and not for any other purposes.

Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of satisfactory off-street parking and servicing/loading/unloading facilities for the development.

List of approved plans

30. List of approved plans and drawings

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision.

Proposed New Build Level -1 (P 109 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build Level 0 (P 110 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build Level 1 (P 111 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build Level 2 (P 112 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build Level 3 (P 113 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build Level 4 (P 114 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build Roof Plan (P 120 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build North Block Northwest Elevation (P 201 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build North Block Northeast Elevation (P 202 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build North Block Southeast Elevation (P 203 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build North Block Southwest Elevation (P 204 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build South Block Southeast Elevation (P 211 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build South Block Northeast Elevation (P 212 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build South Block Southeast Elevation (P 213 Rev P02)

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016**Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US**

Proposed New Build South Block Southwest Elevation (P 214 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build Section 01 (P 301 Rev P02)
 Proposed New Build Section 02 (P 302 Rev P02)
 Proposed QVH Level 0 (P 110 Rev P02)
 Proposed QVH Level 1 (P 111 Rev P02)
 Proposed QVH Level 2 (P 112 Rev P02)
 Proposed QVH Level 3 (P 113 Rev P02)
 Proposed QVH Roof Plan (P 120 Rev P02)
 Proposed QVH Northwest Elevation (P 201 Rev P02)
 Proposed Level -1 Plan (P 109 Rev P02)
 Proposed Level 0 Plan (P 110 Rev P02)
 Proposed Level 1 Plan (P 111 Rev P02)
 Proposed Level 3 Plan (P 113 Rev P02)
 Proposed Level 4 Plan (P 114 Rev P02)
 Proposed Roof Plan (P 115 Rev P02)
 Proposed Site Plan (P 120 Rev P02)
 Proposed Site Elevation East (P 202 Rev P02)
 Proposed Site Elevation South (P 203 Rev P02)
 Proposed Site Section 01 (P 301 Rev P02)
 Proposed Site Section 02 (P 302 Rev P02)
 Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Tree Protection Plan (Aug 15)
 Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Aug 15)
 Updated Heritage Letter
 General Arrangement (Drg. No. LL490-100-0001 Rev A)

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt

Advices

1. Minor works on the public highway: The development hereby approved includes the carrying out of work on the public highway. You are advised that before undertaking the work on the highway you must enter into a highway agreement under s184 or s278 of the Highways Act 1980 with the council. You will be required to pay fees to cover the council's costs in undertaking the approval and inspection of the works. You should contact the Highways Asset Management Team on 0117 9222100.
2. The development hereby approved is likely to impact on the highway network during its construction. The applicant is required to contact Highway Network Management to discuss any temporary traffic management measures required, such as footway, Public Right of Way or carriageway closures, or temporary parking restrictions. Please call 0117 9036852 or email traffic@bristol.gov.uk a minimum of eight weeks prior to any activity on site to enable Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders to be prepared and a programme of Temporary Traffic Management measures to be agreed.
3. Note that in deciding to grant permission, the Committee/Planning Service Director also decided to recommend to the Council's Executive in its capacity as Traffic Authority in the administration of the existing Controlled Parking Zone of which the development forms part, that the development should be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers ineligible for resident parking permits.

Development Control Committee A – 15 June 2016

Application No. 15/01681/F: Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Crime Reduction Unit	20 May 2015
Contaminated Land Environmental Protection	9 June 2015
Pollution Control	18 June 2015
Historic England	9 June 2015
Urban Design	23 July 2015
Landscape	28 May 2015
Flood Risk Manager	18 May 2015
City Centre Projects (Public Art)	8 June 2015



**Development Control Committee A
15 June 2016**


Supporting Documents

1. Brunel House City Of Bristol College College Road
2. Regents House/ Consort House
3. Queen Victoria House

Supporting Documents

1. Brunel House City of Bristol College College Road

1. Proposed Overall Site Layout Plan
2. Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Block C
3. Proposed 1st & 2nd Plans – Block C
4. Proposed SE & SW Elevations – Block C
5. Proposed NW & NE Elevations - Block C
6. Proposed Ground & Basement Floor Plans – Blocks A & B
7. Proposed First & Second Floor Plans – Blocks A & B



Notes
 This drawing may be scaled for the purposes of Planning Applications, Land Registry and for Legal plans where the scale bar is used, and where it verifies that the drawing is an original or an accurate copy. It may not be scaled for construction purposes.
 Always refer to signed dimensions. All dimensions are to be checked on site. Discrepancies and/or ambiguities between this drawing and information given elsewhere must be reported immediately to this office for clarification before proceeding. All drawings are to be read in conjunction with the specification and all works to be carried out in accordance with latest British Standards / Codes of Practice.

NOTES:
 1) See Design and Access Statement for further details of provision and design
 2) See Block Plans and Demolitions drawings for details of building and extensions removed
 3) Works to College Road and other areas outside of the Baystar Developments ownership boundary are subject to negotiation with the City of Bristol College
Agreement in principle has been reached

KEY to planting

- New tree
- Removed tree
- Retained tree
- Privacy zone or ornamental planting

See Landscape Scheme and Tree Report for full details

To Jessop Court and Cricket Club development

Rev	Date	Init	Notes	Clkd
F	09/05/16	WK	Revisions to Block C following further discussions with officers	PB
E	21/03/16	WK	Block C reduced in size and pulled away from historic wall	PB
D	25/02/16	WK	Numerical error corrected	PB
C	22/02/16	EC/ WK	Revised following consultation with community & officers	PB
B	30/11/15	WK	PLANNING issue	PB
A	11/11/15	WK	Block & road names added, colour removed pending further detail	PB



Drawing Originator
AWW inspired environments
 London - 7 Birch Lane, London, EC3N 9BW 020 7160 6000
 Bristol - Rivergate House, Bristol, BS1 1LS 0117 923 2035
 Plymouth - East Quay House, Plymouth, PL4 0RN 01752 261 282
 RIBA Chartered Practice www.aww-uk.com

Project Title
Brunel House Restoration & Development

Drawing Title
Proposed Overall Site Layout Plan

Scale	Sheet	Drawn	Checked	Date
1:250 @ A1	A1	WK	PB	
Status	Project No. 3520			
Drawing Reference	Drawing No.	Revision		
	0103	F		

- KEY to service access**
- ① Refuse & recycling - (storage)
 - ② Refuse & recycling - (collection point)
 - ③ Cycle store (shed) ③a Cycle store (cage)
 - ④ Fire service vehicle access
 - ⑤ Low railings
 - ⑥ Low metal, decorative gates (no locks)
 - ➡ Main entrance (with dry risers as required)
 - ➡ Other resident shared access / escape
 - ➡ Private entrance

CAR PARKING
 70 spaces:
 49 spaces for 2B, 3B and 4B apartments
 1 space for wheelchair accessible flat (in covered car park)
 1 space for Car Club vehicle
 1 space allocated for electric car charging point
 18 additional spaces available for other apartments and visitors

We have provided an additional 11 spaces (a 19% increase) while addressing concerns about pedestrian safety & vehicle access. The ratio is now 0.76 spaces per dwelling

CYCLE PARKING
 156 spaces:
 Blocks A + B - 108 spaces
 100 in external sheds & covered store, and 8 visitor spaces on 'Sheffield' stands
 Block C - 48 spaces
 42 spaces in internal cycle store and 6 visitor spaces on 'Sheffield' stands

This provision now exceeds the guidelines, and visitor spaces have also been increased


REFUSE PROVISION

Block A:
 General refuse - 3no 1100l Eurobins
 Dry recyclables - 3no 360l Eurobins
 Organic recycling - 1no 240l Eurobins

Block B:
 General refuse - 4no 1100l Eurobins
 Dry recyclables - 5no 360l Eurobins
 Organic recycling - 2no 240l Eurobins
 Cardboard - 1no 1100l Eurobin

Block C:
 General refuse - 4no 1100l Eurobins
 Dry recyclables - 5no 360l Eurobins
 Organic recycling - 1no 360l Eurobins

Recycling capacity now exceeds the BCC guidance provisions, with some space for additional future recycling storage



Notes
 This drawing may be scaled for the purposes of Planning Applications, Land Registry and for Legal plans where the scale bar is used, and where it verifies that the drawing is an original or an accurate copy. It may not be scaled for construction purposes.
 Always refer to signed dimensions. All dimensions are to be checked on site. Discrepancies and/or ambiguities between this drawing and information given elsewhere must be reported immediately to this office for clarification before proceeding. All drawings are to be read in conjunction with the specification and all works to be carried out in accordance with latest British Standards / Codes of Practice.

Key


- 1B 2P Flat
- 2B 3P Wheelchair Access
- 2B 4P Flat
- Ancillary

* Wheelchair Accessible Flat Layout (no fixtures etc)

- P - Patio
- G - Garden
- PB - Planting bed/privacy zone



Rev	Date	Init	Notes	Clkd
E	10/05/16	WK	Replanned to revised footprint & fenestration following further discussion with planning officers; entrance approaches & layout revised	PB
D	21/03/16	EC/ WK	Block C reduced in size and pulled away from historic wall. Flat C02 revised to provide wheelchair accessible layout. Cycle store and water intake room revised to provide side access to parking bay 72.	PB
C	22/02/16	EC/ WK	Revised following consultation with community & officers	PB
B	03/12/15	EC	Drafting correction	PB
A	30/11/15	WK	PLANNING issue	PB




Client

Drawing Originator

AWW inspired environments
 London - 7 Birch Lane, London, EC3N 9BW 020 7160 6000
 Bristol - Rivergate House, Bristol, BS1 1LS 0117 923 2326
 Plymouth - East Quay House, Plymouth, PL4 0HN 01752 261 282
 RIBA Chartered Practice www.aww-uk.com

Project Title
Brunel House Restoration & Development



Drawing Title
Proposed Ground Floor Plan - Block C



Scale	Sheet	Drawn	Checked	Date
As indicated	A1	WK	PB	
Status	Project No.			
PLANNING	3520			
Drawing Reference	Drawing No.	Revision		
	0220	E		


Notes
 This drawing may be scaled for the purposes of Planning Applications, Land Registry and for Legal plans where the scale bar is used, and where it verifies that the drawing is an original or an accurate copy. It may not be scaled for construction purposes.
 Always refer to figured dimensions. All dimensions are to be checked on site. Discrepancies and/or ambiguities between this drawing and information given elsewhere must be reported immediately to the office for clarification before proceeding. All drawings are to be read in conjunction with the specification and all works to be carried out in accordance with latest British Standards' Codes of Practice.

Key
 1B 2P Flat
 2B 3P Flat
 Ancillary




1 First Floor
 1 : 100

2 Second Floor
 1 : 100



Rev	Date	Init	Notes	Chkd
F	10/05/16	WK	Rear/northern flats replanned, and stairways and fenestration revised, following further discussion with planning officers	PB
E	24/03/16	WK	Drafting error corrected to plot names C11 & C15	PB
D	21/03/16	EC/ WK	Block C reduced in size and pulled away from historic wall. Rear/NE elevation simplified and balconies removed. Flat layouts C22 and C25 revised.	PB
C	22/02/16	EC/ WK	Revised following consultation with community & officers	PB
B	03/12/15	EC	Drafting correction	PB
A	30/11/15	WK	PLANNING issue	PB



Client

Drawing Originator

AWW inspired environments
 London - 7 Birch Lane, London, EC3V 9BW 020 7160 0000
 Bristol - Rivergate House, Bristol, BS1 6LS 0117 923 2535
 Plymouth - East Quay House, Plymouth, PL4 0HN 01752 261 282
 RIBA Chartered Practice www.aww-uk.com

Project Title
Brunel House Restoration & Development

Drawing Title
Proposed 1st & 2nd Plans - Block C - 100 Scale

Scale	Sheet	Drawn	Checked	Date
1 : 100	A1	WK	PB	
Status	Project No. 3520			
PLANNING				
Drawing Reference	Drawing No. 0221	Revision	F	

Notes
 This drawing may be scaled for the purposes of Planning Applications, Land Registry and for Legal plans where the scale bar is used, and where it verifies that the drawing is an original or an accurate copy. It may not be scaled for construction purposes.
 Always refer to figured dimensions. All dimensions are to be checked on site. Discrepancies and/or ambiguities between this drawing and information given elsewhere must be reported immediately to the office for clarification before proceeding. All drawings are to be read in conjunction with the specification and all works to be carried out in accordance with latest British Standards / Codes of Practice.




KEY

- 1 Brick similar to colours & patterns of stonework on Brunel House: Wienerberger Bemmel Stock in metric size proposed (210 x 100 x 50mm high)
- 2 Aluminium plank cladding, colour slate-grey, matt finish
- 3 Triple glazed aluminium/timber combination windows, outer frames grey-green
- 4 Coloured opaque glass solid panels - final colour to be agreed with officers
- 5 Structural glass balcony balustrades with stainless steel handrails and clamping plates; balcony bases to be supported on (set-in) posts or cantilevered where necessary
- 6 Bath Stone/artstone copings
- 7 PPC aluminium rainwater pipes serving roof and balconies

1 Proposed SE (Entrance) Elevation
 1 : 100

Page 144



2 Proposed SW (Front) Elevation
 1 : 100

Decorative grilles
 Car park gates

Rev	Date	Int	Notes	Checked
D	09/05/16	WK	Revisions to Block C following further discussions with officers	PB
C	21/03/16	EC/ WK	Block C reduced in size and pulled away from historic wall. Rear/NE elevation simplified and balconies removed. Flat layouts C22 and C25 revised.	PB
B	22/02/16	EC/ WK	Revised following consultation with community & officers	PB
A	30/11/15	WK	PLANNING issue	PB

Client

Drawing Originator

AWW inspired environments
 London - 7 Birchen Lane, London, EC2V 6BW 020 7160 0000
 Bristol - Rivergate House, Bristol, BS1 4LS 0117 923 2535
 Plymouth - East Quay House, Plymouth, PL4 0HN 01752 261 282
 RIBA Chartered Practice www.aww-uk.com

Project Title
Brunel House Restoration & Development

Drawing Title
Proposed SE and SW Elevations - Block C

Scale	Sheet	Drawn	Checked	Date
As Indicated	A1	WK	PB	
Status	PLANNING		Project No.	3520
Drawing Reference	Drawing No.	0230	Revision	D

Notes
 This drawing may be scaled for the purposes of Planning Applications, Land Registry and for Legal plans where the scale bar is used, and where it verifies that the drawing is an original or an accurate copy. It may not be scaled for construction purposes.
 Always refer to figured dimensions. All dimensions are to be checked on site. Discrepancies and/or ambiguities between this drawing and information given elsewhere must be reported immediately to this office for clarification before proceeding. All drawings are to be read in conjunction with the specification and all works to be carried out in accordance with latest British Standards / Codes of Practice.



0m 2m 4m 6m 8m 10m
 VISUAL SCALE 1:100 @ A1

KEY

- 1 Brick similar to colours & patterns of stonework on Brunel House: Wienerberger Bemmel Stock in metric size proposed (210 x 100 x 50mm high)
- 2 Aluminium plank cladding, colour slate-grey, matt finish
- 3 Triple glazed aluminium/timber combination windows, outer frames grey-green
- 4 Coloured opaque glass solid panels - final colour to be agreed with officers
- 5 Structural glass balcony balustrades with stainless steel handrails and clamping plates; balcony bases to be supported on (set-in) posts or cantilevered where necessary
- 6 Bath Stone/artstone copings
- 7 PPC aluminium rainwater pipes serving roof and balconies

Page 145



Rev	Date	Init	Notes	Checked	Clkd
D	09/05/16	WK	Revisions to Block C following further discussions with officers	PB	
C	21/03/16	EC/ WK	Block C reduced in size and pulled away from historic wall. Rear/NE elevation simplified and balconies removed. Flat layouts C22 and C25 revised.	PB	
B	22/02/16	EC/ WK	Revised following consultation with community & officers	PB	
A	30/11/15	WK	PLANNING issue	PB	

Client

Drawing Originator

AWW inspired environments
 London - 7 Birch Lane, London, EC3N 9BW 020 7160 6000
 Bristol - Rivergate House, Bristol, BS1 6LS 0117 923 2325
 Plymouth - East Quay House, Plymouth, PL4 0HN 01752 261 282
 RIBA Chartered Practice www.aww-uk.com

Project Title
Brunel House Restoration & Development


Drawing Title
Proposed NW and NE Elevations - Block C

Scale	Sheet	Drawn	Checked	Date
As indicated	A1	WK	PB	
Status	Project No. 3520			
PLANNING				
Drawing Reference	Drawing No.	Revision		
	0231	D		

2 Proposed NE (Rear) Elevation
 1 : 100


Flat Types

- 1B 1P Flat
- 1B 2P Flat
- 2B 2P Flat
- 2B 3P Flat
- 2B 4P Flat
- 3B 5P Flat
- 4B 5P Flat
- Ancillary




Page 146


1 Proposed Ground Floor Plan
 1 : 200



Proposed Basement Plan
 (based on CBC drawings): no alterations proposed to basic fabric. Services will be renewed, including installation of new gas fired boilers (using existing flue routes); radon protection installation will be maintained, and walls, ceilings & floors (where appropriate) will be redecorated.



Rev	Date	Init	Notes	Checked	Drawn
E	22/02/06	EC/ WK	Revised following consultation with community & officers. Additional notes added for clarification	PB	
D	04/12/15	EC	Drawing annotation added	PB	
C	30/11/15	WK	PLANNING issue	PB	
B	23/11/15	WK	Updated in line with large scale & demolition plans; window seat removed in favour of reinstating original window; modern doorway removed.	PB	
A	11/11/15	WK	Detail added & flats keyed	PB	



Client

Drawing Originator

AWW inspired environments
 London - 7 Birch Lane, London, EC3N 9BW 020 7160 6000
 Bristol - Rivergate House, Bristol, BS1 1LS 0117 923 2525
 Plymouth - Esaf Quay House, Plymouth, PL4 0HN 01752 261 282
 RIBA Chartered Practice www.aww-uk.com

Project Title
Brunel House Restoration & Development

Drawing Title
Proposed Ground and Basement Floor Plans - Blocks A & B

Scale	Sheet	Drawn	Checked	Date
1 : 200	A1	WK	PB	
Status	Project No.			
PLANNING	3520			
Drawing Reference	Drawing No.	Revision		
	0120	E		


Notes
 This drawing may be scaled for the purposes of Planning Applications, Land Registry and for Legal plans where the scale bar is used, and where it verifies that the drawing is an original or an accurate copy. It may not be scaled for construction purposes.
 Always refer to signed dimensions. All dimensions are to be checked on site. Discrepancies and/or ambiguities between this drawing and information given elsewhere must be reported immediately to this office for clarification before proceeding. All drawings are to be read in conjunction with the specification and all works to be carried out in accordance with latest British Standards / Codes of Practice.



Flat Types

- Studio
- 1B 1P Flat
- 2B 3P Flat
- 2B 4P Flat
- 3B 5P Flat
- Ancillary

2 Proposed Second Floor Plan
 1 : 200




Flat Types

- 1B 1P Flat
- 1B 2P Flat
- 2B 2P Flat
- 2B 3P Flat
- 2B 4P Flat
- 3B 5P Flat
- Ancillary

1 Proposed First Floor Plan
 1 : 200

Rev	Date	Init	Notes	Cl'd
D	22/02/16	EC	Revised following consultation with community & officers.	PB
C	04/12/15	EC	Drawing annotation added	PB
B	30/11/15	WK	PLANNING issue	PB
A	11/11/15	WK	Detail added & flats keyed	PB




Client

Drawing Originator

AWW inspired environments
 London - 7 Birch Lane, London, EC3V 9BW 020 7160 6000
 Bristol - Rivergate House, Bristol, BS1 1LS 0117 923 2326
 Plymouth - East Quay House, Plymouth, PL4 0HN 01752 261 282
 RIBA Chartered Practice www.aww-uk.com

Project Title
Brunel House Restoration & Development

Drawing Title
Proposed First and Second Floor Plans - Blocks A & B



Scale	Sheet	Drawn	Checked	Date
1 : 200	A1	WK	PB	
Status	Project No.			
PLANNING	3520			
Drawing Reference	Drawing No.	Revision		
	0121	D		

Supporting Documents

1. Regents House/Consort House Imperial Arcade

No Supporting Docs Supplied

Supporting Documents

1. Queen Victoria House Redland Hill Bristol BS6 6US

1. Site Map
2. Site Map
3. Proposed Level O Plan
4. Proposed QVH Northwest Elevation
5. Elevational Views
6. Street Scene
7. Street Scene

REDLAND HILL

SIMPLY HEALTH

QUEEN VICTORIA HOUSE

HARPER HOUSE

HOME GARDENS


CARLTON HOUSE

ST VINCENT'S HILL

GROVE ROAD

WESTBURY
Page 150





REDLAND HILL ROAD

GROVE ROAD

Page 152


- KEY / NOTES
- Site boundary
 - - - Non-development zone.
 - ▽ Access
 - Apartment
 - Circulation
 - Communal facilities
 - Tempered spaces
 - Unheated spaces
 - Parking
 - Wellness centre
 - Balcony

- ① Main pedestrian access
- ② Hall / reception area
- ③ Lounge & restaurant
- ④ South terrace
- ⑤ Pedestrian walkway
- ⑥ Private garden
- ⑦ Ramp
- ⑧ South vehicular access
- ⑨ North block west core
- ⑩ North block east core
- ⑪ South block west core
- ⑫ South block east core
- ⑬ Refuse area

PROJ: 2103/15 - layout for planning
REV: DATE

NOTES

1. Do not scale from this drawing, other than for Planning purposes.
2. All dimensions to be checked on site by the contractor and not dimensions to be his responsibility.
3. Report all drawing errors, omissions and discrepancies to the architect.
4. This document may be bound in an uncontrolled CAD format to enable others to use the background information to make alterations and/or additions to the information. The file will be accompanied by a PDF version. It is for those making such alterations and additions to ensure that they make use of current background information.
5. AFRM Ltd accepts no liability for any alterations or additions to the background information or arising out of changes to background information which occur prior to alterations or additions being made.



ALLFORD HALL MONAGHAN MORRIS

ARCHITECTS
2ND FLOOR, BLOCK C, 5 28 OLD STREET LONDON EC1Y 9EA.
TEL: 020 7321 2021 FAX: 020 7321 9123 WWW.AM.MCM.CO.UK

JOB NO: QUEEN VICTORIA HOUSE

drawing title: location
PROPOSED LEVEL 03 PLAN


drawn by	checked	scale	status	revision	revision no.	revision
14031	X	1:250@A1; 1:500@A3	PLANNING	[00]	P 110	P01





- KEY / NOTES
- Red brick
 - Stone
 - Slate tiles
 - Buff brick
 - Dark metal roof
- 21 Proposed QVH's rooftop extension
 - 22 New main entry
 - 23 Stairs Removed
 - 24 Entrance and stairs removed
 - 25 New doors

PO: 2103/13 issued for planning
 REV: DATE
 NOTES
 1. Do not scale from this drawing, other than for Planning purposes.
 2. All dimensions to be checked on site by the contractor and such dimensions to be his responsibility.
 3. Report all drawing errors, omissions and discrepancies to the architect.
 4. This document may be issued in an uncontrolled CAD format to enable others to use the background information to make alterations and/or additions. In this instance the file will be accompanied by a PDF version. It is for those making such alterations and additions to ensure that they make use of current background information.
 ARCHD Ltd accepts no liability for any such alterations or additions to the background information or arising out of changes to background information which occur prior to alterations or additions being made.



ALLFORD HALL MONAGHAN MORRIS
 ARCHITECTS Ltd
 2ND FLOOR, BLOCK C, 5-29 OLD STREET LONDON EC1Y 9AE,
 TEL: 020 7601 8001 FAX: 020 7361 6123 WEB: WWW.AHM.CO.UK
 job file
 QUEEN VICTORIA HOUSE

drawing title / location
 PROPOSED QVH NORTHWEST ELEVATION

drawn by / checked	scale	status	PLANNING
	1:100@A1; 1:200@A3		
project	zone	classification	drawing no. / revision
14031	Q	[00]	P201 / P01





