

# **Bristol City Council**

## **Minutes of the Development Control A Committee**



**6 September 2017 at 2.00 pm**

### **Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Harriet Bradley, Tom Brook, Stephen Clarke, Mike Davies (Vice-Chair), Kye Dudd, Steve Jones, Olly Mead, Jo Sergeant, Clive Stevens, Chris Windows (Chair) and Mark Wright

### **Officers in Attendance:-**

Gary Collins – Development Management, Norman Cornthwaite- Democratic Services

### **1. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies were received from Councillor Celia Phipps, substitute Councillor Harriet Bradley.

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

### **3. Minutes of the previous meeting**

In relation Empire Sports 223 Newfoundland Road, Councillor Mead confirmed that he had abstained but may have voted for had there been more information available concerning the heritage issue.

**Resolved - that the minutes of the above meeting be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the addition of the above reference.**

### **4. Appeals**

Old BRI Building – The Representative of the Service Director - Planning explained that the Applicants had appealed against non determination and that a report would be submitted to the Next Meeting of Committee B.

### **5. Enforcement**



There were no enforcement issues to raise with Councillors.

## 6. Public Forum

Members of the Committee received public forum statements in advance of the meeting. The statements were heard before the application they related to and were taken fully into consideration by the Committee prior to reaching a decision.

## 7. Planning and Development

The Committee considered the following Planning Application.

## 8. Application Number 16/06594/P - Land At The Adjoining Callowhill Court, Broadmead and the Horsefair

The Head of Development Management addressed the Committee at the start of this item.

He explained that the Committee had before them a very important planning application for the future of Bristol's development. He added that this was a crucial point in time for the Council as Local Planning Authority to take a view on this application and express its support.

He explained that the reason for saying this was that, starting the day before the Committee meeting, a Public Inquiry had commenced into the planning application for what would be a significant expansion to the The Mall development at Cribbs Causeway. South Gloucestershire Council had considered this application some time ago and resolved to grant planning permission. However, the Secretary of State had decided to call in the application for his own determination. As a result of this, the SoS has appointed a Planning Inspector to advise him on the decision that should be made and the Inspector would do this after having heard evidence from the developers, SGC and other interested parties such as the City Council who oppose the development. The Inquiry was due to close at the end of this month.

It was commonly recognised that there will be one major investment in retail-led development in the West of England sub-region during the next 10-15 years. This was likely to be either at Cribbs Causeway or at the site before the Committee at the meeting.

The officer went on to explain that the retail-led mixed use redevelopment of the Bristol Shopping Quarter was supported by policies within the adopted Bristol Local Plan which is the Council's Development Plan, particularly:

Policy BCS2 of the Core Strategy (Bristol City Centre's role as a regional centre to be promoted and strengthened)

Policy BCAP13 of the Central Area Plan (Major retail growth to be focused on sites in the Bristol Shopping Quarter)

Policy BCAP36 of the Central Area Plan (The Horsefair & Callowhill Court allocated for major retail-led mixed use redevelopment) Officers felt that it is very important that the Secretary of State's Planning



Inspector receives a clear message from the City Council about its support for the redevelopment of the site in central Bristol, so that the Inspector can weigh this up when advising the SoS on the proposals at Cribbs Causeway. So far, the Council (through the Cabinet decision of 15<sup>th</sup> August) had agreed in principle to use CPO powers to enable the development of Callowhill Court. Today was a good opportunity, whilst the Call-in Inquiry is open, for the Council as LPA to express its support for the proposals.

He explained that taking this step is a serious matter. The Committee had a planning application before it that had to be determined. The application was an outline application and had been the subject of Environmental Impact Assessment. Many detailed issues (the Reserved Matters) are still to come forward and these would be considered by Committee in the future. The Committee, though, must be satisfied that there is sufficient information and that a suitably robust assessment has been carried out, in order for the Committee to be content to resolve to grant outline planning permission.

The applicants and officers have worked hard to get the application to where it is, bearing in mind the wider context that had been explained. The application had been thoroughly assessed at the right level of detail for an outline application with so many matters reserved.

He explained that the exception to this though is the issue of air quality. Unfortunately, officers could not say that at this point in time that they had fully assessed the air quality impact evidence that had been submitted with the application. As a result, on this particular issue officers could not provide the Committee with a clear recommendation or set out the scope of any potential mitigation measures that could be justified.

Therefore, the officer recommendation put forward is that the Committee should resolve that it is **minded to grant outline planning permission for the development**, but subject to the impacts of the development on air quality being fully assessed along with proposed mitigation measures.

Officers' assessment of the air quality impacts would then be brought back to the Committee at the next meeting (18<sup>th</sup> October) for consideration, where the Committee would then be asked to make a final determination of the outline planning application. At that stage the Committee would still be able to fully consider the issue of air quality and weigh that up against Development Plan policy and all of the other material planning considerations before making a final resolution on the granting of outline planning permission.

Whilst this approach was not typical, officers felt that it was appropriate in the circumstances and was procedurally robust."

He then handed over to the case officer who summarised the Application highlighting the following:

- The Amendment Sheet which includes the Officers' Recommendation
- The Adopted Plan designates this as a retail area
- The extent of the site
- The Capacity Assessment
- The Committee is being asked to agree the principle of the development along with the access and delivery arrangements
- More detailed plans will be put before the Committee at a later date under Reserved Matters



The Representative of the Service Director, Transport summarised the transport considerations highlighting the following:

- Access
- Traffic Impact
- Car Parking
- Deliveries and Servicing
- Sustainable Travel

### Questions and Answers

The following answers and clarifications were provided for Members of the Committee:

- There would no demolition of heritage buildings in Brunswick Square
- The extent of car park usage in Broadmead and Cabot Circus is known with capacity already reached in November and December; this development will inevitably create extra demand for car parking
- The proposed car park will not be for commuters and charging rates will reflect this
- There will also be a range of public transport for accessing the development
- A lot of detailed design has still to be agreed but the scheme will generate extra car journeys
- Although there is some residential development within the scheme, it is not possible to require that this be increased
- The scheme met the four criteria set out in Policy BCAP36 relating to this site
- York Street traffic information had been including in the traffic modelling
- M32 traffic information was also included in the traffic modelling
- It was confirmed that there would be changes to a number of bus routes should this scheme proceed
- The Air Quality Impact Report will be presented to the Committee at its Meeting in October when a final decision on the application will have to be made taking account of this report

### Debate and Decision



During the debate on the application Members expressed their concerns about access arrangements by way of Brunswick Square, the car park provision which was thought to be unnecessarily large and would encourage additional car journeys leading to increased pollution, and congestion. There were also concerns that the scheme was not doing enough to encourage or promote public transport use and was giving a higher priority to car usage over public transport usage.

Councillor Stevens stated that he was minded to vote against the application for the following reasons:

Does not meet BCS2 as plenty of evidence priority is not being given to pedestrians, cyclists and buses over cars.

Does not meet DM23 as the effect of the 40 changes of traffic lights per hour along Bond St would cause unacceptable traffic conditions.

Does not meet BCS22 protection of heritage assets due to the effect on Brunswick Sq Conservation Area and its quiet, peaceful characteristic.

The Head of Development Management reminded Members that they could not re-design the scheme but were entitled to highlight what they agreed with what they had concerns about.

Councillor Windows stated that this was a very important decision and as the scheme is very important to the City. He would be voting in favour of it.

Councillor Wright moved the following Motion:

The Committee strongly supports the redevelopment of the site but considers the car park access via Brunswick Square to be unacceptable; therefore the car park should be reduced and possibly moved or eliminated to allow for a more sensitive solution. If this is achieved, the Committee would be disposed to grant outline planning permission, subject to detailed air quality assessment.

Councillor Dudd seconded this Motion

Councillor Sergeant then moved an Amendment to the Motion that after the words “car park” the word “should” be replaced with the word “must”.

Councillor Mead seconded this Amendment and on being put to the Vote it was Carried 11 for and 0 against.

The Amended Motion was then put to the Vote it was Carried – 11 for and 0 against.

It was therefore



**Resolved – that the Committee strongly supports the redevelopment of the site but considers the car park access via Brunswick Square to be unacceptable; therefore the car park must be reduced and possibly moved or eliminated to allow for a more sensitive solution. If this is achieved, the Committee would be disposed to grant outline planning permission, subject to detailed air quality assessment.**

#### **9. Date of Next Meeting**

10.00 am on Wednesday 18th October 2017.

Meeting ended at Time Not Specified

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

