

**Bristol City Council
Minutes of the
Development Control A Committee**



10 January 2018 at 6.00 pm

Members Present:-

Councillors: Tom Brook, Stephen Clarke, Mike Davies (Vice-Chair), Richard Eddy, Margaret Hickman, Olly Mead, Celia Phipps, Jo Sergeant, Clive Stevens, Chris Windows (Chair) and Mark Wright

Officers in Attendance:-

Gary Collins - Head of Development Management, Jim Cliffe - Planning Obligations Manager, Laurence Fallon - Transport Development Manager, Angelo Calabrese, Matthew Bunt - Planning Officers, Allison Taylor – Democratic Services.

1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

These were done.

2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from Councillor Jones with Councillor Eddy attending as substitute.

3. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Sergeant declared that she lived near the development but was open minded. Councillor Clarke declared that he used to be a Governor of Redland High School and was open minded. Councillor Wright declared that he had previously visited the site at the invitation of the applicant but this had not influenced him and he remained open minded.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

These were agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

Resolved - that the minutes be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.



5. Appeals

These were noted.

6. Enforcement

These were noted.

7. Public Forum

Statements

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

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

Statements

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

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

8. Planning and Development

The following items were considered:

a. Planning Application Number 17/04263/F - Redland High School

An amendment sheet was provided to the Committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-

1. The application was for the redevelopment of the former school into residential use for 43 dwellings with a mix of number of bedrooms;



2. Strong objections were received from Historic England, BCC City Design, the Georgian Group and other amenity groups regarding the loss of heritage assets. Planning officers considered the objections and concluded that there was less than substantial harm;
3. No objections were made to the demolition of the east range, the removal of the Sports Hall and the reinstatement of the Belvedere Terrace which were considered positive elements of the proposal;
4. It was acknowledged that the proposal would impact on the silhouette and prominence of the main building on the skyline. However, the view of the building from the south would be significantly improved by the removal of the large Sports Hall, reinstatement of the cupola, and the removal of the ancillary tennis structures with the return of the landscaped garden;
5. There was no design objection by officers to the proposed town houses and the scale next to the science block was considered acceptable. The main issue was the impact on neighbouring houses with overshadowing to the North and objections from local residents had been received. A light assessment was undertaken and it found there would be a suitable level of daylight but officers accepted there would be a significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers;
6. Officers were comfortable with the overlooking on Woodstock Road;
7. Regarding the West Villa, officers agreed that this would have a negative impact on the setting and views of the main building and the 'secret garden';
5. There would be a new vehicular access point and 44 on-site car parking spaces sub-divided into 18 within the existing external courtyard, 17 within the basement and 4 adjacent to the frontage of the properties on Woodstock Road, with the remaining in the form of garages to the town houses. Traffic calming would be provided along Redland Court Road;
6. In summary, the impacts from the less than substantial harm should be given considerable weight and the Committee had to consider whether there were other material planning considerations and public benefits that were sufficient to outweigh that harm;
7. The Planning Obligations Manager stated that the primary issue for this application in relation to affordable housing was viability. The applicant had bought the site for £7.4m unconditionally and without the benefit of it being allocated for housing in the Local Plan or the site having residential planning permission. On a per unit basis, the amount paid was significantly more than comparable sites that traded with planning permission. The applicant's viability consultant stated that the Site Value was £5.4m, £2m less than the applicant had paid for it. A key consideration when bidding for a Site was government guidance and Local Plan policies. There was no evidence that the applicant had taken account of affordable housing policies. The Council's consultant concluded the site's existing use value as a school was unknown as there was a limited market for the sale of educational establishments for their continued use as schools. The conversion of the site for residential purposes therefore represented the optimum use of the site and valued it as Alternative Use Value with policy compliant use of 40% affordable housing at £3.118m. However, this would need to be increased in order to incentivise the site to come forward for redevelopment and it was considered that £4.3m was appropriate and would generate a surplus of £1.6m. The applicant in their initial application made an off-site offer of £115,000 and on 18 December this was increased to £500,000, then on 21 December it was increased to £750,000 which was £250,000 higher and the equivalent of holding costs during the period for pursuing an appeal if planning permission was refused. The applicant had been adamant that it was not possible to provide affordable housing, only an off-site contribution. However, an offer was received the day before this meeting of on-site provision of 12% (5 units) and was subject to a Housing Association taking the site on. This was welcomed by



officers and showed a willingness to make progress and should be given due weight by the Committee. However, Officers stood by the robust Consultant's report and that £1.6m which would provide 10 units representing 23% affordable housing remained the position, and that the application should be refused for the lack of affordable housing;

8. Officers therefore concluded that the application be refused for harm to heritage assets and for lack of affordable housing.

The following points arose from discussion:-

1. The Chair stated that he had visited the site and greatly admired the building. He felt it would be a great shame to allow such an historic building to deteriorate if planning permission was not granted. He did not believe the value of the site was a big issue. He would vote against the officer recommendation to refuse;
2. Officers confirmed that they were not comfortable with the level of development and its impact on heritage assets and on the sub division of the main building;
3. Councillor Eddy did not understand the concerns for the price paid for the land and its perceived value. He believed this was a unique application that would preserve and enhance a grade II* listed building and meet some of the city's housing needs. The development did not impact negatively on neighbours and was in a good location. If this did not proceed the site would be left for years and the listed buildings would deteriorate. Finally, he believed that the applicant's offer for affordable housing was satisfactory in this unique circumstance;
4. Councillor Davies asked whether site ratios took account of Grade II* listed buildings and was informed that they often did not. Developers had to bid high to secure land but a guide for land value was planning policies and therefore a bid should be based on providing 30/40% affordable housing. If a site did not have planning permission the risk was increased. In this case, the value was out of kilter with other sites with planning permission;
5. Councillor Stevens noted that 1400 square feet was a big area and it might be possible to increase the gross number of affordable housing units. The Planning Obligations Manager replied that officers had to assess what was before them. The vast number of units were larger than standard which provided better living conditions;
6. In response to an enquiry regarding the likely success of an appeal, the Head of Development Management replied that this was a judgement call, officers stood by their recommendations following careful assessment and internal debate;
7. Councillor Wright did not feel the site was overdeveloped – the bulk, mass and numbers were just about acceptable. He agreed with the viability appraisal. He was minded to abstain at this point. He would vote to refuse if it was on the basis of insufficient affordable housing only;
8. Councillor Sergeant had sympathy for neighbours but on balance accepted the development. However, she could not accept the level of affordable housing and suggested that the applicant could make an off-site contribution to push towards the amount officers sought, which might persuade her to vote against the officer recommendation;
9. Councillor Brook did not feel the proposal was overdeveloped but the viability was an issue. The developer had paid too much and had not taken account of affordable housing policy. He did not expect



40% but the current offer was too low. He would vote to refuse the application if only on the grounds of lack of affordable housing and he supported Councillor Sergeant's suggestion that an additional offer off-site could be made;

10. Councillor Eddy proposed a one-year planning consent. He wanted the application to proceed as soon as possible;

11. Councillor Clarke supported Councillor Sergeant's suggestion. The only reason to refuse the application would be on the level of affordable housing offered;

12. Councillor Stevens noted that the density of the development drove the ability to make money. He was minded to put forward an amendment that the application be refused on the grounds of the level of affordable housing;

13. Councillor Sergeant noted that if the number of units was increased on site, the size of the units would have to be reduced and therefore off-site provision might be better. She also expressed some concern about this becoming a gated community and suggested a condition regarding access to the site by the public on specific occasions ;

14. The Head of Development Management acknowledged the clear steer from the Committee on not refusing the application on the grounds of harm to heritage assets. He advised that it would be better to positively decide on the application by the following:-

- Referring the application to the Secretary of State because of the Grade II* listed building element and;
- Instruct officers to negotiate a s106 agreement for an affordable housing contribution to include an on-site offer and an additional off-site offer of £925,000 and an obligation regarding the access to the site on specific occasions. He added that it would be more problematic to reduce the size of units in order to increase numbers as that was redesigning the scheme.

15. The Planning Obligations Manager added that applicant had calculated 5 units on shared ownership providing a £750,000 contribution which left a shortfall of £925,000 to reach the £1.6m contribution recommended by the consultants. Granting on this basis would give the applicant an opportunity to move forward but they could also appeal the decision;

16. Councillor Clarke supported the on-site contribution but believed the off-site contribution was too large a burden for the developer but agreed an additional offer should be made;

17. It was noted that the profit was likely to be 20% and the provision of affordable housing would come out of their profit which was likely to be in the region of £6m;

18. Councillor Wright supported the officer advice but felt the off-site amount was implausible. He suggested that £750,000 which doubled the on-site offer was satisfactory;

19. Councillor Steven moved that the application be referred to the Secretary of State with respect to the Grade II* listed building and that permission be granted subject to conditions and a S106 agreement relating to TRO's, 5 shared ownership affordable housing units on site and an off- site affordable housing contribution of £750,000. This was seconded by Councillor Brook. On being put to the vote it was:-

Resolved (10 for, 0 against, One Councillor did not take part) –



1. That the application together with responses to the publicity and consultations, the Committee report and members' comments be referred to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

If the Secretary of State makes no comment within the 21 day period from receipt of notification, then planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

2. That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement relating to TRO's, 5 shared ownership affordable housing units on site and an off- site affordable housing contribution of £750,000.

b. Planning Application Number 16/06594/P - Land At the Adjoining Callowhill Court, Broadmead and the Horsefair

An amendment sheet was provided to the Committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-

1. The wider planning context when considering the application was set out. The Call-In Public Inquiry relating to proposals at Cribbs Causeway in South Gloucestershire had taken place towards the end of last year. Whilst the Inquiry hearings ended back in September, the Inspector held open the Inquiry until the new year (primarily to consider new transport modelling evidence) and the Inquiry remained open until early February. The Callowhill Court application had last been considered in September and a decision was deferred. The Committee now had an opportunity for Bristol City Council as Local Planning Authority to take a view on this application and express its support whilst the Call-In Inspector was able to receive further evidence and representations before making a recommendation to the Secretary of State on the Mall expansion planning application.

2. IT WAS COMMONLY RECOGNISED THAT THERE WOULD 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 THIS APPLICATION SITE. THE RETAIL-LED MIXED USE REDEVELOPMENT OF THE BRISTOL SHOPPING QUARTER WAS SUPPORTED BY POLICIES WITHIN THE ADOPTED BRISTOL LOCAL PLAN WHICH WAS OUR DEVELOPMENT PLAN, PARTICULARLY:

- **POLICY BSC2 OF THE CORE STRATEGY (BRISTOL CITY CENTRE'S ROLE AS A REGIONAL CENTRE TO BE PROMOTED AND STRENGTHENED)**
- **POLICY BCAP 13 OF THE CENTRAL AREA PLAN (MAJOR RETAIL GROWTH TO BE FOCUSED ON SITES IN THE BRISTOL SHOPPING QUARTER)**
- **POLICY BCAP 36 OF THE CENTRAL AREA PLAN (THE HORSEFAIR & CALLOWHILL COURT ALLOCATED FOR MAJOR RETAIL-LED MIXED USE REDEVELOPMENT)**



It was very important that the Secretary of State's Planning Inspector received a clear message from the City Council about its support for the redevelopment of the site in central Bristol, so that the Inspector could weigh this up when advising the SoS on the proposals at Cribbs Causeway.

3. The Committee in September resolved to defer as follows:

"...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."

4. Since then the Applicants have amended the application in the following respects:

- Revised customer vehicular access arrangement is proposed – access was still to be taken from Bond Street, but no longer included circulation access via Brunswick Square. Access to the proposed multi-storey car park would be via a new signalised junction from Bond Street, with a right-in/left-out arrangement
- A reduction in car parking spaces from 580 to 380 spaces.
- The controlling parameter plans to be approved have been updated and included a reduction in height for the blocks on Bond Street and Merchant Street. The detailed design would follow in subsequent reserved matters application(s) which would evolve the illustrative ideas included within the application documents.
- A new pedestrian link from Bond Street had been included.

Additional information relating to this had been submitted, including the submission of an addendum to the Environmental Statement, and a further round of consultation had been undertaken. Also, Air Quality had now been fully assessed.

5. The Transport Development Manager set out the revised transport arrangements. The recommendations were based on evidence derived from network-wide traffic modelling using the Council's microsimulation program. The originally submitted scheme was not supported as the impact of 1,000 parking spaces and an all-movements junction was unacceptable;

6. The revised scheme that came to committee in September was for a reduced car park of 580 spaces with vehicle entry via York Street only and exits (in both directions) to Bond Street. The applicant and officers had taken account of the Committee's decision and a number of changes were now proposed. The fundamental changes were: the right turn lane into the car park from Bond Street; the removal of the right-turn out onto Bond Street and the reduction in spaces to 380, of which 292 were new spaces (88 being relocated from elsewhere). Bond Street;

7. There is an existing pedestrian Toucan Crossing to the east of the access which is part of the SCOOT system and therefore, the signal access to/from the car park would work in conjunction with the crossings to minimise the amount of red time for through traffic. The SCOOT system prioritises major routes over side roads and therefore officers were satisfied (with associated management of the right turn lane) that this would not have a detrimental impact upon Bond Street. There was a condition requiring this lane to be closed on occasions to prevent tail backs to St James Barton. The applicant had modelled the junction and the queues were not forecast to overrun with the 380 spaces;



8. The amount of green time on the left turn out was 8 seconds in an 80 second cycle time;
10. Contributions had been obtained for works between Stokes Croft and York Street in order to get cyclists safely across the dual carriageway and this had been reflected in the condition, as there were still a number of outstanding matters before the design can be finalised in detail.;
11. The Local Plan maximum standard for a car park for the net additional uses proposed is 1250. The 380 space car park was therefore a 70% reduction. There are 88 existing parking spaces being relocated to the new car park from Horsefair, Penn Street, Callowhill Court and Cabot Circus Car Park and Penn Street. The undercroft at Cabot Circus has 42 of the above spaces and is proposed to provide space to accommodate the relocation of coaches boarding and alighting facilities which would be subject to a new application;
12. A Parking survey was undertaken on 25 November 2017 and considered the worst case scenario when the highway network and parking provision is at greatest (worst-case) demand. Accepting the high peak, there were other occasions when the car parks filled up;
13. A key issue to consider with regard the increase in parking was that the development would bring expenditure to Bristol and with increased leisure uses dwell times would increase, therefore leading to existing car parks remaining full for longer;
14. The trip generation was set out in the report. Additional activity would mean additional traffic and without an additional car park, there would be additional traffic congestion caused by motorists circulating the central area to find parking spaces to that already being experienced;
15. The impact forecasts were set out in the report. There would be a very small increase in queuing from the car park and modelling supported that and it was not therefore possible to justify refusal on that basis;
16. As a Regional Shopping Centre there would be significant contributions to CIL which could be channelled towards the wider public transport improvements specified in the Joint Spatial Plan and its accompanying Joint Transport Strategy such as Park and Ride, Rapid Transit and improved rail facilities. The application provided a balance for motorists but safeguarded other modes. If the Horsefair and Penn Street is to benefit from pedestrianisation, traffic movements, including deliveries, disabled parking and public transport has had to be relocated elsewhere;
17. Detailed analysis of public transport had been undertaken and concluded that the scheme was workable and therefore compatible with the emerging City Centre Movement Strategy, which is also considering the potential of a right turn from Lewins Mead into Union Street, which would reverse the current one-way order to become southbound for buses only, freeing up further kerb space for additional bus stops.
18. Work was still needed on the East to West cycle routes. 3-4 cycle hubs providing 670 cycle parking spaces were proposed. It was proposed to make a feature of these hubs to stand out and attract users;
19. In summary, the following key aspects to the proposal were highlighted:

- There was more detail to come regarding delivery service and waste strategy, subject to a condition;
- Signage and Wayfinding would be conditioned;
- A Construction Management Plan was conditioned;
- Off-site works would be phased;
- Potential access from Lewins Mead into Union Street (southbound);
- A cycle route on Bond Street and Horsefair;
- A full Travel Plan for all users;
- There would be zero parking for the residential development save a car club and disabled residents;
- TV screens and digital advertising would be subject to a condition to prevent glare / distraction to motorists;
- A Section 106 obligation for bus shelters, RTI and raised kerbs;



- Section 106 contributions identified for cycle routes;
- A section 106 contribution for VMS/driver information;
- Travel Plan monitoring which could now be done in-house, and requires a section 106 contribution;
- CIL contributions had not yet been quantified.

20. The Head of Development Management concluded that the Committee would need to give weight to the following:-

- The proposals were Development plan and NPPF compliant and there was a S.38(6) statutory duty on the Council to determine in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise.
- The impact upon heritage assets was in a form consistent with legislation and in particular NPPF i.e. none/enhancement or 'less than substantial harm' with significant public benefits balance.
- The environmental impacts of significance and their mitigation was acceptable.
- The benefits that would flow from the development.

The following points arose from discussion:-

1. All Reserved Matters would come before a Committee;
2. The S106 agreement required a 40% level of Affordable Housing. The outline application could not be more than 150 units in total but this was often amended in a subsequent application so could be higher;
3. Councillor Davies noted that the Bristol Cycling Campaign found the scheme unacceptable at the Horsefair. The Development Transport Manager reported that the junction had been designed next to a Toucan crossing in order to address where cyclists crossed. Work was underway on getting cyclists off Stokes Croft and onto quiet routes such as York Street and Brunswick Square and through to Penn Street which would be safe and traffic free. Fairfax Street was also being considered for a cycle route given the flat nature of this route;
4. A west facing car park was best suited for the geographic spread of customers and kept traffic on the major road network and provided better access from the west and kept traffic off of the network;
5. There was no change to the application with regards to the retention of 5 trees. These trees would either have a TPO or other mechanism to protect them;
6. S106 arrangements would ensure that the land was maintained by the new developer;
7. Councillor Stevens referred to the flows of traffic into the car park at different times of day and calculated that it would only be 40% full from 12-3. The Transport Development Manager replied that this car park would have longer dwell times and forecasts indicated it would (at busiest times) be full by 11am, drawing on the survey data collected. Councillor Stevens questioned the robustness of the traffic flow modelling and referred to BCAP 29 paragraph 7.15. He believed this policy had not been adhered to in this proposal as this was more than an element of car park. The Transport Development Manager stated that more work was needed in respect of accumulation at early times, but again referred to the evidence collected in November that car parks fill up and this is to the detriment of the free flow of traffic around the City Centre. It was important to be clear on classifications – 7/8 hours for long stay and 2/3 for short stay. The Head of Development Management added that this proposal was not contrary to BCAP 29



which referenced a 'sustainable means of transport, particularly short stay but not exclusively' and had an 'important part to play in supporting retail policy particularly leisure'; The Transport Development Manager added that the proposal was not comprising private long-stay parking, but public short-stay parking. Current dwell times at Cabot Circus are between 90 minutes and 3 hours which, if subject to an increase raises the issues of additional congestion due to traffic circulation.

8. Councillor Mead appreciated the importance of the development. He asked whether the developer could guarantee that the development would go ahead prior to Cribbs Causeway as he had seen a press article regarding the merger of the two developers. He asked whether the S106 agreement could include road improvements to enable buses to navigate new routes. He felt that the car park being used only as an overflow for Cabot Circus discriminated disabled users as it would not be accessible at times when not required, given the number of spaces provided for disabled users within the car park. The Chair asked the developer's representative if they would wish to respond. The representative commented that the press article referred to an intention, a number of steps would be required before a merger. At this time both corporate entities remained separate;

9. Councillor Sergeant referred to the zero parking for residents but noted that residents were often assured that this could be overcome. She was informed that the advice included on this development would request that parking permits were not to be issued and that the RPS orders were being updated to reflect new developments. She also referred to the lack of diversity in the units which would be large chains only, how difficult it would be to compete with Cribbs Causeway because parking was free and the pressure for the Council to improve on air quality, the possibility of increasing car parking charges if public transport improved and the waiting times on lights of 8 seconds. The Transport Development Manager responded that the cycle time modelled was 80 seconds from start to finish, 62 seconds to the main road, 8 to turn left. Modelling had been undertaken on air quality and its impact and the proposal could not be refused for the reason of traffic congestion. He added that it was well documented and modelling compared to Cribbs Causeway demonstrated how the same level of net additional development at The Mall at Cribbs Causeway was forecast to generate ten times the amount of net additional traffic of the Callowhill Court scheme (using The Mall's own figures)

The Head of Development Management added that there was no specific policy on diversity for A1 units for this site, however this could be influenced in other localities;

10. Councillor Stevens referred to disabled parking in the overflow car park and asked whether this could be overcome by shifting access to the goods vehicle route. He was informed that this would raise concerns regarding the operation of the bus lane when waiting for the bollards to be lowered and would lead to regular blockage of buses in addition to the requirements of delivery vehicles to access the premises;

11. Councillor Eddy welcomed the proposal noting it had been awaited for years. He hoped the Committee would fully support it. He feared that if any element was not supported it would send out a message that Broadmead was closed for business and the public should go to Cribbs Causeway;

12. Councillor Wright believed that that the proposal was now good enough. He had considered the suggestion of the car park as an overflow but believed this was much worse as a prime piece of land in the City Centre would be left empty for 90% of the time. He would vote in support of the proposal;

13. Councillor Mead supported the proposal, and in particular the Quakers Friars enhancement. He asked that consideration be given to the concerns of the Cycling Campaign's concerns, the routing of buses for easy access, disabled access in the car park;



14. Councillor Davies acknowledged the compromise in this application and the applicant's constructive response. He would vote for the application;
15. Councillor Clarke supported the proposal except for the car park and believed the car park as an overflow was a good solution. The car park would lead to even greater air quality and congestion problems than currently experienced;
16. Councillor Brook noted the compromise and the applicant had taken into account the Committee's concerns. On balance, he would vote for the application;
17. Councillor Stevens acknowledged that the development needed to go ahead but wanted improvements in modelling, stating that air quality would lead to more deaths;
18. Councillor Mead moved the officer recommendations to grant and this was seconded by Councillor Eddy;
19. Councillor Clarke moved an amendment that the car park be used only as an overflow in the event that Cabot Circus is 90% full and this was seconded by Councillor Stevens. The amendment was put to the vote and it was lost (3 for, 6 against, 1 abstention). The substantive motion was then put to the vote and it was:-

Resolved (8 for, 2 abstentions) – That planning permission be granted subject to a legal agreement and conditions as set out in the report.

Councillor Hickman left the meeting during the debate for this item.

c. Planning Application Number 17/04132/F - Olympia House, 36-38 Beaconsfield Road, St George

Councillor Eddy left the meeting.

9. 17/04132/F – Olympia House, 36 – 38, Beaconsfield Road, St. George.

The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-

1. The application had been referred to Committee by Councillor Asher Craig;
2. This application was for full planning permission for the redevelopment of Olympia House to provide 26 residential flats whilst retaining the historic and architecturally important elements of the site;
3. The rearshed-like structures would be demolished to facilitate a 12 space car park and a new build of 4 flats;
4. The development also included refuse and bicycle storage and a landscaped area adjacent to Beaconsfield Road;
5. The number of units proposed triggered the Affordable Housing policy but as the building was vacant it benefited from Vacant Building Credit and was not therefore obliged to provide affordable housing. This fact should not be held against it when considering the application;



6. The objections received related to residential amenity including noise, disturbance and privacy, the amount of the proposed development and its impact on on-street parking, the lack of affordable housing and the lack of 3 bedroom units;
7. A condition requiring windows to be glazed on the elevation over-looking residences and even without that condition, officers believed the overlooking was acceptable;
8. A Construction Management Plan condition would ensure that buildings were demolished as the area was developed so that there would not be a large number of vehicles and cranes on site at one time;
9. The applicant had submitted information that the 12 parking spaces could accommodate the 26 flats and a survey of nearby streets showed that there was capacity for overspill parking. A TRO would ensure that there would be no parking near or at the junction of the site so as not to cause disruption;
10. The renewable energy target was not quite met given the nature of the proposal. There was a condition requiring solar panels;
11. In summary, the conversion was sensitive, the 26 flats would help the housing supply and the development benefited from Vacant Building Credit. Officers recommended grant subject to conditions and a legal agreement and a contribution to the TRO's.

The following points arose from discussion:-

1. Councillor Sergeant questioned the level of parking provision given the development was not in the City Centre and was informed that the development was within walking distance of Church Road which was considered a distinct centre and was therefore sustainable. It was accepted that parking was limited but there was sufficient parking near the site for overspill;
2. The site was advertised for use for 12 months since the date of the report;
3. Officers would have preferred more 3 bedroom units but the applicant had increased the number so was on balance better;
4. Councillor Stevens stated that electric heating was wasteful and a rough deal for owners and asked whether a condition requiring ground source heat pumps had been considered. He was referred to Condition 16 which required the applicant to provide details of the proposed heating controls to minimise energy use;
5. A number of conditions imposed provided sufficient controls to ensure the development was carried out as proposed. If not developed as planned enforcement measures could be used;
6. Councillor Davies did not accept that the developer could not meet the 20% reduction Carbon Dioxide emissions from residual energy use. He also shared concerns about parking and suggested that the application be deferred and a less intensive proposal be submitted;
7. Councillor Clarke agreed with the previous comments regarding 20% reduction in Carbon Dioxide.
7. Councillor Mead believed the site was not appropriate for an intensive housing development and that it lent itself more to an artist's studio and that criteria A & B argument regarding its use for employment had not been properly made. He asked that the application be refused; The Head of Development Management responded that the policy test had been met. There had been a limited number of enquiries when marketed. It was not possible to hold out for a wider aspiration and refusing the application on that basis would be difficult to defend;



8. Councillor Sergeant did not support the application as she believed it would lead to increased traffic congestion as there were insufficient spaces in the car park. She acknowledged the lack of affordable housing was not a reason to refuse but was nevertheless disappointed that there was none;
9. Councillor Brook stated that the site was not overdeveloped and there was a need to densify in order to meet housing targets. He noted there was insufficient parking but there was a need to reduce car use and there were good public transport links. The loss of privacy had been well conditioned. There were no grounds to refuse the application;
10. Councillor Stevens asked if Condition 16 could be enhanced to ensure the 20% reduction in CO₂;
11. Councillor Wright stated that there were some issues with the application but not enough to merit refusal. He added the 20% reduction should be imposed as a minimum. He would vote for the approval of the application;
12. Councillor Brook moved the recommendations as set out in the report with the addition of an amendment to Condition 16 to ensure the 20% reduction in Carbon Dioxide emissions from residual energy use was met and this was seconded by Councillor Stevens. On being to the vote, it was:

Resolved (6 for, 3 against) – That planning permission be granted subject to a Section 106 agreement and conditions as set out in the report save for an amendment to condition 16 so that the condition also requires the development to provide sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from residual energy use in the building(s) by at least 20% as required by Core Strategy policy BCS14.

9. Date of Next Meeting

21 February 2018 at 10am

Meeting ended at Time Not Specified

CHAIR _____

