



# West of England Partnership

Bath & North East  
Somerset Council



North  
Somerset  
COUNCIL

South Gloucestershire  
Council

## Minutes of meeting of the

## Planning, Housing and Communities Board

Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> March 2010, 2.30pm The Campus, Weston-super-Mare

### Present

Cllr Charles Gerrish	Bath and North East Somerset Council
Cllr Vic Pritchard	Bath and North East Somerset Council
Cllr Mark Wright	Bristol City Council
Cllr Elfan Ap Rees	North Somerset Council
Cllr Mathew Riddle (Chair)	South Gloucestershire Council
Cllr Brian Allinson	South Gloucestershire Council

### In Attendance

David Trigwell	Bath and North East Somerset Council
Zoe Willcox	Bristol City Council
Nick Hooper	Bristol City Council
Karuna Tharmananthar	North Somerset Council
Karen Ross	South Gloucestershire Council
Barbara Maksymiw	South Gloucestershire Council
Terry Wagstaff	West of England Partnership
Tim Lansley	West of England Partnership
Laura Grady	West of England Partnership

### 1. Apologies for absence

### Action

Apologies were received from Dave Crook (GOSW).

### 2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

### 3. Member and Public Forum

There were no public forum items.

#### **4. Minutes of meeting held on 15 February 2010**

The minutes were agreed as a true record.

#### **5. Matters arising from the minutes**

Cllr Riddle indicated that he would be writing to CLG about insufficient government funding for grant support for disabled facilities, if further clarification of the position was not secured from GOSW. TL/DC/Cllr Riddle

The post of Housing Co-ordinator for a 12-month period would be advertised openly.

#### **5. Joint Waste Core Strategy**

LG advised that responses from some 36 organisations had been received from the consultation of the Submission Draft of the Strategy. SW Councils had indicated that they consider the draft to be sound while GOSW had offered a similar view subject to clarification of a few concerns.

A number of concerns had been expressed about the approach to landfill related to the capacity available to manage waste and the flexibility of the Strategy in respect of this issue.

LG confirmed that Bristol City Council would be defending the absence of St Philips from the list of areas identified as suitable for waste management.

In response to concerns expressed about the pressure for waste management facilities at Avonmouth, LG advised that national and European policy prevented any planning restrictions being placed on such proposals on the basis of the need for waste capacity. Any refusal would need to be based on other planning considerations.

TW advised that further legal advice on this issue would be secured.

It was agreed that officers would consider further legal advice and other information recently received on landfill capacity. A report on the issues arising would be made to the Partnership Board. Any outstanding issues would be reported to a further meeting of the Planning, Housing and Communities Board in April. LG/TW

#### **6. Infrastructure and Delivery Investment Plan**

LG advised that the Plan is likely to address three topic areas- infrastructure, green infrastructure and strategic urban design considerations, and that further consideration will be given to the relationship of the proposed plan with other planning documents.

LG confirmed that the Plan would give support to the delivery of the draft RSS (June 2006) dwelling targets over the next 5 years and would serve to re-affirm the development trajectory for the area support by the councils.

Concerns were expressed about the need for a clear justification for the

content of the Plan and the benefits arising from securing SPD status, and the implications for the timetable for securing an agreed document. The need to consult with GOSW and 'Heads of Planning' in order to secure consistency with Core Strategies was highlighted.

TW advised that the broad content of the proposed Plan reflected a commitment made by the authorities in securing 'Growth Points' funding which was in turn reflected by the MAA.

## **7. Industrial land requirements in the wider Bristol area**

TL advised that the report addressed industrial land requirements arising at Avonmouth/Sevenside and separately, across the remainder of the wider Bristol area. He advised that pressures for large scale industrial development at Avonmouth/Sevenside are likely to continue, that accommodating in full these pressures would require resolution of major flood risk and highway concerns, requiring in turn a development strategy and major public investment.

TL advised that across the wider Bristol area beyond Avonmouth/Sevenside, new industrial development comprised a mix of redevelopments, extensions and changes of use of existing development, and the take-up of new mainly Greenfield sites. Over the last 20 years, the former had accounted for about 180 ha of development and the latter about 120 ha. Relocations of local businesses, service, supply and distribution depots generally serving the wider Bristol market account for much of the new development undertaken. Currently about 50-55 ha of industrial land is allocated leading to the potential for a shortfall in capacity to meet future requirements over the medium and longer-term if past development trends are maintained.

Cllr Ap Rees advised that a large amount of industrial land is coming forward at Weston-super-Mare, that this could meet any Bristol shortfall and that to provide for further expansion opportunity in the Bristol area would lead to continuing over-concentration of development on Bristol.

Cllr Allinson advised that further provision for development could only be made if supported by investment in new infrastructure.

Cllr Pritchard indicated that past trends with industrial development were unlikely to be maintained over the future and that instead new industrial development would be more likely to require less space and support fewer jobs. Cllrs Gerrish and Pritchard highlighted the need to make full use of brownfield sites and that Greenfield releases would lead to under-use of existing industrial sites.

Other concerns raised related to the need to resist developer pressures that conflicted with brownfield and town centre regeneration. Concerns were also expressed about the need to safeguard existing industrial areas and sites from pressures for other developments.

TW highlighted concerns that the failure to meet industrial investment requirements could lead to a loss of potential jobs and new investment from the sub-region. He advised that further reports on this issue would be made to

the Board.