Purpose of the report:

The purpose of the report is to update Cabinet on progress in the project and to seek approval of a number of recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION for Cabinet approval:

That Cabinet

1. Approves the Community Vision.

2. Delegates the Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and City Development in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to approve the terms of a future Developers Brief.

3. Delegates authority to the Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and City Development and Service Director, Finance in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration to enter into a development agreement and any ancillary contract(s) with a development partner following relevant tender processes with bidders to carry out the redevelopment of Carriageworks/Westmoreland House, Stokes Croft

4. That subject to:
   a) The prior completion of an appropriate indemnity agreement with a selected development partner as to CPO costs
   b) The council and the development partner entering a Development Agreement
   c) A planning consent being secured or an application having been made that is considered to have an acceptable prospect securing consent
then
i) the Council shall make a Compulsory Purchase Order or Orders under Section 226(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and if so required Section 13 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 and/or under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (exact powers to be exercised shall be subject to further detailed legal advice) all within 24 months from the date hereof, for the acquisition of land edged black as shown in Appendix 1, for the purposes of comprehensive re-development of the site.

ii) That the Head of Legal Services be authorised to take all necessary steps to secure the making, confirmation and implementation of the Compulsory Purchase Order and to acquire the order land including any steps necessary to agree and pay compensation including negotiating and entering into agreements or undertakings with land owners setting out the terms for the withdrawal of the objections to the order, including where appropriate seeking exclusion of land from the order.

The proposal:

1. In a report to Cabinet on 3 March 2011 a recommendation was agreed as follows:

   “1. That Cabinet agrees to the strategy set out in the report

   2. Agrees in principle the use of compulsory purchase powers in order to ensure that the site of Westmoreland House/Old Carriage Works at 104-106 Stokes Croft and 4 Ashley Road is brought back into beneficial use.”

2. The strategy in that Report sought to acquire the property by negotiated agreement and failing that by Compulsory Purchase. The council would seek a development partner to provide the certainty on financial and deliverability issues.

3. Since March 2011 significant progress has been made towards achieving the overall strategy that continues to move forward on several as reported below.

Community Vision

4. In early 2011 it was decided in discussion with community groups that a Stakeholder Group should be set up to work with the council. This umbrella group represents all the main stakeholders and groups within the communities affected by the site. The group proposed a consultation exercise to identify a community vision for the site. The vision should complement planning policy, in particular SPD10.

5. Between September and December 2011 extensive consultation took place. The outcome was the Community Vision document at Appendix 2. The methodology of the consultation is set out in that document.

6. The vision was unanimously agreed by the Stakeholder Group at its meeting on 15 December 2011. The meeting discussed and recorded its feelings on the exercise. Generally, the feedback on the process was positive and agreed the consultation had been well carried out and was a success (see Appendix 3).

7. It is proposed that the level of liaison with the Stakeholder Group (now named the
Carriageworks Action Group - CAG) be maintain throughout the project.

**Appointment of Property Consultants**

8. In March 2012 GVA was selected to act as the council’s development consultants to the project. External advisors are required due to the extent and complexity of issues that would affect the project. For example, site/development appraisal, the CPO process, developer selection, procurement and development agreement.

9. GVA reviewed and supported the strategy the council is adopting to secure development of the site. The full report is commercially sensitive but is available to members of Cabinet on request. The report’s conclusion is

“In conclusion we recommend that the Council resolve to use their compulsory purchase powers to bring about the regeneration of this site in accordance with planning policy.

A development partner should be sought by competitive tender in accordance with EU procurement regulations who will be required to enter into a conditional development agreement with the Council subject to planning permission and CPO. A more defined programme and CPO strategy will evolve following the selection of a development partner.

Negotiations should continue with the current owners throughout the process in an attempt to secure the acquisition of the site.”

10. One of GVA’s first actions was to approach the owner to try and start negotiations to acquire the site by agreement.

**Approach to Owner**

11. GVA met the owner on 14 April. The meeting confirmed that the owner sought a price that was far in excess of the council’s opinion of value. It is considered that the difference is too wide to enable negotiations to be successful. It is therefore considered likely that Compulsory Purchase powers will be needed to support site acquisition. Nonetheless negotiations to acquire by agreement will continue even if a CPO is made.

**Compulsory Purchase Resolution**

12. For the reason given in the previous section it is considered necessary at this time to seek a resolution from Cabinet to make a CPO. This will support a further approach to the owner that will be made as the overall strategy for the project continues to move forward. If that approach also fails then it is proposed that steps commence to make and secure Secretary of States approval to a CPO following the selection of a development partner and the satisfaction of the following conditions:

a) The prior completion of an appropriate indemnity agreement with a selected development partner as to CPO costs

b) The council and the developer entering a Development Agreement

c) A planning consent being secured or an application having been made that is considered to have an acceptable prospect securing consent.
Procurement Approach

13. The current intention is to procure the works and services required to regenerate the site using a competitive dialogue approach (a multi-stage process which allows the Council to negotiate with prospective developers in a competitive environment). At the end of the competitive dialogue process, the Council will enter into a development agreement with a developer to provide the regeneration works.

Developers Brief

14. To progress redevelopment BCC with the support of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and in partnership with the Carriageworks Action Group (CAG) will seek a development partner that can take forward a commercially viable inner city mixed used scheme.

15. BCC’s main aims and objectives for securing the redevelopment of the Westmoreland House/Carriageworks site are set out in the approved project business plan as follows:

- To address a long standing derelict site on a major gateway into the city centre, a ‘key’ priority for the Council.
- To secure ownership of Westmoreland House/Carriageworks
- To deliver the Community Vision objectives developed by the Carriageworks Action Group and to be approved by Cabinet.
- To secure a high quality development of the Carriageworks a Grade II* listed building of architectural and historic significance to the city.
- To bring back into productive use a site of significant visual and economic impact which has long blighted this major route way into the city centre and its adjacent mixed inner city communities.
- To attract new investment to secure the economic, physical and environmental revitalisation of the Stokes Croft area of the city currently suffering from deprivation and long-term economic decline.
- Create an integrated mixed tenure scheme which addresses the housing needs in SPD10 by a residential led mixed use scheme that seeks to include employment generating uses.
- To engage effective community involvement in the design, delivery and management of the final scheme
16. Re-development proposals should provide a mix of uses that include commercial, retail, leisure and residential.

- Redevelopment should reflect the diverse mix of uses in the area, while striking a balance between community spaces, commercial and residential. It should also seek to contribute to the economic viability and hence the vitality of the area.

- Residential development should include a mix of unit sizes and tenures that address housing demand and the shortfall of affordable housing and other imbalances that exist in the area. Hostel and student accommodation is considered inappropriate due to its unsuitability and over concentration in the area.

- Retail or other uses, appropriate to a secondary retail frontage (Class A1 to A3), of acceptable scale and size will be required along the Stokes Croft frontage. This could include galleries and display space.

- Employment uses related to the creative industries, graphic design, multi-media or other similar uses, probably within Class B1 could also be acceptable on ground and upper floors along the Stokes Croft frontage and/or elsewhere within the development site.

- Community uses related to leisure and employment uses may be required, although this could be ancillary to the principle use. The Community Vision for the site identifies a local aspiration for community uses and recognises that these could be provided in a broad range of flexible uses that are accessible to the community such as business units, shops, arts space, cafes, performance space and meeting spaces.

17. A development brief will reflect the above issues and will be prepared by the Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods and City Development in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing, Property and Regeneration.

**Consultation and scrutiny input:**

a. **Internal consultation:**
   - Legal Services
   - Compulsory Purchase; OJEU/Procurement; Contract
   - Affordable Housing Development Manager - NH - Strategic Housing
   - Scrutiny via party whips
   - Service Director Strategic Housing, NH

b. **External consultation:**
   - English Heritage
   - Homes and Communities Agency
   - Carriageworks Action Group
Other options considered:
The report to Cabinet of 3 March 2011 set out the various options that had been considered or acted upon.

- Attempts have been made over the last two decades to purchase the site by agreement or to encourage the owner to develop. None has been successful.
- Select a development partner to advance a scheme to form the basis for a purchase by agreement or CPO. This was attempted in 2006/7 but the market recession caused the developer to withdraw.
- Compulsory Purchase. The council has considered this in the past on several occasions (in 1992 the Planning Committee considered a report to CPO). This route needs a deliverable scheme and a development partner if a CPO is to be secured. The option to make a CPO to support site assembly will only be used if it is not possible to purchase the site by agreement.
- Do nothing and leave the site to the market to solve. This has not produced any results in the last 20 years.

Risk management / assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>INHERENT RISK</th>
<th>RISK CONTROL MEASURES</th>
<th>CURRENT RISK</th>
<th>RISK OWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the report</td>
<td>(Before controls)</td>
<td>Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation)</td>
<td>(After controls)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Failure to select development partner</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Robust and inclusive selection process</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lack of agreement on proposed scheme</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Full and effective consultation. Ensure Community Vision embedded in scheme</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dealing with community issues</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Full and effective consultation. Ensure Community Vision embedded in scheme</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Financially viable scheme not achieved</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Maximise funding opportunities and scheme value. Seek to balance financial viability and requirements placed on scheme that have cost implications</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Failure to secure planning consent</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Secure fully compliant masterplan through close liaison with local community and planners</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cannot agree purchase of property by agreement</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Maximise offer to owner. Use CPO powers as final options</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Failure to secure CPO</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Ensure grounds for CPO are robust</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CPO compensation and costs exceed budgets</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Secure robust valuations advice to identify correct compensation. Manage CPO process to minimise costs.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Owner seeks and/or secures planning consent thereby weakening CPO case whilst not securing development</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>If owner progresses application then encourage acceptable application and progress to development</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 2
The risks associated with not implementing the (subject) decision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>RISK</th>
<th>INHERENT RISK</th>
<th>RISK CONTROL MEASURES</th>
<th>CURRENT RISK</th>
<th>RISKOWNER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Threat to achievement of the key objectives of the resort</td>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Probability</td>
<td>Mitigation (ie controls) and Evaluation (ie effectiveness of mitigation)</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A council led solution will not succeed and development will rely on the market</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Encourage the owner to progress an acceptable solution and progress to development</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The HCA may recall the unspent grant</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Liaise with HCA to identify strategy</td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community expectations not met</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Work with owner/developer to ensure any scheme reflects expectations set out in Community Vision</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Carriageworks listed building at increased risk</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Work with owner and external agencies to agree strategy to protect building</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Public sector equality duties:
The aim of the consultation process has been to reach consensus with local communities in order to deliver a scheme and an outcome that is in line with the Community Vision. Ongoing dialogue and communication with local people will continue to assist in achieving this.

The information on the Equalities Impact Assessment is very limited and so therefore doesn’t fully demonstrate if there have been any issues raised by equality stakeholders and so in the coming months this will need to be addressed.

Whilst effective consultation seems to have been undertaken it is not clear how representative this process has actually been as far as equality groups are concerned. Due to this and to demonstrate that the process has been transparent and inclusive it is recommended that a full Equalities Impact Assessment is completed to make sure that any issues are identified and that the Public sector equality duties are given due regard.

Advice given by Jane Hamill, Equalities Advisor, City Development
Date 22 May 2012

Eco impact assessment
See Appendix 4

Advice given by Steve Ransom, Environmental Performance Programme Co-ordinator Sustainable City Group
Date 11 May 2012

Resource and legal implications:

Finance
a. Financial (revenue) implications:
The estimated cost of agreeing to this course of action is £75,000 for the next stage of the strategy (attempting to negotiate a purchase by agreement and selection of the development partner). This would be met by the HCA grant. The Council is to seek an indemnity agreement from the development partner to indemnify the Council for its share of the costs for securing and using CPO powers.
b. Financial (capital) implications:
It is intended that site acquisition and other eligible costs will be covered by the grant from the HCA. There are therefore no capital costs for the Council at this stage. In pursuance of CPO powers clarity on the financial implications depends on the value assigned as compensation (see Risk Assessment). Therefore any resultant financial or funding arrangements may need to be the subject of a further report to Cabinet.

Advice given by Mike Harding, Finance Business Partner, Neighbourhoods and City Development
Date 14 May 2012

c. Legal implications:
Procurement:
The Council intends to enter into a development agreement where the value of the works the developer is to provide will be over £4.3m. The development agreement may be a works concession agreement.

If the development agreement is a works concession agreement, the Council’s internal Procurement Regulations and the EU Treaty Principles must be followed (e.g. the procurement process must be fair, transparent and all bidders must be treated equally).

If the development agreement is not a concession arrangement, the Council’s internal Procurement Regulations, the EU Treaty Principles and the Public Contracts Regulations 2006 (“the Regs”) must be followed (e.g. a ‘full’ tender process must be carried out in accordance with the Regs).

Advice given by Sinead Willis, Contracts Solicitor, Legal Division
Date 24 April 2012

Compulsory Purchase Order
The decision to make a compulsory purchase order (CPO) will engage the Human Rights Act 1998. This act incorporated into UK domestic law the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The aim of the ECHR is to protect the rights of the individual.

Government guidance sets out that before a CPO can be made there must be a compelling case in the public interest. The Council must act in accordance with the ECHR in deciding whether or not to make a CPO. Article 1 of the First Protocol provides that every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions.

Compulsory acquisition of property involves the interference with a person’s rights under this Article. These rights are enjoyed by corporate bodies as well as individuals and if their property rights will be affected by the compulsory acquisition of their property then the rights under the convention are engaged.

The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions under this Article is a qualified rather than an absolute right as the wording of the Article permits the deprivation of an individuals possessions where it is in the public interest and subject to conditions provided by law. The Council will need to balance the public interest and the individuals rights whereby any interference with the individual’s rights must be necessary and proportionate.
Proportionate in this context means any interference with the property rights must be no more than is necessary to achieve the identified legitimate aim. A fair balance must be struck between the rights of the individual and the public interest.

If the Council does need to exercise CPO powers at some point in the future of this project it will be a proportionate act as the aim of comprehensive regeneration of the site cannot be achieved without the site (as detailed on the attached plan) be acquired and used for the purpose of the project. The site will be acquired subject to the conditions provided by law – CPO powers – and the owners of the site will have a statutory right of appeal.

Advice given by: Joanne Mansfield Principal Solicitor.
Date: 11 May 2012

d. Land / property implications:
The site is in private ownership. Any purchase by CPO will be accompanied by a back to back agreement with a development partner under a development agreement. During the agreement the developer will be responsible for the site. The freehold of the site will eventually be transferred to the developer.

Advice given by Jan Reichel, Principal Project Officer, Corporate Property
Date 2 May 2012

e. Human resources implications:
There are no HR implications contained in this report.

Advice given by Chris Dagger, Business Partner City Developments
Date 10 May 2012

Appendices:
Appendix 1 – Site Plan
Appendix 2 - Community Vision December 2011
Appendix 3 – Carriageworks Consultation 2011: What worked?
Appendix 4 – Eco Impact Checklist
Appendix 5 – Equalities impact assessment
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Reports to Planning and Development Committee 6 May 1992, 16 December 1992 and 3 March 1993
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Report to Cabinet of 3 March 2011
Carriageworks
Community Vision
December 2011

Carriageworks
www.Carriageworks.org.uk
Introduction

The Carriageworks and Westmoreland House have been derelict for 25 years. Many people have only known the buildings as a burden that are ‘too hard to tackle’. As such they contribute to the image of a whole city quarter. Despite their presence, however, recent years have seen a turnaround in the fortunes of Stokes Croft with many new businesses emerging, bringing a life and vitality to the streets. It was therefore to be expected that thoughts would turn, albeit not for the first time, to the future of the Carriageworks and Westmoreland House and how to ensure that they make a positive contribution to the local area.

This Community Vision is the work of the residents, businesses and organisations of Stokes Croft and the surrounding communities of St Pauls, Montpelier, Kingsdown and Cotham. Our work has been supported by Bristol City Council.

The Vision deals with big ideas and principles rather than fine details. It aims to be ambitious but at the same time seeks to build consensus in our communities and retain what we believe is overall viability. It sets out how we would like to see the buildings and the surrounding land used, and the contribution we would like them to make to the ongoing success of our communities.

As we wrote this vision, 95% of people said that they want to see the dereliction of this site addressed. We will work with any organisation that shares our vision for the future.
The Site

The Carriageworks, Westmoreland House and the surrounding land are owned by the Comer Homes Group, a London based property developer which bought the site in the 1980s.

The Carriageworks was designed by EW Godwin, an important Victorian Architect. It is a Grade II* listed building in poor condition and is in English Heritage’s top ten buildings most “at risk” in the South West. The neighbouring Westmoreland House is a six storey 1960s concrete frame office building, last occupied in 1986 by the Football Pools. At the rear is 4 Ashley Road, a derelict but Grade II listed house, and a site currently occupied temporarily by a small group of people. The whole site measures 0.5 hectares (the same size as 1.6 football pitches).

In 1989 planning permission was granted for a development of 63 flats, offices and underground parking but building works never started. In 2006 the Council and local communities agreed a policy for St Pauls (SPD10) that included guidelines for a variety of uses on the site including residential, business and leisure facilities. The owners submitted a new planning application for 153 flats, 5 shops and 112 parking spaces but in 2010 the Secretary of State refused permission at appeal.

In 2011 a further planning application was submitted by the owners for the development of 183 flats, shops and underground parking on the site. During the writing of this Vision the application was being considered by the City Council.
Methodology

In early 2011 local residents started discussions with Bristol City Council to ensure that the dereliction of the Westmoreland House and Carriageworks site would be addressed. It was decided to prepare a Community Vision for the site as a way of expressing the ambitions of the local neighbourhood. This would then be used to find a suitable developer.

A Stakeholder Group made up of local residents, organisations and businesses was established to oversee the process with a smaller Contact Group being responsible for more detailed involvement. In August, using funding from the Homes and Communities Agency, 2md Regeneration Ltd was appointed to lead the process of consulting on and writing the Vision. Throughout, volunteers from the local community formed an essential part of the process.

There were two phases to the consultation. Phase 1 of the consultation was launched on 16th September:

- A press call resulted in coverage in local newspapers, radio and television.
- A Leaflet and questionnaire was delivered to approximately 7000 local households.
- A project website was established at carriageworks.org.uk with an online questionnaire.
- A rickshaw provided by Pedal Walla was used to advertise the consultation and attract people at events.
- Social networking using Facebook and Twitter promoted the consultation.
- Regular emails were sent out to a mailing list that grew to 650 addresses.
Drop-ins staffed by volunteers and 2nd Regeneration were held on 29 September and 4, 6, 12 and 14 October.

Street surveys were carried out on 17 September and 14 October.

Voxpops were recorded in the final week of consultation and published on the website.

Many local businesses, especially retail, were directly approached for their response to the survey.

Phase 1 of the consultation ran for four weeks and ended on 15 October. In all there were 1436 responses to the survey plus additional emails. The responses were analysed with the raw data made available on the Carriageworks website.

A workshop for the Contact Group and additional people from the Stakeholder Group was held on 4 November with the aim of starting to develop the final vision. This included a tutorial delivered by the University of the West of England on how to assess the viability of a property development. The workshop found consensus in ideas for how the site should be developed.

Phase 2 of the consultation was launched on 1 December and followed unanimous approval of a Vision Discussion Paper by the Stakeholders Group on 22 November. Drop-ins were held on the weekend of 3-4 December at which participants were asked to vote on 8 draft vision statements that condensed the aspirations stated in the first round of consultation. Phase 2 of the consultation ended on 7 December.

The Community Vision was then amended and this final version approved by the Stakeholder Group on 15 December.
The Consultation Findings

Phase 1
The questionnaire to establish people's thoughts about the future of the Carriageworks attracted 1436 responses. People also contributed their views via email, drop-ins, community meetings and other engagements.

The Results
55% of responses came from the area immediately surrounding the site and 39% came from other parts of Bristol. Respondents represented a cross section of users of the area with 59% passing through, 54% living locally, 45% spending leisure time in the area, 44% shopping locally and 19% working in the area.

Respondents were asked what mixture of uses they would like to see built on the site. 75% said community facilities, 66% said arts facilities, 53% said residential, 50% said shops, 49% said leisure, and 38% said business units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The questionnaire also asked who should ideally lead any redevelopment of the site. 51% of respondents said a community organisation with the right skills, 33% said it doesn’t matter so long as they get on with it, 8% said a private developer, and 3% said the existing owner.

Many people contributed additional comments all of which can be found in the Technical Appendix.

**Commentary**

The Phase 1 responses show the desire for the site to benefit the local community not only through the activities on the site but also through the development process. The popularity of arts facilities reflects recent trends, and other uses including residential, retail, and leisure attract support as well. A mixed development is clearly the preferred approach. The additional comments show that space for local businesses is supported, but large office blocks are not.

One contentious area that emerged is car parking. Many people are concerned about traffic and pollution levels and therefore want to see site parking very restricted, especially given the site’s proximity to public transport routes. However, others are concerned that a lack of site parking would exacerbate existing problems on surrounding streets. Traders also want to see parking provision for shoppers increased.
Phase 2

300 people took part in the second phase of consultation, 90% of whom participated in the drop-ins.

The Results

Overwhelming support was given for the Vision. 97% of people support the overall vision statement. 95% of people support our wide interpretation of the activities that comprise ‘community facilities’. 78% support the creation of a route through the site. 95% support active uses on the ground floor. 77% support mostly mixed residential on the upper floors. 97% support the design approach. And 93% of people support our delivery approach.

The only contentious area remains car parking. 33% of people said that there should be “just adequate” provision and 30% said there should be “as little as possible”. Meanwhile 28% said there should be a greater “sufficient” level of car parking and 6% said there should be as much as possible. So two thirds of people are in favour of limiting parking, but it is an issue that attracts great passion and is likely to remain a topic of heated debate as the project progresses.

Commentary

Clearly there is support for the draft vision statements, which in themselves reflect the preferences and comments received in Phase 1. People have expressed views on the details of any development and these will help inform the debate as the project progresses. For the moment though the support received gives enormous confidence to the final Community Vision. It also endorses the guidance for the development of the site contained in the City Council’s planning guidance document SPD10.

Full details and results from the consultation are available in the Technical Appendix.
The Overall Vision

The Carriageworks development will make a positive contribution to the economy, culture and environment of Stokes Croft and surrounding area. It will be a mixed use development that is home to many activities, businesses and people. It will be a buzzing, vibrant place for people from the local communities and from further afield. We want to see the dereliction of this site addressed as a priority and are keen to work with any organisation that embraces our vision for the future.
We want this site to be developed for a broad range of uses that are accessible to the community. Flexible, accessible spaces need to be included to accommodate a range of activities that directly contribute to the vitality and character of the local area. This might include business units as well as shops, arts space, cafes, performance space and meeting spaces.
Creating new open and inclusive spaces on the site is important for many of us. This could be achieved by designing a new pedestrian route through the site connecting together public spaces that can contribute to a vibrant local culture; these public spaces might host activities such as a market and performances. Good design and management will need to be exercised to avoid conflicts with other site users e.g. residents living nearby, neighbouring businesses etc.
Active uses on the Ground Floor

We want to see the site opened up with active uses (e.g. shops, small businesses, market, cafes, arts, workshops etc.) both on the Stokes Croft frontage and inside the site. The units will need to be provided in a range of sizes that are viable for local businesses and be flexible in design in order to adapt to future changes; they will need to be managed to ensure a good mix at all times.
Upper Floors

We recognise the benefit of residential development on the upper floors to boost viability. We want to see a true mix of housing types for sale and for rent including private and social housing, both low and high cost; a range of sizes should be provided to suit a mix of needs, from single people to families. We do not want to see a gated community or a monotype development. Some small business and other uses on the upper floors may also be appropriate.
An amount of car parking that is “just adequate” should be provided on the site. The parking provision should balance the need to make best use of space on the site whilst avoiding increases in parking congestion and pollution in the surrounding area. Residents and businesses should have sufficient access to their premises.
We want the new development to be designed to a high quality with good environmental standards. The Carriageworks building should be restored to its former glory but other existing buildings may or may not be retained. We want to see full use being made of roofs to provide opportunities for biodiversity and the creation of gardens, perhaps for growing food.
We are looking for a developer who will go the extra mile to deliver a scheme of which we can be proud. We are determined to find the best developer for the job who will ensure that we are continually involved in the development process and who will champion our Vision. It is accepted that there will need to be some level of flexibility in the choice of developer.
What happens next?

In the Spring 2012, Bristol City Council will prepare a ‘development brief’ for the site, drawing on this Community Vision. Later in 2012 the development brief will be used to invite interest from a wide range of developers so that one can be selected who will best respond to the Vision.

The selection process will involve representatives of the Action Group and the City Council.

The selected developer will take the scheme forward in partnership with the Council and the local community. This will include purchase of the site if necessary using compulsory purchase powers.

It is recognised that any redevelopment of the site is likely to take some years.

The current ownership

The site is currently owned by Comer Homes. In 2011 they submitted a planning application to build 183 flats on the site together with shops and parking; a scheme which has significant differences to our Vision. If their application is successful they could progress with the development. Nevertheless we hope that they will amend their scheme and work with the community to help deliver our Vision.

Stay in touch!

Ongoing updates together with information from the consultation process can be found on our website, www.carriageworks.org.uk, where you can also leave comments and sign up to our email newsletter.
Credits

This Community Vision has been the work of many people from the local community, the City Council and businesses. In no particular order they have been:


Funded by the Homes and Communities Agency.

Enabled by Bristol City Council.

Coordinated by 2md Regeneration.

Made by everyone.
Carriageworks Consultation 2011: What worked?

At the final Stakeholders Group, there was a brief discussion about what made the Carriageworks consultation a success. This is an analysis of the key elements.

The Context
People have been working on this for a long time: SPU has enabled the a coherent vision for the area which has been adopted as planning policy (SPD 10). This is in the context of a highly politicised area, going back over decades (e.g. Full Marks bookshop in the 1980s), and the more recent riot, anti corporatism, and the growth of alternative groups over the last 5 years. Add to this mix a wonderful, Grade 2* listed building that captures the imagination, an archetypal wicked developer, and an active community: “all the ingredients for a great plot”. Beyond Stokes Croft, there are many initiatives in Bristol that support the development of something different, and creative in the area. This supports the approach to change with this difficult site, and for a sensible and coherent discussion about what this should be.

This is not the first time that the buildings have been tackled, but there was also a view that “this time it feels much more energised” and this gave people more hope.

What were the factors that contributed to this energy and optimism?

The Process
The consultation was clear in its purpose and its time-table. It was very well designed. Because there was a clear end goal, the consultants were able to shift direction, and adapt to local circumstances as the process unfolded.

The consultants acted as independent brokers, and this enabled a higher level of trust in this process from the outset. They were very creative in their approaches. The materials were well designed and so very engaging; there were some particularly bright ideas, e.g. the tee shirts, the vox pops, and Pedal Walla. Nothing was ruled out, e.g. taking the Boards onto the street.

Bristol City Council played a genuinely enabling role, supporting, making things happen, and funding but not seeking to control or direct. There was a good budget and this enabled the creativity and quality within a well designed process.

There was a very committed core “Contact Group”, whose members provided a link between all the elements of the process. They each contributed an enormous amount of time and created connections within a range of communities. This role lent credibility to
the process, and enabled a wide range of views to be expressed and brought into the process.

The process and the time scale was transparent throughout. The communication was clear. Nothing was hidden: even all the minutes were publicly available on the website. This made is a very inclusive process. It was a grass roots consultation from the start.

The People
The Carriageworks Action Group brought together a very wide alliance of residents and organisations, many of who have been working on this issue for a long time. It represents a very skilled group with varied perspectives. The approach of the group has been to allow discussion; there is not a fear of debate, and there were some heated discussions! Keeping an eye on the final outcome meant that we always came to an agreement in the end, and kept working together. The Action Group became “more than the sum of its parts” and this enabled some constructive work and for a wide range of views to be brought into a cohesive vision.

This inclusive, transparent and energetic partnership helped even the most cynical to have confidence in the process, and that something will actually happen this time.

Lori Streich
February 2012
Appendix 4

Eco Impact Checklist

Title of report: Carriageworks/ Westmoreland House

Report author: Jan Reichel

Anticipated date of key decision: 31\textsuperscript{st} May 2012

Summary of proposals: Approval for terms of a developer's brief/ development agreement, procurement of a development partner and approval for a CPO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the proposal impact on...</th>
<th>Yes/ No</th>
<th>+ive or -ive</th>
<th>If yes...</th>
<th>Briefly describe Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emission of Climate Changing Gases?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-ve</td>
<td>Any demolition, refurbishment and construction of buildings and associated ongoing heating and lighting requirements of any new buildings will result in emission of climate changing gasses. In the longer term, any new buildings will increase the carbon footprint of the site.</td>
<td>See overall mitigation measures outlined in summary. All works will meet planning policy guidance BCS13-15 as laid down in Bristol City Council's Core Strategy 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol's vulnerability to the effects of climate change?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-ve</td>
<td>Any development work that takes place to support this proposal may: - Place additional demand on the mains drainage system. - Increase water run-off by creating more impermeable surfaces. - Not be designed to cope with extreme temperature variations, or violent storms. - Increase water consumption.</td>
<td>In accordance with the Bristol Development Framework climate-related impacts will be considered as part of Sustainability Statements submitted with any planning applications for proposed development to demonstrate compliance with BCS 13-16. A strategy for SUDS will be included in Sustainability Statements will demonstrate that the optimal approach to SUDS has been taken for any development works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of non-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+ve</td>
<td>Bringing a city-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>-ve or +ve</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>renewable resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ve</td>
<td>Centre site back into beneficial use provides for more sustainable modes of travel.</td>
<td>See overall mitigation measures outlined in summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the short term fossil fuels and other non-renewable materials and products are likely to be used during any refurbishment and development works.</td>
<td>Any new developments associated with the project will be accompanied by an energy strategy as part of Sustainability Statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the long term any additional properties will consume fossil fuels for heating and power.</td>
<td>As per BCS14 the new developments will be required to show that they have applied the heat hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, recycling or disposal of waste</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-ve</td>
<td>In the short term, building material waste will arise from any construction, refurbishment and demolition works that may take place as part of this project.</td>
<td>Any contractor(s) involved in refurbishment, demolition and construction elements of this project will be required to produce a site waste management plan and recover a minimum of 80% of construction and demolition materials. Opportunities to re-use demolition material in any new build will be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The appearance of the city?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>+ve</td>
<td>The Old Carriageworks is a listed building - bringing it back into use will enhance its appearance and protect it from dereliction. New buildings are subject to normal planning controls, and community consultation.</td>
<td>Appearance of the buildings will be considered as part of the planning application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pollution to land, water, or air?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>-ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The site may have been contaminated by previous activity. Any demolition and construction that takes place is likely to generate dust. New development has the potential to increase traffic movements, may worsen local air quality in the immediate area, increase noise, and increase sewage discharges and surface water run-off.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated land issues to be considered as part of the planning process. Where works will take more than 6 weeks to complete contractors will register with the considerate constructors scheme and as a minimum achieve a 'certificate of compliance' level. Any potential localised air quality impacts will be considered during the planning process. City-centre location provides for reduced reliance on private car transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wildlife and habitats?

| Unknown |
| Demolition, construction and refurbishment may impact upon wildlife and habitat. For example, the current derelict structure may provide a habitat for species such as bats and housemartins. |
| Seek advice from the BCC Natural Environment Team. Further survey and mitigation measures may result. Opportunities to increase biodiversity in the development area will be investigated with the Natural Environment Team. |

**Consulted with: Steve Ransom**

**Summary of impacts and Mitigation - to go into the main Cabinet/ Council Report**

The potential positive impacts of this project include improved local amenity, improved visual amenity, and provision for sustainable travel.

The potential negative impacts include those from any demolition and construction works which may take place which will consume non-renewable resources. Any new buildings constructed will create an ongoing energy demand.

Mitigation of these negative impacts will be achieved by:

- Meeting planning policy guidance BCS13-16 as laid down in Bristol City Council’s Core Strategy 2011. In order to demonstrate compliance with the core strategy Sustainability Statements, which will include an Energy and SUDS strategy, will submitted with planning applications;
In order to comply with BCS14 any new development will incorporate on-site renewable energy sources in order to achieve a 20% reduction in CO₂ emissions arising from residual energy demand, going beyond this if the viability of the project allows. Any new development will show that the heat hierarchy, as outlined in BSC14, has been followed;
New buildings/ refurbishment will be built to high environmental standards included within the Development agreement.

Overall, the environmental impact of this proposal is negative.

Checklist completed by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Jan Reichel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept.:</td>
<td>Corporate Property, Corporate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension:</td>
<td>24032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verified by</td>
<td>Steve Ransom, Environmental Performance Programme Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable City Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Equality Impact Assessment Westmoreland House Stoke Croft

Part one of an EqIA – the screening – should be carried out at the planning and development stage of a policy, project, service, contract or strategy. This form should be used in conjunction with the guidance and as the first part of a full EqIA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of policy, project, service, contract or strategy being assessed</th>
<th>Westmoreland House, Stoke Croft, Bristol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directorate and Service</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names and roles of officers completing the assessment</td>
<td>Jan Reichel, Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main contact telephone number</td>
<td>017 922 4032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>28 July 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Identify the aims of the policy, project, service, contract or strategy and how it is implemented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Notes / Answers</th>
<th>Any actions needed?</th>
<th>By whom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Is this a new policy, project, service, contract or strategy or a review of an existing one?</td>
<td>New project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 What is the main purpose of the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?</td>
<td>Secure the regeneration of Westmoreland House, a privately owned derelict building and land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What are the main activities of the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?</td>
<td>Acquisition of the property; identify a development partner; secure redevelopment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Who are the main beneficiaries? Whose needs is it designed to meet?</td>
<td>The regeneration of the property will remove the blighting effect its dereliction has on the surrounding area and community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Which staff carry out the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?</td>
<td>The project team is made up of officers from Corporate Property, Planning Services, Legal Services, Neighbourhoods and Housing and City Developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Are there areas of the policy or</td>
<td>A development partner will be selected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function that could be governed by an officer's judgement? eg. home visits &quot;where appropriate&quot;. If so, is there guidance on how to exercise this to prevent any possible bias/prejudice creeping in?</td>
<td>probably a Registered Social Landlord. The appointment will be made jointly with the Homes and Communities Agency. The selection panel will identify criteria against which a selection will be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.7</strong> Is the Council working in Partnership with other organisations to implement this policy or function? Should this be taken into consideration? eg. Agree equalities monitoring categories Should the partnership arrangements have an EqIA?</td>
<td>It is proposed that this is a jointly funded project with the Homes and Communities Agency. BCC and HCA will monitor equality issues to comply with their policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.8</strong> Taking the six strands of equalities, do you have any initial thoughts that any of the six equalities strands have particular needs relevant to the policy or function? Or is there anything in the policy, project, service, contract or strategy that you can think of at this stage that could discriminate or disadvantage any groups of people? ie. Gender (include Transgender) Disability</td>
<td>Residential homes will seek to provide a mix of unit sizes and tenures that cater for varied tenant and occupancy types. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>Faith/Belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do any other specific groups have particular needs relevant to the policy, project, service, contract or strategy?</td>
<td>Development of housing will seek to address identified housing needs set out in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.9 Did you use any data to inform your initial thoughts above? What data do you already have?

1.10 Are there gaps in the data that require you to do further work? What are these gaps?

Precise requirements for residential units size and tenure mix has yet to be established for this property. In preparing a development brief SPD10 will be influential in identifying housing needs and demands that need to be addressed.

If the result of the screening process is that there is the potential for a significant impact on any equality group or if any equality group has significantly different needs, then a full equality impact assessment must be carried out. If you are unsure please seek advice from a directorate or corporate equalities officer.

Signed:       Signed:
Service Manager:     Directorate Equalities Adviser/Officer or Equalities Contact
Date:        Date: