



Bristol City Council
Minutes of Development Control Committee B
 Wednesday 17 December 2014 at 6 pm

Members:-

(A) Denotes absence (P) Denotes present

Labour	Liberal Democrat	Conservative	Green
Councillor Smith – Vice-Chair (P) Councillor Holland (P) Councillor Payne (A) Councillor Mead (P) Councillor Hickman (P)	Councillor Martin (A) Councillor Woodman (P) Councillor Leaman (P)	Councillor Abraham – Chair (P) Councillor Lucas (P) Councillor Windows (A)	Councillor Fodor (P)

27. Apologies for absence (Agenda Item 1)

Apologies were received from Councillors Martin, Payne and Windows and from Councillor Woodman for lateness.

28. Declarations of Interest (Agenda Item 2)

Councillor Lucas declared an interest in Applications Number 14/04812/F and 14/04813/LA as he had been in discussions with groups that had commented on this application. However, he confirmed that he retained an open mind on it.

Councillor Colin Smith declared an interest in Application Number 14/04983/FB as a friend lives in Rownham Mead. However, he confirmed that he retained an open mind on the application.

29. Minutes of the Development Control (B) Committee held on 12th November 2014 (Agenda Item 3)

Resolved - that the Minutes of the Development Control Committee B Meetings held on the 12th November 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the word “shows” on the ninth line of Page 4 being altered to read “show”.

30. Appeals (Agenda Item 4)

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director (Planning) (Agenda Item No. 4) noting appeals lodged, imminent public inquiries and appeals awaiting decision.

It was noted that most recent appeals had been dismissed. However, it was noted that a split decision had been taken in respect of Appeal Number 52 (Clifton High School College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3JD) – the decision in respect of the window at the top of the school green building east end had been successful.

31. Enforcement (Agenda Item 5)

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director (Planning) (Agenda Item No. 5) noting any enforcement notices.

Resolved - that the report be noted.

32. Public Forum (Agenda Item 6)

Members of the Committee had received public forum statements in advance of the meeting. Details of these have been placed in the Minute Book. A copy is available for Public Inspection.

33. Planning and Development (Agenda Item 7)

The Committee considered a report of the Service Director (Planning) (Agenda Item no. 7) considering the following matters, together with an Amendment Sheet which had been circulated and setting out changes to each of the original reports as appropriate (copies of which are contained in the Minute Book):-

(1) Application Number 14/04746/M – Wapping Wharf D,E,F,G Wapping Road, Bristol BS1 5RN – Application for Reserved Matters Following Outline Approval 11/01842/R (Extension Of Time Limit for Outline Planning Permission 04/04126/P) for the redevelopment of the site, including demolition works, to provide a mixed use scheme of residential, retail, office, community workspace, hotel and leisure uses (Classes C1, C2, C3, A1, A2, A3, B1, D1, D2) with associated landscaping works and car parking (Major Application).

The Service Manager and Case Officer made the following points in respect of the above application:

- Details of the following were provided – site plan, aerial photo, Masterplan 2 indicating building heights, Phase 1 Ground Floor Plan, Outline, Building Heights, the historic context, views of the site from

different locations, a shadow analysis, details of the representations from Knightstone Housing Association, acknowledgement that there will be at least 3 blocks of accommodation including some element of affordable housing across the whole site (which currently equates to 18.9% of the floorspace provided in phases 1 and 2, in comparison with the outline permission which required 20% across the whole site), a lack of provision of 3 bedroom accommodation due to a lack of demand which nevertheless complied with the policy aims of BCS18 relating to mixed community use. Officers indicated that they believed the existing design and conditions requiring details of materials would deal with any potential problems caused by segregated housing blocks and any attempts at value engineering would be resisted. There was car parking available at Block G with 2 spaces on site – the parking area in Block F could be made available if required. Since office parking required very little parking, it was not proposed to impose any restrictions. It was not believed there would be any issue in relation to designated parking spaces for affordable housing

- Councillor Woodman confirmed that, since he had arrived late for this item, he would be unable to participate in the debate of this item and would also be unable to vote.

Councillors made the following comments:

- The concerns about social housing needed to be acknowledged, ideally via a condition if this was possible;
- The issue of affordable housing is of serious concern – larger units will avoid ghettoising certain areas;
- It was vital that the finishing was carried out properly on all blocks;
- This is a critical site – social housing will be part of the area and the community. The past record of Knightstone Housing Association in providing such housing was acknowledged;
- Whilst the amount of family housing was slightly below the recommended amounts (ie 10% as opposed to 15%), the proposed volume of housing was important to the rented sector. There was a risk that any refusal would be difficult to sustain at appeal and would risk Bristol City Council losing control of future developments on the site;
- The extra height would not make a big difference

Upon being moved by Councillor Abraham and seconded by Councillor Lucas, it was

Resolved (6 For, 0 Against, 2 abstentions) – that the application be approved subject to conditions and advice notes set out in the report and amendment sheet and also including an additional Advice Note stating that “ For all Future Applications concerning this development, the Committee would be seeking an increase in the number of three bedroom flats.”

(2) Application Number 14/04983/FB – Merchants Dock, Rownham Mead, Bristol – The proposal is to increase the width of the walkway, which runs between the entrance to the former Merchant’s Dock and the Rownham Mead development by 3 metres

The Case Officer made the following points in respect of this application:

- Details of the site, wider area, block plan and proposed layout were provided, including proposed elevation;
- Ferry access would be retained;
- Under the current arrangements, there had been very few accidents since the chicane had been installed;
- The proposed increase in width would result in the walkway being very similar to the other nearby walkway. Bollards would restrict hazardous access;
- An assessment was required on the impact on the heritage asset (the dock) – whilst there would be a marginal impact on the heritage asset, it was not substantial and would, in officers opinion, be more than compensated for by the positive public impact of improving the route for cyclists and would maintain the character of the area;
- It was not considered that there would be an impact on houses at the front of the walkway;
- There were no concerns related to ecology and flooding

Councillors made the following comments on this application:

- Under previous Transport Policy, there had been an approach to ensure that pedestrians received the most protection in terms of the possible impact of such schemes, followed by cyclists. This scheme seemed to take the opposite approach and would be very dangerous for pedestrians. The removal of the chicane which had prevented accidents was puzzling. In addition, the covering of the historic infrastructure with the walkway was of concern;
- It was important that there should be segregation of pedestrians and

cyclists in such areas. The concerns and residents appeared to have been ignored in relation to this scheme;

- The scheme was sexist, ageist and also discriminated against disabled people;
- The scheme seemed ill-conceived and would demonstrably cause harm to users;
- The harbour should not be used as a commuter route – routes for cyclists could be installed elsewhere;
- An increase in the width of routes was an improvement and, whilst the scheme was not perfect and would be improved by increased segregation, it should be supported
- Committees needed to form a judgement on the basis of what was available rather than a perfect scheme – the scheme would be an improvement. Segregated routes could be ignored by all road users (pedestrians as well as cyclists)
- During events held near this location, cyclists could travel in a very dangerous way and be very dangerous for pedestrians.

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

Resolved (6 For, 2 against, 1 abstention)) that the application be refused on the grounds of increased conflict between cyclists and pedestrians contrary to Policy DM28.

(3) Application Number 14/04812/F – The Pump House Merchants Road, Hotwells Bristol BS8 4PZ – Pedestrian and Cycling Link Across the Junction Lock to Include New Structures Across the Southern Lock, Modifications To The Existing Swing Bridge, Partial Demolition of the Pump House Boundary Wall and Protecting Buffer to the North Entrance Lock and Application Number

14/04813/LA – The Pump House, Merchants Road, Hotwells, Bristol BS8 4PZ – Pedestrian and Cycling Link Across the Junction Lock to Include New Structures Across the Southern Lock, Modifications to the Existing Swing Bridge, Partial Demolition of the Pump House Boundary Wall and Protecting Buffer to the North Entrance Lock

The Case Officer made the following points during a presentation on this application:

- Details of the site were provided, together with an overview of the development;
- The removal of Toby Bollards and narrowing of the pavement would improve the situation concerning cyclists;

Councillors made the following comments:

- This was part of a co-ordinated plan to improve cycling routes and should be supported;
- The current route was an intimidating journey for a cyclist, even an experienced one;
-
- This should be supported, although it should be noted that it could create a bottleneck elsewhere;
- This section is narrow. Whilst there was some concern about its impact on the heritage, it was noted that English Heritage had no objection to it;
- This junction was dangerous – the loss of the walls was not of major concern

Councillor Abraham moved, seconded by Councillor Smith and, upon being input to the vote, it was:

Resolved – (8 for, 0 against, 1 abstention) that the application be approved in accordance with the recommendations set out in the report.

(4) Application Number 14/03815/F – Stapleton Allotments, Stoke Lane, Stapleton, Bristol – Erection of New Fencing, Community Building and Storage Container At Stapleton Allotments. Proposed Car Parking and Alterations To Access.

The Case Officer made the following comments during the presentation:

- The amendment sheet clarified the Tree Impact Assessment and survey and included the provision of a Planning Agreement to achieve financial mitigation of the tree loss;
- The figure for Section B should be £15,300 not £14,535;
- Clarification was provided on the site layout;
- The re-provision of allotments did not require Planning consent as this had already been permitted by the Secretary of State – all proposed works were within the smallholding area;
- The new building was on land designated as Green Belt. However, it was acknowledged that the NPPF made allowance for building associated with the agriculture and outdoor recreation;
- Following a request by the Bristol City Council ecologist, the development would include a green roof and green living walls. Whilst 7 trees were to be removed, 27 trees would replace them to mitigate the loss – the requirement for 20 to be planted off site was proposed and it was required that this should be secured through memorandum of understanding that had the same effect as a Planning agreement;
- The development would be a single storey small building behind a landscaped area and with tree planting together with wildlife mitigation

for the car park area. This was considered acceptable in a Conservation Area;

- There would be a small area within the building where produce from the allotment could be sold;
- Officers considered that this would be a valuable community building with associated facilities

Councillors made the following comments:

- The proposed development was not on an allotment but adjacent to it. It seemed a valuable community facility which outweighs any negative aspects
This was a good community facility on an allotment and should be supported

Councillor Woodman moved, seconded by Councillor Smith and, upon being put to the vote, it was

Resolved – (5 for, 0 against, 3 abstentions) that the application be approved in accordance with the recommendations set out in the amendment sheet and updated verbally.

(5) Application Number 14/03974/F – Part of the Former Sevalco Site, Chittening Road, Bristol BS11 0YU

Development of a Renewable Energy Plant Producing Diesel, Carbon Black and Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG) From End-of-Life Tyres. Development to Involve a Tyre Storage Facility Plant To Grind And Process End-of-Life Tyres (To Produce Rubber Crumb and Steel) Thermodynamic Cracking Unit (Using the Crumbed Tyres) Which Will Convert Into Synthetic Diesel Oil and LPG To Be Stored In Three On-Site Tanks (2 for diesel and 1 for LPG) and Carbon Black to be Removed Off-Site for Recycling. Part of the Diesel Will Be Sold As Waste Oil and Part Used To Fuel Diesel Generators To Produce Electricity For The National Grid. There will be Two Fume Stacks and a Connection To the Sub-Station Switchroom On Site. Development will also provide ancillary office/staff facilities, landscaping, parking for vehicles and cycles, and access and egress (Major Application)

The Service Manager and Case Officer made the following points:

- Whilst the report indicated that no CIL was payable, this was under review – it was likely that CIL could be up to £166,000;
- Details of the site location and process were outlined;
- Issues relating to site access, elevations, the historic site and current site were outlined;

- Condition 26 required the provision of a 27 metre stack and required the use of an environmental permit.

Councillors made the following comments:

- The scheme seemed satisfactory from an air quality perspective, albeit not strictly renewable;
- It was pleasing to see a process that would recycle tyres, which were very difficult to recycle.

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

Resolved (unanimously) - that the application permission be approved in accordance with officer recommendations in the report and in the Amendment Sheet.

- (6) **Application Number 14/05072/F – 44 Bellevue Road, St George, Bristol BS5 6DS
New Dwelling C3 on Land To The Rear of 44 Bellevue Road**

The Case Officer made the following points during his presentation:

- Comments from the Transport Team were listed on Page 6 of the report
- An additional objection had been received since the report had been issued
- The current scheme had been proposed to address the concerns listed by the Inspector following the dismissal of a previous scheme
- Any concerns about flood risk had been addressed through a condition

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

Resolved: (unanimously) that the application be approved in accordance with the recommendations set out in the report.

- (7) **Application Number 14/01990/F – 4 Worcester Crescent, Bristol BS8 3JA
Retrospective Application for the Formation of A Vehicular Access/Opening, together with the installation of gates to rear boundary (Clifton Park Road) and the formation of a hard standing area**

The Service Manager introduced this report and made the following points:

- This report was being brought to Committee as Bristol City Council had a land ownership arrangement with the partners of the building
- Details of the site plan, aerial photo and the street scene were provided
- Whilst officers were frustrated that this application was being submitted retrospectively, it was nevertheless recommended for approval;
Parking was required since the property was run by a charity for former offenders – other units in the area provided street parking.

Councillors made the following comments:

- The flats in this area will be entitled to less parking permits in this area following the introduction of the RPZ. Therefore, there would be an increase in on street parking;
- This application should not affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
- Since this was a Bristol City Council owned property, it was particularly important for the Council to be more vigilant in future in avoiding such retrospective applications

Councillor Woodman moved, seconded by Councillor Smith and, upon being put to the vote, it was

Resolved (7 for, 0 against, 1 abstention) – that the application be approved in accordance with the recommendations set out in the report.

34. Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting was scheduled for **2pm on Wednesday 4th February 2015.**

(The meeting ended at 9.30pm)

CHAIR