



Agenda Item No: 3b

# Bristol City Council

## Minutes of Development Control Committee B

Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> February 2015 at 5.30pm

---

Councillors Present: -

Councillors: Peter Abraham (Chair), Colin Smith, Martin Fodor, Helen Holland, Charles Lucas, Margaret Hickman, Bill Payne, Christian Martin, Olly Mead and Chris Windows.

Officers in Attendance: -

Patricia Jones, Paul Chick, Nigel Butler, Katy Dryden and Laurence Fallon.

### **1. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Woodman and Councillor Leaman.

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

Councillor Mead declared his membership of the Bishopston Society.

### **3. Public Forum**

Statements were heard before the application and taken into consideration by the Committee when reaching a decision. Copies of the Public Forum submissions can be found in the Minute Book.

#### **4. Planning and Development**

##### **Application No. 14/05030/F: Gloucestershire County Cricket Club Nevil Road Bristol BS7 9EJ: Planning permission sought to erect 6 no 45m tall permanent floodlights.**

An Amendment Sheet was provided to the committee in advance and circulated again at the meeting.

The representative of the Service Director (Planning) provided a detailed presentation of the issues affecting the application and highlighted the principal considerations to be taken into account in reaching a decision. This included: -

- The need for permanent floodlights at cricket grounds as required by the England and Wales Cricket Board (ECB) and the International Cricket Council (ICC) – to ensure that cricket clubs provide the high levels of light required for evening matches and television broadcasts.
- Details of the 3 rounds of consultation carried out and the significant representations received in response (set out in detail in the report and Amendment Sheet).
- A location plan of the 6 floodlights and proposed restrictions/conditions of use to minimise the impact and effect on local residents.
- Detailed information on the intensity of the floodlights and the illuminance (lux) created by them in comparison to other conditions – sunset/ a winter's day.
- Design – permanent versus temporary, fixed versus retractable, and the financial viability of the different options.

The committee gave detailed consideration to the officer report, the economic justifications for the scheme and the potential harm to amenity if the proposal was granted. The genuine benefits to the economy were discussed and generally accepted. However it was

felt that the alternative and perhaps less intrusive options had not been explored in enough detail to enable the committee to reach a confident decision.

The Chair advised officers that should the committee be minded to defer the application, this would provide more time to reconcile the concerns raised at the meeting and fine tune what was currently a finely balanced argument.

A brief discussion followed in relation to the pre-commencement conditions/proposed mitigation measures set out at page 38 of the report.

Councillor Lucas stated that the commercial benefits of the scheme could not be ignored and moved to approve the proposal in line with the officer recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Martin but was not carried when put to the vote (4 voting in favour, 5 against and 1 abstention).

In conclusion, it was moved by the Chair, seconded by Councillor Holland and on being put to the vote (6 voting in favour 0 against and 4 abstentions): -

**RESOLVED - that the decision be deferred subject to a site visit and receipt of further information to consider alternative options.**

**Application No. 14/04519/F: 541-551 Fishponds Road  
Fishponds Bristol BS16 3AF**

An Amendment Sheet was provided to the committee in advance and circulated at the meeting. The committee was advised that further representations had been received resulting in a revised total of 534 comments (513 objections, 20 in support and 1 neutral). It was noted that the online petition referenced within the report had also closed, resulting in a total number of signatories of 1699 when combined with its paper counterpart.

Further documents had also been submitted by the agent as specified in the Amendment Sheet. The parking provision of 26

spaces at page 4 of the report was amended to 28.

The committee was invited to consider the application site in the context of the surrounding area and designated town centre boundary. The representative of the Service Director (Planning) provided a detailed presentation of the issues affecting the application and highlighted the principal considerations to be taken into account in reaching a decision: -

- Highway safety concerns – significant impacts upon traffic flow and crossings along Fishponds Road arising from the arrival and departure of customers and resulting queues, especially at peak times.
- Whilst BCC Transport was satisfied with the projected figures submitted as part of the Transport Statement, the traffic arrangements at Sheene Road were not considered a reasonable comparison in terms of understanding trips generated and parking issues.
- Servicing/delivery provision – this would take place during the restaurant's hours of operation.
- Parking provision – in order to deter car trips, the maximum standards for this development equated to 9 spaces. Over three times this number was proposed as part of this scheme.
- No further clarity had been offered by the applicant in response to officer transport queries.
- Residential amenity and highway safety harm – the proposal failed to satisfactorily demonstrate that no unacceptable harm would arise from noise, odour and light pollution. The scheme would also create highway safety harm associated with traffic/transport arrangements outlined above, the impact of which could not be mitigated against.

The Chair invited members of the committee to comment on the proposal. Officers were commended for the concise report and

presentation.

There was specific discussion around the proposed transport arrangements and Public Health - the proximity of the development to local schools and the council's statutory responsibilities for promoting and safeguarding this.

Members of the committee indicated that they were persuaded by cogent and compelling arguments for refusal, made out both in the report and in the representations from the public.

In conclusion, it was moved by the Chair, seconded by Colin Smith and on being put to the vote, unanimously: -

**RESOLVED - that planning permission be refused on the grounds of unacceptable highway safety impacts and the harm to residential amenity.**

(the meeting ended at 8.00pm)

CHAIR