

Item 1: - Finzels Reach Bridge Hawkins Lane Bristol BS1 6JQ

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
4	<p>12no. further objections have been received. In the main, these did not raise any additional issues than those already summarised in the main report. However the following further comments are to be noted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This particular design will also directly oppose the cities 'green status' by decreasing the amount of people who can actually use the river for both competitive and recreational sport in the city. - The redesign involving moving the bridge piers slightly further apart does not address the basic problem of placing a bridge pier on the inside of "Brewery Bend. <p>3no. further support comment has been received which did not raise any additional issues than those already summarised in the main report.</p>
10	<p>The Conservation Advisory Panel have commented as follows:</p> <p>With hindsight, it is clear that the Panel should have questioned the wisdom of proposing a bridge at Finzel's Reach, under section 106 funding, before having considered the possible outcome. The idea of such a bridge allowed the optimistic to visualize a graceful and delicate structure completely spanning the river at a high level. On reflection, familiarity should not have clouded appreciation of the value of the architectural clarity of the townscape and its meaning. It would be unthinkable to suggest building a bridge nearer The Ponte Vecchio in Florence, or the Rialto Bridge in Venice, than is the case at present.</p> <p>The location is not the backwater of an inconsequential canal; it is a meander of the Avon, at the historic heart of the city, where for hundreds of years Bristol Bridge was the river's lowest bridging point and a principle reason for the city's existence. Bristol Castle stood on the northern bank, defending the crossroads of road and river traffic. The topography is reinforced and flattered by the sheer, unrelenting architecture on the southern bank between St Philip's Bridge and Bristol Bridge and the width of the river beneath. There should be no bridge to mollify that.</p> <p>However, to consider the proposed bridge in its own terms, the brief and the context have overwhelmed the designer and that is clear in the proposals. Instead of a light and elegant tensile bridge, there is a structure of post and lintel, reminiscent of a viaduct, whose tortuous length makes a nonsense of the bridge's proximity to Bristol Bridge.</p>
12	<p>Sustrans have further commented as follows</p> <p>"Further to the publication of the committee report in relation to the above proposals, Sustrans has been in further dialogue with the agent and wishes to remove their outstanding concern in relation to the bridge deck treatment. The applicant and CTS, the bridge manufacturer, have confirmed the material proposed is a Non-Slip</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
12	<p>Decking product range called Hi-Grip Extra. This product has a wide non-slip strip across the centre of a timber deck board providing an enhanced and smoother slip resistant surface that is ideal for disabled users, wheelchairs, cyclists as well as pedestrians. Sustrans are satisfied that if this material is agreed by way of planning condition it addresses all our outstanding concerns. We would strongly recommend, however, that a maintenance plan is put in place once the bridge is constructed in order to ensure that this bridge remains a valuable asset within the city's walking and cycling network."</p> <p>The Castle Park Users Group have further commented as follows:</p> <p>"Castle Park Users Group maintains its objection to any bridge being built across the floating harbour between the Finzels Reach development and Castle Park. We would state that the shorter footbridge originally proposed to the council would have serious implications for the disruption and use of Castle Park, with disturbance to the walls of the park and major alteration to the existing footpath layout, and endangering the fig tree on the wall of Castle Park. Whilst we object to another bridge being built at all, we think that the latest design for a footbridge will have a less damaging impact on Castle Park than the original proposal. In particular, there would be no danger to the fig tree, no damage to the walls of Castle Park and no change or disruption to the layout of the existing pathways of Castle Park"</p>
13	<p>The Inland Waterways Association has commented and this is summarised as follows:</p> <p>Object to the application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Seriously concerned regarding the clearance height of the proposed bridge and location closer to the sharp 90 degree bend in the course of the harbour - Whilst headroom may be sufficient for majority of locally based canal boats the Kennet and Avon Canal has seen increase in non traditional type craft which are higher above the waterline than traditional narrow boats - Minimum headroom should not be less than 3.3m found at the lowest other bridges and crossing points between Bristol Bridge and Netham Lock - The lowest level of the proposed bridge will be barricaded reducing the navigable width to the deepest water. This will reduce opportunity for unpowered craft to stay away from the path required by powered craft. - Increases the safety risk of collision between powered and unpowered craft which are unable to view oncoming vessels until the last minute especially at dusk/nightfall
30 & 35	<p>Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage</p> <p>The applicant has now submitted further technical information to seek to address the flood risk and associated surface water drainage refusal reason (Refusal Reason 2).</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Due to the timing of the submission of this further information the LPA have not had the opportunity to formally re-consult the Environment Agency prior to the committee date. The Flood Risk Management Team has assessed the information specifically relating to surface water drainage and is content that the solution could be acceptable. However the LPA have not had sufficient time to fully consider any associated structural and design implications of the surface water drainage and nor has the Environment Agency formally considered this information comprehensively with regard to the wider Flood Risk issue. As such, without formal comments on the additional/revised information from the Environment Agency (statutory consultee) or from all relevant specialist departments within the Council, the LPA do not consider is acceptable to remove or amend the refusal reason as written at this point.</p>

Item 2: - Central Library Deanery Road Bristol BS1 5TL

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
45 & 53	<p>Condition 4 (14/04253/F & 14/04254/LA)</p> <p>Following discussions with the applicant regarding timescales for the works to commence Condition 4 is amended to read as follows:</p> <p>Maintenance Plan</p> <p><i>Prior to the first occupation of the school accommodation hereby approved a maintenance plan shall be</i> submitted to and approved by the LPA for the areas proposed for use by Cathedral Primary School. The plan should set out the projected maintenance of the building and exterior spaces identified within the Lease as under responsibility of the School, over the next 10 years. The plan shall indicate maintenance of landscaped areas around the new entrance, the front basement lightwell, clearing and repairing rainwater goods and drains, servicing, of fibre-optic collectors, AC units and other plant.</p> <p>Reason: To secure the conservation of the Heritage Asset whilst under dual occupation</p>