

Development Control A Committee Agenda



Date: Thursday, 4 March 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Virtual Meeting - Zoom Committee Meeting
with Public Access via YouTube

Distribution:

Councillors: Donald Alexander (Chair), Chris Windows (Vice-Chair), Fabian Breckels, Stephen Clarke, Mike Davies, Paul Goggin, Margaret Hickman, Olly Mead, Steve Smith and Mark Wright

Copies to: Gary Collins, Matthew Cockburn, Laurence Fallon, Lewis Cook, David Grattan and Stephen Peacock (Executive Director for Growth and Regeneration)

Issued by: Jeremy Livitt, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol BS3 9FS

Tel:

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Date: Wednesday, 24 February 2021



Agenda

7. Public Forum

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item.

(Pages 4 - 57)

Any member of the public or Councillor may participate in Public Forum. The detailed arrangements for so doing are set out in the Public Information Sheet at the back of this agenda. Public Forum items should be emailed to democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk and please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:-

Questions - Written questions must be received 3 clear working days prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your question(s) must be received in this office at the latest **by 5pm on Friday 26th February 2021.**

Petitions and Statements - Petitions and statements must be received on the working day prior to the meeting. For this meeting this means that your submission must be received in this office at the latest **by 12 Noon on Wednesday 3rd March 2021.**

Anyone who wishes to present their public forum statement, question or petition at the zoom meeting must register their interest by giving at least two clear working days' notice prior to the meeting **by 2pm on Tuesday 2nd March 2021.**

PLEASE NOTE THAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEW STANDING ORDERS AGREED BY BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL, YOU MUST SUBMIT EITHER A STATEMENT, PETITION OR QUESTION TO ACCOMPANY YOUR REGISTER TO SPEAK.

Please note, your time allocated to speak may have to be strictly limited if there are a lot of submissions. This may be as short as one minute.

10. Amendment Sheet

(Pages 58 - 83)



Public Forum

D C Committee A (Remote)

4th March at 2pm



1. Members of the Development Control Committee A

Councillors: Don Alexander (Chair), Fabian Breckels, Stephen Clarke, Mike Davies, Paul Goggin, Fi Hance, Margaret Hickman, Olly Mead (Job Share), Paul Goggin (Job Share), Steve Smith, Chris Windows (Vice-Chair) and Mark Wright;

Statements/Petitions		
	Name	
20/03286/F Swift House, Albert Crescent, Bristol		
A1	Becky Whitmore	
A2	Veronique Bensadou, Grundon	Speaking
A3	Sam Robbins	
A4	Tracey Gudonis	Speaking
A5	Emma Jones	As per statement A3
A6	Eric Green	As per statement A3
A7	Stuart Butler	As per statement A3
A8	Brendan Sorohan	As per statement A3
A9	Stuart Phelps	Speaking – as per statement A3
A10	John Ross	As per statement A3
A11	Jean Palmer	
A12	Edwin Hill	
A13	Simon Holmes St Phillips Marsh Nursery School	Speaking
A14	Denise Draper, St Phillips Marsh Nursery School	Speaking
A15	Megan Butler	As per statement A3
A16	Naznin Sheikh	As per statement A3
A17	Emmeline James	As per statement A3
A18	Alan Blake	As per statement A3
A19	Margaret Blake	As per statement A3
A20	Nick Ingram	As per statement A3
A21	Ben Watson	As per statement A3
A22	Hilary Edey	As per statement A3
A23	Kate Webber	
A24	Rob Worsfold	
A25	Annie Oliver	As per statement A3
A26	Shona Jemphrey	As per statement A3
A27	Sharon Cutler	
A28	Margaret Blake	
A29	Nola Hersey	
28/05023/F 493-499 Bath Road, Brislington, Bristol		
B1	Mark Sommerville Savills	Speaking

B2	Steve Trenwith, Sovereign Housing	Speaking
B3	Joyce Ward	Speaking
20/04934/P – St Catherine’s Place, East Street, Bedminster, Bristol		
C1	Jock Shepherd	
C2	Ferdinando Manfredonia	
C3	Katherine Harrison	
C4	Zoe Dyer	
C5	Lucy Tuck	
C6	Aileen McLoughlin	Speaking
C7	Amandine Tchou	Speaking
C8	Sean Cook	Speaking
C9	Mike Orr, CJS Planning	Speaking
C10	Jacqui Pollard, Stride Treglown	Speaking
C11	Nick Townsend	Speaking
C12	George Grace, Bedminster BID	Speaking
C13	Simon Dicken, Bedminster BID	Speaking
C14	Charlotte Cameron-Beaumont	Speaking
C15	Diane James	Speaking
C16	Helen Adshead	Speaking
C17	Roland Oliver	Speaking
C18	Tessa Fitzjohn	Speaking
C19	Darren Jones	
C20	Miranda Kellas	
C21	Tomas Noga	
C22	Esme Clutterbuck	
C23	Kurt Wolfgang	
C24	Sally Cavanagh	
C25	Olivia Nava	
C26	Clr Jon Wellington	

STATEMENT A1 – Becky Whitmore

Dear planning committee members,

As a parent I'd like to plead with the committee not to grant permission for this waste transfer site to be built opposite my son's nursery school.

The quality of air in the area is already poor and why would we, as a city, do anything to make this worse. We can't deny the damage air pollution cause our bodies. Please don't put some of the most vulnerable in our community (those ages 2-5 years old) at further risk.

When the city is about to introduce a Clean Air Zone because it regularly exceeds lawful air pollution levels. Surely, we want to make things in the city better not worse!

If could, I would share a video of our walk to nursery from Barton Hill. The noise, the smells, the speed of the cars is not an enjoyable experience. I can't talk to my son on our way home because I can't hear him over the noise. I rush to the safety, tranquillity and sanctuary of the nursery or our home, in the back of my head worry about the pollution I am subjecting him to during the walk.

I expect the air pollution levels at the nursery aren't ideal. But the level of care he receives, dedication of the staff, environment inside, locality (in relation to my house) and affordability of the care is second to none. I ask you again, please don't grant permission for this waste transfer site to be built opposite my son's nursery school.

Yours hopefully,

Becky Whitmore

STATEMENT A2 – Veronique Bensadou, Grudon Waste Management

Land at Swift House Albert Crescent Bristol BS2 0UD

Planning Ref. 20/03286/F: Erection and operation of a waste transfer station and ancillary structures, including a trailer shelter, a weighbridge and weighbridge office.

Development Control Committee A – Thursday, 4th March 2021, 2pm

To:- Mr. Chairman and Members of the Development Control Committee, Bristol City Council

This statement is being submitted by Mrs. Veronique Bensadou, Head of Estates and Planner at Grudon (The Applicant).

Grudon is seeking planning permission to operate a new waste transfer station for the management of waste collected from local businesses. The Site is located within the St Philip's Marsh industrial area, which is designated as a Principal Industrial and Warehousing Area in the adopted Local Plan.

All aspects of our proposal have been subject to rigorous assessments of their likely impacts. These studies have demonstrated that the operation of the facility would not result in any detrimental impact or unacceptable harm to the environment or local amenity.

If consented, the site would also operate in accordance with an Environmental Permit monitored by the Environment Agency. The Permit would govern the day-to-day operation of the site and set out pollution and environmental control measures. These controls would be in place to protect the local environment and the amenity of the local area.

Amongst the statutory consultees, Bristol City Council's Pollution Control officer, Transport Development Management officer and Air Quality officer, amongst others, have raised no objection to the proposals, and so did the Environment Agency.

Officers have carefully considered the application proposals, and have determined that they accord to the local and national planning policy and recommended approval. For this reason and those I have outlined, I hope you will endorse this recommendation.

Thank you.

V. Bensadou

STATEMENT A3– Sam Robbins

Objection to Planning Application 20/03286/F: Swift House Albert Crescent Bristol BS2 0UD -
Erection and operation of a waste transfer station and ancillary structures, including a trailer shelter,
a weighbridge and weighbridge office

Community Involvement Statement

There has been no communication with the Community or local facilities like the school. Reliance cannot be placed upon its use of Community Liaison groups elsewhere in the UK. If permission is granted, the establishment [and maintenance] of a liaison group should be a condition of operation.

Objections and Supporting Comments

Fourteen of the supportive comments came from outside Bristol, from places as far afield as Windsor, Sandhurst, and Gwent. This contrasts with the objections, all from Bristol and many local to the site.

Learn @ MAT the Meriton Adolescent Unit Is also opposite the proposed Waste Transfer Station but is mostly ignored in the Application.

Noise

Loading and tipping waste within the building may seem to satisfy the noise concerns. Still, the residents of Totterdown have frequently complained about the noise from Bristol Waste's operations during 'normal' working hours. Loading late at night when there is little other activity means will carry far further from this site and affect a far wider area.

Flies/Odour/Rats/Gulls

The waste transfer will create problems. Arguing that the company will operate at the highest standards, is undermined by the experiences of similar assurances that have been given to the residents of Avonmouth.

Odour is notoriously difficult to monitor in a consistent way. Not allowing the problem to occur by refusing Planning Permission is the obvious solution. If granted, a monitoring system must be put in place with the onus on Grundon's to remove the odour or disprove the complaint; rather than the Nursery School staff having to 'prove' a problem via an app like 'OdourCollect'.

Lorry Traffic

It is hard to see how 116 additional lorries will not significantly affect the local traffic flow and patterns every day. Coupled with the impact of displaced traffic from the Clean Air Zone avoiding the city centre, the Totterdown and Avonmeads access points to St Philip's Marsh will become overloaded at critical times of the day. Similarly, the access via Avon Street is subject to current traffic management discussions between BCC and the University

To argue that the Nursery School Children will not be put at risk by increased heavy lorry traffic because they will be accompanied by their parents/carers

1. Displays a lack of knowledge about the behaviour and unpredictability of small children, and
2. Ignores the lack of a safe crossing point

Further, the Adolescents attending the Learn @ MAT the Meriton Adolescent Unit will not be accompanied, and by their very nature, are likely to be young people who lack an ability to concentrate or be always aware of their surroundings.

If granted; provision of a pelican crossing opposite the school should be a condition of development.

Air Quality

The original objections remain unanswered and the Committee report fails to distinguish between Nitrogen Dioxide and Particulates. There is growing evidence that the impact of Particulates is more severe upon human health than previously recognised. Ultrafine Dust from handling waste on the site is a serious threat to the health of the infants attending the Nursery school.

The entire report is based on modelling using sensor data from outside St Philip's Marsh. There were no Air Pollution readings for St Philip's Marsh until RADE [Residents Against Dirty Energy] installed Particulate and Nitrogen Dioxide sensors at the school earlier in September. Already their data indicates the situation on St Philip's Marsh is far worse than the developer's report states. Time should be allowed for the gathering of accurate local air pollution data.

The Council must not forget that the 'Sensitive Receptors' referred to in the report are very young children [2-5 yrs] from some of the city's most deprived communities.

In the middle of an industrial area, it's hardly surprising that the air quality is poor at the bottom of a valley. Nothing should be done to make it worse. Tipping waste, storing it, then loading and unloading lorries are all going to make the situation worse.

Arguing that the Air Quality Management Area passes by on either side of the site, ignores the fact that air [and pollution] know no boundaries and can easily travel 50 meters. So close to a Nursery School and an Adolescent Unit, the Precautionary Principle should be applied - our children's lungs are too valuable to risk.

From Mrs S E Robbins

STATEMENT A4 – Tracey Gudonis

Please take this as my outright objection to the proposed Grundons Waste Transfer Station at St Philips Marsh. As a parent of children who attended St Philips Marsh Nursery I am flabbergasted that I find myself objecting to YET ANOTHER ridiculous plan to develop a highly polluting site so close to the nursery and the Educational unit adjacent to that. Having read through the document where it is suggested that the plan might well be approved I would like to ask if you or anyone within the planning department at Bristol Council have taken the time to stand near the EXISTING WASTE PLANTS in St Philips and take a few good, long, deep breaths to see just how clean you think the air is there. I can assure you that you can feel the particulates entering your nasal cavity and lungs on a wind free day.

Adding to this existing pollution is not an option, especially so close to young children and vulnerably teenagers.

As a parent of a child with poor lung health I know only too well how distressing it is seeing your child struggle for breath, and what an extra stress on the NHS it is having additional children staying overnight on oxygen, ventilators, monitors and observation. This is simply NOT the place for this site and I would also argue that it reeks of environmental racism. I'm sure you would never contemplate placing such a facility as this in Clifton!!!

I would like an opportunity to speak at the committee meeting on Thursday please?

Please see also the following, very valid and well researched points. (SEE STATEMENT A3)

Kind regards,

Tracey Gudonis

STATEMENT A10 – Jean Palmer

to whom it may concern

I would like to send my objection to the planning of a waste disposal site so close to a local nursery school and commuter routes. The detrimental effects to the lives of children and the public through rats, disease, the smell of rotting, and the heavy lorries in and around the routes children and the general public are trying to use safely is mindless! We are working hard to promote healthier lifestyles by walking cycling and promoting a sense of mental wellbeing. Destroying the local environment and putting mental and physical life in danger is ridiculous and against everything Bristol City council are suggesting is important to Bristolians. Are we being lied to ?? how can you expect Bristolians to respect decision-makers if we are asked to do one thing then have the worst thing DONE TO US. it's very sad and extremely short-sighted.

Regards

Jean Palmer

STATEMENT A12 – Edwin Hill

Objection to Planning Application 20/03286/F: Swift House Albert Crescent Bristol BS2 0UD -
Erection and operation of a waste transfer station and ancillary structures, including a trailer shelter,
a weighbridge and weighbridge office

I agree with the concerns raised by RADE.

Future consideration of any residential/habitable use of this area or surrounding areas within a
substantial radius would have to be abandoned if this proposal goes ahead and the cost of the
necessary relocation of the Nursery and Adolescent Centre should be a factor in determination.

Regards,

Edwin Hill.

Objection to planning application 20/03286/F

- This application does not seriously address the impact of a massive increase in heavy traffic in the narrow streets of St Philip’s Marsh. In particular it does not address the impact on children’s lungs from the increased particulates in air pollution this will cause.
- Neither does it take seriously the implications for road safety and the parents with young children trying to cross the road directly opposite the plant. The school is less than 20 metres from the entrance to Grundons. It insultingly implies that as traffic has always been bad in the Marsh, it won’t make much difference. A pedestrian crossing is not considered necessary, Why? It would certainly make children, parents and staff feel a whole lot safer.
- Lawrence Hill ward has one of the highest levels of multiple deprivation in the country, and the highest level in Bristol. It has the worst health outcomes in Bristol, the highest level of hospital admissions for lung disease, and the highest level of hospital admissions for childhood asthma.
- In the USA the practice of allowing polluting and environmentally damaging developments in the poorest areas of the city is called ‘environmental racism’. Lawrence Hill ward has the largest BAME population in Bristol. We do not think a development such as this would be permitted in any other area of the city. How is Bristol different?
- A recent court cases in Manchester found against the Council granting permission for the building of a multi-story car park 26 metres from a primary school. Manchester City Council was found by the judge to be;

‘Blind to the potential impact on the school’ and to have; ‘Failed in its public sector equality duty by not considering the likely health effects on children attending the school’. It was criticised for relying on; ‘error filled reports regarding air quality’

Ella-Kissi Debrah is the name of the 9 year old London girl whose tragic death was caused from traffic air pollution which triggered her asthma. For the first time this was recorded as a cause of death by the coroner.

- There is no Council Air Quality Monitoring outside our School.
- This application is completely against the spirit and vision of what has been modelled by the Temple Quarter Development zone for the re-generation of the area. Instead of affordable housing, small business and green spaces we will now have four waste recycling plants within quarter of a mile of the school and increased heavy traffic and air pollution right in the middle of the city.
- This application should be refused on the grounds that it is harmful to children and the environment and should not be sited in the middle of a city next to a school.

Simon Holmes (Headteacher St Philip’s Marsh Nursery School) 2nd March 2021

Objection to planning application 20/03286/F

Statement for planning application

It is hard to see how 116 additional lorries will not significantly affect the local traffic flow and patterns every day. Coupled with the impact of displaced traffic from the Clean Air Zone avoiding the city centre, the Totterdown and Avonmeads access points to St Philip's Marsh will become overloaded at critical times of the day.

To argue that the Nursery School Children will not be put at risk by increased heavy lorry traffic because they will be accompanied by their parents/carers

1. Displays a lack of knowledge about the behaviour and unpredictability of small children, and
2. Ignores the lack of a safe crossing point

Further, the Adolescents attending the **Learn @ MAT the Meriton Adolescent Unit** will not be accompanied.

If granted; provision of a pelican crossing opposite the school should be a condition of development.

The Council must not forget that the 'Sensitive Receptors' referred to in the report are very young children [2-5 yrs] from some of the city's most deprived communities. A recent court case in Manchester found against the council granting permission to build a multi-storey car park. The judge found that the council were **"blind to the potential impact on the school" and to have "failed in it's public sector equality duty by not considering the health effects on children attending the school"**. It was criticised for relying on **"error filled reports regarding air quality"**. It is worth noting that there are no Council Air Quality Monitoring outside our school.

In the middle of an industrial area, it's hardly surprising that the air quality is poor at the bottom of a valley. Nothing should be done to make it worse. Tipping waste, storing it, then loading and unloading lorries are all going to make the situation worse.

In 2003, Ella-Kissi Debrah, 9 years old, from London tragically died and her cause of death was recorded, by the Coroner, as traffic from air pollution triggering her asthma. This is the first time this has been recorded as a cause of death.

The application goes against the vision for the Temple Quarter zone and instead of affordable housing, small businesses and green spaces this just adds one more waste recycling plant leading to increased heavy traffic outside the Nursery and worsening air pollution right in the middle of the city.

This application should be refused on the grounds that it is harmful to the health of children, staff and parents and to the well being of all. It should not be sited next to a school and would further impact on inequality in the area.

STATEMENT A23 – Kate Webber

Objection to Planning Application 20/03286/F: Swift House Albert Crescent Bristol BS2 0UD

I would like to make a written public forum statement to state my opposition to this planning application.

As a Governor at St. Philip's Marsh Nursery school, I cannot believe less than two years after successfully campaigning to stop the building of a gas-fuelled power station opposite the nursery, we now find ourselves fighting the potential installation of a rubbish tip next to our nursery. Nurseries and childcare provision of all kinds have been working overtime to continue providing vital support to infants and children throughout this pandemic, and knowing the council are minded to approve this application feels like a complete kick in the teeth, given the future of these nurseries, (acknowledged as 'essential' throughout the previous year and a cornerstone of young children's development), is already so precarious.

This proposal flies in the face of the council's alleged commitment to resolving a climate emergency they themselves declared, and undermines ongoing work to improve air quality under the Clean Air for Bristol initiative. How can the council seriously expect its citizens to give up their cars and decommission their fireplaces and woodburning stoves for the sake of the environment, whilst at the same time wave through a proposal that will create more than 100 additional lorries trundling down a road right next to a nursery and a nearby pupil referral unit?

This proposal will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the already poor air quality in this part of the city, which the proposal does not fully take into account; the council should collect air quality data on this site before allowing any new project to be signed off, to allow the impact to be properly assessed, rather than estimated. I wish to cite two recent judgements with reference to other local councils that I believe are highly pertinent to this case.

First, the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near the South Circular Road in Lewisham, London, and died in 2013, following an asthma attack. Southwark Crown Court ruled in December 2020 that air pollution 'made a material contribution' to Ella's death, making her the first person in the UK to have air pollution listed as a cause of their death. At St. Philip's Marsh we have several pupils with asthmatic conditions and/or from lower socio-economic backgrounds, exacerbating their exposure and vulnerability to air pollution, which in of itself is also linked to suffering more severe forms of covid, if it is contracted. The council must take full responsibility for ensuring the air its infants are breathing is safe, that is surely the most basic minimum level of care it should be compelled to provide - why are we having to even make a case that polluting children in the midst of a respiratory pandemic is far from ideal? Who on earth would support this?

Finally, I also wish to invoke a high court judgement in Manchester from only a few weeks ago, where a group of campaigners sought a judicial review of Manchester council's decision to build a temporary car park near a primary school. On Friday 19 February, the judge ruled in favour of the Trees not Cars campaign, noting the local authority failed its public sector equality duty by not considering the likely health effects on children attending New Islington Free School - some 26 metres away from the proposed site of the car park. Additionally, the judge ruled Manchester council officers 'misled' members of the city's planning committee by relying on error-filled reports regarding air quality impacts.

Campaigners from Trees not Cars said their victory exposed the 'hypocrisy' in the local authority's approach to addressing air pollution and global heating. In its report on the judgement, the Guardian newspaper noted this case 'may also be viewed as a warning shot to other councils which, like Manchester, declare "climate emergencies" and then push through polluting development projects'.

I am saddened we find ourselves yet again having to remind the council of the importance of the local maintained nurseries it is supposed to care for, particularly St. Philip's Marsh Nursery, which, along with its sister site Cashmore, provides the foundation for learning for some of the most deprived and disadvantaged infants and children of Bristol. The staff have been tireless in ensuring the nursery has remained open throughout the coronavirus pandemic, providing a safe, calm and caring environment, as their predecessors have dutifully done for the past century (2021 marks 100 hundred years since the school was originally built), and yet the council sees fit to reward this incredible endeavour by allowing a literal dump to be built across the street.

I would say it was unbelievable, but this is now the third time the nursery has had to fight an egregious application for a polluting proposal and I, and sadly the staff and local community are all very used to it. When will the council finally remember its duty of care is to its citizens, communities and its children, NOT corporations, and start making good on its promises regarding climate change, air quality and improving the lives of young people? How could anyone in good conscience sign off this monstrous proposal?

Yours sincerely, Kate Webber

Community Governor, St. Philip's Marsh Nursery School

STATEMENT A24 – Rob Worsfold

This is all so depressing as we as governors have been here before.. This is the third planning application over the past few years that has actually threatened the lives of the children at St Phillips Marsh Nursery. We came to the last planning meeting with some mothers and ‘receptors’ who would be affected, ie very young children, and thankfully the unsafe application and approval was overturned. It seems amazing that after such a short time a planning application that increases particulates, increases pollution, increases traffic from heavy lorries, increases smells in the air, increases the risk of vermin is even considered less than 20m from a Nursery School! It is obvious from the report that proper measurement of current air quality has not been undertaken, nor has there been proper consideration of future air quality.

The report shows a complete lack of understanding of families with small children, prams, push chairs and siblings walking together along a narrow footpath and the risk heavy lorries thundering past. There is not even consideration for a safe crossing. When I was a head teacher at Air Balloon I requested a crossing outside the school. I was told very clearly by Bristol City Council that I would only qualify for one if a child was killed. Is this still the price that we have to pay?

The report omits to consider the presence of a unit for some of the cities most vulnerable children next to the nursery whose very unpredictability can make their arrival and departure from school a challenge and a risk.

The dangers are obvious and evidence from London, Ella Aloo-Kissi-Debrah, and Manchester, The Trees Not Cars court victory against Manchester City Council, should ensure that this application is quashed. Bristol City Council makes a lot of noise about improving air quality, fighting for young children and fighting for equality, particularly with regard to ethnicity and diversity and it would be nice if that noise translated into action and not just bluster and hot air. It would be interesting for a survey to consider the objections and support regarding the planning application. As most of the support came from outside Bristol, I wonder how many were written by directors and leaders of the company making the application??

We have heard a great deal about the exciting plans put forward for the area over recent years, The Temple Quarter Plan, and others, but due to hesitancy or incompetence by Bristol City planners nothing has been agreed or put in place. This planning application would scupper all future plans as who would want to buy, lease, rent or pay student fees for accommodation next to and affected by a rubbish dump?

Finally we all know that if this application was submitted for Clifton or Redland it would not pass the first stage. This suggests that the claim of environmental racism could well be true. I hope that at the final stage Bristol City Council can once again see the bigger picture, stand up for a poor community and quash this dangerous and under researched application.

Rob Worsfold - Community Governor St Philips Marsh and Cashmore Nursery School.

STATEMENT A27 – Sharon Cutler

Objection to Planning Application 20/03286/F: Swift House Albert Crescent Bristol BS2 0UD

I would like to make a written public forum statement to state my opposition to this planning application

I work and live in the vicinity of St Philips Marsh and the preposterous planning applications that we have to fight time after time!!

I would like to know how Bristol City Council can claim they are working toward 'Clean air' as part of the clean air for Bristol initiative while agreeing to a rubbish dump be placed in St Philips Marsh- opposite a Nursery School and a pupil referral unit.

My objections are as follows:

- Flies – there are no preventative measures that can stop flies or even limit them!!
- Traffic noise- lorries thunder past the Nursery from morning till night some with total disregard for the speed limit.
- Road safety- I live a stone's throw from work but even I am not brave enough to walk or cycle to and from work due to the lack of road crossings, narrow pavements and the sheer amount of traffic...
- Odours- have anyone at this meeting smelt rotten food?? Believe me it will stay with you.
- Air Quality- with more traffic delivering and collecting waste from the rubbish Dump will generate dust, fumes and goodness knows what else, the air can only get worse than it already is.

WAKE UP BRISTOL....

It is diabolical in this day and age to dictate to the residents of Bristol to get newer, cleaner running cars and decommission log burners only to pollute the air with a rubbish dump. There is total disregard for the area of St Philips Marsh, the families that use the Nursery, the children that attend the Nursery and their health and wellbeing. These little people are NOT receptors these are our next generation.

Elle Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, London-2013, died from an Asthma Attack, a material contribution of her death was Air pollution. There are many children and adults using the Nursery that have a Doctor's diagnosis of Asthma. How many more premature deaths before Councils and planning Departments

Air pollution is a public Health Crisis

The health impacts of air pollution are well known, including increased deaths from heart disease, breathing problems, and lung cancer. Around 300 deaths a year in Bristol are linked to air pollution. Like cigarette smoking, its harmful effects have been known for a long time before enough action is taken. Some people are more vulnerable to air pollution. Air pollution particularly affects the old and the young, and those with heart and lung conditions. It can lead to children growing up with smaller lungs, and exacerbates asthma. Air pollution has even been associated with changes in the brain linked to dementia.

Sharon Cutler. Resident and worker of St Philips Marsh

STATEMENT A28 – Margaret Blake

Objection to Planning Application 20/03286/F: Swift House Albert Crescent Bristol BS2 0UD

I would like to make a written public forum statement to state my opposition to this planning application.

It is well documented that pollution/toxic air can damage children's growth and leave them with lasting health problems. It poses a particularly severe risk to those children and young people already suffering from heart conditions or respiratory problems, such as asthma and cystic fibrosis. We currently have children attending the nursery school who are classed by the NHS as 'CEV' (clinically extremely vulnerable) for these very reasons. The increase in traffic will exacerbate the pollution in the area and therefore have a detrimental effect on all children's health, but in particular, those children who are already extremely vulnerable. The increase in toxic air not only violates a child's right to health, but also their future - it could impact their right to education, their right to play and ultimately, their right to life (a right protected by the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child). Do the Council really want this?

The school is situated in Lawrence Hill ward (one of the most deprived wards in the country) and many of the children who attend live in low-income households, often in high rise flats without a garden. Therefore, their time in the nursery garden is often their only access to a stimulating, enriching outside environment. But at what cost to their health?

Research has found that children from low-income households also have lower aspirations and attitudes. What impression do you think it gives the children that attend the school that a rubbish dump is on the doorstep of where they are cared for and educated – are they not worthy/important/good enough?

It is galling that we are again in this position of having to protest at a polluting proposal – when will the Council start putting the health and wellbeing of our young people at the forefront – they are after all the future.

STATEMENT A29 – Nola Hersey

Dings Community Grundon Application response, March 3, 2021

**Objection to Planning Application 20/03286/F: Swift House Albert Crescent Bristol BS2 0UD -
Erection and operation of a waste transfer station and ancillary structures, including a trailer
shelter, a weighbridge and weighbridge office**

High level summary - objections due to

1. No consultation with neighbouring communities, including the Dings, by Grundon
2. Completely inappropriate to have a waste facility opposite **two schools** for the following reasons - noise and air pollution, road danger, potential for pests and vermin
3. Concern over flies and rats impacting on nearby communities if food is held there

Two other points to note, with reference to the photos below

The sign requesting people not to smoke near the children at the Alternative Learning Provision hub.
This health risk pales in the face of a waste transfer station across the road.



If the Bristol Ambulance is to stay in it's current location a waste transfer station would not be conducive to maintaining clean ambulances, staff health or road safety.



Individual responses from the The Dings community as follows:

"The report notes that the nursery school will only be occupied during school hours and thus the exposure to odours will be limited to approximately six to eight hours each day, with no exposure on weekends. Whilst this is true I do not feel it can justify any odour at the nursery from the site."

As stated-unacceptable levels of odour to a nursery. Psychological effects of school place being uninhabitable due to odour and sound. Could have an impact on learning.

Question of pollution over long term exposure for children attending nursery, especially during outside use of site (Breaktimes/To & From school).

Noise pollution to children too, the sound will not just be average traffic sounds but heavy machinery, breaking of waste materials, the incessant sounding of HGVs reversing. Adverse effects to children and the wider community.

Overall appearance to nursery site affected, could cause loss of service to business- damages to be considered.

Totally agree with what you've said. Also flies, pests etc potentially causing issues for the children is a horrible thought

Everything that has been previously stated - except for me it's objections not queries. Plus how does this chime with University of Bristol's intentions to make its Temple Quarter Enterprise Campus the flagship that will enhance not only the international standing of this Russell Group HEI, but also aspects of the public realm of this neighbourhood/ part of town.

There is absolutely no barrier/ legislation/ preventative action against flies. I am nauseated. If this proceeds I will expect a substantial investigation into our council tax bands and a rationalisation / justification of why they should remain the same.

There has been very little consultation. This is the first I have heard. 3 articles beneath (going back to 201) regarding the situation in Avonmouth

STATEMENT B1 – Mark Sommerville, Savills

I'm Mark Sommerville, Associate Director at Savills Planning and agent for this 100% affordable housing application on an allocated, brownfield site.

Sovereign listened carefully to the feedback of Members at the last Committee and at the subsequent briefing session, and the proposals in front of you today include positive revisions to both key matters in response. In particular, the briefing session was invaluable in giving Sovereign the opportunity to explain the rationale for elements of the proposal.

On design changes, the units within the Block A/B "hinge" have been reconfigured to improve their quality, sense of privacy, and the amount of light they get.

On energy, Sovereign have increased the units served by Air Source Heat Pumps from 8% to 25%. The remainder of the units are served by state of the art, high efficiency, low cost Electric Resistive Heating, which, together with PVs, increases the carbon reduction to 23%. Altogether, this is compliant with Policy BCS14.

Good planning should be about achieving sustainable outcomes; and this scheme achieves that on all fronts. At a time when the Council is not able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and "fails" the Housing Delivery Test, we respectfully request that permission is granted.

Thank you.

STATEMENT B2 – Steve Trenwith, Sovereign Housing Association

I'm Steve Trenwith, Land and Planning Director at Sovereign Housing Association.

This application for 100% affordable housing on an allocated, brownfield site comes at a time when there are over 15,000 households on the housing waiting list and over 850 in temporary accommodation.

These aren't statistics. They are real people. Families with lives on hold because they don't have a place to live.

This scheme is no compromise nor is it driven by profit or gain. Every decision made by Sovereign in its design has been to put residents' needs first, but not at the expense of environmental sustainability. This is recognised by the Council's Housing Delivery Team who support the proposals.

Contrary to information in the Report, I can categorically assure you that this scheme is 100% affordable housing and will be managed and maintained as such in perpetuity by Sovereign.

In light of the scale of housing need, the opportunity for this quality and quantum of affordable housing must carry very substantial weight in the determination of this application.

Thank you.

STATEMENT B3 - Joyce Ward

My name is Joyce Ward and, as per the last Committee, I speak to you as Chair of the Resident and Board Partnership within Sovereign Housing Association and an affordable housing resident of over 11 years.

I represent about 140,000 affordable housing residents that live in Sovereign's properties, by scrutinising everything Sovereign do in terms of strategy, policy, quality and housing standards. It's my job to give Sovereign a hard time!

One of residents' biggest concerns is how to manage money, a key part of which is fuel poverty.

The type of heating systems residents have is crucial to having warm homes and avoiding stress and debt. Residents must be able to have choice over their energy suppliers, monthly billings and a regular understanding of how much they are spending. Many of the heating systems in the Council's Policy BCS14 simply don't allow that.

I am utterly dismayed that, for the second time, the Committee Report has chosen to entirely ignore this element of Sovereign's evidence and justification explaining why the proposals are as they are. This is totally and absolutely irresponsible of Bristol City Council.

As a responsible housing association, Sovereign cannot and do not ignore this issue and they understand that these proposals give affordable housing residents choice and control, and put our needs first; something that the planning process repeatedly fails to do.

For all those people in need of good quality housing, please approve these plans.

Thank you.

STATEMENT C1 – Jock Shepherd

I would like to register my support for the Firestone application (subject above) that will be heard on March 4th and would like this note to be lodged in positive recognition of this planning application.

STATEMENT C2 - Ferdinando Manfredonia

My name is Ferdinando Manfredonia and I am the owner of flat 44 in Catherines House.

I am writing to give my support Firmstone planning application (ref. 20/04934/P)

The area has a huge potential and plenty of young families are keen to move around here as soon as the area is improved and regenerated.

There are some new local shops in the area that are attracting people from other neighbourhoods but are still in need of extra income as lots of people living in this area still prefer drinking cider on the road all day long.

Also, roads, road connections, paths are not safe at the moment. The underground cross-road in front of Catherines House is a huge hazard for kids, walkers and is always so full of rubbish that it is also a serious hazard for everybody's health.

During evening hours and night, people don't feel safe walking there as criminal actions keep happening.

The regeneration proposed by Firmstone can be the perfect boost to help this part of the city to get out of the darkness and become another point of attraction for students, tourists, and the citizens of a city, Bristol, that is growing more and more and is on its way to becoming a valid alternative to London.

I strongly believe that East Street's destiny is strictly connected to the whole City's destiny and there is no valid reason for not allowing this improvement to happen anymore.

STATEMENT C3 – Kathereine Harrison

I am writing in support of the application No. 20/04934/P Site Address: St Catherines Place East Street Bedminster Bristol.

I am a leaseholder in Catherine's House and I feel the regeneration will be beneficial to those of us living in the area.

Kind regards

Kathereine Harrison

STATEMENT C4 – Zoe Dyer

Hello,

I support the East street and SCP regeneration.

20/04934/P

Many thanks

STATEMENT C5 – Lucy Tuck

Adding my support to planning application 20/04934/P : East Street and St Catherine's Place

This project is a hugely positive injection of investment in the dwindling area. The high street is going to relaunch and reinvent itself in the coming years and so current closed retail units are ripe for some flair and considered development. I was not convinced by the previous application due to building scale and impact to daylight, but I am in favour of intelligent, socially sensitive progression that doesn't price out existing traders and residents and I know Firmstone took this on board and did one to one updates calls to all residents/owners of Catherine's House last summer, which was exceptional and assisted in good relations. I particularly approve of the extension of Mill Lane which will open up East Street up to better street design and herald in independent businesses, not necessarily just coffee shops either, good practical premises, it would be good to see some imagination in the small businesses that would consider East Street to base themselves and enhance the sense of existing community that is strong and no nonsense but add also some style too. I think Catherine's House was redeveloped very well, looks good, is managed well and is a positive addition to the area. Certainly I patronise all local shops as this is important to me coming from a village upbringing.

STATEMENT C6 – Aileen McLaughlin

Following on from my request to speak at Thursday Dev Committee here is my statement

Development Control Committee A – 4th March 2021 Full Planning Application 20/04934/F

Statement Aileen McLoughlin 49 Bayham Road Knowle BS4

We are forced to operate under the constraints of national planning laws and regulations and Tory obsessions with de-regulation. I am tired of this. Trying to play within these rules is depressing and can feel futile. Citizens of this City pore over planning documents trying to find arguments that will work to stop extractive over-development on their doorstep but the odds are stacked against them.

If you are the person on the Council waiting list how is this development helping you? This is the only thing that matters to me. We are building loads of housing but we are not helping the people who desperately need homes. How can we hold our heads up high as a City when we let this happen?

There is a lot of land here – thousands of people need homes in this area. What is the reason we are not using the land to meet needs? The answer is priorities, land values and systems that protect the land-owners and the wealthy over the people who just need a home

It is just not OK to build 180 homes and not make 30% of them available for social and affordable rents. 180 dwellings are being built in South Bristol but they are not being built for the people who need them. Who are they for?

Look, Firmstone are not evil or solely responsible for this situation we find ourselves in. But it is also not the Cities problem that they paid an over-inflated price for land and now have to maximise yield to make this viable. That is their error of judgement. Who should pay for this? It seems to me that the people on the Council waiting lists are the ones paying the price and that is not OK by me.

I have great respect and sympathy for officers and the members and Chair of this committee who have to make apolitical considered decisions demonstrably linked to planning regulations and guidelines. Not to do so would risk appeals and potential fines.

I do not want to be where we are. I call on councillors to refuse on the basis that this development does not meet our needs for affordable homes

Aileen McLoughlin

STATEMENT C7 – Amandine Tchou

20/04934/P – St Catherine’s Place: Statement in support

Dear Committee Members

I am Amandine Tchou, own VX Bristol - a vegan restaurant and grocery. Last year we were voted the third best vegan restaurant in the World - right here in East Street!

East Street is an interesting and friendly community, but things have become incredibly challenging for the area as its decline continues.

Things were already bad for traders in East Street, but have been made far worse by the pandemic. At VX, we have been able to keep going, providing Vegan groceries during limited opening hours to our fantastic and supportive customers, alongside a click and collect service. But East Street is in serious trouble. Around 50% of the shops around us have gone.

We desperately need regeneration in our area. We need more people living and shopping on East Street. We need people here 24/7. At times, it is like a ghost town after 5pm and we can't help feeling that East Street has been forgotten.

These plans before you today offer us the lifeline we need as a community of traders and residents. These new plans look to have addressed any concerns you had with the old development and this is the only opportunity now to regenerate St Catherine’s Place in the heart of East Street. Please help East Street to survive and thrive by approving these plans today.

Thank you.

Amandine Tchou
Owner, Vx Bristol

STATEMENT C8 – Sean Cook

20/04934/P – St Catherine’s Place: Statement in support

Dear councillors,

Thank you for the opportunity to address the committee in support of the long-overdue regeneration of St Catherine’s Place.

I live in East Street, owning a property right by St Catherine’s Place. I am really proud of our corner of Bedminster, but the way it has been allowed to decline while investment has been held up is a great shame.

As residents in East Street who live surrounded by decline, closing businesses, vacant and unsuitable retail units - we feel that we have been left behind while other parts of Bristol reap the rewards of investment and regeneration. These plans can change all that. St Catherine’s Place is a blot in the heart of East Street and it is crying out for this transformation. The thought of the new public spaces and the walking and cycling link right onto East Street give me hope that things can improve. The thought of new residents moving into quality new homes all around us can only mean vast improvement for the fortunes of local businesses. Having seen closure after closure over the past few years, can we now dream of new businesses opening up to serve new residents? With these plans and your support today, we can.

Please give us hope of better times for our neighbourhood. Please approve these plans. The thought of St Catherine’s Place sitting undeveloped any longer doesn’t bear thinking about. We need this place cleaned up and developed right now - if it is left any longer, I fear there will be nothing of East Street left to save.

Thank you

Sean Cook, East Street Resident.

**ST CATHERINE'S PLACE, EAST STREET, BEDMINSTER, BRISTOL 20/04934/P
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A THURSDAY 4TH MARCH**

- My name is Michael Orr, Director of CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd. I am the agent for the application.
- I commend the Officer Report recommending approval, concluding that the proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan as a whole.
- St. Catherine's Place and East Street has seen decades of underinvestment and decline. It is in perilous condition and needs urgent attention.
- This hybrid (full and outline permission) scheme will revitalise the East Street shopping centre and make a huge difference to the economy and local environment.
- The site constraints are extremely complex. The application effectively tackles land contamination, flood risk and below ground archaeology, all of which will cost a substantial sum to sort. The scheme will deliver 180 dwellings which will address all public frontages and bring about substantial environmental improvement.
- The scheme will deliver a substantial package of mitigation, through the S106 and a very substantial CIL receipt.
- In conclusion it is high quality urban regeneration that is worthy of your planning permission. I respectfully ask for your support. Thank you.

STATEMENT C10 – Jacqui Pollard, Stride Treglown

The current shopping centre suffers from low retail uptake, areas with poor levels of natural daylight, a low level of natural surveillance and associated antisocial behaviour.

At this stage, a comprehensive redevelopment of the site is not feasible due to the long leaseholds of some retail units and private maisonettes at first floor of the shopping centre. Three parcels of land were identified which could be brought forward for redevelopment without current leasehold constraints.

Over the past year we have worked comprehensively with the City Design Group to prepare the revised submission and the CDG acknowledge the many positive changes the revised scheme has made. The proposal is compliant with the Urban living SPD and the Bedminster Green Framework and delivers 180 high quality homes and prime ground floor retail to East Street. Homes will have improved quantum of private and shared amenity, be well day lit and benefit from sustainable heat generation.

The scheme will contribute a significant quantum of new and renewed public realm and work together with the remaining Bedminster Green plots to positively revitalise the area.

Kind regards

Jacqui

STATEMENT C11 – Nick Townsend

When recently discussing the pandemic, Lord Crisp, who was Chief Executive of the NHS (2001-6) and who now co-chairs the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Global Health, asserted on Newsnight that 'health is made at home, while hospitals are for repairs'. He argued for 'communities designed differently ... to see better housing which is fit for purpose, which has daylight, which is big enough and has access to green spaces. This application, like the previous Firmstone one which was rightly rejected by HM Inspectorate, does not even begin to address these issues. A building creating a healthy environment would have a mixture of housing so a sense of community could develop, not just consisting of one or two bedroomed flats, where children don't have a place. It would have outside areas that were not perpetually in shadow and it would not overshadow surrounding buildings and reduce their natural light, causing mental health problems. This development fails on every count.

Furthermore, with no affordable housing whatsoever, this application does nothing for the local community, and means that there are only 22 affordable units in this scheme and Dandara combined! In all honesty, why bother having a council policy on affordability at all? Combined with Dandara, it will form a monstrous glass wall along Dalby Avenue, which is another reason why this scheme is detested by most real residents. In 20 years, we will almost certainly be experiencing regular summer temperatures of 35C, where living in these kind of dense developments will become unbearable. Shouldn't we therefore be building the healthiest, most sustainable and future proofed buildings possible? Because if not now, when? We need to do much better than this. This application should be refused.

20/04934/P – St Catherine’s Place – Statement in support of the planning application

Bedminster BID supports this application in the strongest terms possible. Quite simply this is the most important development for the successful regeneration of East St in terms of its immediate proximity to the highly visible gateway from the city centre and the potential to kick start not just a daytime renaissance but also an evening economy with more people living on the street.

The Bedminster BID and Town Team has spent nearly a decade trying to reinvigorate East Street, once the thriving retail heart of South Bristol. We have had wonderful support and involvement from the local community – and enjoyed some successes. However, it remains a huge challenge, with a much worsening retail outlook given the current crisis - sadly reflected in dozens of empty shops, and a proliferation of charity shops, pawnbrokers, vapes shops etc.

Given the impact of austerity over the past ten years and now Covid, the prospect of significant and much needed investment by the public sector continues to be bleak. We believe therefore the best prospect for East Street and the many small business owners and their employees is to turn the area around via significant new local demand. An ongoing challenge for the businesses here is the low level of immediate catchment - for several years this has been our number one priority to bring increased local footfall.

The proposed regeneration of St Catherine’s Place is absolutely critical to the future of East Street given the blight the run-down site currently causes for this end of the street and indeed the entire 'gateway' to East Street from the wider city. The various developments outlined in the Bedminster Green Framework, of which St Catherine’s Place is a crucial part, will create an estimated £3-5m worth of additional economic demand and transform the prospects for existing businesses and their employees and create the incentive for others to open here and finally turn the tide.

The continued growth and impact of the internet on retailing, the impact and consequences of Covid, plus the recent closure of four of the five largest retailers on East Street means the time to act on East Street is indisputably now - because if not, then soon when you do go there... there will be no there there!

STATEMENT C13 – Simon Dicken

Development Control Committee A, 4 March 2021

20/04934/P

St Catherine's Place, Statement in support

Simon Dicken – Chair, Bedminster BID

Dear Councillors,

My name is Simon Dicken and I am the Chair of Bedminster Business Improvement District. Bedminster BID has always been fully supportive of plans to regenerate St Catherine's Place, in line with the Council's aspirations at Bedminster Green.

I am also the manager of Wilkos on East Street and have witnessed first-hand the decline of our street as more and more shops have closed. It was a blow to us when the previous scheme for St Catherine's Place was turned down.

Sadly, since last year things have got worse for traders and residents in East Street with the loss of a number of anchor shops, including Poundstretcher and Boots. More than half our shops have gone now. Furthermore, the pandemic has made an already challenging situation far worse and we are going to need all the help we can get if we are to have any hope of bouncing back when normality returns.

Previous refusals have been a disappointment and have meant that the decline of East Street has continued. If you approve these plans in line with the recommendation of officers, you will be helping us to build back a vibrant local high street, with the help of footfall from new homes on our doorstep and vastly improved attractive links from Bedminster Green.

It can not be overstated how much we need this development to turn around the fortunes of what at times can seem a forgotten part of Bedminster.

Thank you.

Statement for St. Catherine’s Place Planning Proposal

Dr.Charlotte Cameron-Beaumont

Point One: Lack of Sunlight to Children’s Play Area (the landscaped courtyard)

Many of the problems with this application could be solved by rearranging the geographical layout of the tall buildings. In this written statement I have described what I see as the problems and then described my potential solution.

- The presence of a landscaped courtyard in this most recent application is a welcome response to the fact that the previous application was partially turned down on lack of resident children’s play areas.
- However I question that this will be a functional space, simply due to the lack of sunlight it will receive: it is surrounded by exceedingly high buildings to the East, South, and West. Buildings of 14 storeys and 11 storeys are sited to the South; a building of 8 storeys is sited to the West; whilst the current Catherine’s House of 8 storeys is sited to the East. There is also a building to the North, currently two or three storeys high, but this is one of the plots with an application for outline planning for residential so this may increase.
- The planning department have negotiated a small gap, where the building will be only 4 storeys high, but this gap is thin. It will let the sun in for only very short periods of time. And let us remember that four storeys isn’t that low. So I don’t count it to be a very functional gap.
- For children living in flats, it is crucially important that they get time out in the sunshine, for mental health and vitamin D, which is absorbed by our skin from sunlight. And also for the health of their parents, who need to be healthy to bring their children up well. Coronavirus has shown us that lack of vitamin D increases the chance of having problematic respiratory infections.
- Other children’s play places in this area include Bedminster Green itself, and Windmill Hill City Farm , but these are both similarly set to be overshadowed by future BG developments. Bedminster Green itself is set to be overshadowed by the prospective development on the Hereford Street car park to the West, Dandara to the North, and Deeley Freed to the East. It is already overshadowed somewhat to the South by Windmill Hill itself. Windmill Hill City Farm is set to be overshadowed in the afternoons by the Deeley Freed development.
- QED: there will not be any areas of sunshine in the afternoon in which children can play , and very few areas in the morning (only the farm) - amongst this entire Bedminster Green development - a vast area of new homes.
- It is true that families can walk up the hill to Victoria Park. A great option, no doubt, but it is involves an outing, crossing main roads; and so, although it will not doubt be a popular place to visit, it does not provide appropriate ‘doorstep play’ types of areas for children, as referred to by the planning inspector in his recent report on the St. Catherine’s previous application.
- The planning inspector at the recent appeal stated that: “the Council’s Child Yield Calculator indicates that at least 27 children would be likely to form part of the future residential population of this development”

My solution:

I think the geographical layout could be much better designed. My ideas are as follows:

- Why not put the taller element in the position of Plot 4; that way it would only overshadow the road and the already high 9 storey student buildings planned for Dalby Avenue on the other side of this wide road. Better this than overshadowing a children's play courtyard and East Street. I'm not sure if the developer owns the Iceland building but this would be an ideal position for a tall building because it stands to the East. It would not overshadow East Street either.
- Plot 3, situated to the west and south, could then become lower rise. You could have 4-6 storeys with gaps of 3 storeys. Thus letting the sun into the courtyard a lot more.
- This would also benefit East Street (which, under the current application plans will I think will be shaded quite substantially (I have calculated using a 3-D sketchup model that it would shade East Street during the morning, and in combination with the Dandara development would have quite a negative effect: really I think that a professional job on this should be requested as part of the planning application)
- If the developer wanted to maximise space for residential he could also create a pedestrianised tunnel with residential buildings above it, at the St. Catherine's Place entrance on Dalby Avenue, instead of the one he has created at the end of Mill Lane. (For the record I don't like the idea of a tunnel myself as I don't think it's sensible for the safety of pedestrians but I'm just offering this in case it is considered by councillors and planning officers as a better solution for all). He could also potentially add more storeys to the current Catherine's House building, leaving everything to the west of that building to be low-rise. This would mean that the courtyard would get some sun in from both the South and the West.
- The pocket park and the wide pedestrianised statement entrance on Dalby Lane could then be moved to the Mill Lane entrance instead . This would make much more sense because it is immediately opposite Bedminster Green itself and therefore would make more of statement for pedestrians and cyclists. You could have a pedestrianised crossing leading from Bedminster Green across to the Mill Lane entrance whether would be a pocket park.
- You could get rid of the tunnel at the end of Mill Lane.
- This solution would work so much better for the Stafford Street houses. It would also work much better for the Catherine's House flats because the tall building would lie to the East rather than the West.
- It would work much better for the children's courtyard.
- It would work much better for E Street, letting more sun into E Street
- it would work much better for Bedminster Green, with the a pocket park at the end of Mill Lane.

Point Two: Concerns about the tunnel under plot 3 which will form the entrance to the new Mill Lane

- personally I don't think a tunnel for a pedestrian walkway is a good idea. I have concerns about safety.

Point Three: comments in favour from Catherine's House

I note there are some comments in favour of the development from Catherine's House. However half of these were flats based on the East side of the development. These are people whose daylight and sunlight will not be affected to such an extent.

Point Four: East Street

A key argument from Firmstone is that this development is necessary to regenerate East Street.

I live locally, and have done for 20 years, and I shop on East Street regularly, and I would say: Yes, we do want urban regeneration and new homes, but this does not have to come with a price tag of over-massed developments, no affordable home component, and no consideration to sustainability or children's health.

I would argue that we want the right development, not just any development: We want a development which will bring well-being to the residents, the community and the economy of the area.

In past Planning Committee meetings, much was made of the need to move fast with BG developments, with the supposition that East Street would die otherwise. My opinion is somewhat different:

- East Street is definitely not gentrified, but it is full of life: In January 2021 we did a count of shops and found a total of 86 units, of which 72 are open and only 14 closed. It includes 7 cafes, a greengrocers, a new independent small-style supermarket which opened last month, 2 butchers, a post office, 2 banks, a chemist, clothes shops, charity shops, 6 barbers and hairdressers, 5 takeaways, a fish stall, a pet shop, key cutting, fish and chips, 2 pubs, 4 phone shops, 3 newagents,1 travel agent,....and much much more. Unfortunately, the normal hustle and bustle is currently on hold due to covid.
- To give you an idea of the catchment population before covid, in January 2020, before lockdown and just before the second planning committee meeting. I counted the numbers of people going past. 501 people went past in 15 minutes, an average of 33 per minute.

If traders are keen to increase their catchment population due to worried about going bankrupt over Covid, I would argue that they would be better with a quickly built lower rise development than a tall building which takes much longer to build.

I would describe East Street as a high street in flux, rather than one in decline. The population around E Street has changed in demographics quite dramatically over the last few years to become much more middle-class, and many of the shops on East Street do not yet reflect that. If some of them are finding that their trade has diminished then I think that this could be one of the reasons. Many of the people living locally choose instead to go either to Wapping Wharf or North Street.

Any development which is substandard in design, massing, height and public realm could see this trend continue, with local people still not choosing to shop on East Street.

This planning proposal would in fact shade the shopping precinct at St. Catherine's, and it would also shade East Street and Bedminster Parade, for most of the morning, in all seasons except summer, as it lies to the South of all three of these shopping areas. What better way to ensure the death of a high street than to put it in the shade? The ideas behind the East Street Vision Project were to create café seating areas – a great idea, but no-one will hang out there if there is no sunshine.

If we build something too monstrous, windy or shady, with no feeling of joy, even the people who do end up living here won't stay around to shop or sit in cafes. They'll go to Wapping Wharf or North Street instead, as many of the present local people do.

If we want a vibrant successful East Street then we need to build fabulous, light, sustainable buildings; buildings which encourage a state of well-being for the inhabitants and the community; and make people want to live here, shop here, and hang out in the vicinity. I don't believe that this development will do this.

Furthermore, we need buildings that enable people to feel a sense of space when they are in the shopping area and which do not block out the sun from our shopping areas. The dense massing and the height of this building unfortunately means that this is not the case for this development.

Great architecture of a human scale will grow the local economy; but dense massing and monstrous heights will diminish it.

So, please, let's hold out for a development that will make Bedminster proud.

Appendix:

Data on East Street shops, collected on Saturday, 23 January 2021: 86 shops in total on East Street, of which only 14 are empty.

East Street Shops as of 23rd Jan 2021:

2 x Estate Agents	7 x Cafes	5 x Pawnbrokers
6 x Barber	1 x Wilko	1 x Key Cutters
1 x off license	1 x Schoolwear shop	2 x Pubs
1 x post office	4 x Nail bar/beauty salon	2 x Clothes Shops
1 x restaurant	2 x Butchers	1 x Opticians
5 x charity shops	4 x Amusement arcades	3 x Newsagents
2 x betting shops	4 x Phone Shop	1 x Card Shop
1 x Vintage Shop	2 x Fruit and	1 x Travel Agent
1 x Poundland	Veg/Supermarkets	2 x Vaping Shops
1 x Chemists	2 x Banks	5 x Takeaways
	1 x Pet Shop	14 x empty shops

Note : St. Catherine's shopping precinct is off East Street, and therefore not included in our count, but the appellant states that, out of a total of 11 premises, only two are paying rent or service charges. Indeed, it is true that many of the 11 shops in St Catherine's precinct are empty, but the number of empty shops has increased since Mr Firmstone owned the site, (according to the staff of the YMCA second-hand furniture shop this was because Firmstone was not renewing leases. The YMCA did not want to leave, but were forced to, in 2019, and they indicated to me at that time that other shops were in the same situation).

Point 6: Equalities Information

The Equalities Impact Statement states that " this application would not have any significant adverse impact upon different groups, or implications for the Equalities Act 2010".

I have two points to raise on this:

1. **Numerous heavy fire doors negatively impact on the elderly, disabled people, pregnant women, and people with young children and buggies**

My elderly mother lives in a block of flats. She has to go through SEVEN fire doors to get out of the building! I recently spent a couple of months staying with her. The fire doors are heavy enough for me, a healthy 49-year-old. When I have shopping to carry in I find it very hard to open the doors and it can negatively impact on my back. I cannot imagine what this must be like for the elderly, disabled, or for young mothers. It makes it so hard to get out of the building. This is particularly bad for young parents who need to be able to easily take their children outdoors without struggling through seven fire doors with a buggy and two young children. This may seem like a minor point, but I consider it to be a very serious issue. Not being able to easily get out of the house can cause isolation and mental health problems -and these things negatively affect elderly, disabled, and young parents more so than others anyway. Moreover, the many fire doors mean that you are much less likely to bump into a neighbour, so they negatively effect on community as well. It is easy enough to put in the more expensive type of fire door which is held open all the time by a catch which let's go when the fire alarm goes off. This would make a huge difference to isolation. I think this should be included as an essential upgrade to all blocks of flats.

2. Might lack of sunlight on courtyard adversely affect BAME children more than others due to differing Vitamin D requirements?

The Equalities Act 2010 may possibly be relevant when considering the lack of sunlight reaching the inner courtyard (which is intended, in particular, to provide for 'doorstep' play amongst the resident children).

I consider this a failing on all the children who will live in this development, and have written about this issue in more detail earlier in my main statement.

Nevertheless, could I ask if the provision of sunlight could be considered to be more important for BAME children than others, due to different requirements for vitamin D? Vitamin D absorption from the sun is known to be lower amongst BAME groups and thus diseases such as rickets, caused by lack of Vitamin D, are found in higher proportions amongst BAME groups. If this is so then it might be something that needs considering under the Equalities Act.

Whilst Vitamin D can be given as a supplement, the following article from the Pharmaceutical Journal says that there is doubt about the efficacy of Vitamin D supplementation.

<https://pharmaceutical-journal.com/article/feature/a-cloud-of-doubt-over-the-sunshine-vitamin>

STATEMENT C15 – Dianne James

20/04934/P Statement

Dianne James

Before making a decision on this application please consider the effect that this development, in its current form, will have on the community of Bedminster.

Bedminster is short of housing, especially affordable homes. How can building more full price apartments, along with the all the others planned between here and the city centre, help the local community unless some of them are going to be affordable? Local people need help. This does not help them. This excludes them.

I ask you to look at the two affordability calculations and conclusions, and then decide as a committee where your priorities lie. Is it to residents or to developers?

The high towers will block light from homes in Catherines House and Stafford St. Residents will be forced to put their lights on earlier so they can see. Their fuel bills will increase. This not helping local people but penalising them.

The height of the main tower will over shadow Bedminster Green, and when all of the plots are built the Green will be completely surrounded by highrise. It will be so overshadowed no one will want to sit there. Consider our well being. Consider the cumulative effect, don't think about this 14 storey tower in isolation, don't make it the first of many.

Please refuse this application.

STATEMENT C16 – Helen Adshead

Statement on St Catherine's PA, March 2021

The Bedminster Green Framework suggests that buildings surrounding Bedminster Green could all be up to 10 storeys tall, with the opportunity for discreet elements to go taller, but not the entire block or frontage. If this Planning Application was approved, along with the Dandara block we would end up with the north side of the Green being a wall of 11, 13, 14, and 16 storeys. Not 10 storeys, and nothing discreet about it.

This would have a devastating impact on our Green. Think Queens Square, Berkeley Square, Millenium Square, all of them work because the buildings are not overpowering. Our wellbeing and happiness are affected by our surroundings and human scale building is what is needed here.

The Bedminster Green Framework was paid for and led by the Developers. It was the end product of negotiations between them wanting as much height and mass as possible to maximise profits and BCC trying to put some restrictions and guidance in place. 10 storeys is the absolute maximum height that should be agreed along that edge of the Green.

Firmstone have made buildings on the rest of the site human scale, they now need to address that same need on this side of the development.

Helen Adshead
1st March 2021

STATEMENT C17 – Roland Oliver

Application no. 20/04934/P St Catherine’s Place/East Street

Statement for Development Control Committee A meeting on Thursday 4 March 2021

Last year Firmstone completed the Engine House conversion at 96 Bedminster Parade. It is a three storey, mixed use structure with Bristol Loaf on the ground floor and flats above. If a plan on similar lines – much more extensive, of course and, say, twice the height – had been proposed for St Catherine’s, we could now be admiring the development, not still talking about it. Instead Firmstone has wasted two years, including six months on a fruitless appeal, of its own and other people’s time and resources, chasing castles in the air.

Any delay is not the fault of this committee. However, if you are minded to nod this through as a sort of sympathy vote, please remember that, whatever the improvements, we will still get a building twice the height of Airpoint, the Firmstone apartment block on West Street. And think of the precedent you will set.

We could easily end up with towers of fourteen storeys on each of the other three sides of Bedminster Green, and fourteen hundred student cells in blocks of nine storeys, closely packed on to Plots 1 and 3. That is not an attractive prospect.

Roland Oliver - 01/03/2021

Contact details on email

STATEMENT C18 – Tessa Fitzjohn

Statement for Development Control Committee A for meeting on March 4th 2021.
St Catherine's Place East St Bedminster Bristol

I am writing to raise my concerns regarding the proposed development Application No 20/04934/P

I am very pleased to see the design has been significantly improved, and welcome the reduction of height to the main tower of 14 storeys. Though it still presents a dominant and imposing presence as it faces directly onto the green and in my view fails to meet planning criteria DM26, asking that buildings respect the architectural context surrounding them, in this case Victorian terraced family homes, small shops and industrial buildings.

I fear for the neighbouring properties whose small flats and houses will lose unacceptable levels of light. St Catherine's House is likely to lose 62% of their light and loss of privacy due to face-to-face neighbouring windows. Similarly Stafford Street will suffer loss 85% daylight.

Stride Treglowan have worked hard to maximise lighting and reduce shadowing, but even so it seems Internal corridors on the ground and first floor will be badly effected.

Sadly, so there will no affordable housing in this development of 180 dwellings. It seems that this application is not viable. Contrary to what we were told years ago when St Catherines first received planning permission

Firmstone have also negotiated a reduced CIL amount which, will be used to improve transport and open up the River Malago which I welcome.

It seems this application is likely to go through today, and if so I would make plea to all involved in urban regeneration to learn from Bedminster Green, as it has worn out its community and become a case study of how not to do regeneration.

I've been involved from the very start and supported WHaM in their actions to aid the regeneration of Bedminster not oppose. , this area badly needs investment. I don't agree with the BID team, I think there out of step with current trends, and I urge any one here to day to put Gainsborough Square into google and read the first headline on the vision document which says 'The Communities Vision....

Thank you

STATEMENT C19 – Darren Jones

St Catherine's Place (20/04934/P)

Support statement

Darren Jones – East Street Fruit Market

Dear councillors,

East Street Fruit and Veg market has been going for more than 30 years now, and East Street now is a very different place to when we started.

You may have heard about us, we are an old-style fruit and veg market, complete with the traditional market chants! Indeed, the Bristol Post has referred to me as the 'voice of Bedminster' for my market patter!

We're very thankful for our loyal customers who keep coming back despite the challenge presented to us by the supermarkets. They appreciate the great produce we provide, as well as the personal service. We always have time for a chat with our customers. We're also lucky to have been able to continue trading during the pandemic, providing deliveries to our more vulnerable customers who haven't been able to get out. I am very proud to be part of what makes Bedminster a proper community.

But trading conditions on East Street are very bad now. They are by far the worst I have seen in three decades. The decline of the street, the closure of so many shops, means that there are fewer reasons for people to come here. Traders just cannot survive with ever fewer customers.

I am asking you to please support this application to breathe new life into St Catherine's Place in the heart of our community. This will help transform East Street for the better and provide new customers on our doorstep, helping us to continue being part of this fantastic but too often overlooked community.

Thank you for listening,

Darren Jones
East Street Fruit Market

STATEMENT C20 – Miranda Kellas

Statement for Planning Application at St. Catherine's Bedminster. March 2021.

We do appreciate that the Developers have worked hard to provide and work out a design that might work within this area to provide accommodation for many people. However the designs don't work to meet the ACTUAL need because they are unviable - they would be unaffordable for most people and unpleasant to live in and around. Also the construction of these high buildings would be very expensive in the use of resources and difficult to maintain to good safety standards for years to come.

We are now trying to adjust to a new era - post COVID and a CLIMATE EMERGENCY.

We need a more careful use of materials, and work out how to actually help people live humanely with more sensitivity to nature and our own communities and mental health. This area of Bedminster could attract people to come together in new ways and with fresh new vision.

A few suggestions:

Rewild - create a BEAUTIFUL space at St Catherine's.

1. Allow the St. Catherine's area to rewild allowing Buddleia, Ponds, Mosses, Aquilegia to grow through the cracks and plant trees.

2. Encourage birds, insects, butterflies. - possibly have an aviary.

3. Have natural seating, wooden, basketry, tree logs, hammocks etc.

4. Encourage singing and acoustic guitars, flutes, and instruments.

5. Have an open area for dance and movement.

6 Have a few wooden (prefab) cabins built on stilts for naturalists observation or homeless people needing shelter for the night. (Have a water and electric source.)

7 Have some unpackaged fresh food stalls - where there is space.

That's it. I don't think this scheme would be very expensive and it would tick quite a few boxes.

Miranda Kellas

STATEMENT C21 – Tomas Noga

Application No. 20/04934/P

Site Address: St Catherines Place East Street Bedminster Bristol

I am a flat owner at Catherine's House and I support this appeal. When we bought our flat we knew that the area was going to be redeveloped with high buildings next to us and around us. The cinema and new shops are very important to Bedminster and will be very necessary with all the new flats being built.

I have lived and worked in Bedminster since 2009 and I fully support this planning appeal.

Thank you

Tomas Noga

STATEMENT C22 – Esme Clutterbuck

I object to the above development.

It is a particularly unsympathetic development which is out of keeping with the character and scale of the area and represents a retrograde step, harking back to the unsuccessful building projects of the 1960s.

It does nothing to create a low carbon future and is not environmentally friendly. Nor does it fit with a healthy living agenda offering inadequate sized living areas and severely reduced light levels in the building and in buildings near it. . Any outside spaces will be overshadowed as the blocks are still far too tall. There is also a likelihood of wind tunnel effects because of the building's proximity to other buildings.

There is no provision for family living. I would like to see far more affordable and social housing offered in this area.

This building degrades the quality of the lives of local people where health, mental well being, community and the built environment are concerned.

Esmé Clutterbuck

STATEMENT C23 – Kurt Wolfgang

PLANNING APPLICATION No 20/04934/P ST CATHERINE'S PLACE EAST STREET FIRMSTONE

STATEMENT TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A ON 4TH MARCH 2021 - OBJECTING

PLEASE NOTE that these objections don't reflect on the skills and competence of the architects and engineers, rather on the brief they have been given.

UNAFFORDABLE: Firmstone said they'd listen but they still "can't afford" affordable housing. Given that it's a basic requirement and one of the two main reasons for objections this is an insult to the community.

UNSUSTAINABLE: Despite all the guff about sustainability and lip service to zero carbon Bristol the proposed scheme will be to the minimum standards of the 2010 building regulations in terms of reducing energy waste - ie build as badly and as cheaply as you can get away with, so long as it looks ok.

The proposed materials and height mean embodied carbon - even "mid-rise" concrete or steel framed buildings are producing in the order of 25-30 tonnes of CO2 equivalent per flat to make, compared with 7-9 tonnes for timber framed (Bangor University for Committee On Climate Change). This isn't even mentioned or justified.

HEATING OPTION A - district heating if it comes in time

The heating system choice is left literally hanging in the air. The sustainability report says option A is district heating, if it's ready in time. There is a plant room (good) and there will be distribution pipes to flats (good). And there will be Heat Interface Units to "draw" heat into the flats. But then it's not clear whether there will be underfloor heating or radiators to transmit that heat into the homes.

But of course we know that the district heating network in Bedminster, based on current action levels, isn't likely to be ready in time. Using the old Bedminster Baths plant room to draw heat from underground water storage is brilliant, but would need a step change in investment and commitment (it's taken over a year just to fix a few ceiling tiles and some pipework in the pool itself)

HEATING OPTION B AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMPS - not planned & not necessarily so green

So what about option B? Air Source Heat Pumps for "each unit". These look like bolt-on air-conditioning units. Where are they going to go? The report - in the cut-and-pasted general section mostly on "nice options we aren't going for" says :

"The heat pump system is sited externally; either on external walls, in external compounds or within a ventilated plant room allowing air to be drawn over the evaporator part of the unit"

and then (after a not-very-nice picture) "ASHP units would need to sit in either an acoustically treated external plant enclosure or within a well-ventilated internal plantroom"

In reality the implication is that 180 of them will be bolted on the elevation. Which will be ugly and probably noisy.

But there are still 2 more questions. The report notes:

"that for every 1kW of electric in, 2.5kW of heat is generated (for ASHP) and up to 5kW (for some ground or water source heat pumps). This efficiency of a heat pump is governed by both the temperatures of the heat source and the heat emitter as shown..Heat pumps are, therefore, best

suited to low temperature systems such as underfloor heating. If radiators are used with heat pumps it is likely that they would be twice the as large as those used with conventional radiators."

So the "air source" heat pumps are the least-efficient sort - but the only ones you can easily use on high rise - and need underfloor heating or large radiators. It's possible that underfloor heating has been assumed, in which case there is just the question of the mounting and performance. Residents may be paying very high electricity bills in the near future if they buy or rent these flats.

OVERALL CO2 EMISSIONS OPPORTUNITY MISSED: If the buildings were built lower and using timber frame or CLT then that would save about 3600 tonnes of CO2 equivalent according to the study noted above (that would allow Mr Dandara to drive his 5 Series BMW over a million miles)

If the buildings were built to "Passivhaus" standards (as recommended by Committee on Climate Change advisors) they would use 30% of the heating energy these will.

And that would make it easier to find a neat centralised solution for powering the heating system, while waiting for the district heating. A ground source heat pump might be possible, particularly if the site wasn't so over-developed.

NO FACILITIES FOR ST CATHERINE'S HOUSE RESIDENTS: The revised scheme has a few supporting comments from people who have bought flats in St Catherine's House (rents now £1200 a month for a 2 bed) who say the new development will bring facilities. Yet the ground floor of St Catherine's House is even now being turned to flats instead of facility space, and there is nothing else proposed in the full application. The "outline" application for the middle section of the site only says "commercial and residential space"

FALSE DENSITY - The planning statement says the density is 175 dwellings per hectare which sounds okay by today's standards, but that's taking the whole site into account. If you just take plots 2,3 and 4 (the flats plots) then it's about double that density (estimated area 5000m2 to middle of Dalby Avenue, though might be a high margin of error as scaling off screen).

SUNLIGHT, DAYLIGHT, & OVERHEATING - The images and plans I have seen are based on midday midsummer conditions where shadows are shortest, and don't allow for any future new buildings in the middle of the site. In reality the courtyards will be dark nearly all the time, and the shopping precinct most of the time.

The lower flats will suffer massive lack of daylight (just look at the cross sections)

The overheating check looks at upper floor flats and says they can open the bedroom windows on summer nights for cooling. But some only seem to have full height french windows. Even if they can open those a crack (and they will be drafty 14 floors up) then that leaves all those flats on the ground floor, most of them right next to public footpaths, which don't even have high "fanlights" to open.

ARCHAEOLOGY - the opportunity to incorporate or display remains of the medieval water mill has been missed, in favour of getting more ground floor flats in.

SO please consider Bristol's population needing affordable housing, and our commitments to zero carbon - recommend refusal for the sake of the city and planet .

STATEMENT C24 – Sally Cavanagh

Tower blocks have been used previously to resolve housing crises but resulted in creating other social and health problems. High levels of depression, social isolation and ‘ghettoisation’ of residents in high-rise blocks are well researched. Building high rise blocks equals building future social isolation on a massive scale; cementing in a culture of the ‘individual,’ not community. Bedminster and Windmill Hill are two of the most densely populated wards in the city, already have 5 tower blocks and with planning permission granted for Little Paradise, 5 more. These wards do not have the infrastructure to accommodate exponential population growth.

Our specific concerns with the proposed development of St Catherine’s Place in application 20/04934/P are:

Incomplete Plans: - The application submitted is incomplete. Without the detailed plans for all Parts 5, 6 and 7 full and proper democratic scrutiny cannot be carried out on the proposed development.

Comments related to aspects of the Application which are fully detailed:

These plans do not meet Bristol City Council’s social housing minimum threshold for new housing developments of this scale. Fluctuations in the value of land is a known risk. Firmstone’s attempt to excuse itself from meeting the key mandatory requirement to include social and affordable housing in the scheme on the basis that they paid too much for the land is unacceptable.

This is a family orientated area with a tangible culture of social responsibility - most people really value this - we would much prefer to see many more socially affordable homes in all plans for new homes in the area.

Loss of light and privacy Residents of St Catherine's House will lose up to 68% VSC. Stafford St will lose up to 75% of day light. We understand that the residents of St Catherine’s House have ‘gagging’ orders, in their purchase contracts, so cannot object to the loss of light without potential litigation. There will be significant loss of light to Bedminster Green, which supports mature trees and flowers.

Overshadowing on homes - Shadow study shows this development will not meet BRE recommendations. Overshadowing significantly impact on the sustainability of the 3 storey flats on Stafford St, whose residents rely on solar roof panels to generate clean, affordable energy.

Highway safety - adding over 4,000 people to this small area of the city, (if all planning applications for all five high-density developments proposed are agreed on three sites adjacent to St Catherine’s Place), will dramatically increase problems with highway safety. That's even without considering highway safety during the construction of these high-rise blocks and numerous even higher ones proposed for adjacent sites. Traffic and parking issues - The proposed development has parking for only 27 residents. 67% of cyclists also own a car – to expect that only people who do not own a car will buy these properties is at best deluded. This proposal will result in significantly exacerbating existing parking problems in the local area.

Noise - It is not possible to add over 2000 people from this and approved Dandara development and for the pre-existing noise level to remain the same. One of the unique characteristics of this area, and one we value most highly, is how quiet the area can be especially at the weekends.

Flood risk - Flood Risk Officer noted there had been no update to the drainage strategy to the previous application. Meaning the developers had not produced a SuDS solution for the site that met BCC requirements.

Fire risk – Avon Fire and Rescue assessed the plans and concluded that there are insufficient Fire Hydrants and water mains dedicated to fire-fighting included in the plans.

Wind tunnel effect – No modelling has been carried out on this development in conjunction with the other 3 or 4 proposed along both sides of Malago Rd/Dalby Avenue – so no understanding of how the wind will behave.

Amenity - Primary care services are stretched to beyond capacity in this area.

East Street is already challenged as a retail area – adding 815 square metres of additional retail space will exacerbate rather than solve the problem.

Design - The three higher buildings for which plans are detailed are 14 and 7 floors look incongruous with the surroundings – over-bearing and imposing, are oppressive and would irrevocably change the character of the local area. To be more congruous with the geography the buildings should be no more than 6 floors - 5 if the bottom floor is double the height. Appearance of the development – The scale, massing and height of the highrise blocks for which there are detailed plans, result in an over-bearing, oppressive, light-blocking, forbidding, imposing presence which is at best, completely incongruous with the prevailing context of 3 storeys on Stafford St.

STATEMENT C25 – Olivia Nava

20/04934/P – St Catherine’s Place: Statement in support

Olivia Nava, Bubble Play Café, East Street

I own and run Bubble Play Café on East Street, employing a number of local people. We are a community-focussed café and restaurant, with a fantastic softplay area on our upper floor for young children.

We love our community and we really want East Street to succeed. But the reality is that keeping going on East Street has been a real struggle in recent years as the street has continued to decline. It is a near impossible situation for traders, with many shops having closed over the years, including a number of key anchor stores.

The pandemic has exacerbated an already very difficult trading environment. As a community-focussed business, we have been able to keep going on a limited basis with a takeaway service, but our softplay has had to be closed for most of the past year.

Without significant investment into our community, the outlook is bleak. East Street needs an injection of life, with new families moving in, new improved public spaces and better links from surrounding areas. This application delivers that. This is the only opportunity to finally regenerate St Catherine’s Place. Only through regeneration can we drive footfall back to our remaining shops and provide the boost we so desperately need to convince new businesses to start up.

East Street traders, and we at Bubble Café, urge committee members to please approve this application which is recommended for approval by your officers, and help us deliver the beginnings of a renaissance for East Street. Without this investment and regeneration, it is very hard to see a viable future for our part of Bedminster as a place to do business and a sustainable community.

Thank you.

Olivia Nava, Bubble Play Café

STATEMENT C26 – Cllr Jon Wellington

This development and the Bedminster Green site are situated in the neighbouring ward of Southville, but the residential area most affected by this application is in Windmill Hill ward, which I represent.

My concerns centre on height, which remains unacceptable to residents of nearby Windmill Hill, design, which has problems as outlined in the report and in statements by local planning groups, and the lack of affordable housing in this development.

The affordable housing element means that it is impossible for a ward councillor to support this. New developments in Bedminster need to have options for lower income people to move in, or else we are creating apartments for one type of group only. This does not encourage our stated aims to have mixed communities. I see the viability report but I cannot accept that we must allow developers to be able to override or in this case, completely negate local policies because they are not making enough profit. I appreciate the developers are not charities but they should be willing to work as partners with the city and to recognise that they have a duty to the city and the community to provide affordable units.

Other concerns around light and overshadowing of neighbouring properties, and the narrow alleyways need to be tested by members of the committee.

The most contentious elements of these applications have always been height and while we have seen a reduction, the fourteen storey tower on Dalby Avenue remains an issue. Rather than 'stepping up' or being in the centre, it will be a presence on the pavement, presenting a looming presence and dominating the areas around here. I think this needs to be reconsidered in the context of surrounding properties.

Overall there are good elements to this but again, I urge committee members to consider the massive change to the area this will bring. The precedent set by previous planning decisions on Bedminster Green mean that the community will have to accept high density development which will change the nature of the area forever. If this is the case, the least we can do is use what tools we have to ensure developers provide an affordable element to fit with our priorities, and to ensure the design complements the area and is sympathetic to its surroundings. I don't think it matches this ambition so I would urge you to reject this application.

Cllr Jon Wellington (Windmill Hill ward)

3rd March 2021

Amendment Sheet 4 March 2021

Item 1: - Swift House Albert Crescent Bristol BS2 0UD

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
26	It should be noted that the illustrative plans on page 26 are inaccurate, and instead Members should refer to the plans provided in the supporting documents at the end of the report.
28	<p>Since the report was written a further 46 objections have been received. In large part these reiterate concerns that were expressed through the original consultation, particularly in relation to the environmental and traffic impacts of the development, particularly with regard to the impact on the nearby day nursery and education centre. In addition, the following comments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the lack of community involvement any decision should be condition on the establishment of a community liaison group, to include clear responsibilities on the applicant to Monitor and resolve impacts. (Officer comment: Having discussed this with the applicant, they are intending to introduce a Community Liaison group in relation to this facility). • Any permission should be condition on the provision of a road crossing at the site (Officer comment: there is already an informal crossing in this location, and given the transport statement shows no significant increase in traffic movement, any upgrade would be difficult to justify). • The air quality assessment relies on monitoring stations outside St. Phillips, and underestimates the impacts, especially the impacts of particulates (Officer comment: the submitted air quality assessment includes a receptor at the nursery, and includes an assessment of the impact of particulates – as such the air quality officer is satisfied that this is fit for purpose). <p>In addition, a comment has been received from Cllr Tony Carey (Brislington East Ward). Whilst this does not specifically object to the application, it does emphasis the value of the nursery adjacent to the site, and states that consideration must be given to moving the day nursery should the development go ahead. (Officer comment: This is beyond the scope of a planning application).</p> <p>In addition, 1 further supporting comment has been received on the basis that the proposal will bring additional jobs to the area</p>
41	<p>Following further discussions with the Council's flood drainage team and additional condition has been recommended, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No development shall take place until a proportionate Drainage Strategy and associated detailed design, management and maintenance plan of surface water drainage for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage strategy shall demonstrate how the proposed site makes improvements to the existing surface water drainage system for the site. The approved drainage strategy shall be implemented in full prior to the development being brought in to operation, and shall be maintained thereafter, in accordance with the approved details.

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal is incorporated into the design and the build and that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and maintained for the lifetime of the proposal.</p> <p>Finally, the applicant has raised a concern about proposed condition 11, which limits the lifespan of the development. This condition has been requested by the Environment Agency, and relates to the impact of climate change on flood levels on the site. The applicant argues that the Flood Risk Assessment demonstrates that the development will be safe even beyond the 40 years. This is being discussed with the Environment Agency, but has not been resolved at the time of writing.</p> <p>Therefore, the recommendation remains as previously proposed with the addition of the drainage condition listed above. Officers also request delegated powers to agree the final wording of condition 11, and to issue the decision once this has been agreed.</p>

Item 2: - 493 - 499 Bath Road Brislington Bristol BS4 3JU

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	No amendments

Item 3: - St Catherines Place East Street Bedminster Bristol

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
Page 88	<p>RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION</p> <p>Since the Committee Report was published, a further 8 comments were received, including a comment from the BS3 Planning Group.</p> <p>Of the 8 further comments, 6 comment were in objection, and 2 comments were in support.</p> <p>The further points of objection cited were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current plans would still create a development that overshadows the current building. • Lack of affordable housing and lack of family housing. • Height, scale and massing of Plot 3 and Plot 4. • Application not considered as compliant with the Bedminster Green Framework. • Impact on the light of local residents. <p>The further points of support cited were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the application would support the need for redevelopment and housing. • Consider the application would support East Street and the existing shopping precinct. • Application is much improved in relation to scale and daylight for St Catherine's House. <p>Officer Note: In reviewing these further points of objection, it is considered that the</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information						
	Committee Report already addresses the points raised.						
Page 94 and 95	<p>Response from internal consultees</p> <p>TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT – APPROVAL SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS</p> <p>Final comments from Transport Development Management have been received to the application.</p> <p>The TDM recommendation is for approval subject to conditions.</p> <p>Final matters relating to highways works; cycle parking; swept path analysis, the travel plan have been addressed satisfactorily and where appropriate secured by way of conditions.</p> <p>TDM is in a position to recommend approval of the application subject to s.106 contributions and the conditions as outlined below.</p>						
Page 96	<p>FLOOD RISK TEAM</p> <p>Further details on the Drainage Strategy have been provided by the Applicant.</p> <p>Further details on the drainage strategy will be secured by way of a condition.</p>						
Page 99	<p>SUSTAINABLE CITIES TEAM</p> <p>Further information has been provided by way of Overheating Analysis.</p> <p>Conditions have been included to cover Energy and Sustainability; BREEAM communities; and Broadband.</p>						
Pages 102 - 104	<p>KEY ISSUE B</p> <p>The following Amendment Sheet text relates to Key Issue B titled <i>“Is the proposed development viable, and does it provide an appropriate level of Affordable Housing?”</i></p> <p>Since the Committee Report was drafted; Knight Frank and Lambert Smith Hampton have had further discussions regarding the Benchmark Land Value (BLV). It is pertinent to note that the applicant is proposing a BLV for Phases 1 to 4, which is significantly higher on a pro rata basis than the BLV previously agreed for the whole site. When asked for an explanation regarding this, Knight Frank responded that the applicant was previously being advised by a different consultant and had taken their advice accordingly. However Knight Frank disagreed with the approach taken and advice given by the previous consultant, and have advised the applicant that the BLV should be arrived at using a different approach. This results in a proposed BLV that is higher on a pro rata basis than was previously agreed.</p> <p>Lambert Smith Hampton and Knight Frank have subsequently agreed that the BLV for Phases 1 to 4 should be £1,689,905.</p> <p>Officer’s revised view of the viability of Phases 1 to 4 is summarised below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="418 1809 1284 1944"> <thead> <tr> <th>Benchmark Land Value</th> <th>Residual Land Value</th> <th>Deficit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>£1,689,905</td> <td>- £572,033</td> <td>£2,261,938</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Consequently, it is agreed that the scheme remains unable to provide affordable housing. Viability Reviews should be undertaken as per the committee report, based on the Lambert Smith Hampton Viability Report, but with the revised Benchmark Land Value</p>	Benchmark Land Value	Residual Land Value	Deficit	£1,689,905	- £572,033	£2,261,938
Benchmark Land Value	Residual Land Value	Deficit					
£1,689,905	- £572,033	£2,261,938					

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	identified above being incorporated.
Page 122	<p>CONDITIONS</p> <p>Set out below is the recommended list of conditions should Members support the Officer recommendation to grant permission.</p>
Page 122	<p>CONDITIONS</p> <p><u>Time limits for commencement of development:</u></p> <p>1. Full Planning Permission</p> <p>Plots 1 – 4 as shown on the approved plans and hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>2. Outline Permission</p> <p>Application for approval of the reserved matters for Plots 5 – 7 as shown on the approved plans shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.</p> <p>The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.</p> <p>Reason: As required by Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.</p> <p>3. Reserved Matters</p> <p>Approval of the details of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for Plots 5 – 7 shown on the approved plans; (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.</p> <p>Reason: This is outline permission only and these matters have been reserved for the subsequent approval of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p><u>Pre commencement conditions:</u></p> <p>4. Phasing Plan</p> <p>With the exception of any demolition of existing buildings on the site, the development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until a Phasing Plan has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Further to the Site Plan - Construction Phases (Drawing No. 153843-STL-ZZ-00-DR-A-XXXX-09008) submitted with the application, the Phasing Plan shall identify the phases of construction and occupation of development, including the relevant public realm / infrastructure elements shown on the approved drawings. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the approved Phasing Plan and/or any subsequent amendments to it that have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of the proper planning of the site.</p> <p>5. Groundwater and Contaminated Land</p> <p>No phase of development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site in respect of the development hereby permitted, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. This strategy will include the following components:</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all previous uses • potential contaminants associated with those uses • a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors • potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site <p>2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site.</p> <p>3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.</p> <p>4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.</p> <p>Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the water environment and to ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>6. Groundwater and Contaminated Land – Verification Report</p> <p>Prior to any phase of development being brought into use, a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>7. Land affected by contamination – surface water drainage</p> <p>No drainage systems for the infiltration of surface water to the ground are permitted other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. Any proposals for such systems must be supported by an assessment of the risks to controlled waters. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the water environment and to ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>8. Land affected by contamination - groundworks</p> <p>Piling and other foundation methodologies using penetrative methods shall not be carried out other than with the written consent of the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the water environment and to ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by,</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>9. Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS)</p> <p>No phase of development (Phases 2 – 4) shall commence (excluding demolition) until further details of a Sustainable Drainage Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Detailed Strategy shall contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed design of attenuation/SuDS features - BRE 365 Infiltration testing to prove that the conditions are suitable/unsuitable for infiltration-based SuDS - Approval that the scheme is acceptable from Wessex Water <p>The approved drainage system shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Sustainable Drainage Strategy prior to the use of the building commencing and maintained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal is incorporated into the design and the build and that the principles of sustainable drainage are incorporated into this proposal and maintained for the lifetime of the proposal.</p> <p>10. Highway works – General Arrangement Plan, Mill Lane, Leicester Street and Dalby Avenue to the east of Stafford Street</p> <p>No development of Plot 3 (excluding demolition) shall take place until general arrangement plan(s) to a scale of 1:200 showing the following works to the adopted highway of Mill Lane and Leicester Street to the east of Stafford Street and along Dalby Avenue to the east of Stafford Street has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Footways of at least 3.5m width with the introduction of street trees must be provided along Mill Lane up to the pedestrianised area. b) The reconstruction of footways and carriageway using a similar design palette as the proposed Mill Lane Link is required and any concrete must be removed and an approved highway construction being installed along Mill Lane, Leicester Street and Stafford Street; c) Pennant kerblines to be installed to full kerb height; d) A lighting design will be required and the lighting in this area will need to be upgraded; e) Any other associated works, including tie-in to any wider works to be undertaken by BCC. <p>The above plans must indicate proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Existing levels of the finished highway tying into building threshold levels; ii. How the works comply with any wider corridor scheme proposed by BCC, retaining a minimum 3m footway width following construction; iii. Physical prevention of servicing, short stay and calling traffic from Dalby Avenue to the east of Stafford Street; iv. Alterations to waiting restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders to enable the works; v. Signing, street furniture, street trees and pits;

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>vi. Structures on or adjacent to the highway;</p> <p>vii. Extent of any stopping up, diversion or dedication of new highway (including all public rights of way shown on the definitive map and statement).</p> <p>No development shall take place over the route of any public right of way prior to the confirmation of a Town & Country Planning Act 1990 path diversion/stopping up order.</p> <p>Prior to occupation of Plot 3 these works shall be completed in accordance with the plans approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety and to ensure that all road works associated with the proposed development are planned; approved in good time (including any statutory processes); undertaken to a standard approved by the Local Planning Authority and are completed before occupation.</p> <p>11. Highway works – General Arrangement Plan, Dalby Avenue to the east of Stafford Street</p> <p>No development of Plot 4 (excluding demolition) shall take place until general arrangement plan(s) to a scale of 1:200 showing the following works to the adopted highway of Dalby Avenue to the east of Stafford Street has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Pennant kerblines will need to be installed to full kerb height; b) The infill of the subway, ramps and steps and associated works; c) A lighting design will be required and the lighting in this area will need to be upgraded; d) Any other associated works, including tie-in to any wider works to be undertaken by BCC. <p>The above plans must indicate proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Existing levels of the finished highway tying into building threshold levels; ii. How the works comply with any wider corridor scheme proposed by BCC, retaining a minimum 3m footway width following construction; iii. Physical prevention of servicing, short stay and calling traffic from Dalby Avenue to the east of Stafford Street; iv. Alterations to waiting restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders to enable the works; v. Signing, street furniture, street trees and pits; vi. Structures on or adjacent to the highway; vii. Extent of any stopping up, diversion or dedication of new highway (including all public rights of way shown on the definitive map and statement). <p>No development shall take place over the route of any public right of way prior to the confirmation of a Town & Country Planning Act 1990 path diversion/stopping up order.</p> <p>Prior to occupation of Plot 4 these works shall be completed in accordance with the plans approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of public safety and to ensure that all road works associated with the proposed development are planned; approved in good time (including any statutory processes); undertaken to a standard approved by the Local Planning Authority and are completed before occupation.</p> <p>12. Highway to be adopted</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>No phase of development (excluding demolition and Phase 1) shall take place until plans to a scale of 1:200 showing the following information has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This will relate to areas within the owners' land where highway dedication will be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long sections • General arrangement • Threshold levels to buildings • Drainage • Structures • Swept path for two directional movement of a 11.4m long refuse vehicle passing a 4.98m long large saloon car <p>Prior to occupation of each phase detailed technical plans to a scale of 1:200 setting out how the internal access road(s) will be constructed to the Highway Authority's adoptable standard shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The works for each phase shall then be completed in accordance with the plans approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the internal roads are planned and approved in good time to a satisfactory standard for use by the public and are completed prior to occupation.</p> <p>13. Structure Adjacent To/Within 6m of the Highway</p> <p>No phase of development shall take place until an Approval In Principle (AiP) Structural Report setting out how any structures (including excavations) within 6 metres of the edge of the adopted highway (and outside of this limit where the failure of any structures would affect the safety of road users) will be assessed, excavated, constructed, strengthened or demolished has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Please note any undersailing of the highway is not permitted.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the works safeguard the structural integrity of the adopted highway during the demolition and construction phase of the development.</p> <p>14. Construction Management Plan – Major Developments</p> <p>No phase of development shall take place, including any demolition works, until a construction management plan or construction method statement for each phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved plan/statement shall be adhered to throughout the demolition/construction period. The plan/statement shall provide for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A construction programme including phasing of works, taking account any neighbouring construction programmes, their timescales and methodology; • A plan that shows any temporary access from the adopted highway and the routes construction traffic will use; • 24 hour emergency contact number; • Hours of operation; • Expected number and type of vehicles accessing the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Deliveries, waste, cranes, equipment, plant, works, visitors; ○ Size of construction vehicles; ○ The use of a consolidation operation or scheme for the delivery of

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p style="text-align: center;">materials and Goods;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Phasing of works; ● Means by which a reduction in the number of movements and parking on nearby streets can be achieved (including measures taken to ensure satisfactory access and movement for existing occupiers of neighbouring properties during construction): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Programming; ○ Waste management; ○ Construction methodology; ○ Shared deliveries; ○ Car sharing; ○ Travel planning; ○ Local workforce; ○ Parking facilities for staff and visitors; ○ On-site facilities; ○ A scheme to encourage the use of public transport and cycling. ● Routes for construction traffic, avoiding weight and size restrictions to reduce unsuitable traffic on residential roads; ● Locations for loading/unloading, waiting/holding areas and means of communication for delivery vehicles if space is unavailable within or near the site; ● Locations for storage of plant/waste/construction materials; ● Arrangements for the turning of vehicles, to be within the site unless completely unavoidable; ● Arrangements to receive abnormal loads or unusually large vehicles; ● Swept paths showing access for the largest vehicles regularly accessing the site and measures to ensure adequate space is available; ● Any necessary temporary traffic management measures; ● Measures to protect vulnerable road users (cyclists and pedestrians); ● Arrangements for temporary facilities for any bus stops or routes; ● Method of preventing mud being carried onto the highway; ● Methods of communicating the Construction Management Plan to staff, visitors and neighbouring residents and businesses; ● Dust mitigation measures as listed Appendix A of the Air Quality Assessment. <p>Reason: In the interests of safe operation of the adopted highway in the lead into development both during the demolition and construction phase of the development.</p> <p>15. Delivery and Servicing Plan</p> <p>No phase of development shall be occupied until a delivery and servicing plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Other than use of the existing Iceland car park, servicing for the commercial units shall not be undertaken from Dalby Avenue to the east of Stafford Street.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>The delivery and servicing plan must consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan confirming the servicing of the commercial units; • Provision for delivery and servicing of St Catherine's House; • The contact details of a suitably qualified co-ordinator; • How vehicle arrivals, departures, parking, stopping and waiting will be controlled to minimise any impact on the adopted highway; • Details of a freight consolidation operation, centre and the delivery and servicing booking and management systems; • How deliveries and servicing will be prevented from taking place from Dalby Avenue to the east of Stafford Street. <p>Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to minimise the impact of vehicles servicing the development upon congestion.</p> <p>16. Highway Condition Survey</p> <p>No development (excluding Plot 1) shall take place (including investigation work, demolition, siting of site compound/welfare facilities) until a survey of the condition of the adopted highway has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The extent of the area to be surveyed must be agreed by the Highways Authority prior to the survey being undertaken. The survey must consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plan to a scale of 1:1000 showing the location of all defects identified; • A written and photographic record of all defects with corresponding location references accompanied by a description of the extent of the assessed area and a record of the date, time and weather conditions at the time of the survey. <p>No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until any damage to the adopted highway has been made good in accordance with the plans approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that any damage to the adopted highway sustained throughout the development process can be identified and subsequently remedied at the expense of the developer.</p> <p>17. Protection of Retained Trees during the Construction Period – Plot 4</p> <p>No work of any kind shall take place on Plot 4 until the protective fences have been erected around the retained trees in the position and to the specification shown on the Barrel Tree Consultancy, Tree Protection Plan (Drawing No. Ref:17361-5). Once installed photos should be electronically sent to the Local Authority Case Officer, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA in order that the Local Planning Authority may verify that the approved tree protection measures are in place when the work may commence. The approved fence(s) shall be in place before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought on to the site for the purposes of the development and shall be maintained until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Within the fenced area(s) there shall be no scaffolding, no stockpiling of any materials or soil, no machinery or other equipment parked or operated, no traffic over the root system, no changes to the soil level, no excavation of trenches, no site huts, no fires lit, no dumping of toxic chemicals and no retained trees shall be used for winching purposes. If any retained tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place and that tree shall be of such size and species, and shall be planted at such time, as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Under no circumstances should the tree protection be moved during the period of the development and until all works are completed and all materials and machinery are</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>removed. Landscaping works within protected areas is to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and carried out when all other construction and landscaping works are complete.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the retained trees from damage during construction, including all ground works and works that may be required by other conditions, and in recognition of the contribution which the retained tree(s) give(s) and will continue to give to the amenity of the area in line with Policy DM17.</p> <p>18. Cellular Confinement Systems – Plot 4</p> <p>No work of any kind shall take place on Plot 4 until a full design specification for the cellular confinement system around Trees 6-8 is provided and confirmed in writing by the local planning authority. The cellular confinement system shall be installed in accordance with the approved Barrell Tree Consultancy, Arboricultural Method Statement prior to demolition and construction taking place and retained and maintained in perpetuity</p> <p>Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that the trees to be retained on-site will not be damaged during the construction works and to ensure that as far as possible the work is carried out in accordance with current best practice.</p> <p>19. Arboricultural Method Statement</p> <p>The applicant/developer shall ensure that all works within the root protection area of retained trees, including the installation of the cellular confinement system must follow the detailed methodology with the Barrell Tree Consultancy, Arboricultural Method Statement. In the instance that major roots are found then further consultation with an arboriculturist will be required, any changes to the specified methodology must be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the retained tree from damage during construction and in recognition of the contribution which the retained tree gives and will continue to give to the amenity of the area.</p> <p>20. Arboricultural Supervision – Plot 4</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of development of Plot 4, a pre-commencement site meeting shall be held and attended by the developer's arboricultural consultant and the designated site foreman to discuss details of the working procedures. A schedule of visits shall be drawn up to ensure the Project arboriculturist is present during key stages of the development which include, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The removal of the existing hard surfacing around Trees T6-8 • Installation of the Cellular confinement system around Trees T6-8 <p>Site visits must be carried out during the key stages identified above. Copies of written site notes and/or reports detailing the results of site supervision and any necessary remedial works undertaken or required shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to occupancy. Any approved remedial works shall subsequently be carried out under strict supervision by the arboricultural consultant immediately following that approval.</p> <p>Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that the trees to be retained on-site will not be damaged during the construction works and to ensure that as far as possible the work is carried out in accordance with current best practice.</p> <p>21. Artificial light (external)</p> <p>No phase of development shall be occupied until a report detailing the lighting scheme and predicted light levels at neighbouring residential properties has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Any light created by reason of the development shall meet the Obtrusive Light Limitations for Exterior Lighting Installations in table 2 of the Institute of Light Engineers Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Lighting, GN01:2011.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers.</p> <p>22. To ensure implementation of a programme of archaeological works, Plot 3</p> <p>No development of Plot 3 shall take place until the applicant/developer has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted by the developer and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording 2. The programme for post investigation assessment 3. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording 4. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records of the site investigation 5. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation 6. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation. <p>Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded prior to their destruction.</p> <p>23. To secure the conduct of a watching brief during development groundworks of Plot 3</p> <p>The applicant/developer shall ensure that all groundworks, including geotechnical works, are monitored and recorded by an archaeologist or an archaeological organisation to be approved by the Local Planning Authority and in accordance with the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 22.</p> <p>Reason: To record remains of archaeological interest before destruction</p> <p>24. To ensure completion of a programme of archaeological works</p> <p>Plot 3 shall not be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under condition 22 and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition has been secured.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that archaeological remains and features are recorded and published prior to their destruction.</p> <p>25. Local Employment Opportunities</p> <p>No development (excluding demolition and Plot 1) shall take place including any works of demolition until the developer/occupier enters into an agreement with the Local Planning Authority to produce and implement a strategy that aims to maximise the opportunities for local residents to access employment offered by the development. The approved strategy shall be undertaken in accordance with an agreed timetable.</p> <p>Reason: In recognition of the employment opportunity offered by the early phases of the construction and operation of the development.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>26. Public Art Plan</p> <p>Prior to the commencement of development (excluding demolition and Plot 1) or as otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, a Public Art Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall set out the specific commissions developed and programme illustrating how the public art commission for the development would accord with the City Council's Public Art Policy and Strategy. The Public Art Plan shall also contain a timetable for delivery and details of future maintenance responsibilities and requirements. The delivery of public art shall then be carried out in full accordance with the agreed Public Art Plan.</p> <p>Reason: In order to secure public art as part of the development in the interests of the amenity of the area.</p> <p>27. Energy and Sustainability in accordance with statement</p> <p>The development hereby approved shall incorporate the energy efficiency measures, renewable energy, sustainable design principles and climate change adaptation measures into the design and construction of the development in full accordance with the Energy & Sustainability Statement (Hydrock, October 2020) and Energy & Sustainability Statement Addendum (Hydrock, January 2021) prior to occupation.</p> <p>A total 13% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions beyond Part L 2013 Building Regulations in line with the energy hierarchy shall be achieved, and a 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions below residual emissions through renewable technologies shall be achieved.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development incorporates measures to minimise the effects of, and can adapt to a changing climate in accordance with policies BCS13 (Climate Change), BC14 (sustainable energy), BCS15 (Sustainable design and construction), DM29 (Design of new buildings), BCAP20 (Sustainable design standards), BCAP21 (connection to heat networks).</p> <p>28. BREEAM communities</p> <p>Prior to construction, a design stage BREEAM communities assessment demonstrating the proposed measures required to achieve a minimum BREEAM 'very good' rating should be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved assessment.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the development is built in a sustainable manner in accordance with BCS15 (Sustainable design and construction).</p> <p>29. Broadband</p> <p>Prior to commencement of each phase, evidence that the residential and non-residential parts of the development will provided with 'next generation broadband' shall be presented to the Local Planning Authority through provision of an installation order placed with BT, Virgin Media, or an alternative provider. Registration should show the speed rating/specification of the connection.</p> <p>Prior to occupation, the development shall be connected to the broadband infrastructure to achieve the speeds stated.</p> <p>Reason: To show that residents and businesses will have access to ultrafast broadband from occupation.</p> <p>30. Further details of the following before relevant element started – Plot 2</p> <p>Further to the floor plan drawings (Drawing No. 153843-STL-P2-00-DR-A-XXXX-01001 - 153843-STL-P2-03-DR-A-XXXX-01004) submitted with the application, the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.</p> <p>a) the provision of natural light and ventilation of the core of the six storey building, to include a glazed partition between stair and corridor to all upper floors and either glazed fire doors or doors on 'hold – open' device linked to fire alarm system to the corridors</p> <p>b) the congruent location of roof lights over the internal circulation and bathrooms of the three storey building</p> <p>c) further details of the flat roof element over the core of the three storey building</p> <p>Detailed sectional and elevational drawings at the scale of 1:10 (unless otherwise specified) of the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.</p> <p>i) Frontage of retail units</p> <p>ii) Enclosure of core for both buildings, six and three storeys</p> <p>iii) Front doors</p> <p>iv) Balcony balustrades</p> <p>v) Rainwater goods</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the character of the area.</p> <p>31. Further details of the following before relevant element started – Plot 3</p> <p>Further to the floor plan drawings (Drawing No. 153843-STL-P2-00-DR-A-XXXX-01010 - 153843-STL-P2-03-DR-A-XXXX-01017) submitted with the application, the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.</p> <p>a) the provision of natural light and ventilation of the core of the six storey building, to include a glazed partition between stair and corridor to all upper floors and either glazed fire doors or doors on 'hold – open' device linked to fire alarm system to the corridors</p> <p>b) refine elevations (Drawing No. 153843-STL-P3-ZZ-DR-A-XXXX-02014) to allow natural light penetration into internal circulation: the provision of a rooflight to serve the second floor corridor and either a glazed side light or clerestory window above the entrance door</p> <p>c) refine plan (Drawing No. 153843-STL-P3-ZZ-DR-A-XXXX-02014) for access to balcony from internal circulation</p> <p>Detailed sectional and elevational drawings at the scale of 1:10 (unless otherwise specified) of the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.</p> <p>i) Windows (including window profiles, external openings, cills, heads and surrounds, reveals, recesses)</p> <p>ii) Front doors</p> <p>iii) Balcony balustrades</p> <p>iv) Rainwater goods</p> <p>v) Frontage of refuse collection point and bicycle storage including metal door with louvered front, metal mesh panel, metal door with metal mesh panel, metal balustrades, metal coping</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>vi) Boundary treatment of existing maisonettes wall and additional visual separation from existing to new courtyard</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the character of the area.</p> <p>32. Further details of the following before relevant element started – Plot 4</p> <p>Further to the floor plan drawings (Drawing No. 153843-STL-P4-ZZ-DR-A-XXXX-01020 - 153843-STL-P4-ZZ-DR-A-XXXX-01022 1) submitted with the application, the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.</p> <p>a) the provision of natural light and ventilation of the core of the six storey building, to include a glazed partition between stair and corridor to all upper floors and either glazed fire doors or doors on ‘hold – open’ device linked to fire alarm system to the corridors</p> <p>b) the inclusion of omitted window on master bedroom</p> <p>c) revision of consistency of elevation – revision of ground floor and first floor kitchen and bedroom window to unit 00-02 and above to be recessed in line with predominant elevation</p> <p>Detailed sectional and elevational drawings at the scale of 1:10 (unless otherwise specified) of the following shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant part of work is begun. The detail thereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with that approval.</p> <p>i) Windows (including window profiles, external openings, cills, heads and surrounds, reveals, recesses)</p> <p>ii) Front doors</p> <p>iii) Balcony precast stone and metal balustrades</p> <p>iv) Rainwater goods</p> <p>vi) Frontage of refuse collection point and disable access including metal door with louvered front, metal balustrades, metal coping</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the character of the area.</p> <p><u>Pre-occupation condition(s)</u></p> <p>33. Flood Risk</p> <p>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (‘St Catherine’s Place Full Planning Application – Flood Risk Assessment’, revision P02 dated 7 October 2020, Hydrock Consultants Limited, ref. 8012-HYD-XX-XX-RP-FR-0002), the additional subsequent Technical Design Note that supersedes the FRA in part (‘St Catherine’s Place, Bristol – Hydraulic Modelling Technical Design Note, Revision P01 dated 15 December 2020, Hydrock Consultants Limited, ref. 08012-HYD-XX-XX-RP-FR-0003) and the following mitigation measures these documents detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 8.867 metres above Ordnance Datum (AOD) for all proposed uses except ‘less vulnerable’ retail units fronting onto East Street, as detailed on page 4 of the Hydraulic Modelling Technical Design Note. • Flood resilience measures shall be provided to a level of at least the “F100yr 70%CC (Upper End) with T1yr in 2120 event peak flood level at the nearest reference point to each building”, as detailed on page 4 of the Hydraulic Modelling

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Technical Design Note, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use of ground supported solid slab ground floors, and low permeability floor coverings ○ Walls constructed of materials with low water penetration, good drying ability, and good retention of pre-flood integrity ○ Sensitive services (i.e. electrics) set as high as is feasible / practicable within proposed buildings ○ Non-return valves fitted to drainage services <p>These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants. To prevent increases in flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>34. Sample Panels before specified elements started</p> <p>Sample panels of the all external materials to the building demonstrating the colour, texture, face bond and pointing are to be erected on site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the relevant parts of the work are commenced. The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the building is occupied.</p> <p>Reason: In order that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.</p> <p>35. Residential sound insulation (general)</p> <p>All recommendation detailed in the Noise Planning Report (REF. SCP-HYD-ZZ-XX-RP-Y-1001) (Hydrock, October 2020) submitted with the application with regards to sound insulation and ventilation of residential properties shall be implemented in full prior to the commencement of the use permitted and be permanently maintained.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers.</p> <p>36. Sound Insulation between residential & commercial – Plot 2</p> <p>No commencement of use of any ground floor units to Plot 2 shall take place until a scheme of noise insulation measures for the partition between the proposed use and the residential accommodation above has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The scheme of noise insulation measures shall be prepared by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant/engineer and shall take into account the provisions of BS 8233: 2014 " Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings.</p> <p>The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the use and be permanently maintained thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby and future occupiers.</p> <p>37. Bird Nesting and Bat Roosting Opportunities</p> <p>Prior to occupation of each phase of the development details provided by a qualified ecological consultant shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority providing the specification, orientation, height and location for built-in bird nesting and bat roosting opportunities integrated within buildings and shown on a site plan with compass directions marked on it. This shall include 20 built-in bird bricks or boxes to include at least 15 swift bricks or boxes and 8 built-in bat boxes.</p> <p>Bird boxes shall be installed to face between north and east to avoid direct sunlight and</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>heavy rain. Bird boxes shall be erected out of the reach of predators and at least 3.5 metres high on publicly accessible sites. For small hole-nesting species bird boxes shall be erected between two and four metres high.</p> <p>Swift boxes or bricks shall be provided in pairs or groups (e.g. at least two or three on a building, avoiding windows) on north, north-east or east facing walls, at least 5 metres high, so that there is a clear distance (drop) below the swift boxes/bricks of 5 metres or more. Swift boxes shall be located under eaves where present.</p> <p>House sparrow nesting boxes shall be grouped together and located at least 1.5 metres apart. House sparrow nesting boxes shall be positioned high up under the eaves where present.</p> <p>Bat boxes shall face south, between south-east and south-west. Bat boxes shall be erected at a height of at least four metres, close to hedges, shrubs or tree-lines and avoid well-lit locations. Bat boxes which are being placed on buildings shall be placed as close to the eaves (if present) as possible.</p> <p>Development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To help conserve legally protected bats and birds which include priority species.</p> <p>38. Noise from plant & equipment</p> <p>No commencement of use shall take place until an assessment to show that the rating level of any plant & equipment, as part of this development, will be at least 5 dB below the background level has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The assessment must be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant/engineer and be in accordance with BS4142: 2014 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby and future occupiers.</p> <p>39. Sound insulation - residential</p> <p>No development of Plots 5 – 7 shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a detailed scheme of noise insulation measures for all residential accommodation, this scheme shall also include details of ventilation.</p> <p>The scheme of noise insulation measures shall take into account the recommendations detailed in the Noise Assessments submitted with the application and the provisions of BS 8233: 2014 " Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings".</p> <p>The approved details shall be implemented in full prior to the commencement of the use permitted and be permanently maintained.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby and future occupiers.</p> <p>40. Noise from commercial premises</p> <p>No commencement of use of the any commercial premises shall take place until an assessment on the potential for noise from that use affecting residential properties as part of this development and existing residential properties in the area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The assessment shall include noise from:</p> <p>Ventilation, refrigeration and air conditioning plant or equipment Customers including outside areas Entertainment Servicing (deliveries and refuse collections)</p> <p>If the assessment indicates that noise from the development is likely to affect neighbouring affecting residential or commercial properties then a detailed scheme of noise mitigation</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.</p> <p>The noise mitigation measures shall be designed so that nuisance will not be caused to the occupiers of neighbouring noise sensitive premises by noise from the development.</p> <p>The noise assessment shall be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant/engineer and shall take into account the provisions of BS4142: 2014 Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound and of BS 8233: 2014 "Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings".</p> <p>The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the use and be permanently maintained thereafter.</p> <p>Advice</p> <p>The recommended design criteria for dwellings are as follows:</p> <p>Daytime (07.00 - 23.00) 35 dB LAeq 16 hours in all rooms & 50 dB in outdoor living areas.</p> <p>Nighttime (23.00 - 07.00) 30 dB LAeq 8 hours & LAmx less than 45 dB in bedrooms.</p> <p>Where residential properties are likely to be affected by amplified music from neighbouring pubs or clubs, the recommended design criteria is as follows:</p> <p>Noise Rating Curve NR20 at all times in any habitable rooms</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby and future occupiers.</p> <p>41. Landscaping (Tree Planting)</p> <p>The Planting proposals hereby approved (Drawing No. 153843-STL-XX-XX-DR-L-XXXX-09140 Rev:PL02) shall be carried out no later than during the first planting season following the date when the development hereby permitted is ready for occupation or in accordance with a program, details of which shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The details to be submitted should explore the realignment of the trees proposed to the front of Plot 3 to the back of the footway in order to give more space to grow and form a contiguous line. All planted materials shall be maintained for 5 years and any trees removed, dying, being severely damaged or become seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced with others of a similar size and species to those originally required to be planted.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory and in line with Policy DM17.</p> <p>42. Land affected by contamination - Reporting of Unexpected Contamination</p> <p>If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.</p> <p>Reason: To protect the water environment and to ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>43. Implementation/Installation of Refuse Storage and Recycling Facilities – Shown on Approved Plans</p> <p>No building or use within each phase of development hereby permitted shall be occupied or use commenced until the refuse store and area/facilities allocated for storing of recyclable materials for that phase as shown on the Phasing Plan approved by condition</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>4, as shown on the approved plans have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter, all refuse and recyclable materials associated with the development shall either be stored within this dedicated store/area, as shown on the approved plans, or internally within the building(s) that form part of the application site. No refuse or recycling material shall be stored or placed for collection on the adopted highway (including the footway), except on the day of collection.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining premises; protect the general environment; prevent any obstruction to pedestrian movement and to ensure that there are adequate facilities for the storage and recycling of recoverable materials.</p> <p>44. Completion of Vehicular Access – Shown on Approved Plans</p> <p>No building or use within each phase of development hereby permitted shall be occupied or use commenced until the means of vehicular access for that phase as shown on the Phasing Plan approved by condition 4 has been constructed and completed in accordance with the approved plans and the said means of vehicular access shall thereafter be retained for access purposes only for the lifetime of the development. Any access point opening onto the adopted highway shall include suitable drainage provision within the curtilage of the site, to prevent the discharge of any surface water onto the adopted highway.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the vehicular access point is safe and includes adequate drainage.</p> <p>45. Completion of Pedestrians/Cyclists Access – Shown</p> <p>No building or use within each phase of development hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the means of access for pedestrians and/or cyclists for that phase as shown on the Phasing Plan approved by condition 4 have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for access purposes only.</p> <p>Reason: In the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>46. Completion and Maintenance of Vehicular Servicing facilities – Shown</p> <p>No building or use within each phase of development hereby permitted shall be occupied or use commenced until the facilities for loading, unloading, circulation and manoeuvring for that phase as shown on the Phasing Plan approved by condition 4 have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter, these areas shall be kept free of obstruction and available for these uses.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that there are adequate servicing facilities within the site in the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>47. Completion and Maintenance of Cycle Provision – Shown</p> <p>No building or use within each phase of development hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the cycle parking provision shown on the approved plans for that phase as shown on the Phasing Plan approved by condition 4 has been completed, and thereafter, be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of adequate cycle parking.</p> <p>48. Submission and Approval of Landscaping Scheme</p> <p>No building or use within each phase hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection, in the course of development. The approved scheme</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>shall be implemented so that planting is carried out no later than the first planting season following the occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. All planted materials shall be maintained for five years and any trees or plants removed, dying, being damaged or becoming diseased within that period shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.</p> <p>Reason: To protect and enhance the character of the site and the area, and to ensure its appearance is satisfactory.</p> <p>49. Details of Kitchen Extraction/Ventilation System</p> <p>No equipment for the extraction and dispersal of cooking smells/fumes shall be installed until details including method of construction, odour control measures, noise levels, appearance and ongoing maintenance have been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be installed before the installation of any such equipment and thereafter shall be permanently retained.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby and future occupiers.</p> <p><u>Post occupation condition(s):</u></p> <p>50. Use of Refuse and Recycling facilities (commercial uses)</p> <p>Activities relating to the collection of refuse and recyclables and the tipping of empty bottles into external receptacles shall only take place between 08.00 and 20.00 Monday to Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby and future occupiers</p> <p>51. Deliveries (commercial uses)</p> <p>Activities relating to deliveries shall only take place between 08.00 and 20.00 Monday to Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby and future occupiers.</p> <p>52. Opening hours (commercial uses)</p> <p>The use of the commercial space shall not be carried out outside the hours of 08.00 to 23.30 on any day.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.</p> <p>53. Outdoor dining/eating areas (commercial uses)</p> <p>There shall be no use of any outdoor eating or drinking areas associated with any A3 use after 22.00 on any day.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of nearby and future occupiers.</p> <p>54. Restriction of Parking Level on site</p> <p>Parking within the development site is to be restricted to the areas allocated on the approved plans and shall not encroach onto areas allocated on the plans for other uses.</p> <p>Reason: To control the level of parking on the site and to safeguard the uses of other areas.</p> <p>55. Protection of Parking and Servicing Provision</p> <p>The areas allocated for vehicle parking, loading and unloading, circulation and manoeuvring on the approved plans shall only be used for the said purpose and not for any other purposes.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of satisfactory off-street parking and</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>servicing/loading/unloading facilities for the development.</p> <p>56. Travel Plan – Implemented by the Highways Authority</p> <p>Prior to occupation or use commenced of each phase, evidence that the pre-occupation elements of the approved Travel Plan have been put in place shall be prepared, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The developer shall then enable the Highways Authority to implement, monitor and review the approved Travel Plan in accordance with the plan approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Reason: To support sustainable transport objectives including a reduction in single occupancy car journeys and the increased use of public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>57. Existing resident parking scheme (RPS) / future RPS permit informing future owners / tenants</p> <p>Future buyers, tenants and owners shall be informed by the current owner, landlord, or lease operator prior to the point of exchange / lease or rent that this development has been approved on the basis that it has been recommended to the transport authority that residents of this development shall be exempted from obtaining residents parking permits of the current or any future RPS in this area.</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and future misunderstanding.</p> <p>58. List of approved plans and drawings:</p> <p>The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision.</p> <p>Site Location Plan (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Existing Ground Floor (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Existing First Floor (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Existing Elevations (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Site Plan - Plots 1-4 (Rev. PL10), received 2 February 2021</p> <p>Site Plan - Indicative Plots 5,6,&7 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Site Wide - Plots 1-4 Site Wide Roof Plan (Rev. PL10), received 2 February 2021</p> <p>Site Plan - Building Plots (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Site Plan - Construction Phases (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Refuse, Servicing & Disabled Parking Plots 1-4 (Rev. PL12), received 22 February 2021</p> <p>Refuse, Servicing & Disabled Parking Plots 5-7 (Rev. PL12), received 22 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 1 Drawings (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - 00 Ground Floor (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - 01 First Floor (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - 02 Second Floor (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - 03 Third Floor (Rev. PL2), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - 04-05 Fourth & Fifth Floors (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 2 - 06 Roof Plan (Rev. PL3), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - 00 Ground Floor (Rev. PL9), received 1 February 2021</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Plot 3 - 01 First Floor (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - 02-03 Second & Third Floors (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - 04 Fourth Floor (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - 05-06 Fifth and Sixth Floors (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - 07 Seventh Floor (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - 08-11 Eighth to Eleventh Floors (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - 12-13 Twelfth to Thirteenth Floors (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - 14 Roof Plan (Rev. PL3), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 4 - 00 Ground Floor (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 4 - 01 First Floor (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 4 - 02-06 Second to Sixth Floors (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 4 - 07 Roof Plan (Rev. PL3), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 Cycle Storage Provisions Lower (Rev. PL), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 3 Cycle Storage Provisions Upper (Rev. PL), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 Cycle Storage Provisions (Rev. PL), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 4 Cycle Storage Provisions (Rev. PL11), received 22 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - North Elevation (Rev. PL11), received 22 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - East Elevation (Rev. PL6), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - South Elevation (Rev. PL6), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - West Elevation (Rev. PL6), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2 - East & West Lane Elevations (Rev. PL6), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 3 - North Elevation (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - East Elevation (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 3 - South Elevation (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 3 - West Elevation (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3 - Duplex Drawings (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 4 - North Elevation (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 4 - East Elevation (Rev. PL5), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 4 - South Elevation (Rev. PL8), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 4 - West Elevation (Rev. PL5), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Plot 2_1-20 elevation study_sheet 01 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 2_1-20 elevation study_sheet 02 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3_1-20 elevation study_sheet 01 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3_1-20 elevation study_sheet 02 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3_1-20 elevation study_sheet 03 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3_1-20 elevation study_sheet 04 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Plot 3_1-20 elevation study_sheet 05 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Plot 4_1-20 elevation study_sheet 01 (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Context site sections - sheet 01 (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Context site sections - sheet 02 (Rev. PL10), received 1 February 2021</p> <p>Landscape General Arrangement (Plots 1-4) (Rev. PL11), received 2 February 2021</p> <p>Tree Retention & Removal Plan (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Planting Plan (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Tree Pit in Soft (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Tree Pit in Hard (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Soil Depths Profile Details (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Site Sections (Rev. PL2), received 9 October 2020</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.</p>
Page 122	<p>ADVICES</p> <p>Set out below is the recommended list of advices should Members support the Officer recommendation to grant permission.</p>
Page 122	<p>ADVICES</p> <p>Works on the Public Highway</p> <p>The development hereby approved includes the carrying out of work on the adopted highway. You are advised that before undertaking work on the adopted highway you must enter into a highway agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 with the Council, which would specify the works and the terms and conditions under which they are to be carried out.</p> <p>Contact the Highway Authority's Transport Development Management Team at transportDM@bristol.gov.uk allowing sufficient time for the preparation and signing of the Agreement. You will be required to pay fees to cover the Councils costs in undertaking the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Drafting the Agreement II. A Monitoring Fee equivalent to 15% of the planning application fee III. Approving the highway details IV. Inspecting the highway works <p>NB: Planning permission is not permission to work in the highway. A Highway Agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 must be completed, the bond secured, and the Highway Authority's technical approval and inspection fees paid before any drawings will be considered and approved.</p> <p>Traffic Regulation Order (TRO)</p> <p>You are advised that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is required. You must submit a plan to a scale of 1:1000 of an indicative scheme for a TRO, along with timescales for commencement and completion of the development. Please be aware that the statutory TRO process is not straightforward, involving the public advertisement of the proposal(s) and the resolution of any objections.</p> <p>You should expect a minimum of six months to elapse between the Highway Authority's TRO Team confirming that it has all the information necessary to enable it to proceed and</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>the TRO being advertised. You will not be permitted to implement the TRO measures until the TRO has been sealed, and we cannot always guarantee the outcome of the process.</p> <p>We cannot begin the TRO process until the appropriate fee has been received. To arrange for a TRO to be processed contact the Highway Authority's Transport Development Management Team at transportdm@bristol.gov.uk</p> <p>N.B. The cost of implementing any lining, signing or resurfacing required by the TRO is separate to the TRO fees, which solely cover the administration required to prepare, consult, amend and seal the TRO.</p> <p>Highway to be Adopted</p> <p>The development hereby approved includes the construction of new highway. To be considered for adoption and ongoing maintenance at the public expense it must be constructed to the Highway Authority's Engineering Standard Details and terms for the phasing of the development. You are advised that you must enter into a highway agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. The development will be bound by Sections 219 to 225 (the Advance Payments Code) of the Highways Act 1980.</p> <p>Contact the Highway Authority's Transport Development Management Team at DMEngineering@bristol.gov.uk You will be required to pay fees to cover the Councils cost's in undertaking the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I. Drafting the Agreement II. Set up costs III. Approving the highway details IV. Inspecting the highway works <p>To discuss the requirement for sewers contact the Highway Authority's Flood Risk Management Team at flood.data@bristol.gov.uk You should enter into discussions with statutory undertakers as soon as possible to co-ordinate the laying of services under any new highways to be adopted by the Highway Authority.</p> <p>N.B. The Highway Authority's technical approval inspection fees must be paid before any drawings will be considered and approved. Once technical approval has been granted a Highway Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 must be completed and the bond secured.</p> <p>Impact on the highway network during construction</p> <p>The development hereby approved and any associated highway works required, is likely to impact on the operation of the highway network during its construction (and any demolition required). You are advised to contact the Highway Authorities Network Management Team at traffic@bristol.gov.uk before undertaking any work, to discuss any temporary traffic management measures required, such as footway, Public Right of Way, carriageway closures or temporary parking restrictions a minimum of eight weeks prior to any activity on site to enable Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders to be prepared and a programme of Temporary Traffic Management measures to be agreed.</p> <p>Restriction of Parking Permits – Existing Controlled Parking Zone/Residents Parking Scheme</p> <p>Note that in deciding to grant permission, the Committee/Planning Service Director also decided to recommend to the Council's Executive in its capacity as Traffic Authority in the administration of the existing Controlled Parking Zone of which the development forms part, that the development should be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers ineligible for resident parking permits.</p> <p>Restriction of parking permits – future controlled parking zone/residents parking</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>scheme</p> <p>You are advised that the Local Planning Authority has recommended to the Highways Authority that on the creation of any Controlled Parking Zone/Residents Parking Scheme area which includes the development, that the development shall be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers are ineligible for resident parking permits as well as visitors parking permits if in a Residents Parking Scheme.</p> <p>Highway Condition Survey</p> <p>The development hereby approved includes the carrying out of a Highway Condition Survey. To agree the extent of the area to be surveyed contact the Highway Authority's Transport Development Management Team at transportDM@bristol.gov.uk</p> <p>Excavation Works on the Adopted Highway</p> <p>The development hereby approved includes the carrying out of excavation works on the adopted highway. You are advised that before undertaking any work on the adopted highway you will require a Section 171 (Excavation) Licence from the Highway Authority which is available at www.bristol.gov.uk/highwaylicences</p> <p>Street Name and Numbering</p> <p>You are advised that to ensure that all new properties and streets are registered with the emergency services, Land Registry, National Street Gazetteer and National Land and Property Gazetteer to enable them to be serviced and allow the occupants access to amenities including but not limited to; listing on the Electoral Register, delivery services, and a registered address on utility companies databases, details of the name and numbering of any new house(s) and/or flats/flat conversion(s) on existing and/or newly constructed streets must be submitted to the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Any new street(s) and property naming/numbering must be agreed in accordance with the Councils Street Naming and Property Numbering Policy and all address allocations can only be issued under the Town Improvement Clauses Act 1847 (Section 64 & 65) and the Public Health Act 1925 (Section 17, 18 & 19). Please see www.bristol.gov.uk/registeraddress</p> <p>Stopping Up/Diversion of Adopted Highway</p> <p>You are advised that to facilitate the development an order must be obtained to stop up or divert the adopted highway under sections 247 and 248 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Please see www.gov.uk/government/publications/stopping-up-and-diversion-of-highways or contact the National Transport Casework Team at nationalcasework@dft.gov.uk</p> <p>Structure Adjacent To/Within 6m of the Highway</p> <p>The development hereby approved includes the construction of structures adjacent to or within six metres of the adopted highway. You are advised that before undertaking any work on the adopted highway you must prepare and submit an AiP Structural Report.</p> <p>You will be required to pay technical approval fees (as determined by the proposed category of structure to be assessed) before the report will be considered and approved. Contact the Highway Authority's Bridges and Highway Structures Team at bridges.highways@bristol.gov.uk.</p> <p>Freight Consolidation</p> <p>You are advised that to reduce the impact of delivery vehicles servicing the development a freight consolidation scheme can be utilised. Further details about freight consolidation are available at www.travelwest.info/freight</p>

