

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control A Committee



5 June 2024 at 2.00 pm

Members Present:-

Councillors: Rob Bryher (Chair), Katja Hornchen (Vice-Chair), Don Alexander (substituting for Al Al-Maghrabi), Sarah Classick, Guy Poultney (substituting for George Calascione), Ellie Freeman, Zoë Peat, Serena Ralston and Richard Eddy (substituting for Bador Uddin)

Officers in Attendance: Jonathan Dymond – Deputy Head of Planning, Pip Howson – Transport Development Manager, Allison Taylor – Democratic Services

1 Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and issued the safety information.

2 Confirmation of Chair

It was noted that Councillor Rob Bryher was confirmed by 21 May 2024 Full Council AGM to act as Chair for the Development Control A Committee for 2024/25 Municipal Year.

3 Confirmation of Vice-Chair

It was noted that Councillor Katja Hornchen was confirmed by 21 May 2024 Full Council Annual General Meeting as Vice-Chair for DCA Committee for 2024/25 Municipal Year.

4 Membership of Committee

The following membership of Development Control A Committee for 2024/25 Municipal Year was noted:-
Councillor Rob Bryher (Chair)



Councillor Katja Hornchen (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Serena Ralston
Councillor Ellie Freeman
Councillor George Calascione
Councillor Zoe Peat
Councillor Al al-Maghrabi
Councillor Sarah Classick
Councillor Bador Uddin

5 Terms of Reference

These were noted.

6 Proposed dates of future meetings

The following dates were agreed:-

2pm 5 June 2024;
6pm 24 July 2024;
2pm 4 September 2024;
6pm 23 October 2024;
2pm 4 December 2024;
6pm 22 January 2025;
2pm Tuesday 4 March 2025 (Reserve Budget Council on 5 March)
6pm 16 April 2025.

7 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

These were received from Councillors Al-Maghrabi, Calascione and Uddin. Substitutes noted above.

8 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Ralston declared that she had previously worked for JPB – the PR/engagement for Planning application no. 22/06085/F but had no involvement in the work with this application.

Councillor Freeman declared that she had been the Chair of Action Greater Bedminster which had fed into the Bedminster Green Framework.



Councillor Poultney declared that he was the Chair of the Community Student Partnership.

9 Minutes of the previous meeting

Councillor Eddy being the only member at the previous meeting agreed that the minutes were an accurate record.

Resolved – that the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record.

1 Action Sheet

0

It was noted that the action listed on Enforcement could now be removed as an Enforcement Update had been provided for this Committee.

1 Appeals

1

It was agreed to report back to a Councillor outside of the meeting on the reasons Appeal 73 was allowed.

1 Enforcement

2

There was no discussion.

1 Public Forum

3

Questions – The Committee noted the responses and the Chair invited Supplementary Questions from Questioners.

Andrew Kemp

1. Why is the manual operation of blinds now recommended and permissible?



Response – The tenure of the building was student accommodation and was therefore different from a residential building. Windows could be opened should an occupant return and require fresh air.

2. Do Dandera now own the site?

Response – Land ownership was not a material planning consideration so no weight was carried. The officer was not aware of a change in ownership.

Angela Truell

1. Why should these applications be considered on their own merits when all three applications' red lines overlap?

Response – The flood risk assessment does consider the development as a whole and the restoration scheme takes account of future growth. It was not possible to consider applications jointly. It is not unacceptable to have overlapping red line boundaries.

2. Why was the Committee not apprised of officers concerns in more detail?

Response – Officers are recommending conditions recommended by the Environment Agency and those conditions adequately address concerns.

Bristol Tree Forum.

1. Did BCC intend to comply with new biodiversity net gains (BNGs) obligations which came into force in February 2024?

Response – This application was considered before BNGs became a mandatory requirement.

2. Please provide a list of locations for the 116 trees as part of mitigation?

Response – 31 trees had been agreed with the trees team and these were listed in the presentation. The other 86 would be in the BCC region and discussions had started on their location.

1 Planning and Development

4

14. A - 22/06085/F - Former Pring & St Hill (Plot 1) Malago Road, Bristol BS3 4JQ



The case officer summarized the key aspects of the application for the benefit of the Committee and the following points arose from questions:-

1. The height was supported by Bedminster Green Framework and the Local Plan and was not raised by the Inspector at the last appeal who had stated that there were not thresholds that could not be exceeded. Height was just one element of the application. The design process had been followed and the architecture layout was of high quality;
2. Enforcement of a car free development would be by conditioning that occupiers were not entitled to future permits. Car owners would be encouraged to use other forms of transport as part of the Travel Plan;
3. Funding had been agreed for an initial consultation with residents about an RPZ. The scheme would be in place within 2 months subject to community support;
4. Reasonable adjustments regarding residents with neurodiversity were a matter for the management of the building;
5. Blue Badge parking would be used if the three parking spaces were occupied;
6. Overall the overshadowing was not an unacceptable impact on daylight or on overshadowing on properties;
7. The timeframe for replacement tree planting was controlled by condition;
8. The view of Windmill Hill was a consideration but was not statutorily protected;
9. There was a ground floor amenity space for students. There was no retail or public usage. Doorways and communal entrances & windows connected to the street;
10. The Travel Plan would manage how the residents moved in and out the building and their trips;
11. Bristol University was supportive of the application and was working with the applicant to meet needs. This application went some way to meeting the need indicated in the Bristol Local Plan;
12. There had not been an assessment of whether such a development took pressure off of private and social housing in order to free up need but there was a wider picture and policies which support such applications;
13. The windows do open but due to noise and overheating the model is for windows to be closed. The Sustainable Cities teams were content with the approach;
14. In the future it would be possible for the development to be residential through the design process;
15. Plot 5 had not yet been determined but was the centre of the area of greatest height hence the design decision to step the buildings up.

The following points arose from debate:-

1. This development provided significant regeneration and was supported by the Bedminster Green Framework. Its height and scale were acceptable and the development met the needs of the travel framework document. It provided 500 student homes and 25% of land was donated for sustainable improvements. It was supported;
2. There was profound concerns regarding the scale of the buildings but equally the applicant had responded to concerns raised and addressed them;



3. It was better than the original scheme but it was questioned whether it was good enough. It was the same generic design and was not solving the critical housing situation. However, it was a Brownfield site so if not here where?
4. Student accommodation was very much needed and this scheme provided an increase in biodiversity on a Brownfield site;
5. It was trusted that the conditions would be adhered to in order to mitigate concerns;
6. Decreasing competition between families and students for homes was a good thing. The applicant had looked at all considerations and the scheme was compliant. It was supported;
7. The scheme was uninspiring but on balance it was supported as something was needed on the site and there were a number of developments of height in the area. The expansion of Bristol University in the Temple Meads area was positive and managing student accommodation properly would effect the rest of housing stock;
8. The scheme had been turned down twice due to height and massing and building more purpose built student accommodation was not a realistic answer. It would be a struggle to support.

There being no further debate the Chair moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Peat and on being put to the vote it was:-

Resolved (8 for, 1 against) – That the application be granted subject to a Planning Agreement.

14 B - 23/00611/FB - Land Across & Adjacent To Plots 1, 3 & 5, Bedminster Green Development Bedminster Bristol BS3 4DN

The case officer summarized the key aspects of the application for the benefit of the Committee and the following points arose from questions:-

1. At the time of drafting the report comments had not been received from the Conservation Team. They were now included in the Amendment Sheet and there was no objection to the scheme;
2. There was no loss of open space as defined in the Local Plan and there was overall a BNG;
3. The amphitheatre structure would require construction and then planting. The path would remain in use;
4. It was not known how long the BNG to return after works were completed but it was conditioned to ensure that it was achieved and tree planting achieved within 5 years.

The following points arose from debate:-

1. This scheme was supported by Bedminster Green Framework. It would provide flooding reduction measures, enhance the conservation area and provide greater public access. It was supported;
2. It would increase BNG including in the rivers;



3. The informal site visit had been helpful. On balance this was supported as it provided a good opportunity to free Malago space to see the river;
4. The BNG was achieved through the developer's financial contribution which provided mitigation. Regulations about BNG were intended to allow off site provision;
5. It would take about 6 years for things to be established again according to the metric.

There being no further debate the Chair moved the officer recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Eddy and on being put to the vote it was:-

Resolved (6 for, 3 against) - That the application be granted subject to conditions.

Date of next meeting.

6pm 24 July 2024.

Meeting ended at 4.20pm.

CHAIR _____

