

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control B Committee

15 March 2017 at 2.00 pm



Members Present:-

Councillors: Harriet Clough, Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Richard Eddy, Martin Fodor, Sultan Khan, Olly Mead, Celia Phipps and Afzal Shah

Officers in Attendance:-

Gary Collins, Laurence Fallon, Allison Taylor (Democratic Services Officer) and Peter Westbury

1. Welcome, Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from Councillors Quartley and Hickman. No substitutes.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were none.

3. Minutes of the previous meeting

It was agreed that an additional bullet point be added to the debate on the Digital Smartscreen Application as follows:-

'A number of members raised concerns regarding the risks in catching trains and buses, wheelchair access, risks from traffic, the phasing of signals and the complications of a junction flowing into a number of lanes.'

Resolved – that subject to the amendments, the Minutes of the Meeting held 1 February 2017 be agreed as a correct record of the Meeting and signed by the Chair.

4. Appeals

The Representative of the Service Director – Planning introduced the report, summarised it for everyone and drew the Committee's attention to:-



1. Wesley College, Westbury on Trym – Proposed construction of four dwellings. This was a Committee decision now subject to appeal;
2. 11 – 13 Queens Road, Clifton – Change of use. On 9 November a Committee granted the applicant a change of use whilst running a concurrent appeal. The applicant chose not to withdraw his appeal and it was allowed with costs.

5. Enforcement

These were noted.

6. Public forum

Members of the Committee received public forum statements in advance of the meeting.

The Statements were heard before the application they related to and were taken fully into consideration by the Committee prior to reaching a decision. (A copy of the public forum list and statements are held on public record by Democratic Services).

7. Planning and Development

The Committee considered the following reports of the Service Director, Planning:

8. 15/03541/COND - The Dolphin School (Formerly Known As Fowlers Of Bristol (Engineers) Ltd) 25A Bath Buildings Bristol BS6 5PT

The following points were made in the Officer presentation:-

1. Planning permission was granted for the two-form entry primary school in June 2014. The need for primary places was established in this part of the City though congestion in the area meant there was a difficult balance. A package of highways works was agreed for this development and there were two rounds of public consultation on the proposals. The Committee resolved that the details of the school's Travel Plan be returned to a future Committee for agreement. The Travel Team had worked hard to produce a good package of measures. The school would open after Easter and it was therefore hoped to have the Travel Plan in place before then in order to reduce car trips to the school;
2. The Transport Development Manager stated that he was satisfied that the school was doing all it could to encourage sustainable travel. The catchment area extended to Coldharbour Road



which was beyond a reasonable walk. A Travel Plan survey was undertaken which showed that more work was needed in order to change travel habits. There were comments regarding the need for more parking spaces for staff and parents but additional spaces would encourage more car use.

The following points arose during discussion:-

1. Staff were deployed at the school entrance in high visibility jackets to manage any traffic issues;
2. Due to the length of the crossing and the left turn facility it was decided that physical measures were the best deterrent for the Bath Buildings crossing;
3. When all works were completed the school would be accessed from both Bath Buildings or Cheltenham Road entrance;
4. The health centre next door had been consulted. Its car park was controlled for users only;
5. A purpose built cycle/scooter store was a very positive asset for the school;
6. Councillor Davies shared the concerns made by Councillor Negus in his statement and asked if there was an opportunity to review the plan if issues arose. The Transport Development Manager replied that the left turn, parking and the removal of bays was currently being consulted on as part of the RPS review. Future complaints would be reported through local groups or Councillors and be monitored;
7. Councillor Eddy stated that the Travel Plan was a safe and affective one and he fully supported it. In light of Councillor Negus's concerns, he asked whether an advice note could be attached to the plan stating that a highway's assessment would be undertaken in 2 years' time. He was informed that it was not possible to add an advice note to discharged conditions but this could be informally reviewed;
8. Councillor Mead supported the Plan, adding that he was impressed by the lack of disruption to traffic.

Councillor Mead moved the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Khan.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED – that the details in relation to Condition 5 (Travel Plan) of planning permission 15/03268/X following the grant of planning permission 13/05209/F for erection of a 2-3 storey, 2 form primary school be approved.

9. 16/06195/F - Former Temple Way House Temple Way Bristol.

Councillor Shah arrived after Public Forum for this application had been presented and would not therefore be able to take part in the decision.



An Amendment Sheet was provided to the committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The following points were made in the Officer presentation:-

1. Noting the level of detail in the Amendment Sheet, Officers were now satisfied with the design of building A and all but one issue of the highway layout;
2. Historic England submitted comments regarding the harm the development, particularly building C would cause in the setting of heritage assets, including listed buildings. It was therefore necessary to determine whether the harm outweighed the benefits of the application. In terms of building A, given the additional information submitted, Officer's view was that impact of the building on the historic tower was limited and therefore there was minimal harm;
3. Given the outline nature of buildings B and C, the harm caused was more difficult to determine, although Officers noted the benefits of the development, including Economic Benefits, and improved accessibility, through improved pedestrian routes through the site.
4. The low car parking scheme was supported, given the accessibility of the site although this would have a significant impact on the highway network in respect of pedestrian and cyclist movements and developers had worked closely with officers to improve accessibility for new cycle routes, pavements and pedestrian crossings. Highway officers remained concerned regarding the servicing bay and this would need mitigation;
5. There were additional conditions to add on archaeology,, design strategy, and some amended and deleted conditions were highlighted, including highway works and freight consolidation . Officers recommended approval subject to a S106 agreement and the conditions in the amendment sheet as amended.

The following points arose from debate:-

1. It was confirmed that officers were recommending approval of the principle of building B and C and the detail of the proposal would come at Reserved Matters stage;
2. Councillor Denyer referred to the space between the buildings and the possible effect on the Church and asked whether a shading study had been undertaken. She was informed that this could be added as a requirement at the Reserved Matters stage;
3. It was clarified that on receipt of the Reserved Matters submission officers would assess whether it would need to come before a Committee;
4. The car parking spaces met minimum standards and complied with 5% of spaces including 2 disabled bays and 4 electric vehicles. There was sufficient infrastructure in the area to help with accessibility;
5. The Transport Development Manager stated that 20% cycle parking for a 3000 employee ratio would equate to 600 spaces. The 412 spaces provided met minimum standards. The Travel Plan could be reviewed if inadequate;



6. The Chair expressed concern regarding accessibility and through routes and its ability to impede transport modes. The Transport Development Manager stated that there would be segregated 2-way cycle routes. They would not extend to the north because of the ambulance station development. There would be an off road segregated route to Tower Hill;
7. A Construction Management Plan condition would be imposed to protect the floating harbour and ecology;
8. The Chair, acknowledging the impact of the Reserved Matters application, stated that there was an expectation that these would be considered by Committee;
9. Councillor Mead believed this was a good example of modern architecture and the potential harm to historic buildings was, in his opinion, nil as they were already surrounded by tall buildings. He noted that the location was sustainable with many bus routes and Temple Meads nearby. He did not share concerns regarding the Reserved Matters stage;
10. Councillor Eddy agreed with the preceding comments adding that the development was a job and wealth creator and a high quality building for staff and visitors to enjoy. He believed there was more harm caused by the derelict flats next to the historic buildings than by this development;
11. Councillor Davies agreed with previous comments and supported the recommendation to grant;
12. Councillor Denyer stated that the design was good and she supported the recommendations with the addition of a shading study condition.

Councillor Mead moved the recommendations as amended and this was seconded by Councillor Eddy.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED –

- 1. That the application, as amended, be granted subject to a Planning Agreement;**
- 2. That a shading study be undertaken to support the future Reserved Matters application;**
- 3. That the Reserved Matters submission be brought before a Committee for consideration.**

The meeting ended at 3.15pm.

Chair _____

CHAIR _____



