

# Bristol City Council

## Minutes of the Development Control B Committee

27 September 2017 at 2.00 pm



### **Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Martin Fodor (Chair), Richard Eddy (Vice-Chair), Donald Alexander, Tom Brook, Harriet Clough, Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Margaret Hickman, Steve Jones, Olly Mead and Afzal Shah

### **Officers in Attendance:-**

Gary Collins, Laurence Fallon, Alison Straw, Jess Leigh, Claudette Campbell and Jeremy Livitt

## **1. Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information**

The Chair welcomed all parties to the Committee meeting.

## **2. Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Harriet Bradley (Olly Mead substituting), Councillor Fabian Breckels (Tom Brook substituting) and Councillor Kevin Quartley (Steve Jones substituting).

## **3. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Carla Denyer declared an interest in Planning Application Number 17/01920/F – Land South of Morris Road as a former member of the Bristol Community Land Trust and indicated that she would not participate or vote on this item.

## **4. Minutes of the previous meeting**

Resolved – that the minutes of the above meeting be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:

Point 5 on Page 8 to read “9 units, with no affordable housing”

Page 10 – In the sentence concerning Councillor Donald Alexander’s motion, the reference to be amended to be removed

Point 4 Page 13 – To be deleted



Point 11 Page 13 – To be re-written as two separate points

(11) – as existing ie “There was another window at ground floor on the bottom left of the site (when looking at the side elevation) which served as a living room

(12) Whilst officers had some concerns about the upstairs rear elevation skylights since they preferred windows which were openable and at an angle, these were the ones which had been proposed and minimal harm would be caused by them. Officers did not believe it would be reasonable to refuse an application on these grounds

## 5. Appeals

As the item Planning Application Number 17/02413/F – Old Bristol Royal Infirmary Building, Marlborough Street (South Side), City Centre, Bristol had been withdrawn from the Agenda, officers provided a verbal update on the appeal situation at this stage of the Committee meeting.

Following the withdrawal of the appeal, only the appeal against the Committee’s decision to refuse permission for the part conversion part new build scheme (Item 29) only the appeal against non-determination remained. However, the situation had changed significantly on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> September when all parties were notified that Historic England had decided to list the chapel on the site (Grade II). At the Appeal pre-inquiry meeting on 26<sup>th</sup> September, the appellants’ legal representative had requested that the appeal process be delayed in order to allow for a challenge to the listing decision. The appellants had 28 days to submit such a challenge and they had been advised that the review process could take up to 6 months. As a result, the Inspector had agreed to delay the opening of the Public Inquiry and hold the appeal in abeyance.

A provisional period of up to 1<sup>st</sup> July 2018 had been set for this (following the Committee meeting the Planning Inspectorate confirmed that the appeal was in abeyance until the end of March 2018). It was noted that a revised report would come back to Committee at an appropriate time.

In response to members’ questions, officers confirmed that, if the challenge to the listing was unsuccessful, it was possible for the developers to submit an application for listed building consent to demolish the chapel in order to support the current planning application, although a very convincing justification would have to be submitted for this in the new circumstances. The developers would also have the option to make a further application that retained the chapel, and it was added that the listing of the chapel had now probably givne the other buildings on the site the status of curtilage listed buildings which might require their retention and conversion as part of any new scheme.

It was acknowledged that the situation was very complicated and that Members would be kept updated by officers.



## 6. Enforcement

It was noted that, whilst there were no enforcement actions to report, it was anticipated that there would be at the next Committee.

## 7. Public Forum

Members of the Committee received Public Forum statements in advance of the hearing.

It was noted that, subject to the Committee agreeing that the item on Agenda Item 8a (Planning Application 17/02413/F – Old Bristol Royal Infirmary Building, Marlborough Street (South Side), City Centre, Bristol should be withdrawn, the 2 Public Forum Statements in respect of this item would not be heard.

The statements were taken fully into consideration by the Committee prior to reaching a decision. ***(A copy of the Public Forum statements are held on public record in the Minute Book).***

## 8. Planning and Development

The following items were considered:

### 9. 17/02413/F - Old Bristol Royal Infirmary Building, Marlborough Street (South Side), City Centre

As previously explained by officers (see Minute 38 – Appeals), it was noted that, with the agreement of Spokespersons, this item had been withdrawn from the Committee

### 10 17/01920/F - Land South of Morris Road

Following her previous declaration of Interest (see Minute Number 36), Councillor Carla Denyer withdrew from the meeting during this item and took no part in the discussion or voting.

The representatives of the Service Director – Planning and Development made the following points:

- (1) The site and the application was described to the Committee
- (2) Access had been raised by objectors as the main area of concern – the proposed entrance had been widened and arranged to improve visibility. However, it was noted that it was a comparatively narrow road and that there was an issue with off street parking
- (3) It was noted that there had been concerns as to whether or not traffic flow can be accommodated. A scheme of parking bays was proposed to mitigate this and to help alleviate the



issues of increased traffic. It was proposed that there would be 64 parking spaces and 5 spaces for electric vehicles

- (4) Sound insulation was to be provided to proposed housing in line with recommendation in the noise assessment
- (5) Proposed drainage arrangements were satisfactory
- (6) The scheme had been assessed as being environmentally sustainable.
- (7) The impact on ecology and trees had been assessed and found to be acceptable on the basis of proposed mitigation to include new planting and bird and bat boxes

In response to Councillors' questions, officers made the following points:

- (8) Details of the arrangements for the parking bays and the traffic restrictions were indicated. It was intended to take on street parking "off street" to improve the traffic flow, with work to be undertaken by the developer
- (9) In relation to a question concerning access for emergency vehicles, this could not be guaranteed but the situation would be improved
- (10) Officers confirmed that this application was too small to trigger the need for a Health Impact Assessment and there was no policy basis to require one on one cumulative grounds
- (11) Whilst concerns about appropriate protection for general biodiversity (including insects and invertebrates) was noted, bats and reptiles had been particularly identified as these were protected species
- (12) Drainage engineers had considered the proposed sustainable drainage scheme and were satisfied with the arrangements.
- (13) There were existing bus routes for this site by Muller Road (Bus Number 24 to the Centre) and Bus Number 17 (East Bristol and Southmead). Wider transport proposals were being considered as part of a wider set of proposals for Lockleaze
- (14) Pollution control were happy with the proposals from a noise perspective
- (15) Officers confirmed that the narrow road estates fund had been used in the past for parts of the city but, if not previously used for a particular area, was now no longer available
- (16) The footprint of the scheme would not be so much greater than the 35 in the site allocation as nine of the additional units were flats.

Members of the Committee noted arrangements for community housing and the proposed affordable housing with this scheme.

It was further noted that issues relating to urban design, impact on neighbours and traffic concerns had been addressed and, in addition, that a construction management scheme had been incorporated into the scheme.

Councillor Richard Eddy moved, seconded by Councillor Afzal Shah and, upon being put to the vote, it was



**Resolved (10 for ie unanimously of those present) – that the application be approved as set out in the report.**

### **11 Date of Next Meeting**

It was noted that the next meeting was scheduled to be held at 6pm on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017.

Meeting ended at 3.10 pm

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

