

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control A Committee



5 September 2018 at 6.00 pm

Members Present:-

Councillors: Donald Alexander (Chair), Clive Stevens, Mark Wright, Fabian Breckels, Stephen Clarke, Margaret Hickman, Olly Mead, Lesley Alexander, Richard Eddy and Celia Phipps

Officers in Attendance:-

Claudette Campbell (Democratic Services Officer), Gary Collins, Alex Hawtin, Jess Leigh, Natalie Queffurus, Ken Reid and Thomas Wilkinson

1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

The Chair Councillor D Alexander led introductions and welcome those present.

2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

The following apologies for absence were received;

- Cllr C Windows – substituted by Cllr L Alexander
- Cllr T Carey – substituted by Cllr R Eddy
- Cllr M Davies – substituted by Cllr C Phipps

3. Declarations of Interest

The Chair, Cllr D Alexander, declared that he had in 2017 called in 8.e) 17/03731/F Land South of Ermine Way because no affordable housing had been offered in the development. That issue had now been resolved in the current application. There was no objection to his chair and participation in the debate and decision making as committee members were satisfied that no predetermination had been made.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

Resolved: that the minutes of the meeting held on 25th July 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair



5. Appeals

The Head of Development Management referred to;

- ND 6 – that the developer had lodged an appeal for non-determination. Appeal timescales were yet to be received. A report would be provided to committee for clarification on the Councils position on the appeal.

6. Enforcement

The list of Enforcement Notices served since the last Committee Meeting was noted.

7. 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.

8. Planning and Development

The Committee considered the following Planning Applications

9. 18/03233/F Merchants Academy Gatehouse Avenue Bristol BS13 9AJ

The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-

The following points arose from questions and debate:-

- a. The application is for the proposed relocation and expansion of the existing Merchants Academy Primary School and Venturers Academy (an Autistic Condition spectrum (ACS) school).
- b. The intention is to create a new combined two-form entry primary school with a nursery and an expanded Autistic Condition spectrum School on existing land to the east of the existing Merchants Academy Secondary School site.
- c. The previous application at the site for a similar development (reference 17/03021/F) was refused by Development Control A on 29th November 2017. The reason for refusal was due to concern about overshadowing, overbearing and overlooking impact of the development on surrounding residential properties; together with the removal of 3 category A trees on site.
- d. An appeal against the decision is scheduled for the 3rd October 2018.



- e. The applicants have made changes to the proposed scheme, including moving the main building away from the boundary to Hareclive road.
- f. This planning application received 11 objections from neighbouring residential properties sighting the impact of the height and proximity to their homes.
- g. Officers support the changes that have been made to mitigate the reasons for refusal and are looking for approval of the scheme.

Members points of clarification

- h. Cllr Hickman sought clarity on the exact distance of the properties bordering the development and an answer to whether the distance would appear as a prison wall to a resident.
- i. The distance of 21metres is the measurement given in the local guidance. The majority of the resident properties have 21 – 25 metres between their property and the development except for a property on the corner that is just 6 metres.
- j. Members requested that in future information shared with committee with specific details & particulars where it covered resident's concerns are checked for accuracy.
- k. Concerns were raised over the width of the pavement along Hareclive road that would be the main thoroughfare, officers were asked what conditions could be applied. Officers advised members that Highways would need to undertake the required feasibility study before any conditions could be imposed.

Member debate

- l. Cllr Eddy advised that he would endorse the development as he was satisfied that the applicant had made changes to mitigate the objections raised previously.
- m. Cllr Mead, noted the significant changes in the design and that the briefing provided insight into the difficulties of developing a site with children with autism being schooled in the vicinity.
- n. Members & Officers took some time to consider the issues around the pavement along Hareclive with the understanding that conditions could not be imposed. The funds given under a S106 award could include in that agreement a term requiring funds to be apportioned to the improvement to a specific section of the highway.
- o. Cllr Stevens proposed that the issue of the pavement along Hareclive road is delegate to officers to investigate.

Resolved (6 approve; 2 Refuse; 1 Abstention) Grant subject to a condition to explore widening of pavement on Hareclive Road.

10 18/02055/P Former School Site Hawkfield Road Bristol

Cllr Stephen Clarke joined the meeting for the start of this item.

The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-

- a. This application forms a part of the Urban Framework Plan for the South Bristol area covering Hengrove Park, Hartcliffe Campus and Imperial Park.



- b. The land is partly owned by the City Council with the City of Bristol College and allocated for housing and business with this application going some way to meeting the city's housing target.
- c. The design of the site complimented the natural drainage of the land; preserving the Butterfly habitat by relocating to another area on site; was sympathetic to the tree preservation orders; a mixed development with family housing and apartments.
- d. Had considered the impact on healthcare services; nearest provision with capacity is in the Hartcliffe centre; conversations are progressing in respect of education provision; adjustment to be made to the highway to allow for road crossing.
- e. Officers recommended approval of the outline application.

Members point of clarification

- f. The application was an outline application; the provision for education school places would be considered by the necessary officers; this area has no issues with school capacity.
- g. Clarification was sought on the boundary as to whether the intention was to have fencing as depicted on the design plan. The design did not show fencing but a line to indicate the need for some form of boundary between properties.
- h. The bus reallocation was to allow for the development of the land.
- i. Further design options would be considered for the required crossing.
- j. Further design options would be pending for the play areas to include the provision for ongoing maintenance; H&S issues; its location to residential homes.

Member Debate

- k. Cllr Mead – urged the developers to consider accessibility needs in its design to ensure that dwellings supported the needs of an aging population.
- l. Cllr Breckels proposed that conditions be applied to support the need for accessibility. Seconded by Cllr Hickman.

Resolved (unanimous) that the outline application be granted subject to conditions being expanded in respect of the landscaping to extend the play areas and the exploration of the widening of the pavements along Hareclive Rd.

11 17.05290.F & 18.02549LA 31-32 Portland Square and Surrey Street Warehouse Bristol BS2 8PS

The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-

The following points arose from questions and debate:-

- a. The application was for the demolition of existing warehouse, partial demolition, conversion and restoration of number 31. & 32. Portland Square to form 93 residential flats and development fronting Portland Square, Cave Street and Surrey Street with associated refuse and cycle storage.



- b. The design plan and layout was shared with committee and the significant improvement to an area of Portland Square that remained damaged and rundown as a result of bomb damage in WW2.
- c. Officers are seeking approval for an application that would bring back a dilapidated site into use and provide affordable housing.

Member points for clarification

- d. Cllr Stevens sought clarity on the reason why the scheme would not link to the district heating network. Officers clarified that the development timeframe did not sync with the construction of the heating network. Officers were satisfied that as the council, were unable to provide details of when the heating network would arrive in Portland Square together with details of associated costs it was not possible to incorporate it into the scheme.

Member Debate

- e. Cllr Mead noted that the development was a positive one resulting in the repair and restoration of war damage frontage in Portland Square whilst providing young professionals with good quality housing.
- f. Cllr Eddy agreed that the scheme was a good one, supporting the heritage of the area and delivered affordable housing.
- g. Cllr Breckels agreed that the design was a fabulous enhancement to the area and the issue of the district heating connection was not an issue that should stall the progress of the scheme.
- h. Cllr Breckels proposed approval and Cllr Eddy seconded.

Resolved (9 approval and 1 refusal) That planning permission be granted subject to conditions set out in the report.

12 18.02548/F & 18.02549/LA 7-29 Wilder Street, 1-3 Backfields and Land at Corner of Backfields and Upper York Street Bristol BS2 8PU

The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-

The following points arose from questions and debate:-

- a. The application was for redevelopment of existing buildings to provide purpose built managed 345 student bed accommodation. An outline planning application had already been granted for the development of up to 105 student bed accommodation on the site.
- b. The design plan was shared with members; it consisted of three development blocks, fronting Wilder Street, Upper York Street and Backfields, with a central courtyard for use by the student occupiers. The ground floor would consist of cluster flats and studios and other related student areas.
- c. The listed building within the development would be restored retaining the existing door openings with the historic floor plan format retained.



- d. Officers recommended granting the application together with all related planning agreement.

Members point of clarification & debate

- e. Members were concerned about the classification of this area as fit for student accommodation causing the saturation of students in the area.
- f. Members were reminded that committee could not give any weight to emerging policy change in the local plan and had to consider the application in line with current policy.
- g. Members were informed that the commercial & retail areas would be concentrated in the Backfields rd section of the development and not across the whole lower ground floor area of the scheme.
- h. Officers confirmed that the developers had permission to construct a scheme with 105 student beds.

Member debate

- i. Cllr Mead led the discussion on the loss of commercial space and in turn the loss of employment space.
- j. Cllr Hickman referenced community intelligence that indicated that residents would not support the development and would be concern about the negative impact on the area.
- k. Cllr Eddy was minded to vote against the development.
- l. Cllr Stevens consider the jump from 105 beds to 345 a stretch too far for the development and the wider impact on the area.
- m. Cllr Breckels noted that the development design was good and pleasing architecturally but the area would be impact by the numbers of students. The area needed residential housing to support a permanent population; accommodation that supported students for a fixed period was deemed more pleasing that one that only provided for fixed one year tenancy.
- n. Members were reminded that a policy did not exist that covered the impact of a development on the character of an area.
- o. Cllr Mead proposed that the scheme was rejected on the basis of the loss of employment space, and the harmful concentration of student accommodation in the area if the scheme increased capacity from 105 to 345 beds.
- p. Cllr Mead proposed refusal seconded Cllr Eddy.

Resolved (9 refusal:1 for) That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- **Loss of employment space**
- **Over-concentration of student accommodation in the area**

13 17.03731.F Land south of Ermine Way Bristol

Councillor Eddy left the meeting.

The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-



- a. The application is for the construction of 39 no. two, three and four bedroom dwellings together with landscaped open spaces, access, parking, landscaping and associated development. On a site that was a former clay pit quarry therefore with a number of associated complications that have to be overcome to allow the development to proceed.
- b. The complications of building on such a site dedicated the number of affordable housing that are to be provided, that is 15% of the development equating to 6 no. dwellings.
- c. The developers have engaged with the residents of the neighbouring properties who will be impacted by the development on a piece of land that has been untouched for a number of years.
- d. Officers are recommending approval.

Members points of clarity and debate:

- e. The Chair confirmed that the development was much needed one in his ward and addressed the issue of a neglected open space. Expressing disappointed that more affordable housing could not be delivered but satisfied that the offer of 15% was a reasonable offer.
- f. Members discussed how refusing an application that did not deliver the required 20% affordable housing would stand on appeal. Officers reassured members that stringent work had been done by the District Valuer office to establish land value and the cost of the development in relation to what could be delivered therefore satisfied with the offer.
- g. Members agreed that there was a need for housing and the design made good use of a complicated site providing much needed housing for the city.
- h. Cllr Mead proposed that the Officer recommendation to approve be agreed and Cllr Stevens seconded.

Resolved (Unanimous) that planning permission be granted with attached conditions outlined in the report

14 Date of Next Meeting

Meeting ended at 9.36 pm

CHAIR _____

