

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control A Committee



22 January 2020 at 6.00 pm

Members Present:-

Councillors: Donald Alexander (Chair), Chris Windows (Vice-Chair), Clive Stevens, Mark Wright, Fabian Breckels, Stephen Clarke, Mike Davies, Margaret Hickman, Afzal Shah and Steve Smith

Officers in Attendance:-

Gary Collins, Laurence Fallon and Norman Cornthwaite

1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

The Chair welcomed those present, drew attention to the evacuation procedure and explained the process to be followed for the hearing of each application.

2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from Councillor Paul Goggin.

3. Declarations of Interest

The following was noted:

Councillor Davies - 19/01892/F - Nos. 31-32 Portland Square and Surrey Street Warehouse. He has submitted a Public Forum statement and would not participate in the item.

Councillor Breckels - 18/05310/F - St Catherine's Place Shopping Centre. He has had discussions on this application but has not made his mind up about it.

Councillor Wright - 18/05310/F - St Catherine's Place Shopping Centre. He has objected to the application and would not participate in the item.



Councillor Stevens – 18/05310/F – St Catherine’s Place Shopping Centre. He had referred to the proposals in a recent statement at Cabinet, as an example of the difficulties in securing affordable housing on some sites, but had not pre-determined this application.

Councillor Clarke - 18/05310/F - St Catherine’s Place Shopping Centre. The applicant had been a client in his previous professional role but did not consider that this was a prejudicial interest and had not pre-determined the application.

In response to questions from Members, the Head of Development Management confirmed that he had sent an e-mail to all Members of the Committee the previous day reminding them not to pre-determine any of the applications.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

Resolved - that the minutes of the Meeting on 20th November 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5. Appeals

The Head of Development Management introduced the report providing an overview of the current appeals. He highlighted Item No. 10, the Hospital Trust Headquarters in Marlborough St, and explained that the Hearing had started the previous day and had now concluded. The decision would be announced potentially in April.

6. Enforcement

The Head of Development Management introduced the report.

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

9. 19/00682/F - 2 - 16 Clifton Down Road

The Head of Development Management and his representative gave a presentation and summarised the report for this item highlighting the following:



Demolition of existing building and erection of three storey (plus basement and additional plant roof top level) building containing 819.5 square metres in total (incl. shared changing area) retail (Use Class A1); 756 square metres in total (incl. terraces) cafe/restaurant (Use Class A3); and 842.5 square metres in total (incl. shared changing area & terraces) office (Use Class B1a), shared-surface highway improvements on Boyce's Avenue and parts of King's Road, landscaping and associated development. (Major Application).

Attention was drawn to the Amendment Sheet

Photos of the site were shown and the previous proposals were also outlined.

The reasons for the recommendation were also described.

Answers for Clarification:

- Although the 2013 permission has lapsed, it is still a material consideration as the site and surroundings have not significantly changed
- Condition 39 will be enforceable as the condition wording is clear and activity on the terraces would be observable
- Advice 16 relates to occupiers and visitors not being eligible for parking permits, so this would include businesses as well as residents

Debate:

- The proposal blends in well with the surrounding area and brings the site back into use
- The proposal replaces an ugly building
- The style and appearance of the proposed building is not attractive and does not enhance or preserve the Clifton Conservation Area
- The proposal is an acceptable scheme

Councillor Davies moved the Officer Recommendation that the application be Approved.

Councillor Hickman seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

Resolved – (voting 9 for, 1 against) that the application be approved.

10 18/05310/F - St Catherine's Place Shopping Centre, East Street, Bedminster

Councillor Wright did not participate in this item.

The Head of Development Management and his representative gave a presentation and summarised the report for this item highlighting the following:



Full planning application for comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide mixed use development comprising 205 residential dwellings (Class C3), 1288sqm of new retail, leisure and commercial space including a cinema (Class A1, A3, D2), refurbishment of existing retail facilities together with parking and amenity space, vehicular access, servicing arrangements, public realm, landscaping and associated works. (Major).

The changes to the report made since the application was last considered by the Committee were explained including the transport issues.

The reasons for recommending that the application be refused were described.

Answers for Clarification:

- Only minor changes have been made to the design of the scheme
- The restrictive parking contribution is to mitigate the impact that the development would have on surrounding streets to ensure that residents of the new development are unable to park in the surrounding area. The implementation of any scheme would be consulted on and delivered by BCC subject to political and local support.
- If the Committee refuses the application, Officers are relatively confident that BCC would win any appeal (i.e. that the appeal would be dismissed)
- The issues of overshadowing and loss of light have been linked to the scale and massing of the proposal

Debate

- The reasons for refusing the scheme are the same as when the Committee considered it in November (2019) and it was not refused; it should be approved
- The lack of sunlight and public realm are real problems and the application should be refused; the scheme could have been differently designed; Officers should be supported in recommending the refusal of poor quality schemes
- Although the developers have done a lot of work, there are still concerns about the height, scale and massing of the proposal
- Footfall in the area has reduced in recent years and something needs to be done to address this problem; there are concerns about the light problems and the lack of facilities for children
- Although the scheme has drawbacks something has to be done for the area

Councillor Davies moved the Officer Recommendation that the application be Refused.

Councillor Hickman seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

Resolved – (Voting 6 for, 3 against) that the application be refused.

Councillors Shah and Smith left the Meeting.



**11 19/01892/F and 19/01893/LA - 31 - 32 Portland Square and Surrey Street Warehouse,
Surrey Street**

Councillor Davies did not participate in this item.

The Head of Development Management and his representative gave a presentation and summarised the report for this item highlighting the following:

Demolition of existing warehouse, partial demolition, conversion and restoration of nos. 31 and 32 Portland Square to form student apartments (sui generis) and development fronting Portland Square, Cave Street and Surrey Street with associated refuse and cycle storage.

The reasons for recommending that the application be approved were described.

Answers for Clarification:

- The change in the use meant this was a new application rather than a variation (as student accommodation is sui generis)
- Each application has to be decided on its merits; whilst noting the appeal for Wilder Street was upheld, Officers would have concerns if this application was refused
- Use class is different; no affordable housing is required
- An S106 Agreement would probably be required to obtain contributions from the developer and for securing the terms for the development to connect to the District Heat Network (DHN) for day 1 connection.
- An advisory would be added to remind the developers that students would not be eligible for parking permits (this is covered in the travel plan documentation).

Debate:

- This scheme, for purpose built student accommodation, is less harmful than numerous proposals for houses in multiple occupancy (HMOs)
- Given the recent Wilder Street decision a refusal on grounds of a concentration in student accommodation could not be justified.

Councillor Breckels moved the Officer Recommendation for Approval of the application.

Councillor Windows seconded the Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

Resolved – (voting 7 for, 0 against) that the application be approved.



12 Date of Next Meeting

4th March 2020 at 2.00 pm.

Meeting ended at 9.15 pm

CHAIR _____

