

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control B Committee

14 August 2019 at 2.00 pm



Members Present:-

Councillors: Richard Eddy (Vice-Chair), Carla Denyer, Lesley Alexander, Tom Brook (Chair), Harriet Bradley, Mike Davies, Olly Mead, Nicola Bowden-Jones, Gary Hopkins and Donald Alexander

Officers in Attendance:-

Peter Westbury - Team Manager, Development Management, Allison Taylor (Democratic Services Officer)

1. Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information

The Chair welcomed all parties to the meeting and explained arrangements for emergency access in the event of a fire.

2. Apologies for Absence

These were received from Councillor Hance and Councillor Phipps with Councillor Don Alexander as substitute for Councillor Phipps.

3. Declarations of Interest

There were none.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

Resolved – that the Minutes be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5. Appeals

The representative of the Head of Development Management introduced the report and summarised it for everyone.



In response to a question regarding item 13 - 7-29 Wilder Street, it was reported that this remained with the Planning Inspectorate and the outcome would be reported to members.

6. Enforcement

The representative of the Head of Development Management introduced the report and summarised it for everyone. There were no questions.

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. 19/00503/F - Brandwells Construction Co Ltd Park House Church Lane St George Bristol, BS5 7AG

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

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

1. The application was for the removal of existing garaging and outbuildings and to construct a two storey extension to the existing office;
2. It was before the Committee due to the objections raised by neighbours;
3. There were no changes proposed to the front of the building;
4. The office space would increase by 73 sq. m and office staff would increase from 19 to 34;
5. The roof windows were at a sufficiently high level so that there were no direct views out;
6. The relationship with neighbours was difficult to assess due to the unusual layout of the site;
7. Given the orientation of the site there would be some overshadowing in the late afternoon/evening however given the separation distance this would likely be very limited in respect of when this occurred and did not therefore warrant refusal;
8. There would be no material increase in traffic movements;
9. There had been no objections from Transport Development Management;
10. An Advice Note as set out in the Amendment Sheet would be added to the decision reminding the applicant of his responsibilities to the nearby Public Right of Way;



11. The application was recommended for approval subject to conditions and the Advice Note as set out in the Amendment Sheet.

The following points arose from questions and debate:-

1. Access to the industrial estate would be from Hammersmith Road and there was no access from the east;
2. The planning permission to occupy the neighbouring site at 55 Sloan Street did not sub-divide the plot but allowed the annex to be used as ancillary accommodation. The impact of the whole site was assessed although in reality the arrangements were not known;
3. The use of the site was lawful. There had previously been a query regarding the discharge of conditions but enforcement officers had chosen to take no further action. Enforcement officers would only take action if harm was caused;
4. Councillor Eddy stated that the application did not cause significant harm to residential amenity and he approved of the design and would therefore support the officer recommendation to approve;
5. Councillor Bradley supported improved conditions for staff and supported the officer recommendation to approve;
6. The recommendation was moved and seconded and it was:-

Resolved (9 for, 1 abstention) – That Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions and the Advice Note as set out in the Amendment Sheet.

10 19/02576/A - Temple Meads (T7) Bus Stop Located On Victoria Street North Eastbound & 19/02317/A - Temple Meads (T2) Bus Stop Located On Temple Gate Northbound

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

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

1. The applications were for two digital LED advertisement displays (19/02317/A & 19/02321/A) and 1 internally illuminated paper sign (19/02576/A).
2. The applications were before the Committee due to the level of public interest, particularly the Temple Gate site;
3. Transport Development Management was satisfied that these panels were not a distraction for motorists and were there for the attention of pedestrians;
4. City Design observed that the new longer bus stops replaced shorter bus stops and there was therefore a decrease in advertising displays;
5. BCC's concession with Clear Channel contained an agreement regarding the control of advertising;
6. Officers recommended approval of the 3 locations subject to conditions.



The following points arose from questions and debate:-

1. The units removed were the same size as the proposed units;
2. The content of the agreement regarding controlled advertising with Clear Channel could be reviewed but this was not a reason for refusal;
3. Facial recognition was included as standard and Clear Channel had a legal right to do so but would need to discuss this with BCC. The Committee was reminded that this was not a reason to refuse. The Committee's focus was safety and amenity;
4. There were no powers to have the cameras removed;
5. The LED displays would be sensitive to light and would have a "maximum" lux level to the equivalent of a 150watt lightbulb;
6. There was no information regarding noise and harm from the displays;
7. It was observed that one of the signs had already been erected before planning permission which was unfortunate given the arrangement between BCC and Clear Channel;
8. If planning permission was refused there would be no advertising displays. The bus stops were permitted development. It was noted that the money generated by advertising contributed to the bus shelters;
9. Councillor Mead noted that the contribution from the advertising funded better bus stops which was welcomed and he would support the officer recommendations;
10. Councillor Eddy was reassured that Transport Development Management that there was no issue regarding safety and would support the officer recommendations;
11. Councillor Davies believed that advertising was not good for wellbeing but would support the officer recommendations based on no significant harm to safety and amenity;
12. Councillor Denyer would not support the officer recommendations as she observed that BCC should not be pressured into accepting things that were not required as an amenity;
13. The officer recommendations were moved and seconded and voted on separately and it was:-

19/02576/A - Temple Meads (T7) Bus Stop Located on Victoria Street North Eastbound

Resolved (9 for, 1 against) - That Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions.

19/02317/A - Temple Meads (T2) Bus Stop Located on Temple Gate Northbound B

Resolved (9 for, 1 against) - That Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions.

19/02321/A - Temple Meads (T3) Bus Stop Located on Redcliffe Way Eastbound.

Resolved (9 for, 1 against) - That Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions.



The meeting ended at 2.55pm.

CHAIR _____

