

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control B Committee

18 December 2019 at 1.00 pm



Members Present:-

Councillors: Lesley Alexander, Nicola Bowden-Jones, Harriet Bradley, Tom Brook (Chair), Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Fi Hance, Sultan Khan, Olly Mead, Jo Sergeant and Steve Smith

Officers in Attendance:-

Claudette Campbell (Democratic Services Officer) and Gary Collins

1. Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information

The Chair welcomed those present and explained the process on hearing of each application.

2. Apologies for Absence

These were received from Councillor Eddy (Substitute Cllr S Smith)

3. Declarations of Interest

There were none.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes were agreed as correct record of the meeting.

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

5. Appeals

The Head of Development Management requested that Committee note the update report.

6. Enforcement



Committee were requested to note that notices were pending with a further update to be given at the next meeting.

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. 19/04331/F Old Building Bristol Royal Infirmary Marlborough Street City Centre Bristol BS2 8HW

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

Cllr Khan arrived after the start of public forum so was unable to participate in the discussion and decision making for this application.

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

- a. Committee were provided with an overview of the extensive history of this development and explained the fundamental changes in terms of the current scheme. The submitted scheme addressed the majority of issues that had arisen about the redevelopment of the site over recent years.
- b. The application sets out: The intended retention and refurbishment of the former BRI building Fripps Chapel for residential and community use / A3, D1 and D2 uses; the erection of new buildings to provide 416 student bedspaces; the enhancement to the public realm with landscaping; public access to a newly created square; the widening of the pavement around the site; connection to the District Heating Network and use of the same; the offer of 12 units to be made available for affordable rent, albeit in this instance not a policy requirement.
- c. The report detailed the remaining outstanding concerns raised by interested parties and the conditions outlined to meet a number of these concerns and agreements arrived at between Officers and the Developer. Officers were confident that they had now arrived at a place that the application could be approved together with the necessary conditions and with the Committees' delegated authority move forward to resolve any outstanding issues as matters progressed.
- d. There was no requirement for the provision of affordable housing as the development benefits from 'vacant building credit' but the applicant had voluntarily offered 12 units to be made available at a discounted rent likely to be used by essential workers – health workers or



educational workers employed by the hospital or university. Committee were advised that this element could only be given neutral weight in coming to a resolution.

- e. Officers recommend approval subject to a s. 106 legal agreement and a number of conditions.

Questions for Clarification

- f. Further clarification was sought on the offer of affordable housing; who was to manage those units? What measure could be put in place to prevent the future sale of units on the open market? Also if the space standards been met for each of the units? Officers were able to comment as follows:
- The offer of 12 units was discretionary; not a policy requirement ; the details of the management of which will be finalised and secured through the s. 106 agreement, Unite would remain the Landlord and manage all units; Bristol University are the preferred client whose students would likely occupy the cluster units; the studio units likely to be offered to other establishments recognising that they can be more suitable to mature students.
 - As ownership remains with Unite they are in a position to sell the flats on the open market should they choose to do so.
- g. Heat network connection – the report detailed the use of the network in the development but a question was asked as to why some units would not use the energy source for all its needs;
- Officers confirmed that the development will connect to the district heating network as outlined in the report; with the network supplying hot water and heat to the residential units and hot water only to the student accommodation. Heating for the student accommodation is to be by electric panel heaters. The report details the objection to this latter element.
- h. A question was asked on how access to the Bus Station that backs onto Whitson Street would be treated and management during and after construction particularly concerns were raised about the disabled drop off area.
- Members were assured that the construction management plan would condition the need for continued access to the Bus station by all including those with a disability and would deal with access to Whitson Street in consultation with Highways.
 - The intention is to ensure that on completion of the development the proposed wider pavements would not be used as an unofficial drop off area; the public realm design layout will include strategically placed street furniture.
 - The taxi rank is to be relocated in part to adjoining Earl Street in the vicinity of the Magistrates Court. This has been agreed in consultation with the Taxi drivers group.
- i. An explanation was sought on the steps taken in the design to mitigate the devastation that a fire causes in the building; clarification on the kind of materials being used in the construction and whether there was any potential that such materials may accelerate such a fire?.
- Members were assured that the issue of building materials used in the construction of buildings are well aired and therefore well controlled by Building Regulations. In addition its known that the insurance industry have strict restrictions in place that encourages & supports good practice from Developers when selecting construction materials.
- j. Discussion
- k. Members of the Committee commended the developers for work done with the planners that has now resulted in a proposal that is fitting and in keeping with the area.



- l. A Member further acknowledged the work done to retain a building that had significant value to the citizens of Bristol.
- m. Members noted that the development satisfied the aspiration of committee to locate accommodation for students within a reasonable walking distance to their centre of learning.
- n. The developers and highways team were requested to do what they could to ensure that traffic and access on Whitson Street was properly managed throughout the construction process.
- o. Cllr Davies proposed and seconded by Cllr Mead, that the planning application be agreed as set out in Officer report, with conditions detailed therein together with that set out in the Amendment Sheet, when put to the vote;
- p. **Resolved** (10 members available to vote: 10 for; 0 against) that the application be granted as per Officer recommendation detailed in the Report & Amendment sheet.

10 19/01690/F Kingsdown House & 1-3 Units Unity Street St Philips Bristol BS2 0HN

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

- a. Committee were provided with an overview of the report that detailed the planning application; for the demolition of Kingsdown House & 1-3 Unity Street located in the Old Market area of Bristol; erection of 3 buildings ranging in height comprising of 102 Co-living studios; 189 Student bedrooms; co-working/employment and other associated items.
- b. Details were given on the numbers of student accommodation buildings in the Old Market area and the projected movement of students.
- c. Officer recommendation was to approve the application and grant delegated authority to Officers to finalise the necessary conditions and the Section 106 legal agreement. .
- d. Questions
- e. The absence of food shops and/or local convenience stores was noted; Officers advised that this was subject to market conditions.
- f. Further explanation was sought & provided on the accessibility of the accommodation for students with disabilities.
- g. Discussion
- h. Members commented the scheme agreeing it was of a high quality; the design reflected the local area; the inclusive of mix use was viewed positively; were hopeful that the co-living arrangements would prove successful and looked to the management company to properly manage the accommodation.
- i. Commented that the area needed 'an uplift' that the application provided that in its design. .
- j. A Member looked to the developer to encourage the occupation of the units by students in the upper years not just first years.
- k. Cllr Mead moved that Committee support officer recommendation to approve, seconded by Cllr Davies when put to the vote;
- l. Resolved: (11 for unanimous) that the application be granted subject to conditions set out in the report.



11 19/05160/H 26 Cranham Road Bristol BS10 5EF

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

- a. Committee received a presentation on the proposal to erect a single storey side and rear extension together with the erection of a small porch to the front elevation at 26 Cranham Road. Members were provided with a full overview of the proposed alteration to the building.
- b. Members were reminded that this matter had come to Committee as required by the Planning Officer code of conduct that prevented Officers presiding over a colleagues planning application.
- c. Questions
- d. There were none.
- e. Debate
- f. Members noted that it was a small scale, householder development and the reason why it had been brought to Committee; requesting that the process is reviewed by committee leads to avoid unnecessary delay to an Officer application; to ensure best use of Officer time & Committee time. The Head of Development Management advised that the Constitution and the Planning Code of Conduct was in the process of being reviewed but until such time that an alternative process was adopted such matters would continue to be presented to Committee.
- g. Cllr Mead moved, Cllr Denyer seconded, the approval of the application as set out in the Officer report when put to the vote;
- h. **Resolved** (11 for unanimous) that the application be approved as set out in the report.

12 Date of Next Meeting

12 February 2020 @ 6pm

Meeting ended at 2.53 pm

CHAIR _____

