

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control A Committee



13 May 2020 at 2.00 pm

Members Present:-

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

Officers in Attendance:-

Gary Collins, Angelo Calabrese, Mark Curtis, Natalie Queffurus, Kayna Tregay Stephen Rockey. Jeremy Livitt, Claudette Campbell

1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

The Chair welcomed all parties to the meeting and explained that it was being held in accordance with recent Government legislation concerning the Covid-19 pandemic.

2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

There were no apologies for absence and no substitutions.

3. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Steve Smith declared an interest in Planning Application Number 19/04970/F – Glencoyne Square as he had previously worked for the Southmead Development Trust. However, he confirmed that he did not have any current connection to this organisation and had not predetermined the application.

Councillor Stephen Clarke declared an interest in Planning Application Number 19/04970/F – Land At Tavistock Road due to a previous connection with the applicant David Freed but that he no longer had an contact and had not predetermined the application.



4. Minutes of the previous meeting - Wednesday 22nd April 2020

Resolved – that the minutes of the above meeting be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

5. Appeals

The Head of Development Management confirmed that the appeal for Hamilton House 80 Stokes Croft, Bristol BS1 3QY had been provisionally re-scheduled for 2nd June 2020.

6. Enforcement

The Head of Development Management advised the Committee of three additional enforcement notices since last meeting as follows:

281 and 283 Gloucester Road.
41 Alma Vale
36 Woodstock Road.

7. Public Forum

Members of the Committee received Public Forum Statements in advance of the meeting.

The Statements were noted 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 applications set out below:

9. Planning Application Number 19/05491/X - 53 Colston Street

The Head of Development Management and his representative gave a presentation and made the following key points:

- There had been a high number of objections to this planning application
- Details of the proposed changes in opening hours were set out
- Planning permission was required for this item
- An aerial shot of the sight was shown
- A smaller smoking area would be provided
- Noise and disturbance were the key issues arising out of the consultation



- There was no objection from pollution control
- With the proposed mitigation, the increased level of noise would be negligible
- Approval would be for a 1 year temporary consent
- There would be routine monitoring by staff of the noise and with a minimum of 3 doors
- Neighbour's concerns related to alleged poor management of the premises, noise disturbance, door staff and dispersal policy
- A 1 year temporary consent was recommended which would then become permanent subject to adherence to restrictions on noise disturbance. There would be a monitoring plan including acoustic consultants and compliance with the Door Staff dispersal policy
- As part of the arrangements for the transition to a late night bar, the acoustic report would be assessed over a total period compared to a measured background. This was to address concerns about it being assessed at a quiet time
- The report referred to two complaints – the Perry Road being held open and volume levels. However, there were different types of noise to be assessed including both music and general noise and evidence showed that it was within acceptable limits
- The use of the outdoor area would continue to be subject to adherence to the relevant conditions
- The issue of the sound limiting device would be dealt with under the licencing regime

Officers were therefore recommending 1 year approval subject to conditions set out in the report.

In responding to members questions, officers made the following points:

- Members concern was acknowledged that the enforcement of the smoking/non-seating area had not ever properly taken place on this site. Members were also concerned that members of the public regularly smoked and sat at tables there. However, it was noted that the premises were open until midnight so enforcement would take place after then. Customers needed to leave the premises by 1am with staff to clear the site by 1.30am
- There would be a condition for a monitoring plan to ensure these were adhered to particularly over key periods such as Christmas, New Year and the summer period
- Although it was noted that this case could be brought back to Committee if it was called in or if there were a large number of objections, officers agreed that a report would come back automatically after the end of the 1 year period
- Members' concerns were noted about the adverse impact on the planning application if the licence was refused. However, officers reminded members that the licencing and planning regimes operated separately under different legislative frameworks. Any decision made on this Planning Application had to be based on planning grounds and with a firm evidence base
- Members concerns about the monitoring of litter and traffic for the 1 year permission were acknowledged. However, it was pointed out that the period in question was only from midnight to 2am and could be evidenced by written evidence and photos or through a diary if required in order to assess impact at different times of the year. In addition, officers could contact the Neighbourhood Enforcement Team as necessary.



- The impact of the proposed Clean Air Zone was acknowledged. However, officers reminded members that following the decision to refuse the 20th February 2020 Proposed Park and Ride Transport hub on the grounds of air quality, the Inspector at appeal had deemed that it should only be given limited weight as it had not yet been approved

Members then made the following comments:

- This scheme should not be supported due to the impact of noise and disturbance on the area
- As the proposal was for a 1 year trial period and clear instructions had been given about collection of evidence of the impact of disturbance on the area, it should be supported.
- The difference between the planning and licensing regimes in making this decision needed to be taken into account

Councillor Mike Davies moved, seconded by Councillor Margaret Hickman and upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED (10 for, 1 against) – that the application be approved for a 1 year trial period in the conditions contained within the report and on the basis that a report would be submitted back to Committee in a year's time.

10 Planning Application Number 19/04970/F - Land At Tavistock Road

The Head of Development Management and his representative introduced this report and made the following comments:

- The details of the planning application were introduced
- The site had been used as a boxing gym until recently but had now been relocated elsewhere. Access was via a dropped curb.
- Five flats would benefit from private tenancies and would have private balconies
- Details of the objections received at different stages in the process were outlined. These included concerns about insufficient off street parking and loss of a community asset. However, the existing building was in disrepair and officers did not believe it would create a shortfall
- Residential development on site was considered acceptable
- The City Design Team had been consulted to ensure it loosely followed the building line. Their assessment was that it was acceptable and did not warrant refusal
- There would be no windows overlooking the two nearest properties
- There were five windows and only one side balcony. The balcony would be angled as required.
- All dwellings met the required safety standard
- Seven flats would benefit from private space and all twelve would benefit from community space
- There was no objection to the proposed development from Transport Development Management
- The Health and Safety Adviser had raised no concerns
- A Management Plan was proposed as a condition



- The development met required energy sustainability levels

In response to members' questions, officers made the following comment:

- It was not deemed necessary by residents or Transport Development Management to have a Waste Management Plan to deal with any concerns that might arise if bins were not returned to properties. There was storage space and a dropped kerb.

Members made the following comments:

- The benefits of the scheme outweighed the difficulties. It provides accommodation that is in short supply. There had been no objections from Councillors

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

RESOLVED: (unanimously) that the application be approved subject conditions contained within the report.

11 Planning Application Number 19/04705/F - Glencoyne Square

During the item, Councillor Steve Smith advised that during the debate a member of the Southmead Development Trust with whom he had previously worked had contacted him. However, he reiterated his previous Declaration of Interest in this application and that he had not predetermined it.

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and made the following comments:

- Details of the site were outlined
- There were 33 comments in support and 5 objections including letters of support from ward councillors
- The scheme was for a 5 storey building
- The choice of materials was predominantly brick and render
- Whilst the applicant can proceed with no affordable housing, there would be affordable housing grants between Bristol City Council and the future landowner
- The applicant was now proposing a hybrid system of heating
- There was sustainable transport to the site. The applicant was required to provide appropriate travel plan management
- Details of highway mitigation had been provided
- The applicants had emphasised that they would be providing affordable housing and that it was extremely likely they would receive significant public funding

Officers confirmed that the scheme was recommended for approval with appropriate conditions.



In response to members' questions, officers made the following comments:

- Members' suggestion that there is a requirement for affordable housing with this scheme was noted. However, officers advised that the policy position was that if a scheme cannot deliver affordable housing it should not be a requirement of the planning system to do so. Also there needed to be additionality involved which would only apply on top of that amount. Officers further advised that the proposal for 85% affordable housing had been agreed with the applicant which could not be secured through a Section 106 agreement

Members made the following comments:

- This had the potential to be an excellent scheme that could release family housing from some people who wish to downsize properties.
- The design of the scheme was good
- Development on this scale in a green space with local support is very encouraging
- It was encouraging to see that the community had been involved, including school children in the preparation of the design. The area had been neglected for too long
- The proposed heat bumps were a good innovative solution.

Councillor Mike Davies moved, seconded by Councillor Fabian Breckels and upon being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED (unanimously) – that the application be approved together with the conditions contained in the report.

12 Date of Next Meeting

It was noted that the next meeting was the Annual meeting for 2020/21 Municipal Year and was scheduled to be held at 2pm on Wednesday 10th June 2020 as a Zoom remote meeting.

Meeting ended at 3.55pm

CHAIR _____

