

# **Bristol City Council**

## **Minutes of the Development Control A Committee**



**10 February 2021 at 2.00 pm**

### **Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Donald Alexander (Chair), Mark Wright, Fabian Breckels, Paul Goggin, Stephen Clarke, Mike Davies, Margaret Hickman, Steve Smith and Fi Hance

### **Officers in Attendance:-**

Claudette Campbell (Democratic Services Officer) and Gary Collins, Head of Development Management

## **1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information**

The Chair welcomed all parties to the Meeting.

## **2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions**

Apologies for absence was received from Councillor Chris Windows.

Councillor Fi Hance substituted for retired Councillor Clive Stevens.

## **3. Declarations of Interest**

The following Declaration of Interest was received and noted:

- Cllr Mike Davies advised that his Ward was in the locality of the application and he had been made aware of this development but confirmed that he was not predetermined.

## **4. Public Forum**

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



The Statements are heard before the application and are taken fully into consideration by the Committee prior to reaching a decision.

## 5. Minutes of the previous meeting

Resolved: that the Minutes of the meeting held on the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2020 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## 6. Appeals

The Head of Development Management introduced the report bringing the following to Committee's attention:

- Item 12: Giant Goram Barrowmead Drive – the appeal was the subject of an Informal Hearing and it had been dismissed. The Inspector considered that it had not been demonstrated that the pub was no longer economically viable or that there was a diverse range of public house provision in the locality. The pub was considered to be defined as a community asset and it was the last of the original five pubs in Lawrence Weston, a community that had lost other facilities and was the location of future development. This was contrary to policies in the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Development Plan. The pub was also locally listed and a heritage asset which would be completely lost, however not every option for its retention had been explored. Applying the planning balance, the obvious benefit of seven new homes did not outweigh the harm that had been identified.
- Item 13 & 14: Former Pring & St Hill site, Malago Road – the appeal was also the subject of a Hearing held in December. There were two proposals, one for mainly student accommodation and some residential units and also a scheme for 100% student accommodation; the decision is expected shortly.
- Item 15: St Catherine's Place Shopping Centre, East St – this appeal was the subject of a recent Public Inquiry and the decision was expected in a few weeks' time.
- Item 16 & 17: Land and Buildings on the South Side of Silverthorne Lane - the Committee had resolved to grant permission for this proposal but there had been an outstanding objection by the Environment Agency on flood grounds; the Secretary of State had called-in the application for his determination and an Inspector had been appointed to hold a Public Inquiry to hear evidence from all parties and recommend a decision to the Secretary of State.
- Item 64-70 Hamilton House Stokes Croft - Appeal on 7 applications; 4 allowed and 3 dismissed. The key issues were the technicalities around what could be defined as a "planning unit" and also whether specific parts of the building could be proven to have been in lawful office use in May 2013.
- Item 94 Poster Panel on Marketside Industrial Site Albert Road - appeal following the decision of the Committee to refuse permission, whereas officers had recommended approval. The refusal was on the grounds of harm to road users; the appeal was allowed as the Inspector considered that no obvious harm could be found.



- Item 96 & 97 85 Whiteladies Road - the Committee had refused this application, whereas officers had recommended approval, on the grounds of breaching the 10% HMO threshold in the locality as referred to in the adopted SPD. Whilst the Inspector gave weight to the breaching of the 10%, he allowed the appeal on the basis that there was no demonstrable harm to the local area that would be caused by exceeding 10%.

## 7. Enforcement

The Head of Development Management Introduced provided a brief summary on matters listed.

## 8. Planning and Development

### 9. Application 19/04802/F Former Gas Holder Site Glenfrome Road Bristol BS2 9UZ

- The Application has been called in for determination by the local Ward Councillors Councillor Tincknell and Councillor Kirk.
- The application is for the construction of a new deport facility including offices, yard and car parking for Wales & West Utilities, who are currently occupy the larger site on the opposite side of Glenfrome Road. This is a relocation of operations across the road.
- The Application site is located on the north-western side of Glenfrome Road, and is bounded to the south-west by a railway line; to the north east by large commercial units, including a builders merchant, and an open space intersected by a public right of way. Residential properties are located to the north on Narrowways Road. The site is also near to a local school.
- Committee were shown and provided with an overview of the plans and ariel photographs of the layout of the site and local area.
- The application was subject to two rounds of consultation resulting in approx. 85 responses, 13 additional comments received after the report had been prepared; areas of concern expressed including: air quality; highway safety, pedestrian safety as Glenfrome Road is the walking route to the local school; existing contamination on site; the appropriateness of the site for industrial use had also been questioned.
- On the issue of the contamination left following the decommissioning of the Gas Works in 2013 committee was referred to the comments of the statutory consultees. The Environment Agency and BCC Land Contamination Officer comments are accompanied with the necessary conditions to be attached if permission is granted.
- A prominent theme amongst the responses received was the suggestion that the pedestrian walkway, that measures in places 1.6-1.7 metres should be widen by demolishing the red brick boundary wall and widen the footway to 2 metres. This was discussed between all parties with the Applicant making the case that such a request was disproportionate.
- The applicant proposes to widen the access entrance to 15 metres; to keep the gate open during the hours of operation; said to be from 07:30hr to 18:30hrs and 08:00hrs to 13:00hrs on a Saturday; together with the proposed Traffic Regulation Order imposing two restrictions; firstly double yellow lines on the opposite side of the road and a right turn ban directing traffic exiting



the site towards the M32 away from the direction of the school. These measures combined with a number of other conditions set out in the report, would support road safety giving all road users better visibility, including HGV vehicles entering and exiting the site.

- i. The Transport Development Manager (TDM) concluded that; there is no net increase of trips on the local network and no new exposure, therefore no concerns regarding air quality for this development. Public Forum respondents have taken issue with the conclusion drawn, expressing concerns about the increase to traffic along Glenfrome Road and claiming that there will be an impact on air quality.
- j. The Officer Recommendation is for the Application to be Granted subject to Planning Agreement and conditions set out in the Amendment sheet.

Questions for clarification were answered as follows:

- k. Officers confirmed the management of the exit off site would be secured by a legal agreement that is, a Traffic Regulation Order, and any breaches would be enforceable.
- l. Members challenged the conclusion drawn by the TDM Officer and sought further assurances on this together with the matter of pollutants from the increase traffic flow along Glenfrome Road.
- m. Officers acknowledged that the area was subject to congestion at peak times but explained that the conclusion drawn by the TDM Officer was based on the relocation of the business, no additional traffic was being added to the existing network. However, should a future application for use of the vacant site be made, consideration would then be given to the cumulative impact on the local road network and also air quality.

#### Debate

- n. Cllr Breckels remained concerned about the issues surrounding peak traffic flows on Glenfrome Road; the need to do more to support visibility for pedestrians; wondered whether a review of the boundary wall could be further considered by Officers via delegated authority. Officers responded that such a requirement would not be appropriate in this case because mitigation was required by the regulations to be related to the impacts of the development in scale and kind.
- o. Cllr Smith viewed the business operation as both new to that locality and additional strain on the networks, to Glenfrome Road in particular; acknowledged and accepted the advice from TDM that it is not reasonable to expect the applicant to address an inherent issue on the highway.
- p. The Chair moved, Cllr Wright seconded, that the Officers recommendation to Grant together with the additional conditions set out in the amendment sheet.
- q. When put to the vote:
- r. Resolved (7 - for; 2 - Abstentions: 0 – Against) that the application be granted as set out in the Officer recommendation with additional conditions set out in the Amendment sheet.

## 10 Date of Next Meeting

Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> March at 2pm



Meeting ended at 3.40 pm

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

