

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control B Committee

9 June 2021 at 2.00 pm



Members Present:-

Councillors: Ani Stafford-Townsend (Chair), Chris Windows (Vice-Chair), Donald Alexander, Lesley Alexander, Fabian Breckels, Andrew Brown, Tony Dyer and Steve Pearce (substitute for Zoe Goodman)

Officers in Attendance:-

Peter Westbury, Matthew Cockburn and Jeremy Livitt

1. Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information

The Chair welcomed all parties to the Committee and explained the arrangements for the meeting.

1. Confirmation of Chair for the 2021/22 Municipal Year

Members noted that Councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend had been appointed as Chair of the Development Control B Committee at the meeting of Full Annual Council on Tuesday 25th May 2021.

1. Confirmation of Vice-Chair for the 2021/22 Municipal Year

Members noted that Councillor Chris Windows had been appointed Vice-Chair of DCB Committee at the Annual Meeting of Full Council on Tuesday 25th May 2021.

1. Membership of the Development Control B Committee - 2021/22 Municipal Year

The Committee noted the membership of the Development Control B Committee for 2021/22 Municipal Year.

1. Terms of Reference

The Committee noted the Terms of Reference for Development Control Committee meetings as confirmed by Annual Full Council at its meeting on Tuesday 25th April 2021.



1. Dates of Future Meetings - 2021/22 Municipal Year

The Committee discussed proposed dates for Development Control B Committee for the remainder of the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

Members agreed that the proposal for meetings to alternate between 2pm and 6pm seemed the fairest option for all parties. It was also agreed that officers, in preparing the list of planning applications for meetings, should make every effort to do so in such a way that meetings commencing at 6pm lasted no longer than 3 hours.

1. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Guy Poultney and Councillor Zoe Goodman (Councillor Steve Pearce substituting).

1. Declarations of Interest

There were no Declarations of Interest.

1. Minutes of the previous meeting held on Thursday 15th April 2021

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting held on 15th April 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

1. Appeals

The Committee noted this report.

1. Enforcement

The Committee noted this report.

1. 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.

1. Planning and Development



The Committee considered the following Planning Applications.

a. Planning Application Number 20/06030/F - 7 Belvedere Road

Officers referred to the applicant's request for the Committee to consider a deferral of the application to allow a full analysis of a servicing bay. However, officers stated that they would address this issue as part of their presentation to enable the Committee to consider the matter at this meeting.

The case officer gave a presentation on the report and made the following comments:

- The location of the site was shown which was located in the Downs Conservation Area
- The Committee was reminded of the past history of the 2018 and 2020 applications. It was noted that the 2020 application for a 17 bed extension had been refused on the grounds of an unacceptable level of parking, highways and an overconcentration of care homes in the area
- An appeal for the 2020 application had been refused immediately prior to the Development Control meeting in March 2021. The Inspector had decided that the transport and highways implications were unacceptable but had not found the development unacceptable in terms of noise and disturbance or in respect of the mix of development
- Parking was already at a premium in the area and there were already issues with unsafe parking and conflict. The proposal for parking bays to address this would not be sufficient to overcome this problem
- The current application was for a reduction in bed spaces from 17 to 14, for a new parking survey, no rear roof extension and no smoking area for staff
- Detailed plans for each floor were shown
- The proposal for extra communal space and a lounge would improve the appearance of the front elevation
- There had been a total of 221 comments including both objectors and supporters of the scheme. The ward Councillor Martin Fodor had referred the matter to Committee
- On balance it was considered that the principle of the development was acceptable and in using the Housing Delivery Test, there was sufficient evidence to warrant a change of use
- The Inspectors did not believe that there was a harmful overconcentration of care homes in the area
- There was no parking on site. Parking surveys had been carried out by both residents and developers. It was noted that the site was just outside the Residents Parking Scheme. The Inspector had placed more weight on the evidence produced by neighbours from photos and logs. At the site visit, the Inspector had found that parking was heavily oversubscribed and that even a relatively low increase would worsen the situation. It was officers view that the proposed reduction in bed space in this application would not significantly reduce this situation
- Officers' drew members attention to the different stages in the process for agreement to the installation of servicing bays. It was noted that at Step 1, officers had assessed this and considered



that it was unacceptable in planning terms due to the loss of space prior to progressing to any further stages

- The proposed switching of the Traffic Regulation Order delivery and the servicing bay would not be possible as this would result in a permanent suspension. The question was purely an issue of whether or not bays would be acceptable in planning terms

In conclusion, officers believed that even a low increase in demand or the provision of parking bays would worsen the highway situation and street parking at the site and therefore they were recommending refusal on this basis. They did not believe it would be reasonable to refuse the application on the basis of residential amenity given the residential nature of the proposed care home.

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

- The applicant had proposed a reduction in the number of beds to redress the concerns from the 2020 application. However, the new application had been submitted before the outcome of the appeal had been known
- The applicant had tried to address problems caused by Anti-Social Behaviour from staff who urinated in the gardens by the creation of a breakout space. However, it was difficult to control behaviour. Officers indicated that, in the event that the application was successful, they could pursue this issue with the applicant
- Other issues, such as the possible banning of idling engines and making the street one-way were not part of the application. It was noted that the problem was parking on the site which would not be solved by making the street one way
- Whilst there were a large number of existing care homes in this road, this had not been planned. It was noted that both care homes were owned by the same person
- If the application were to be approved, there would need to be a separate condition requiring consent for the provision of parking bays

During discussion, Councillors made the following comments:

- There was a need for good quality care in this area and if the application was refused it would create problems elsewhere
- This application would be a step too far in terms of highways and highways safety and should be refused in accordance with officers' recommendations
- If the highway situation continued to worsen, it could result in a serious accident. The Inspector gave a clear ruling on this issue and on that basis, the application should be refused
- It was noted that the role of the Committee to improve the applicant's scheme which needed to be considered on its own merits. It could not be approved as it currently stood and due to the highway situation at the site it was unlikely to ever be able to be approved to enable any such application to be successful
- Whilst the need for care homes was clear, there seemed to be an overconcentration in this street. The application should be refused



- Air pollution in this area was also a problem. The application should be refused
- Whilst reservations about refusing this planning application could be understood, it was impossible to approve given the situation concerning highways safety and parking on the site.

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

RESOLVED (unanimously) – that the application be refused in accordance with the officers’ recommendation.

b. Planning Application Number 20/04678/F - St Johns Lane Health Centre

Officers gave a presentation on the above item and made the following points:

- Details of the application were provided
- It was noted that there was an error in the application description. The number of parking spaces was 14 (13 with one disabled space), not 8
- Some changes were proposed to conditions to make implementation easier
- The site location was shown to the Committee
- Officers provided details of the site history. There had been a Doctors Surgery on site until it was vacated in 2018 and a retail unit which had been vacated in 2019. A previous application had been approved in May 2020 and was a material consideration
- Members’ attention was drawn to the nearby existing Malago Greenway cycleway
- The application was for 36 affordable apartments and upper level deck access
- Details of the upper floor were shown, together with a 3D image showing the development which was of red brick construction. This was in accordance with the existing character of the area and the urban living SPD
- There had been 5 objections and 1 neutral comment – the objections related to the level of parking, the impact on the highway as well as the scale and massing of the development
- The principle of the scheme was that it contributed to affordable housing. Retail housing was not viable.
- Whilst the recommendation was for 36 affordable housing units, only 11 of these would be secured for perpetuity via a Section 106 Agreement
- The transport team considered that the proposed 14 car parking places would be sufficient and would significantly improve the car parking ratio
- In terms of residential amenity, the site would benefit from the north east corner
- The building was the same size and massing as the William Hill building and was consistent with window to window distances
- The fourth floor terrace would be removed and a number of privacy screens included

Officers were recommending approval of the scheme, together with a travel plan.



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

- The purpose of cladding the 4th Floor in a different material was to enable it to blend in better against the sky from a distance
- All of the permanently fixed 11 affordable housing units would operate as intermediate rented properties
- The material of the rear access could be controlled through a condition. However, it had not been possible to insist on gated access due to the need for highway access
- There would be a condition requiring a landscaping strategy and plans
- There was an intention to keep a similar mix on site of between 9 and 11 intermediate rented properties
- It was not feasible to require the £10,000 donation for car park spaces to operate through a car club since there was existing cycle access through the Malago Cycle route. However, a condition would be put in place to require the developer to sign with a car club. The Transport Officer confirmed that this was a frequently used arrangement that worked well and seemed a good solution in this case

Committee members made the following comments:

- The proposed screening should address the issue of the impact of the fourth storey on the adjacent screen south of the site
- Whilst normally it was good to see 100% affordable housing for a scheme, it was disappointing that there was no socially rented accommodation. However, the application could not be refused on this basis
- Whilst there remained some concerns about the situation at the rear of the property, there were many good elements of the scheme and it should be approved

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

RESOLVED (unanimously) – that the application be approved as per the officer report and the additional conditions proposed in the amendment sheet.

1. Date of Next Meeting

The Committee noted that the next meeting was scheduled to be held at 6pm on Wednesday 21st July 2021 in the Council Chamber, City Hall, College Green, Bristol.



Meeting ended at 3.20 pm

CHAIR _____

