

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control A Committee



22 September 2021 at 2.00 pm

Members Present:-

Councillors: Richard Eddy (Chair), John Geater, Paul Goggin, Fi Hance, Tom Hathway, Philippa Hulme, Steve Pearce, Ed Plowden and Andrew Varney

Officers in Attendance:-

Gary Collins

1 Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

Cllr Richard Eddy welcomed everyone to the meeting and issued the safety information.

2 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Cllr Steve Pearce notified the committee that he may have to leave early for a hospital appointment.

3 Declarations of Interest

None received.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting

RESOLVED The minutes of the previous meeting 11th August 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

5 Appeals

Officers drew attention to the following items:

Item 10 and 11 are public enquiries still awaiting Secretary of State decision which is expected by the end of the year.

Item 12 had a public enquiry at the end of August.

Item 13 appeal against refusal on flooding, there is no enquiry date set as yet.



Item 48 and 49 the appeals against non-determination were dismissed, but costs awarded against the Council. Cost to be determined.

There was a comment on the current high volume of appeals. There can be more appeals in a difficult economic climate and there have been many appeals on telecommunications applications lately.

6 Enforcement

There were no enforcement notices on the agenda. The Council tries to resolve issues without formal notices but will serve notices if this approach does not work and harm is still being caused. There is a backlog of cases and notices will appear at committee in due course.

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 applications.

9 21/01999/F - Former Car Park, College Road, Clifton

Officers presented the report and highlighted the following points:

1. Members flagged some errors of the report which are below the usual quality standard for which officers apologised. These issues were addressed in the amendment sheet.
2. The application has been revised from 65 to 62 dwellings in 3 blocks. The application received 350 objections, mainly related to block A. This block has been amended, reduced in size and set back with less massing.
3. Distance from other buildings is not a significant impact.
4. Officers recommend approval, subject to legal agreement on 20% affordable housing on site.

Questions for clarification:

5. The buildings use air source heat pumps, this meets policy requirements. Sustainability is important, in terms of density, amenity space and parking. It is a matter for the committee to weigh up the material issues. There are 121 units, 45 parking spaces and green spaces in reasonable distance.
6. Zoo finances are not a material consideration for the committee.



7. The visual amenity of the application is largely subjective. The scale of the application alone is not a reason for refusal. Improvements from the original plan had been made. The scheme is compliant in terms of density.
8. The site is brownfield and no longer appropriate for its original use. Members are asked to weigh the potential benefits against the potential harm of the scheme. The nearest play area is near to the suspension bridge.
9. The development should be ambitious in terms of energy use in line with sustainable practice, however Zero Carbon is an aspiration. The applicant has been assessed on sustainability measures. Members could refuse the application over sustainability concerns if they are considered it outweighs other aspects.
10. A decision should be made on the plan as it stands rather than deferring it, there is the possibility of appeal if no decision is made.
11. The committee has some interest in biodiversity and notes the issue is lacking in the report. A condition on this will be attached. It is worth noting that biodiversity net gain requirement is not yet included in planning law.

Debate Notes:

12. Bristolians love the zoo, and the committee should look to the future. The application is a bold decision but members should consider it on its own merits. The community has been consulted and the statement by Francis Greenacre is reassuring. Brownfield sites should be the priority location for development and a former car park is a prime target. The density of the development is not too high, and nature of the buildings is satisfactory. The committee should have faith that these properties will be bought because they will meet the needs of potential buyers.
13. The committee thanked members of the public for their engagement. This part of college road is unattractive at present, and the scheme will enhance it. The scale of the proposed buildings is suitable, and the biggest trees will remain. The proposed buildings are an appropriate distance from the old buildings. The Clifton Downs are nearby and families are likely to inhabit the terraced houses rather than the flats.
14. The buildings should either reflect the existing architecture of the area or add interest and diversity to the area.
15. Clifton is a beautiful area and it would be good for people on lower incomes to be able to enjoy it. The committee should trust the zoo to consider biodiversity. The site is brownfield and building more housing should be a goal for all wards.
16. The development is in a good location, but concerns remain over design.
17. The future needs to be zero carbon and this development could be more ambitious in this regard. Block A is not satisfactory.

DECISION was moved by Councillor Eddy and seconded by Councillor Goggin.

RESOLVED (5 for / 3 against / 1 abstain) application approved as per officer recommendations.



1 19/06107/F - Paynes Shipyard & Vauxhall House, Coronation Road

0

Officers presented the report and highlighted the following points:

1. The application is within a primary industrial area. This is also a growth area but there is no interest in commercial use at this location.
2. The site includes 154 flats in 4 blocks. The proposed housing mix is as follows: four blocks of 1 and 2 bed flats. There will be 62 one bed flats and 92 two bed flats. There are no plans for family units. 20 percent is to be affordable housing and 3 units will be wheelchair accessible. A further 6 units could be adapted for wheelchair accessibility. However, 41% of properties are single aspect, which is concerning.
3. 25 responses were received in public consultation and the majority of objections pertained to traffic, parking and height.
4. There will be 56 parking spaces on the site, 20% of these including electric charge points. Space will be provided for 180 cycles. 9 parking spaces will be lost from Coronation Road.
5. Significant negotiation and amendment has been undertaken in relation to highway safety and servicing matters, with the scheme as presented being supported by BCC Transport Officers.
6. The nearest residential buildings are opposite on Coronation Rd and are between 19-to-21-metres away, which is acceptable.
7. Whilst there are identifiable shortfalls, the standard of the accommodation is generally good , and the design picks up on key themes and features of existing historic buildings nearby within the Conservation Area .

Questions for clarification:

8. The inclusion of electric storage heaters creates sustainability concerns. The design contains heat pumps, solar PV, also electric panel heating. It would not be able to connect to the council district heat network for heat without significant and disruptive retrofit works.

Debate notes:

9. The proposal builds on a brownfield site and will help meet the Bristol's housing needs.
10. Electric panel heating is an issue but there has not been any development in the area for some time, so this development is welcome.
11. The development is an opportunity to open the riverbank with new views and aspects. Concerns about heating remain, but the benefits of the scheme outweigh those concerns.
12. The lack of a good mix of housing is also a concern.
13. There is a lack of parking on site which could cause pressure for the area and appears to be contingent on a Resident's Parking Scheme that may not happen.
14. A member was reassured by the statement of support from the relevant ward member.

DECISION was moved by Councillor Eddy and seconded by Councillor Hulme



RESOLVED (8 for / 0 against / 1 abstain) application approved as per officer recommendations.

1 21/00531/P - Hengrove Leisure Park, Hengrove Way

1

Officers presented the report and highlighted the following points:

1. This is an outline application for up to 350 Class C3 dwellings, up to 1650sqm of flexible class E space, including 150sqm Sui Generis (to cover hot food takeaway). Class E is highly permissive.
2. This application seeks approval for access points to the site. Those will be set today for a future reserved matters application. The officer recommendation is to grant subject to legal agreement.
3. Loss of leisure use is a concern. However, officers and members cannot refuse an application based on how we would want something to be. The commercial reality is that this site is not sustainable for the existing leisure uses, and the assessment is whether this an acceptable site for residential development.

Questions for clarification:

4. There is a major play area at Hengrove which is a significant asset. Car parking is important for accessibility to this park. An intensive housing scheme could reduce the amenity of the park as users cannot get close enough to it. This would be relevant for a future scheme.
5. Members expressed concern about the input they are permitted to have on this application given the objections regarding leisure amenity and transport. The nature of outline applications makes them difficult as a future application cannot be predicted. Members are asked to agree the description of the site as a residential led development with up to 350 dwellings. This does mean losing the existing leisure use. The mix of uses being proposed cannot be reviewed later.
6. It was confirmed the development is proposed to be 30% affordable.
7. The leisure buildings are around 20 years old and cannot be repurposed. The development was designed around older principles such as heavy car use, which is no longer relevant.

Debate notes:

8. The loss of leisure facilities is regrettable, but this is market forces in action. The restaurants are viable, but the cinema and bingo hall are operating at loss.
9. Members raised concerns about the loose definition of Class E space and would prefer a tighter definition and/or appropriate caveats.

RE move that approval with additional E Class

DECISION was moved by Councillor Richard Eddy and seconded by Councillor Plowden.

RESOLVED (8 for / 0 against / 1 abstain) approve application subject to suitable conditions to be drafted by officers.



1 Date of Next Meeting

2

The date of the next Development Control A committee is 3 November 2021.

Meeting ended at 4.30 pm

CHAIR _____

