

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control A Committee



15 December 2021 at 2.00 pm

Members Present:-

Councillors: Richard Eddy (Chair), John Geater, Fi Hance, Tom Hathway, Philippa Hulme, Ed Plowden, Andrew Varney, Marley Bennett and Chris Jackson

Officers in Attendance:-

Gary Collins, Laurence Fallon, Claudette Campbell (Democratic Services Officer) and Peter Westbury

2 Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

3

Councillor Richard Eddy welcomed all parties to the meeting and gave guidance on the use of the building together with the emergency evacuation procedure.

2 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

4

The Committee noted apologies from Cllr Goggin (substituted by Cllr Bennett) and Cllr Pearce (substituted by Cllr Jackson).

2 Declarations of Interest

5

There were none.

2 Minutes of the previous meeting

6

It was moved by the Chair Cllr Eddy and seconded by Cllr Fi Hance that Committee
RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting held on the 3rd November 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.



2 Appeals

7

The Committee noted the details of the appeals lodged and set out in the report.

- a. Attention was drawn to the Silverthorne Lane and Clanage Road public inquiries; an outcome from the Secretary of State relating to Silverthorne Lane is expected early 2022 and for Clanage Road the decision is expected by the second week of February 2022.

2 Enforcement

8

2 Enforcement Committee Report - 15th December 2021

9

Committee noted the enforcement notices set out in the report.

- a. Breach of Condition notices had been issued to two food stores who are in breach of conditions relating to the hours of delivery.
- b. Officers explained that such breaches are dealt with by the Magistrate Court should the stores fail to comply with the Notices issued.

3 Public Forum

0

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

3 Planning and Development

1

The Committee considered the following Planning Application.

3 Planning Application No.21/03020/F St Mary Le Port

2

Officers introduced this report and made the following points during their presentation:

The application is for the demolition of existing buildings and structures including the office buildings known as, Bank of England, Bank House and Norwich Union House on Wine Street. The construction of three new office buildings for commercial, business and service use. The ground floor for retail outlets, food and drink establishments. Alterations and repairs to St Mary le



Port Church tower and ruins and wider improvements to the public realm. The site borders Castle Park.

The presenting officer highlighted the following:

- That the applicant had the option, through the City Centre Framework, to develop all 4 quarters of the site but have submitted plans for just 3/4 of the site; 3 buildings.
- Shared with committee a presentation with views of the development as a visual aid.
- The site is in the City and Queens Square Conservation Area
- The plans showed the proximity to Bristol Bridge.
- The report outlined in depth the issues arising from the removal of the trees on site and the proposed mitigations.
- The applicant had moved the location of Building B to preserve a higher number of trees.
- In respect of the conservation areas the report includes comments and concerns raised by Historic England.
- Officers recommend approval subject to the amendment sheet; seeking delegated authority to finalise s106 Agreement conditions.

The following clarification were given:

- a. The site is allocated for mixed use within policy BCAP37, the Central Bristol Area Plan.
- b. Officers assured committee that the benefits of the scheme had been carefully weighed against the harm that would be caused to heritage assets; assessed against all policies and issues arising from the wider consultation to form a balanced view on the development.
- c. Committee in their questioning fully explored the issue of the loss of trees.
- d. Officers confirmed that they had liaised and discussed at length with the applicant each tree on site; a detailed slide of the trees to be retained and those removed was shared with committee. The assessment carried out meant that DM17 policy had been adhered to.
- e. Regrettably trees will be lost but conditions had been imposed to protect those trees being retained during the course of construction; the development had been redesigned to move the position of building B, on High Street, to retain trees.
- f. That at this stage it was not possible to determine where the replacement trees would be located within the development, but officers were confident that this would be finalised via s106 agreement; accepted that financial contribution and replanting of new trees, would not offset the loss of senior/older trees.
- g. Funds would be available to the Area Committee CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy); Members suggested an advice note to that committee to consider investment into Castle Park.
- h. The development plot is not a large area only 1.2 hectares; a difficult site that had been derelict for many years, for this reason; the proposed height of the buildings allowed the development to be commercially viable; that the current economic projections supported a commercial development even with the impact of the pandemic; discussions had taken place with housing developers who had not progressed such a development at the site; confirmed that commercial developments did not require a Viability Study.



- i. According to the energy statement the development will achieve a 16.4% reduction in residual emissions against the policy requirement to achieve 20%; the applicant expects to achieve the 20% required as the development progresses; appropriate conditions to be applied.
- j. The design incorporated a walkway to St Nicholas Market; that the projected increase in footfall was welcomed by traders; that there would be engagement on issues that impacted those who traded from the market.
- k. The City's Climate Emergency declaration and ambition to be carbon neutral has yet to be incorporated into planning policy however officers ensure this is given significant weight in line with local planning policy.
- l. Confirmed that the development had been considered in line with existing policy.
- m. Comments from the Crime reduction unit are outlined in the report; the park suffers from anti-social behaviour; they welcomed the proposed improvements to the public realm that includes improved lighting on the development that would go towards mitigating anti-social behaviour.
- n. The proposed building design would cause overshadowing to the area of the park near the development.

The following comments were noted from the debate:

- o. Committee agreed that it was a complex site, in a prominent location, that had been derelict for several years that had become an eyesore.
- p. There was overall support for the restoration of the church tower.
- q. There remained concerns about the imposing height of the buildings; mass and scale so near to the historic centre of the city; the overshadowing of the park.
- r. Members expressed concerns about the loss of mature trees despite mitigation, a mature tree can never be replaced.
- s. Acknowledged the enhancements to the public realm and welcomed the much needed revitalisation of the area.

A proposal was moved by Councillor Eddy, Chair, to accept officer's recommendation and to issue an advice note to the local Area Committee to consider allocating sums from the CiL funding to Castle Park improvements, seconded by Cllr Jackson.

When put to the vote:

Resolved (5 for / 4 against / 1 abstain) application approved as per officer recommendations together with the issuing of the advice note to the local Area Committee about investment into Castle Park from anticipated funding awards.

3 Date of Next Meeting

3

The next meeting will be held on the 2nd February 2022 at 6pm.



Meeting ended at 3.46 pm

CHAIR _____

