

Bristol City Council
Minutes of Development Control Committee B
1 February 2017 at 6pm



Present:

Councillors: Donald Alexander, Harriet Clough, Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Richard Eddy, Martin Fodor, Margaret Hickman, Olly Mead, Celia Phipps, and Chris Windows.

28. Apologies for Absence, Substitutions and Introductions.

Apologies were received from Councillor Sultan Khan, substitute Councillor Donald Alexander; Councillor Keven Quartley, substitute Councillor Chris Windows; and Councillor Afzal Shah

29. Declarations of interest.

There were none.

30. Minutes

Councillor Denyer – Declarations of Interest – She clarified that she had voted for a competing scheme at the Neighbourhood Partnership Meeting (not the scheme that was considered by the Committee).

Councillor Denyer - 15/04217/F – Land to North Paintworks – Referring to the second last line of bullet point 11 on page 6 of the papers, she stated that the word should be “once” not “one”.

Councillor Denyer - 15/04217/F – Land to North Paintworks - Referring to the second line of bullet point 1 on page 7 of the papers, she stated that “BT” should be clarified as referring to “Bristol Tree”.

Councillor Fodor - 15/04217/F – Land to North Paintworks - Referring to the third part of bullet point 2 and the resolution on page 7 of the papers, he stated that he had requested a fence between the cycleway and parking spaces but the resolution referred to “boundary treatment”. The Representative of the Service Director – Planning clarified that the reference to “boundary treatment” includes a fence.

These amendments were then agreed.



Resolved – that subject to the amendments, the Minutes of the Meeting held 21 December 2016 be agreed as a correct record of the Meeting and signed by the Chair.

31. Appeals

The Representative of the Service Director – Planning introduced the report, summarised it for everyone and drew the Committee’s attention to:-

Item 25 – The North advertising screen (approaching the city) was approved and the South advertising screen (leaving the city) was refused, in line with the Committee’s decision. The rate of refresh was changed to 10 seconds.

Item 29 – Officers had recommended approval. The tree needed to be removed and replaced (or a financial contribution made) but the Committee had refused the application on the basis of the loss of the tree. The Inspector had agreed that the tree could be removed.

32. Enforcement.

The Representative of the Service Director – Planning confirmed that there were no items to report. He explained that Enforcement Team Staff were temporarily assisting with planning applications and so enforcement activity had inevitably been affected by this. He also stated that Notices were not being recorded properly, but that this would be rectified.

33. 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. (A copy of the public forum list and statements are held on public record by Democratic Services).

34. Planning and Development

The Committee considered the following reports of the Service Director, Planning:

(1) 16/05382/A - City Point, Temple Gate BS1 6 PL LED Digital Smartscreen

The Representative of the Service Director – Planning introduced the report and summarised it for everyone. He explained how the adverts would change on the screen. He advised Members that the two issues they needed to take into account when considering the application were amenity and public safety. Officers consider that there is no harm to amenity. However Transport Development Management considers that the application should be refused on the grounds of public safety. Development Management officers considered that the impact on public safety was not significant and that the proposals should be supported.

The Representative of the Service Director – Transport confirmed that they object to the application as it is considered that the screen would distract drivers and other road users at a



junction where there are already a number of distractions. He showed videos giving examples of how traffic typically operates at the Junction.

Recent appeal decisions support the view that this application should be refused.

The Representative of the Service Director – Planning stated that on balance they consider that the application should be approved. They do not consider that the distraction issue warrants refusal. They are recommending that the adverts change every 30 seconds (rather than the usual 10 seconds) and this, along with other proposed Conditions, should mitigate the impact of the screen.

He drew Members attention to the Amendment Sheet.

The following points arose during the debate on the application:

- Although there are different levels of traffic at different times of the day, restricting the hours of operation of the screen from those applied for is not relevant; the applicants want as many people as possible to see the adverts
- It was confirmed that the report by Dr Lansdown supports the application
- The green light time for traffic departing Temple Meads Station is quite short – 10 to 15 seconds
- It was noted that Inspectors look at the merits of each case presented them before coming to a decision
- Each location has to be judged by its merits and there is no conclusive evidence throughout the country to suggest that the presence of advertising screens has led to an increase in the number of accidents at their locations
- It was noted that there are several other forms of advertising that could distract drivers, including on buses
- It was generally considered that allowing this screen at a junction that it already dangerous could make the junction even more dangerous

Councillor Mead moved that the application be refused on the following grounds:

The proposed digital advertising screen is likely to increase the likelihood of distraction to persons resulting in the severe detriment of highway safety, in particular vulnerable highway users. The presence and nature of the proposed development is prejudicial to road safety contrary to The National Planning Practice Guidance on advertising. The impacts on safety on Temple Gate and subsequent deleterious impacts on the safe and effective operation of the Bristol's highway network is therefore contrary to policy BCS10 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted June 2011), policy DM23 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (adopted July 2014), and paragraph 32 of National Planning Policy Framework (published March 2012).



Councillor Davies seconded this Motion.

On being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED – (Voting 8, 2 against) that the application be refused on the following grounds: The proposed digital advertising screen is likely to increase the likelihood of distraction to persons resulting in the severe detriment of highway safety, in particular vulnerable highway users. The presence and nature of the proposed development is prejudicial to road safety contrary to of The National Planning Practice Guidance on advertising. The impacts on safety on Temple Gate and subsequent deleterious impacts on the safe and effective operation of the Bristol’s highway network is therefore contrary to policy BCS10 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted June 2011), policy DM23 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (adopted July 2014), and paragraph 32 of National Planning Policy Framework (published March 2012).

The Meeting finished at 7.20 pm.

Chair _____

