

**Bristol City Council**  
**Minutes of the Development Control B Committee**

**30 January 2019 at 6.00 pm**



**Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Sultan Khan (Chair), Richard Eddy (Vice-Chair), Carla Denyer, Harriet Clough, Lesley Alexander, Tom Brook, Harriet Bradley, Mike Davies, Fi Hance, Olly Mead and Jo Sergeant

**Officers in Attendance:-**

Gary Collins, Laurence Fallon, Norman Cornthwaite, Tom Watson, Anna Schroeder, Kayna Tregay and Natalie Queffurus

**1. Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information**

Councillor Sultan Khan welcomed all parties to the meeting and explained arrangements for emergency access in the event of a fire.

**2. Apologies for Absence**

None were received.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

None were received.

**4. Minutes of the previous meeting**

The Committee noted a Public Forum Statement from Councillor Stevens concerning the application relating to Stoke Lodge which was considered by the Committee.

**Resolved – that the Minutes be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

Councillor Eddy raised a Point of Order (CMR 11.12 refers) concerning the fencing being erected on the Stoke Lodge site and TPO Legislation.



The Chair stated that as this was not an item on the Agenda he could not permit a debate on it, but would ask the Head of Development Management to update the Committee on Stoke Lodge.

The Head of Development Management stated that BCC had taken advice from Counsel before agreeing that the erection of the fencing was permitted development. BCC Officers have visited the site to ensure that the trees are not being harmed and that what is going on at the site is acceptable, and that arboricultural good practice is being carried out. There is ongoing dialogue with the School and BCC Officers have provided advice to the School; the School has responded positively to the advice given. A TPO application is not required and he (the Head of Development Management) has responded to Local Members concerning the issue.

## **5. Appeals**

The Head of Development Management gave an overview of the Appeals in progress drawing attention to the following appeals concerning digital adverts:

Item 12 – City Point, Temple Gate. This Appeal has been dismissed on public safety grounds.

Item 45 – Central Reservation Temple Way. This Appeal has been dismissed.

Item 46 – Public Footpath, West side of Bond Street. This Appeal has been allowed.

## **6. Enforcement**

The Head of Development Management stated that whilst there had not been any notices served since the last meeting (due to the Christmas break) there are likely to be Enforcement issues to be reported at the next Meeting.

## **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 Planning Applications

## **9. Planning Application Number 18/02968/X - Avon Crescent, Bristol BS1 6XQ**



This item had been considered by the Committee at its Meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> November 2018, but a decision had been deferred pending a site visit. The site visit took place on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2018 and Members were reminded that only those who attended the site visit could participate in the item at this Meeting. The Members who attended the site visit were as follows: Lesley Alexander, Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Richard Eddy, Fi Hance, Sultan Khan, Olly Mead and Jo Sergeant.

The Head of Development Management and his representative presented this item and made the following comments:

- This is an application to vary a Condition (No. 15) on a previously granted permission
- It is to improve highway safety
- Drivers will be slowed down through various measures
- Members attention was also drawn to Condition 9
- The application was recommended for approval

#### Answers to questions

- The Committee is acting as the Planning Authority and the decision on the application has to be made on planning grounds
- The scheme was originally approved in 2014 and revisions have been made since then
- A Condition concerning access to Underfall Yard is included
- The footway width is a minimum of 1.1 m but varies and is considered acceptable; it would be difficult to get a wider footway
- The trees are not detailed on the plan as there is a Condition to require the submission of details of landscaping
- Having a cycleway all along the street would impinge on parking
- Although there is No Entry at one end it is effectively a two way street; it will be narrowed and the proposed table will reduce speeds
- Any diversionary route would cut off access to businesses
- There will be a small increase in the number of proposed on-street parking spaces
- Residents and businesses were consulted as part of the scheme evolution
- A Zebra Crossing was not considered to be deliverable
- The scheme has to be assessed against Policy and although this scheme is not optimum it is considered to be acceptable

#### Comments

- It was not considered that assurances to residents had been met and there were concerns about safety
- There was disappointment with the scheme
- There were concerns that the quality of the safety measures had been reduced to save money



- The scheme was not considered acceptable on highway safety grounds
- In response the Head of Development Management advised that an unintended consequence could be that no scheme is delivered. The revised scheme had been submitted because the project did not have the budget to deliver the original scheme and if permission was refused for this scheme it was possible that Avon Crescent could remain unchanged. There was no effective legal powers to require the original scheme to be implemented.

Members were reminded that they could refuse, approve or defer a decision on the application. They could also strengthen Condition 9.

Councillor Eddy moved refusal of the application on highway and pedestrian safety grounds. This was seconded by Councillor Mead and on being put to the vote, it was

**Resolved (5 for, 1 against, 2 abstention) – that the application be refused on highway and pedestrian safety grounds.**

### **10 Planning Application Number 18/04911/F - 21 St Thomas Street, Bristol BS1 6JS**

The Head of Development Management and his representative presented this item and made the following comments:

- This is a full application for the demolition of existing structure and construction of a new 13 storey development
- The details of the development and the Key Issues were described along with the consultation
- The application was recommended for refusal and the reasons for refusal were summarised

#### Answers to questions

- The bulk and massing of the proposed development is considered to be a problem and out of keeping with the Conservation Area and immediate neighbours
- 18 affordable units are proposed although these are proposed as key worker housing and therefore do not meet the BCC requirements for 77% social rented affordable housing and 23% intermediate affordable housing.
- University staff are not considered to be Key Workers, although school staff are
- There is no BCC Policy on Key Workers
- A clause in a S106 agreement could be added concerning affordable housing but it might not be possible to deliver this as this had not been offered by the applicant

#### Comments

- Concerns about there being no affordable housing
- Concerns about the proximity to low level buildings and space standards



- Concerns about harm to existing residents' amenity

Councillor Eddy moved refusal of the application for the reasons contained in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Mead and on being put to the vote, it was

**Resolved (8 for, 2 against, 1 abstention) – that the application be refused for the reasons contained in the report.**

### **11 Planning Application Number 17/04072/F - 66 Church Road, Redfield Bristol BS5 9UY**

The Head of Development Management and his representative presented this item and made the following comments:

- This is a full application for the demolition of existing structure and construction of a new 13 storey development
- The details of the development and the Key Issues were described along with the consultation
- The application was recommended for refusal and the reasons for refusal were summarised

#### Answers to questions

- The bulk and massing of the proposed development is considered to be a problem and out of keeping with the Conservation Area and immediate neighbours
- 18 affordable units are proposed although these are proposed as key worker housing and therefore do not meet the BCC requirements for 77% social rented affordable housing and 23% intermediate affordable housing.
- University staff are not considered to be Key Workers, although school staff are
- There is no BCC Policy on Key Workers
- A clause in a S106 agreement could be added concerning affordable housing but it might not be possible to deliver this as this had not been offered by the applicant

#### Comments

- Concerns about there being no affordable housing
- Concerns about the proximity to low level buildings and space standards
- Concerns about harm to existing residents' amenity

Councillor Eddy moved refusal of the application for the reasons contained in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Mead and on being put to the vote, it was



**Resolved (8 for, 2 against, 1 abstention) – that the application be refused for the reasons contained in the report.**

### **12 Planning Application Number 17/04071/F - 68 to 70 Church Road, Redfield, Bristol BS5 9JY**

The Head of Development Management and his representative presented this item and made the following comments:

- This is a full application for the demolition of the existing building and replacement with a mixture of residential units and retail/business unit
- The details of the application and Key Issues were described
- Summary of the objections received was also provided
- It was noted that this and the adjacent proposal – 66 Church Road – do not provide a coherent development
- The recommendation for the application is refusal and the reasons for the recommendation were summarised

Answers to questions

- Although the issue of access to the electricity sub station would be a private matter, if the application were granted a Condition would be included concerning access and waste, etc.

Councillor Eddy moved refusal of the application for the reasons contained in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Denyer and on being put to the vote, it was

**Resolved (6 for, 4 against, 1 abstention) – that the application be refused for the reasons contained in the report.**

### **13 Planning Application Number 18/05677/F - Merchants House, Wapping Road, Bristol BS1 4RW**

The Head of Development Management and his representative presented this item and made the following comments:

- This is a full application for external and internal works including installation of a roof terrace, recladding the elevations, new pedestrian access and altered parking provision
- The details of the application and Key Issues were described
- Summary of the objections received was also provided
- The recommendation for the application is refusal and the reasons for the recommendation were summarised



## Comments

- Some Members liked the proposed appearance of the building and considered the application to be acceptable
- Other Members did not like the proposals and thought the appearance was not appropriate in this conservation area and within the setting of the listed buildings, and that the cladding would soon date

Councillor Mead moved refusal of the application for the reasons contained in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Brooks and on being put to the vote, it was

**Resolved (7 for, 4 against, 0 abstention) – that the application be refused for the reasons contained in the report.**

## 14 Date of Next Meeting

The Committee noted that the next meeting was scheduled for **2.00pm on Wednesday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2019** in the Council Chamber, City Hall.

Meeting ended at 9.10 pm

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

