

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

**13 March 2019 at 2.00 pm**



**Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Sultan Khan (Chair), Richard Eddy (Vice-Chair), Harriet Clough, Lesley Alexander, Mike Davies, Fi Hance, Olly Mead, Jo Sergeant, Jude English and Margaret Hickman

**Officers in Attendance:-**

Gary Collins and Norman Cornthwaite

**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**

Apologies were received from Councillors Harriet Bradley (substitute Margaret Hickman), Tom Brook and Carla Denyer (substitute Jude English).

**3. Declarations of Interest**

The following declarations were received and noted:

Councillor Clough – Agenda Item No. 8a 18/04977/P Trust Headquarters. Member of UBHT.

Councillor English - Agenda Item No. 8a 18/04977/P Trust Headquarters. Had submitted an objection to the application and did not participate in the Item.

Councillor Hickman – Agenda Item No. 8e 18/04108/F St Gabriel's Court. Submitted a Public Forum Statement and did not participate in the Item.

**4. Minutes of the last Meeting**

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



## 5. Appeals

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and summarised it for everyone.

## 6. Enforcement

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and summarised it for everyone.

## 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. 18/04977/P - Trust Headquarters, Marlborough Street

Councillor English did not participate in this Item.

The Head of Development Management and his representative summarised the report and gave a presentation that included the following:

- This is an Outline Application for Access and Scale for the demolition of existing structure and the erection of a hospital transport hub
- A full description of the site and application were provided
- The reasons for recommending refusal were described

#### Answers to questions

- There are no figures that quantify the air pollution caused by cars being driven around to find a parking space
- The application has been treated in the same way as every other application and there are sound planning reasons for refusing it
- The availability of parking may encourage some people to drive who may have used another form of transport to travel to the hospital
- An assessment of the total number of available parking spaces was made; the unsuitability of Trenchard Street Car Park for people with mobility problems was noted



- The size of the proposed car park is not acceptable and the modelling carried out does not provide evidence that it is needed
- Any alternative proposals would be considered on their merits, although the proposals had remained largely the same during a lengthy pre-application process
- The Travel Plan put forward proposes similar arrangements to those that are already in place

#### Comments

- There are air quality issues, traffic problems and housing issues
- There are hills around the BRI that cause access problems and the Committee should consider the wider picture; there is a need to make patients' lives easier
- There are access problems relating to the BRI but these relate to the wider transport issues, not just car parking; this is not a good enough application
- Disabled people have difficulties accessing the BRI
- Fit and well people do not always appreciate the difficulties that people with mobility problems have
- There should be other ways for staff and patients to reach the BRI
- Public consultation has not been good enough
- There are concerns about the demolition of the flats
- Concerns that refusal of the application will result in delays in resolving patient accessibility issues
- Patients taking taxis to the hospital result in more car journeys and pollution being created

It was noted that the application should have been determined by 14<sup>th</sup> January 2019 and there was a theoretical risk of an appeal against non-determination if a decision was deferred.

Councillor Eddy moved deferral of the application pending a site visit and further discussions with the Trust. This was seconded and on being put to the Vote it was LOST (4 for, 5 against).

Councillor Davies moved that the application be refused for the reasons given in the report. This was seconded and on being put to the Vote it was

**Resolved (5 for, 4 against) – that the application be refused for the reasons given in the report.**

#### 10 18/05184/P - Broadwalk Shopping Centre

The Head of Development Management and his representative summarised the report and gave a presentation that included the following:

- This is an Outline application for the partial demolition, refurbishment and redevelopment to provide a mixed use scheme including residential, retail, cafes bars restaurants, offices, community and leisure
- The details of the application site and the proposed development were described, including the proposed provision of affordable housing along with the consultation responses received. The application was recommended for approval with delegated authority sought for Officers to finalise transport mitigation and the planning conditions to be attached to a future notice of decision.



## Comments

- This is an exciting scheme and concerns expressed by residents can be dealt with under reserved matters

It was noted that the reserved matters would be the subject of a further application, consultation, assessment and consideration by the Committee at a future date.

Councillor Eddy moved approval 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 (10 for, 0 against) – that the application be granted subject to the Conditions contained in the report.**

## 11 18/06358/F - Alexandra Park Public Car Park

The Head of Development Management and his representative summarised the report and gave a presentation that included the following:

- This is a full application for the sui generis development of 34 residential studio units
- The details of the site and application were fully described
- The reasons for recommending approval of the application were detailed

## Answers to questions

- A Condition concerning design is included
- A Condition would allow the period of 2 years for tenancies to be extended if appropriate
- A 10 year consent could be conditioned but the permission would have to be extended or the units moved to a different site, so this was not being proposed

## Comments

- Although the units are smaller than the national space standard, it will be a useful exercise to find out how the modular units work

Councillor Mead moved approval of the application for the reasons contained in the report. This was seconded and on being put to the Vote, it was

**Resolved (10 for, 0 against) – that the application be granted subject to the Conditions contained in the report.**



## 12 18/04727/F - Public Conveniences, Circular Road (The Downs)

The Head of Development Management and his representative summarised the report and gave a presentation that included the following:

- This is a full application for the demolition of the existing toilets and construction of a café, replacement toilets and education booth
- A full description of the site and application was provided
- The reasons for recommending approval of the application were explained

### Answers to questions

- The Secretary of State (DEFRA) would be required to approve the scheme but this is separate from the Planning process
- The Planning Approval is sought for a café, the operator is not specified – this would be a matter for The Downs Committee
- The Downs Act is completely separate from Planning Legislation
- The present toilets comprise male, female and disabled
- It was confirmed that an amendment could require management arrangements that ensure that the baby changing facility doesn't interfere with the disabled toilet
- The operation and management of the café and toilets is a matter for The Downs Committee

### Debate

- The roof of the building may be vandalised at night
- There is no known demand for a café at that location
- The proposed development is a great improvement on the present building
- The Downs Act preserves The Downs for everyone in Bristol and the surrounding area, and a toilet that is manned is a safe facility for everyone
- The Downs Committee needs to generate income and this facility will be an enhancement
- This is a modern well designed proposal with an educational facility

Councillor Mead moved approval of the application subject to the Conditions contained in the report, along with Officers being given delegated authority to attach a condition requiring management arrangements to ensure that the baby changing facility does not interfere with the disabled toilet .

This was seconded by Councillor Davies and on being put to the Vote, it was

- **Resolved (8 for, 2 against) – that the application be granted subject to the Conditions contained in the report, and Officers being given delegated authority to attach a condition requiring management arrangements to ensure that the baby changing facility does not interfere with the disabled toilet .**



Councillor Lesley Alexander left the Meeting at this point.

### **13 18/04108/F - St Gabriels Court, St Gabriels Road**

Councillor Hickman did not participate in this item.

The Head of Development Management and his representative summarised the report and gave a presentation that included the following:

- This is a full application for the demolition of existing buildings, altered access and the construction of a mixed use development
- The details of the site and the application were described
- The recommendation for the application is approval and the reasons for the recommendation were summarised

#### Answers to questions

- The play area is already overlooked and surveillance of it is welcomed; there will be no impact on safeguarding
- The applicants have signed an exemption certificate meaning that the Council will not be liable to formally adopt the internal roads
- No gate to the site will be installed as it would create access problems

#### Comments

- There are no Planning reasons to refuse the application
- A condition should be added requiring permission for any gate at the site entrance

Councillor Hance moved approval of the application subject to the Conditions contained in the report and subject to an additional condition relating to the gating of the development. This was seconded and on being put to the Vote, it was

**Resolved (8 for, 0 against) – that the application be granted subject to the Conditions contained in the report and an additional condition relating to the gating of the development.**

### **14 19/00253/H - 6 Alford Road**

The Head of Development Management summarised the report and gave a presentation that included the following:

- This is a full application for a domestic extension, garage and associated works



- The details of the site and the application were described
- The recommendation for the application is approval and the reasons for the recommendation were summarised

Councillor Davies moved approval of the application subject to the Conditions contained in the report.

Councillor Clough seconded this and on being put to the Vote it was

**Resolved (8 for, 0 against) – that the application be granted subject to the Conditions contained within the report.**

### **15 Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> April 2019 at 6.00 pm.

Meeting ended at 6.45 pm

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

