

# Bristol City Council Minutes of the Development Control B Committee

10 July 2019 at 2.00pm



## **Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Tom Brook (Chair) Richard Eddy (Vice Chair), Lesley Alexander, Don Alexander (for Harriet Bradley), Nicola Bowden-Jones, Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Fi Hance, Celia Phipps.

## **Officers in Attendance:-**

Gary Collins – Head of Development Management and Allison Taylor – Democratic Services

### **1. Election of Chair 2019/20.**

Councillor Brook was nominated and seconded. There were no further nominations and it was:-

**Resolved – That Councillor Brook be elected as Chair for 2019/20 Municipal Year.**

### **2. Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information**

The Chair welcomed all parties to the meeting and explained arrangements for emergency access in the event of a fire.

### **3. Election of Vice-Chair 2019/20.**

Councillor Eddy was nominated and seconded. There were no further nominations and it was:-

**Resolved – That Councillor Eddy be elected as Vice-Chair for 2019/20 Municipal Year.**

### **4. Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information**



The Chair welcomed all parties to the meeting and explained arrangements for emergency access in the event of a fire.

## **5 Apologies for Absence.**

These were received from Councillor Mead and Bradley with Councillor Don Alexander substituting for Councillor Bradley. It was noted that Councillor Hopkins was not in attendance.

## **6. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Hance declared that – in relation to Item 3 – her daughter attended Bristol Cathedral School but that she remained open minded in relation to the application.

## **7. Minutes of the previous meeting.**

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

## **8. Appeals**

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and summarised it for everyone. He particularly highlighted the large number of applications for digital screen advertising which were in the main delegated and refused. If recommended for approval they were brought to Committee. The success rate of defending at appeals was good.



## 9. Enforcement

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and summarised it for everyone. He was asked to update the Committee regarding the enforcement investigation relating to trees on Lower Ashley Road. The Committee were advised that whilst the trees were protected by a Tree Preservation Order, an outline planning permission granted a couple of years ago had accepted that the trees could be removed as part of a redevelopment with suitable replacement planting. A new planning application had recently been submitted for a different development and the applicants had been strongly advised to cease any works to the trees until the application was determined.

## 10. 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.

## 11. Planning and Development

The Committee considered the following Planning Applications:

### **18/03879/F - St Annes House, St Annes, Road St Annes Bristol.**

The following points arose:-

1. This report was before the Committee as it was previously agreed that an update setting out how the use had operated would be presented to a future meeting;
2. Councillor Eddy acknowledged that he had previously had some concerns regarding the application but was pleased to see there had been no complaints;
3. The Chair noted that the decision to provide the facility outside of the City Centre was deliberate and he was pleased to see it had been a great success and that service users seemed satisfied

**Resolved – That the update report be noted.**

### **19/02090/F - Chalks Road Public Car Park Chalks Road Bristol.**

An Amendment Sheet was provided to the Committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-



1. The conditions set out at page 88 of the report had now been replaced with the conditions set out in the Amendment Sheet. The Amendment Sheet also included comments from Transport Development Management;
2. No additional comments were received from Avon Fire Service. The applicant would have to adhere to building regulations in the usual way;
3. Trees would help to screen the development but it was a prominent building;
4. The development would comprise of two two bed dwellings either end with nine one bed dwellings in the middle above the car park which would remain a public car park;
5. The dwellings named Zed Pods had been displayed at the Bristol Housing Festival and were factory built housing units brought to site;
6. The City Design Group had recognised the experimental nature of this development and the need for imaginative ways to meet housing needs;
7. With conditions in place relating to the management of the site officers were satisfied that the park could operate as it currently did and access to Redfest would be maintained and therefore recommended approval subject to conditions.

The following points arose from discussion:-

1. Regarding overshadowing of neighbours, officers had visited the site and discounting the trees it was not felt that the impact was harmful to residences in Lyndale Road;
2. The Site Management Plan condition could include signage so that it was clear that the car park remained for public use;
3. The presence of Wardens on site was above and beyond what could be conditioned. The Site Management Plan would include ongoing upkeep of the site;
4. Officers had been assured that it was a car free scheme and as the development was a different way of providing housing it did not need to meet parking standards. The site was also in a sustainable location;
5. The car park would continue to be managed by the Council's Parking Services and it would not allow parking from residents to colonise spaces;
6. It was noted that the car park was a 24 hour operation. It was not possible to curtail this use as this was beyond the scope of the application;
7. The Construction Management Plan could specifically refer to a Tree Management report and that access to Redfest to be maintained;
8. The pilot nature of the scheme did not set any precedent for future applications. The 30 year lease was separate from the planning process. The only time limit within the planning process was that construction commenced within 3 years of planning permission;
9. Air quality had not been assessed in detail for future residences as this was an unusual application meeting a need for emergency accommodation;
10. Concern was also expressed regarding overheating as if air quality was bad residents would not want to open their windows;
11. Any complaints regarding the site would be directed to the Parking Services Manager;
12. The Head of Development Management suggested a condition be imposed requiring an update report come to Committee on the management of the site after 12 months occupation. This was supported;
13. Councillor Eddy acknowledged the importance of providing housing in the city and that this was an innovative good scheme which he wholeheartedly supported;
14. Councillor Don Alexander fully supported the proposal and moved that it be approved subject to conditions and in addition a condition regarding an update report on management of the site and tree management and



access to Redfest being added to the Construction Management Condition and this was seconded and on being put to the vote, it was:-

**Resolved (8 for, 0 against, 1 abstention) – That Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in the report, the Amendment Sheet and in addition:-**

- 1. Condition 2 (Construction Management Plan) to also specifically refer to a Tree Management report and also details of how access to Redfest will be maintained.**
- 2. That an additional condition be attached requiring the submission of a report on the management of the site after 12 months occupation and for this to be reported to a Committee;**

#### **19/01927/FB - Land Southwest Of Stoke Park Primary School Romney Avenue Bristol.**

An Amendment Sheet was provided to the Committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points by way of introduction:-

1. The application was for the demolition of a vacant caretakers house and construction of educational facility for 1220 pupils with sports hall facility, artificial sports pitch, multi-use games area, car, minibus and cycle parking, landscaping, access and associated highway works;
2. 561 properties were consulted and the responses received expressing concern regarding the significant visual impact, the loss of 58 trees and the impact on street parking;
3. The design was a three storey - roof building consisting of gold metal cladding and presented a prestigious presence and positive identity. The City Design Group had some concerns regarding the entrance but did not consider that the mass and scale was harmful to the street scene;
4. Five residential properties were affected by the sports pitch being 2m higher than their garden. The fence reduced noise levels to 2 db. A condition restricting the use of the pitch until 9pm on weekdays and 6pm on weekends would be imposed;
5. Floodlights would be restricted to use until 9pm. The LUX plan shows that light spill to nearby properties will be well beneath the maximum allowable level;
6. The Air Quality team have raised objections that there will be an impact on a number of receptors at the Muller Road/Shaldon Road junction although this could be mitigated by electric vehicle charging, car sharing spaces, a Travel Plan and measures to offset the impact on the local highway. The Highways team also outlined measures being secured under a memorandum of understanding and other highway works being carried out in the area that could improve options for alternative modes of transport.
7. The Sustainability team made no objection subject to conditions;
8. Officers therefore recommended approval subject to the conditions set out in the report and the Amendment Sheet and an additional condition to address overheating (climate change).

The following points arose from discussion:-



1. The Transport Development Manager confirmed that the figure of 264 additional vehicular trips was accurate based on evidence from other schools in the area. This increase can be met subject to improvements to the walking and cycling network, bus infrastructure, school travel planning and staggering arrival times between the two schools;
2. Councillor Denyer expressed disappointment regarding energy efficiency and why it had not been possible to achieve the highest BREEAM rating of 'excellent'. It was agreed that in future reports more detailed reasons would be provided regarding the BREEAM ratings. She agreed that there was a net impact on air quality with fewer, shorter journeys and that the walking and cycling infrastructure was good and she supported the application;
3. The calculation of 48 cycle spaces per 188 staff was based on the policy of 1 space per 5 staff. The Travel Plan would include a clause stating that if this proved insufficient than more spaces should be installed;
4. No representations were received regarding the height of the fencing;
5. Consultation regarding the sharing of space with the community would be taken into consideration by the school;
6. Councillor Hance move the officer recommendation to grant subject to conditions and this was seconded and on being put to the vote it was:-

**Resolved (Unanimous) – That Planning Permission be granted subject to conditions set out in the report and the Amendment Sheet.**

The meeting ended at 3.30pm

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

