

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control B Committee

6 November 2019 at 6pm



Members Present:-

Councillors: Tom Brook (Chair) Richard Eddy (Vice Chair), Lesley Alexander, Harriet Bradley, Don Alexander (Substitute for Olly Mead), Mike Davies, Fi Hance, Harriet Bradley, Jo Sergeant

Officers in Attendance:-

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

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 Apologies for Absence.

These were received from Councillors Denyer, Khan and Mead and Bowden-Jones with Councillor Don Alexander substituting for Councillor Mead.

4. Declarations of Interest.

Councillor Bradley declared an interest in item 19/03253/F – 90-92, Wick Road, Brislington. She had submitted a statement on this item so would stand down from the meeting for this application.

The Chair declared that his ward neighboured the ward that item 19/01213/FB – Stoke Park, Park Road, Stapleton was in but he remained open minded.



5. Minutes of the previous meeting.

These were moved and seconded and it was:-

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

6. Appeals

The Head of Development Management highlighted Appeal No.4 – Trust Headquarters, Marlborough Street. This application had been refused by Committee on 13 March 2018 and the appeal against this decision would be considered at a two day hearing starting on 21 January 2020. There were no questions.

7. Enforcement

The Head of Development Management reported four enforcement notices since the last meeting. There were no questions.

8. 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.

9. Planning and Development

The Committee considered the following Planning Applications:

19/01213/FB - Stoke Park, Park Road Stapleton.

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

1. This was an application for a formal, shared use (pedestrian and cyclist) access route through Stoke Park estate;
2. The estate was owned and managed by Bristol City Council (BCC) although the northern quarter was located within South Gloucestershire. BCC had therefore made an application to South Gloucestershire Council (SGC) for development of the path within their area. This would be subject of separate decision;
3. The path would be surfaced in gravel like the paths in Queen Square;



4. The development would require the removal of 9 trees in the SGC area and 2 in BCC area. These would be replaced by 15 trees;
5. There were 42 objections and 17 supporters in the first round of consultation and 8 objectors and 2 supporters in the second round. All internal and external consultees had supported the application;
6. Historic England supported the proposal following a reduction in the width of parts of the path;
7. Officers' view was that that public benefit of increasing access to the park and encouraging walking and cycling outweighed a low degree of harm which would result to the park as a heritage asset following development and recommended approval subject to conditions.

The following points arose from questions and discussion:-

1. K barriers would be installed in order to allow access to all including buggies and mobility vehicle users but prevented motorbikes and vehicles gaining access;
2. Officers were not unduly concerned regarding the shared use of the path with pedestrians and cyclists. The potential for cyclists to speed is reduced as the path was flat and has a gravel surface. There would also be good visibility of other users. There was also no history of accidents on paths elsewhere within the park;
3. Lighting the path had been ruled out by nature conservation on the basis of harm to wildlife habitat, specifically bats. It was noted that there were alternative routes with street lighting should users not wish to use at night. It was possible to use signage to inform users that there was no lighting. It was recommended that comments relating to use of signage to advertise the fact the path was un-lit would be forwarded to the applicant and BCC Parks team;
4. Councillor Hance observed that the area was very boggy so any improvements to drainage were to be welcomed and she would support the recommendation to approve;
5. Councillor Eddy noted equality relating to park accessibility within the city to be poor and any proposals to reverse this should be supported

Resolved (Unanimously) – That the application be approved subject to conditions as set out in the report.

19/02665/F - 66 Church Road Redfield Bristol and 19/02692/F - 68 Church Road Redfield Bristol.

The Committee agreed to consider both applications at the same time but to vote on them separately. The representative of the Head of Development Management made the following points:-

1. 66, Church Road was an application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three storey building to contain 4 No. apartments and a ground floor retail unit and 3 No. three storey townhouses fronting Dove Lane;
2. The consultation attracted 5 objections;



3. This original application which came before Committee in January 2019 was refused for five reasons. This application was almost identical to the original application and overcame two of the reasons for refusal. However, it failed to mitigate the other three reasons;
 4. The impact of its height, scale and massing on the amenity and in particular on Cowper Street was considered unacceptable;
 5. The living environment was not compliant with policy as it was compromised and of poor quality and was therefore considered unacceptable;
 6. The application failed to overcome design related issues and was therefore considered unacceptable;
 7. Officers had maintained a consistent approach in assessing the application and concluded that it should be refused as it did not address the aforementioned reasons for refusal;
 8. 68, Church Road was an application for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a three storey building to contain 2No. three bedroom apartments on first and second floor and ground floor retail unit;
 8. The application was almost identical to the one refused by Committee in January 2019;
 9. Consultation had attracted four objections – 2 opposed, one mixed and one neutral;
 10. There were three reasons for refusal and officers' assessment was that this application only addressed the reason for refusal relating to the living environment of future occupiers by submitting a noise report. The reasons relating to height, mass, scale and design had not been overcome with this application;
- Officers had maintained a consistent approach in assessing the application and concluded that it should be recommended for refusal as it did not address the aforementioned reasons for refusal.

The following points arose from questions and discussion:-

1. It was not possible to be confident that both applications would come forward if approved as the applicants were different;
2. Councillor Shah had referred the original applications to Committee but had not commented on the current applications;
3. Councillor Hance would have preferred both proposals amalgamated together but was frustrated as the site needed to be developed. She would therefore support the officer recommendation. She was informed that an amalgamated application would have made it easier for officers to assess, would remove uncertainties as to whether one or the other would come forward and would make matters clearer for residents;
4. Councillor Bradley expressed disappointment that so little had been done to address the original reasons for refusal though felt conflicted as the site had been empty for so long;
5. Councillor Eddy expressed the same disappointment and would therefore endorse the officers' recommendation to refuse;
6. Councillor Sergeant agreed with previous comments;
7. Councillor Eddy moved the officer recommendation for 66, Church Road and it was seconded and on being put to the vote it was:-

66, Church Road – Resolved (7 for, 1 against) That the application be refused.



8. Councillor Eddy again expressed disappointment that too little had been done to mitigate reasons for refusal and moved the officer recommendation which was seconded. On being put to the vote it was:-

68, Church Road – Resolved (7 for, 1 against) That the application be refused.

Councillor Bradley stood down for the next item as she had submitted a Public Forum Statement on it.

19/03253/F - 90 - 92 Wick 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:-

1. The application was for the extension and change of use from residential use to Sui Generis use to create a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO);
2. The application had been called-in by Councillor Bradley under the Councillor referral scheme;
3. There were currently eleven HMO's in the area;
4. A detailed parking survey had been submitted to address parking concerns;
5. All bedrooms met the licensing requirements for HMO accommodation;
6. The applicant had gone above and beyond necessary requirements for such a scheme;
7. Officers recommended the application for approval subject to conditions.

The following points arose from questions and discussion:-

1. Calculation on parking in the area did not take into account developments under construction:-
2. The parking problems were accepted but it was noted that the locations was sustainable with various bus routes nearby;
3. Councillor Don Alexander observed that there were lots of units for just one shared kitchen. However, it was reported that both the units and the kitchen exceeded licensing requirements for HMO's;
4. Councillor Sergeant would have preferred another communal room on the top floor. It was reported that the applicant's Management Statement stated that young professionals would occupy the HMO. This condition would have to be varied for students. The residents would have to stagger the times they ate with a shared kitchen;
5. Councillor Eddy was reassured by the parking survey and that young professionals would be more likely to occupy the HMO and he would vote in support of the officer recommendation;
6. Councillor Hance observed that working people found it difficult to find accommodation in Bristol and she would vote in support of the officer recommendation;



7. Councillor Eddy moved the recommendation and it was seconded and on being put to the vote it was:-

Resolved – (5 for, 2 abstentions) That the application be granted subject to conditions as set out in the report.

19/03847/H - 16 Berkeley Road Westbury Park Bristol.

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

The meeting ended at 7.25pm

CHAIR _____

