

# Bristol City Council

## Minutes of the Development Control B Committee

4 December 2019 at 6pm.



### **Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Tom Brook (Chair) Lesley Alexander, Harriet Bradley, Fabian Breckels, Sultan Khan, Fi Hance, Celia Phipps, Jo Sergeant, Clive Stevens.

### **Officers in Attendance:-**

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

### **1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information.**

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

### **2. Apologies for absence.**

These were received from Councillor Eddy, Councillor Denyer (Substitute Councillor Stevens), Councillor Davies (Substitute Councillor Phipps) and Councillor Mead (Substitute Councillor Breckels)

### **3. Declarations of Interest.**

There were none.

### **4. Minutes of the last meeting.**

The minutes were agreed as correct record of the meeting.

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



## **5. Appeals.**

The Head of Development Management drew the Committee's attention to item 18 – 37, Wellington Hill and reported that the appeal against refusal was dismissed. He suggested that this was a clear signal from the Planning Inspectorate that the requirement to intensify housing was not to be at the expense of quality and character.

## **6. Enforcement.**

It was noted that one enforcement notice had been served since the last 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 Application:

### **18/05823/F - Westbury Gardens Residential Home Falcondale Road.**

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

The details of the application were as follows:-

The following points arose from questions and discussion:-

1. The application was for the remodelling of an existing residential care home resulting in an increased number of bedrooms and overall improvement to the existing care home facilities;
2. There had been substantial public concern and officer concern regarding the impact on residential amenity on previous applications for this site and the current application had been substantially amended to reflect concerns;
3. There had been 3 rounds of consultation for the current application with the level of opposition being maintained at each round. The issues of concern being:



- Congestion and parking;
- Over-development;
- Noise nuisance;
- Loss of privacy and overlooking;
- Overbearing impact;
- Uncharacteristic and incongruous design.

4. The increase in massing at the Shipley Road end was fairly modest in comparison to the previous structure. The first floor terrace was reduced in size and ultimately removed, windows were removed on the first floor western elevation and the lightwell/fire escape in place of the terrace was also reduced in depth;

5. The application was policy compliant and officers recommended approval subject to conditions.

The following points arose from questions and discussion:-

1. Councillor Lesley Alexander suggested that a site visit would be worthwhile and asked whether car parking could be conditioned similarly to the cycle parking and she was informed that this was possible;
2. It was confirmed that there would be a net increase of 5 bedrooms added to the current 19 bedrooms (arranged as 14 bedrooms on the ground floor and 10 on the first floor). On the same complex was a nursing home which would be losing 15 bedrooms and there would be a net loss of 10 bedrooms and would be less pressure on car parking on site;
3. It was confirmed that where the residents would be rehoused during the building works was not a consideration for the Local Planning Authority (LPA);
4. Space standards only applied to Class C3 developments (self-contained dwellings) and this was not the case here. The quality and scale of the bedrooms was a matter for the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and not the LPA. Social Care within BCC had a relationship with the CQC and it was important to leave this matter to the regulator and that part of BCC. It was noted that the additional floor space on the first floor meant that the rooms were larger than before;
5. No proposals had yet been put forward by the developer regarding outside lighting;
6. The Head of Development Management stated in response to concerns raised in a Public Forum statement regarding the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) that BCC's design policies were relatively up to date but would be reviewed following revised NPPF guidance. The Local Plan policies allowed the LPA to require quality where it could influence how the building looked and in relation to the character of the area. There had been 5 versions of this development and it had been improved and scaled back. The process had been rigorous and had incorporated the LPA's good design policies which was why officers recommended it for approval;
7. The trees to be removed were of poor quality so there would be no requirement to compensate for their loss. The hedging surrounding the development would remain;
8. Councillor Bradley accepted the design and gave credit to the developer for not interfering with the site lines and views. The bedroom sizes were better than before and the additional space would benefit the residents and staff. There was no substantial harm and she would therefore support approval;



9. Councillor Breckels supported the principle of improvements to the quality of care homes and he noted the substantial improvements to this proposal compared to the previous one. He did not support the need for a site visit and would support approval of the application;
10. Councillor Hance understood the concerns of local residents but there were no material planning reasons to refuse it. She did not support a site visit;
11. Councillor Stevens stated that the aspects he did not like were not material planning matters so he would vote in support of approval;
12. Councillor Khan was minded to support approval;
13. Councillor Breckels moved the officer recommendation to approve with the addition of a condition concerning car parking and this was seconded and on being put to the vote it was:-

**Resolved (Unanimous) – That the application be granted subject to conditions as set out in the report, the Amendment Sheet and an additional condition regarding car parking.**

The meeting ended at 7pm.

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

