

Bristol City Council
Minutes of the Development Control B Committee
(Remote/Virtual)
29th April 2020 at 2.00 pm



Members Present:-

Councillors: Tom Brook (Chair) Lesley Alexander, Nicola Bowden-Jones, Harriet Bradley, Mike Davies, Carla Denyer, Fi Hance, Sultan Khan, Olly Mead and Jo Sergeant,

Officers in Attendance:-

Gary Collins – Head of Development Management, Norman Cornthwaite – Democratic Services

1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the arrangements for the Meeting.

2. Apologies for absence.

Apologies were received from Councillors Richard Eddy (Vice Chair) and Celia Phipps.

3. Declarations of Interest.

Councillor Davies. 19/00066/F and 19/00067/LA - 6 Upper York Street. The site is located within his Ward and although he referred the applications to a Committee, his referral form took a neutral position and he had not predetermined the applications.

4. Minutes of the last meeting.

Councillor Brook moved that the Minutes be agreed as an accurate record of the meeting. Councillor Denyer seconded this Motion.

Resolved – that the Minutes be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chair.

5. Appeals.



The Head of Development Management introduced the report and summarised it for everyone. He drew attention to Items 6 to 12 Hamilton House. He also advised that in relation to Item 16, 16 Hadrian Close, the Appeal had been dismissed.

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 noted 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:

19/03104/F - 7 Belvedere Road

(Councillor Bowden-Jones joined the Meeting during this item and did not participate in it.)

The Head of Development Management and his representative gave a presentation and summarised the report for this item highlighting the following:

Change of use from 3 x flats to a 17 x bed extension to the nursing home at 8-9 Belvedere Road.

Answers for Clarification

- The perceived character of the applicants cannot be taken into account; the application must be judged on its planning merits
- No photos were taken of the car parking survey but a register was taken of the parking spaces within 150 metres of the site; the survey was undertaken correctly and was carried out on two separate days
- There would be up to two new members of staff at any one time onsite.
- Quality of care on the site is not a planning matter and that is managed by the Care Quality Commission.
- The Loading Bays are proposed outside 2 & 3 Belvedere Road and 8 & 9 Belvedere Road
- The tenants of the existing flats at the site support the application
- The applicant has presented a strong case for a Care home in the Needs Assessment.
- There is no smoking room and although there is a garden to the rear of the property its use is not clarified; a Condition could be part of a Management Plan but it may be difficult to enforce



- A Construction and Environment Management Plan (CEMP) would cover considerate construction, hours of working and control of pollution, etc.; there would be a complaints procedure as well
- There is a lift in the building
- Residential amenity is assessed in relation to planning issues
- A Condition covers the place for the storage of recycling and waste, and Bristol Waste have standards for Care Homes
- The parking survey indicated that there would be sufficient parking taking account of the impact of this development
- The number of trips included in the report includes those by staff, visitors and the servicing of the premises
- The Loading Bays would be used by ambulances would therefore be required 24 hours per day

Debate

- The application is detrimental to the residents of the street; there would be traffic problems;
- There are already too many Care Homes in the street
- There have been traffic problems over a number of years
- The conclusions of the Parking Survey are not accepted
- The application is encroaching on residents
- This is a mixed community but there is an over saturation of Care Homes
- There would be a loss of homes in a sought after area because of the nearby schools

The following were noted:

1. The quality of care provided by Care Homes is not a planning issue and cannot therefore be given weight in coming to a decision on the application.
2. The level of parking observed recently cannot be taken into account due to the unique circumstances relating to Covid-19; the parking survey that was undertaken is a more accurate indicator of the demand for parking in the area.
3. Policies BCS18 and DM2 have equal weight.

Councillor Brook moved the Officer's Recommendation for approval of the application.

Councillor Khan seconded this motion.

On being put to the Vote it was Lost – Voting 1 for, 8 against.

It was suggested that a decision on the application be deferred until a further report could be considered by Committee at its next Meeting as Members are "minded to refuse" this application. The report will include the areas of concern raised by Members of the Committee and which of these areas of concern could be considered valid reasons to refuse the application.



Among the areas of concern raised by Members were: traffic and parking; an over concentration of Care Homes in the area affecting the mixed and balanced community; and the rationale for considering the site as being near to shops and services due to the nature and limited mobility of the likely residents.

Councillor Brook moved that a decision on the application be deferred (as Members were minded to refuse) until a further report can be considered by the Committee.

Councillor Sergeant seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

Resolved – (Voting 9 for, 0 against) that a decision on the application be deferred (as Members were minded to refuse) until a further report can be considered by the Committee.

19/00066/F and 19/00067/LA - 6 Upper York Street

The Head of Development Management and his representative gave a presentation and summarised the report for this item highlighting the following:

19/00066/F Conversion and extension of 6 Upper York Street and the former Coroner's Court and erection of a four-storey building to create 46 no. residential units; business space for Class A2/Class B1 uses; associated cycle storage and landscaping.

19/00067/LA Physical works to facilitate the conversion and extension of Coroner's Court, as part of the wider development including the conversion and extension of 6 Upper York Street and the erection of a four-storey building to create 46 no. residential units; business space for Class A2/Class B1 uses; associated cycle storage and landscaping.

Answers for Clarification

- The works will take place over a period of time and there are Conditions included to address the issue of noise generation
- The details of the ramp for disabled access will be secured by condition; Transport Development Management has confirmed that the cycle stores are accessible
- No petition relating to the planning application has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority; information relating to the objections to the planning application that have been received are summarised in the report; the Council's Regulatory Function is separate from its Executive Function; the Committee should therefore make a decision on the planning application
- If someone deliberately allows a listed building to fall into disrepair, the Local Authority should take this into account in any decision
- The Coroner's Court building is a listed building; the Lakota building is locally listed; the scheme has to be considered as a whole
- All of the affordable accommodation meets space standards



- It is not known why the owners of Lakota purchased the Coroner's Court building, but there would be difficulties in obtaining planning permission for a housing development adjacent to a nightclub
- Development Control Committee resolved to grant planning permission previously, around 2008, but the development did not happen; it was also predicated on Lakota closing
- Nine affordable units are proposed throughout the development which equates to 20%, in accordance with the Council's Affordable Housing Practice Note
- The provision of play space within the development, together with the nearby Pauls Park, is sufficient to meet the demand associated with the development

Debate

- There is a public benefit in developing the site
- Safeguards are in place and there is affordable housing and a play area to be provided
- There are concerns about the loss of a music venue, as a community and cultural facility
- Acknowledgement that the site is allocated in the Local Plan for residential-led development, and the weight that should be attached in favour of the development by meeting this allocation
- The scheme does not enhance the area
- The public realm is being improved
- There will be a benefit to the local community
- A listed building will be restored
- Not convinced by the quality of the development
- The scheme only included the bare minimum for sustainability

Councillor Brook moved the Officer Recommendation for approval of both applications.

Councillor Khan seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

Resolved – (Voting 6 for, 3 against, 1 abstention) that both applications be approved.

The meeting ended at 4.55 pm.

Chair _____

