

**Bristol City Council**  
**Minutes of the Development Control A**  
**Committee (Remote Meeting)**



**10<sup>th</sup> June 2020 at 2.00 pm**

**Members Present:-**

**Councillors:** Donald Alexander (Chair), Fabian Breckels, Stephen Clarke, Mike Davies, Paul Goggin, Margaret Hickman, Afzal Shah, Steve Smith, Clive Stevens, Chris Windows (Vice-Chair), and Mark Wright (Audio only)

**Officers in Attendance:-**

Gary Collins, Development Management; Laurence Fallon, Transport Development Management; Norman Cornthwaite, Democratic Services

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

The Chair welcomed everyone and explained how the Meeting would operate and the process to be followed for the hearing of each application.



## 2. Confirmation of Chair

It was noted that Councillor Don Alexander was appointed Chair for the 2020/21 Municipal Year by Full Council at its Meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2020.

## 3. Confirmation of Vice Chair

It was noted that Councillor Chris Windows was appointed Vice Chair for the 2020/21 Municipal Year by Full Council at its Meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2020.

## 4. Membership of the Committee

The Membership of the Committee as set out in the Agenda was noted.

## 5. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference of the Committee as approved by Full Council at its Meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> May 2020 were noted.

## 6. Dates and Times of Meetings

There was a debate during which some Members expressed a preference for the Meetings alternating between 2.00 pm and 6.00 pm, whilst other Members expressed a preference for all of the Meetings starting at 2.00 pm at least whilst the Covid 19 Lockdown is in place.

Councillor Breckels moved that the Meetings alternate between 2.00 pm and 6.00 pm.

Councillor Smith seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was Lost – Voting 4 for, 7 against.

The Chair then suggested that all Meetings start at 2.00 pm at least until the end of the Covid 19 Lockdown when the situation can be reviewed.

This was agreed.

**Resolved - that all Meetings of the Committee start at 2.00 pm at least until the end of the Covid 19 Lockdown when the situation can be reviewed.**

## 7. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

There were none.



## 8. Declarations of Interest

The following was noted:

Councillor Stevens - 20/00691/F - 6 – 8 Belgrave Hill. He has submitted a Public Forum Statement and would not participate in the item.

## 9. Minutes of the previous meeting

Councillor Smith requested that the following amendment be made to the Minutes - At the top of item 11 on p17 of the report it notes that he said he'd been contacted by a member of SDT. He would just like it to note that it was a social contact and unrelated to the application. This was agreed.

**Resolved – that, subject to the above, the minutes of the Meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.**

## 10 Appeals

The Head of Development Management introduced the report providing an overview of the current appeals. He confirmed that the correct version of the report is now on the website.

Councillor Smith asked whether the Council would make an application for costs in relation to the appeals at Hamilton House. The Head of Development Management replied that this would be considered if the appellants had acted unreasonably.

## 11 Enforcement

The Head of Development Management introduced the report and summarised it for everyone. He confirmed that the correct version of the report is now on the website.

## 12 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.



## 13 Planning and Development

### 18/06186/F - 90 West Street St Philips

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

Resubmission of application 17/04953/F - construction of 12no. flats, 2 retail units and addition of one storey to 90 West Street.

Answers for Clarification:

- Information relating to noise has been provided by Environmental Protection; the complaints received relate to noise generated by music; noise insulation will be provided as part of the scheme; traffic noise is generated in West Street; bedrooms are located at the front of the property as some units only have one bedroom; the developer may have to reduce the number of units to achieve all bedrooms being located at the rear
- One of the benefits of the scheme compared to existing residential properties is that noise insulation measures are required
- Measures in this scheme to deal with overheating issues would not result in a substantial change to the building; any material or substantial change to the building would require a further application to be submitted
- Agent of Change relates to one development jeopardising the nature of an area by virtues of being either a noise generating or a noise sensitive use; a new entrant to an area has to mitigate their impact on the area
- The Committee has to give significant weight to the Neighbourhood Development Plan
- It was confirmed that BCC had carried out local consultation in relation to this application

Debate:

- The scheme is a key development for Old Market and the concerns raised by residents should be listened to
- There are concerns about the impact of noise generated in the area
- The benefits of a new build scheme providing noise insulation measures are recognised
- The scheme could be improved in terms of future amenity of proposed residents by some minor changes

Councillor Davies moved the Officer Recommendation that the application be Approved.

Councillor Smith seconded this Motion.



### **On being put to the vote this Motion was lost 4 / 7**

Councillor Alexander proposed deferring a decision to seek changes to the design concerns expressed by the Committee.

Councillor Hickman seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

**Resolved – (voting 10, for, 1 abstention) that a decision be deferred until a future Meeting of the Committee to enable the Officers to seek changes to the design of the scheme.**

### **20/00691/F - 6-8 Belgrave Hill**

Councillors Stevens did not participate in this item, having submitted a Public Forum Statement.

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

Proposed development of a single dwelling (Use Class C3) with associated external works (Self Build).

Answers for Clarification:

- There is a backlog of TROs at the moment and they are taking 6 to 8 months to be legally enforceable; this one would be in place before the development is completed
- This is an application for a single dwelling; any change to that would require a different application
- Rock anchor work has been carried out properly in the past and any further work would require geotechnical supervision
- Consultation has been carried out with Avon Fire Service but there was no response in relation to this application; the Fire Service already have access to this area. There are no changes to the access arrangements from the previous application, which had not been refused permission on these grounds.

Debate

- There is loss of amenity, over development, unsuitable site for residential development and loss of parking
- Although it is not a good development, the application is for one house so the reason for the previous refusal has been addressed leaving no reason for refusal
- It is over development and the concerns of the residents should be taken into account
- Concerns about refusal of the application resulting in a loss at any Appeal



- It was noted that the application had been considered a number of times previously and it would be difficult for Officers to prepare reasons for refusal that would be convincing at an Appeal

Councillor Davies moved the Officer Recommendation that the application be Approved.

Councillor Wright seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was Lost – Voting 3 for, 6 against, 1 abstention.

Councillor Alexander moved that a decision on the application deferred until a future Meeting of the Committee. However there was no seconder for this Motion so it fell before a vote was taken.

Councillor Smith moved that the application be refused for reasons relating to loss of amenity due to the loss of on-street car parking in the area

Councillor Windows seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

**Resolved – (Voting 6 for, 3 against, 1 abstention) that the application be refused for reasons relating to loss of amenity due to the loss of on-street car parking in the area.**

Councillor Wright left the Meeting after this item.

### **20/01254/A - Unit 5 & 6 Markerside Industrial Site Albert Road**

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

Upgrade of 1no. poster panel to digital LED display advertisement (single-sided).

Answers for Clarification:

- Drivers approaching the roundabout would have the usual rights of way at a roundabout; it is a well lit roundabout and the sign would not impact on vision at night
- A condition only allowing the screen to change during daylight hours could be included but it may not be accepted by the applicants
- There has been no previous application for this site and the current advertisement has been there since at least 2008, although without permission
- Adverts do draw attention to themselves but there is already an advert on the site; this one would change every 10 seconds
- The signed route for cyclists is along the River Avon



- Although there are 5 advertisement boards adjacent to the roundabout, none of them are LED; each application has to be judged on its merits, although the legislation does allow cumulative effect to be taken into consideration
- There is no available evidence of an increase in road accidents as a result of the installation of an LED board at Lawrence Hill Roundabout
- Not having planning permission for the current board cannot affect the decision on this application, which has to be determined on its merits
- Albert Road is not an area of high cycle usage

Debate:

- There are no valid reasons to refuse the application, this is one of the least worst examples
- LED screens are different from static screens – they distract drivers and cause highway safety problems
- The application should be deferred pending the receipt of more information on the effect of digital advertising on road accidents
- There are concerns about an increase in cycling in the area and the impact of the proposed advert on safety conditions

Councillor Breckels moved that a decision on the application be deferred until a future Meeting of the Committee and receipt of a report on the impact the installation of LED screens at roundabouts has on the level of road accidents.

Councillor Stevens seconded the Motion. He added that he would like Officers to consider imposing a condition that only allows the screen to change during daylight hours.

On being put to the Vote it was

**Resolved – (Voting 10 for, 0 against) - that a decision on the application be deferred until a future Meeting of the Committee and receipt of a report on the impact the installation of LED screens at roundabouts has on the level of road accidents; Officers are also asked to consider imposing a condition that only allows the screen to change during daylight hours.**

#### **14 Date of Next Meeting**

8<sup>th</sup> July 2020 at 2.00 pm.

Meeting ended at 5.10 pm.

**Chair** \_\_\_\_\_



