

Amendment Sheet

2 September 2020

Item 1: - 493 - 499 Bath Road Brislington Bristol BS4 3JU

Page no.	Amendment/additional information																																						
Page 26	<p>Minor edit/addition to the proposed bed space mix and levels of car/cycle parking as set out in Page 26 of the Committee Report. See red text amends below.</p> <p>The bed space mix is:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of dwelling</th> <th>No. of dwellings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1 bed, 2 person</td> <td>63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 bed, 3 person</td> <td>74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 bed, 4 person</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 bed, 5 person dwellinghouse</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 bed, 6 person dwellinghouse</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>146</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The proposed cycle and car parking would be:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Block</th> <th>Cycle Parking</th> <th>Car Parking</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>130</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>94</td> <td>35</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>8</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Visitor</td> <td>42</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>280</td> <td>97</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of dwelling	No. of dwellings	1 bed, 2 person	63	2 bed, 3 person	74	2 bed, 4 person	6	3 bed, 5 person dwellinghouse	2	3 bed, 6 person dwellinghouse	1	Total	146	Block	Cycle Parking	Car Parking	A	130	44	B	0	0	C	94	35	D	8	9	E	6	6	Visitor	42	3	Total	280	97
Type of dwelling	No. of dwellings																																						
1 bed, 2 person	63																																						
2 bed, 3 person	74																																						
2 bed, 4 person	6																																						
3 bed, 5 person dwellinghouse	2																																						
3 bed, 6 person dwellinghouse	1																																						
Total	146																																						
Block	Cycle Parking	Car Parking																																					
A	130	44																																					
B	0	0																																					
C	94	35																																					
D	8	9																																					
E	6	6																																					
Visitor	42	3																																					
Total	280	97																																					
Page 27	<p>Following the publication of the Committee Report for this application, a total of two further public comments have been received.</p> <p>One comment was neutral (neither in support or objection to the application); and one comment was in support of the application.</p> <p>In terms of the neutral comment this did not object to the redevelopment of the site, it related to Roman Walk and car parking pressures in the area. These concerns are similar to those raised previously and are addressed within the report.</p> <p>In terms of the comment in support of the application, it cited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The lack of affordable and social housing in Bristol and the length of the waiting list for council property, and the length of time that this site is still not under construction. ▪ Brislington is a sought after area for housing and the demand is likely to increase after the new university campus opens. ▪ Consider that the site has been well designed; the blocks are not too high, there is public space with planting, and good availability of bicycle and car parking ▪ Consider this type of development is preferable to the spread of HMOs in existing terraced housing which is considered a problem in Brislington. ▪ Cite that this is not the easiest site and the application makes good use of it. 																																						

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There have not been a huge number of local objections ▪ Note the disagreement over the proposed heating systems and suggested if this could be made a condition of acceptance. ▪ The application offers a good number of social and affordable units which are desperately needed, in a location in reach of the city centre employment, and they would not want to see further delays in the utilization of the site.
Page 36 and 45/46	<p>As noted in the conclusion of Key Issue B:</p> <p><i>Should committee be minded to refuse the application, then one of the reasons must be due to a lack of affordable housing provision. This is because there is currently not a Section 106 Agreement in place to secure the affordable housing. However, if the applicant wished to appeal the refusal, the lack of affordable housing reason could be overcome by the applicant and the Council concluding a Section 106 Agreement to secure the affordable housing, and presenting it to the inspector prior to the subsequent appeal.</i></p> <p>As such the following reason for refusal has been added:</p> <p>The proposed development fails to make an appropriate contribution towards the provision of affordable housing and is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policy BCS17.</p> <p>As noted above, this is because there is currently not a Section 106 Agreement in place to secure the affordable housing proposed.</p> <p>If the applicant wished to appeal the refusal, the lack of affordable housing reason could be overcome by the applicant and the Council concluding a Section 106 Agreement to secure the affordable housing, and presenting it to the inspector prior to the subsequent appeal.</p>

Item 2: - 85 Whiteladies Road Bristol BS8 2NT

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
70	<p>Addition to public consultation response section</p> <p>Following publication of the Committee Report for this application (finalised Friday 21st August), a total of 8 further public comments have been submitted prior to the 2nd September Committee meeting. These all raised further objections to the application.</p> <p>Objections have been received from the following amenity/residents groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Redland & Cotham Amenities Society ▪ The Richmond Area Residents Association ▪ Clifton Down Community Association ▪ Totterdown Residents Environmental & Social Action <p>Objections have now therefore been received from a total of 19 parties.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Grounds of objection are similar to those raised previously, with key grounds summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Over concentration of student residential use in the area ▪ Building would not be adaptable to other uses ▪ Waste storage inaccessible leading to bins left on pavements ▪ Poor living environment within bedroom adjacent to Hampton Lane ▪ Lack of outdoor amenity space ▪ Poor quality living environment due to proximity of rooms to commercial uses at 85 Whiteladies Road ▪ Further HMO would have negative impact on residents through noise from parties ▪ Design does not complement the conservation area ▪ Building will impinge on servicing/amenity space to rear of existing site ▪ Building will make passing/access on narrow Hampton Lane more difficult ▪ Building makes access to adjacent garages more difficult ▪ Building too tall and too near the footway ▪ Impact to privacy ▪ Seasonality of student occupation is detrimental to community cohesion ▪ Proposal undermines the emerging HMO SPD ▪ No green space ▪ Application will set a precedent for the area
Page 71	<p>Addition to Councillor Clive Stevens comments</p> <p>A further comment on the application was made by Councillor Clive Stevens on 28th August. This reads as follows:</p> <p><i>"I object to this application. I note that there are 13 other objections put in recently after the amendment of size (from 9 rooms to 6). And that's without any further notices from the Council. Indeed 2 of the respondents listed in the officer's report (RCAS and CHIS) have objected again at this reduced size.</i></p> <p><i>I am saving my main reasons for objection for my presentation to Committee, here I list the smaller ones:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>the rear garage of no. 43 Cotham Hill (on Hampton Lane) would become unuseable as the road width will be just 3.5m, not enough to turn most cars in.</i> - <i>the proposed bins and bike storage are inadequate. The bins are to be collected by a private contractor presumably the same one servicing the restaurant 85 WL RD. That needs to be conditioned. The space is not big enough for two operators. And when the offices above the restaurant are converted to flats (which could well be permitted development) then the officer says (to me) there isn't enough room in the planned bin store to accommodate all. It would be a reason for objection in the future. But you can't object then as it would be permitted development.</i> - <i>noise from one off events (as typical from the occupants of HMOs) isn't recorded by Neighbourhood Enforcement (NET - see their website) and so when Planning Officers seek the evidence to comply (or not) with policy DM2 then it's not there. I have some residents who are surrounded by HMOs and woken regularly (most weekends) but NET have no records of this as they are different properties each weekend. I note that this application has its living room on the first floor thus maximising the impact of one off noise events.</i> <p><i>But as I have said, I am leaving the main reasons for objection for the Committee Meeting on Wednesday."</i></p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
Page 74	<p>Addition to internal consultation section</p> <p>Strategic City Planning, Bristol City Council:</p> <p>Further guidance has been sought from the Strategic City Planning Policy team regarding the emerging HMO SPD. The following comment has been provided:</p> <p><i>“Policy DM2 should be relied on for all decisions relating to proposed HMOs. The SPD won’t replace DM2 but provides further detail on its implementation. It will have full weight only once adopted.</i></p> <p><i>The additional guidance in the SPD on what constitutes a harmful concentration does not state that proposals should be refused where HMO proportions are over 10%. It does state that such proposals 'are unlikely to be consistent with Local Plan policy'. This provides a degree of flexibility. There may be some situations where officers consider that exceeding the threshold does not constitute a harmful concentration and will need to explain their reasoning in such cases with reference to policy DM2.”</i></p>

Item 3: - 8 Harley Place Bristol BS8 3JT

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	No amendments