

Bristol City Council

Minutes of the Development Control A Committee



11 August 2021 at 6.00 pm

Members Present:-

Councillors: Richard Eddy (Chair), Paul Goggin, Fi Hance, Tom Hathway, Philippa Hulme, Steve Pearce, Ed Plowden and Andrew Varney

Officers in Attendance:-

Gary Collins, Oliver Harrison

1 Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and issued the safety information.

2 Election of Vice-Chair

Councillor Paul Goggin was elected Vice-Chair.

3 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

Apologies were received from Cllr John Geater, Cllr Jonathan Hucker substitutes.

4 Declarations of Interest

Cllrs Ed Plowden, Paul Goggin and Steve Pearce were unable to attend the site visit for the first application so will not vote on the outcome.

Cllr Fi Hance has submitted a statement in support of the third application so will not participate on that item.

5 Minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 30th June 2021

RESOLVED The minutes of the previous meeting 30 June 2021 were agreed as a correct record.



6 Appeals

Officers drew attention to the following items:

Items 9 and 10 (Colston Avenue), refer to the vacant plinth in the centre following the removal of the Colston statue. Officers resolved not to determine the statue as this is part of a major public consultation exercise currently being done by the Council. It was felt it was right to defer to that consultation rather than make a planning decision on this individual proposal. The Inspector dismissed the appeals, however, the Inspector did award costs against the Council.

Item 14 relates to the move of Baltic Wharf Caravan Club to the former police horse and dog training site. Following a call-in by the Secretary of State the Public Inquiry finished a week ago and we await the decision.

Item 59 (Eldridge Close) was refused under delegated powers but was permitted on appeal by the Inspector. This was a different view to BCC about the effect of the application on the surrounding area.

The Chair commented that there has only been one upheld appeal in this period, reflecting well on planning officers and members.

7 Enforcement

Officers reported that no enforcement notices had been issued since the last meeting, but such notices were in the pipeline.

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 applications.

1 Planning Application Number 21/00746/F - 6 Clyde Park

0



Officers presented the report but did not want to repeat information that had already been covered. The report is comprehensive, and members had a site visit today.

Questions for clarification:

1. The concept of “garden grabbing” can be permitted if certain criteria can be proven: efficient use of land within a high density area, improvement in design for the area or the proposal is an extension of an existing dwelling. Officers considered clause 1 in this case, the efficient use of land in a high-density area around the city centre (which is 800m from the site).
2. There has been lots of discussion about this application setting a precedent. Clyde Park is itself a suitable location for a new development. It is stated in the conservation area appraisal that back lanes are not as important as major routes.
3. The distance between properties is 19m.

Debate notes:

4. Members appreciated the site visit so they could clearly visualise the impact of the application. Parking is very difficult on this road. Clyde Park is a “dog leg” so there are concerns about the safety of vehicles and pedestrians. This development would have a negative impact on a conservation area. The views across existing gardens would be impacted. This application could set a precedent for garden grabbing.
5. The visit allowed members to get a good feel for the conservation area and what we are trying to preserve. The development would have a negative impact. There is an issue of overlooking existing properties and the lane is very narrow.
6. There are many objections on this application. A properly positioned mirror could mitigate some of the vehicle risk.
7. Heritage is the main issue of concern in this application, and it is clear from the site visit today it would not be in keeping with the character of the area.

DECISION

8. Cllr Varney moved to approve the officer recommendations. There was no second so this motion falls.
9. There was a discussion about the appropriate grounds for refusal for this application to defend the decision against possible appeal.

RESOLVED (6 for / 0 against / 0 abstain) application is REFUSED on heritage and conservation grounds.

1 Planning Application Number 20/03659/F - Green Court Access 18, Avonmouth

1

Officers presented the report and highlighted the following points:

1. This is an unusual application. Committee is not examining the original decision for planning consent but looking at conditions being amended so the planning considerations at this stage are relatively narrow. This would normally be an officer decision, but the ward councillor has referred it to the committee.



2. This application already has planning permission. The change in conditions refers to the type of fuel being processed at this plant. The business has a 50-year lease on the site and needs the flexibility of being able to process different fuels.
3. There are no external variations to site and all structures remain the same.
4. The application is to combine Refuse Derived Fuel (RDF) and waste wood. There is previous approval for RDF in 2010 and wood in 2017.
5. There have been some objections, several related to the presence of flies which is a persistent issue for the area. This is largely a matter for the Environment Agency, who would consider the relevant environmental permits and attach conditions.

Questions for clarification:

6. The wider environmental investigations into fly issues in Avonmouth is ongoing, however this should not have a bearing on this application.
7. This application will need two separate pieces of approval. The planning application as per today, then a further application for an environmental permit via the Environment Agency. A deferral of planning based on environment issues is inappropriate given the future requirements for a permit.
8. Refuse Derived Fuel is any waste material that is not otherwise recycled. There should be processing before burning to remove hazardous material.

Debate notes:

9. The ability of the committee to act under the circumstances of the application is limited. If a change in conditions is not agreed, the applicant will continue to process waste under existing permissions. The amendment is unlikely to influence the wider fly issues.
10. We do not have full details on what will be burned and the pollution that will result. Do we want to encourage the burning of waste? The alternative is landfill, so the options are difficult.
11. Members were satisfied on the general principle that the detailed pollution control issues are a matter for the Environment Agency rather than Planning Committee.
12. If we were determining the 2010 application under current policy, we may have refused it but the planning history before us means the only issue is increased tonnage and variation in fuel types.
13. Pollution and odour are material consideration for planning, but the EA will be able to regulate these to a higher degree.

DECISION

RESOLVED (9 for / 0 against / 0 abstain) the application is approved as per officer's recommendations.

1 Planning Application Number 21/00288/F - Ferro Whapping Wharf, Bristol

2

Officers presented the report and highlighted the following points:

1. The report shows the location of the houseboat within the harbour. There are pictures before and after alterations. There has been a significant increase in the height of the boat.
2. The application is within a conservation area, so members should give that relevant weight.



3. There are 53 letters of support for the application. However, the officer recommendation is to refuse based on policy within a conservation area and the scale of alteration to the boat.

Questions for clarification:

4. Members expressed confusion about why planning permission applies in this situation. It is a grey area, but some determining features are the permanence of the mooring to services and this vessel having no engine or propulsion. It is classed as a residence so will need planning permission.
5. There are many boats in the area used as residences, but they are active vessels despite variations of design.
6. The application impacts on the character of a conservation area. There are policies to inform that, but it is ultimately a subjective view. Officers give an informed opinion and make recommendations for members. Applications go through several officer teams, the reports are based on that consensus, they are not a singular view.
7. Although rare, there have been other applications where officers recommend refusal, but public comments are all supportive. These applications go to committee for determination.
8. Granting this application will inevitably set a precedent for other heavily converted houseboats.
9. These applications need both planning consent and the licensing consent from the harbour. They are separate processes and decisions.
10. It would be helpful for there to be a cohesive policy that applicants can follow. Cllr Eddy as a member of the Harbourside Council asked for officer assistance in addressing this in the upcoming Harbourside review plan.

Debate notes:

11. The Bristol docks is an area where people work, live and play. It is incumbent on members to find a balance. This application is a good example of creating water borne accommodation in the city centre and represents the housing diversity that we should be aiming for. The impact on heritage grounds is not significant given the mixed nature of the harbour. Members should support innovative and sustainable design.
12. Some members expressed sympathy for the applicant due to the delays caused by there not being a clear policy to cover these types of conversions. The Harbourside is a working and semi-industrial area so conservation arguments have a limit in this context. The unique design is likely to add to the character of the area.
13. Public comments are overwhelmingly supportive. In such a high-profile area, we would expect many complaints if the design was poor. It is unintrusive even with the increased height.
14. In the context of a city-wide housing crisis, boathouses are a feasible part of the solution.
15. There was concern about setting a precedent and the need for a policy. Cllr Eddy volunteered to write to the Harbourside Forum on behalf of the committee to take this forward.

DECISION

RESOLVED Members declined to move the officer recommendation.

Councillor Eddy moved the approval of the application seconded by Councillor Pearce.



RESOLVED (8 for / 0 against / 0 abstain) approve application subject to suitable conditions to be drafted by officers.

1 Date of Next Meeting

3

The next DCA meeting is 22 September 2021 at 2pm.

Meeting ended at 7.30 pm

CHAIR _____

