

Public Document Pack

Bristol City Council Minutes of the Development Control A Committee



3 November 2021 at 6.00 pm

Members Present:-

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

Officers in Attendance:-

Matthew Cockburn, Jim Cliffe, Jonathan Dymond and Jeremy Livitt

1 Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

Councillor Richard Eddy welcomed all parties to the meeting and explained the emergency evacuation procedure.

The Committee noted that this meeting and all future Development Control Committee meetings held between Monday and Wednesday would be webcast.

2 Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

The Committee noted that there were no apologies for this meeting.

3 Declarations of Interest

Councillors Andrew Varney, Steve Pearce and Ed Plowden all declared interests in Planning Application Number 19/03940/F – 345 Bath Road since it was either in their ward (Councillor Varney) or they lived near the application site (Councillors Pearce and Plowden). All of these Councillors confirmed that they retained an open mind concerning this application.

4 Minutes of the previous meeting held on Wednesday 22nd September 2021

It was moved by Councillor Fi Hance, seconded by Councillor Philippa Hulme and

RESOLVED – that the minutes for the meeting held on 22nd September 2021 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.



5 Action Sheet

The Committee noted the action sheet for Development Control A Committee. It was noted that a rolling action sheet had recently been agreed for both Development Control A and B Committee. This had been approved to ensure that action incidental to the main decisions on Planning Applications was followed up as requested with updates provided as appropriate.

Agenda Item 13(a) – Planning Application Number 20/05811/F - Plot 3, Dalby Avenue and Whitehouse Lane, Bristol -Request to the appropriate Cabinet member to fast track the proposal for an RPZ for Windmill Hill.

Councillor Ed Plowden expressed his disappointment with the Mayor's decision on this issue.

The Chair stated that he would contact the Service Manager, Development Management, to request that he provides a verbal update on this issue for the next meeting.

ACTION: Councillor Richard Eddy to contact Gary Collins as indicated above.

6 Appeals

The Committee noted details of the appeals lodged and set out in the report.

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

7 Enforcement

The Committee noted details of one enforcement notice which was dated 6th October 2021 and was set out in the report.

Following a request from a Committee member, Jonathan Dymond agreed to speak to Gary Collins to arrange a briefing for Councillors on enforcement including outstanding enforcement cases.

ACTION: Jonathan Dymond to discuss with Gary Collins as indicated above.

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 Planning Application:

a Planning Application Number 19/03940/F - 345 Bath Road

Officers introduced this report and made the following points during their presentation:

- National policy gave a presumption in favour of housing development
- The design had changed significantly from the original proposal
- The elevation facing the Paintworks had been reduced in size in the current application and the number of units had also been reduced
- Details of the car park area, storage area, refuse area and landscaping were all indicated
- Details of the bus layby as requested by Transport Development Management and now included in the proposal were shown to the Committee
- There was a good standard accommodation on the site
- The level of affordable housing required by policy is 30%. However, it was noted that whilst 15% was all that is proposed by the developer and is to be secured through a Section 106 agreement and could be legally enforced, the remainder would be provided through the Homes England Grant via the public purse

In response to members' questions, officers made the following points:

- There was no reason to believe that the developer would not be able to meet their commitments concerning affordable housing. Generally, the track record with these sorts of schemes was very good and developers did honour their commitments. Officers confirmed the applicant had the expectation of delivering 50% Affordable Housing, though 35% of this figure would be secured by a Homes England grant. However, the Committee should bear in mind that they are not able to guarantee the additional 35%, and whilst highly unlikely, it is possible that the deal the developer has with the housing association to provide the additional 35% could fall through.
- The Flood Team had indicated that, following the agreement to provide a new sewer, they were prepared to support the application
- Traffic - The initial traffic assessment of the number of vehicles passing would reduce as the scheme bedded down
- Cycle Places – the total number had been confirmed with the developer up to 200 overall which was in compliance with the required policy
- There were lots of potential sources of funding available to address any problems related to concerns about below standard lighting on the cycle path
- The development was compliant with the Council's Net Zero Development Target such as those requiring 26% carbon reduction and it will be required to attain a BREEAM Excellent Score. It would also be future proofed to connect to the District Heat Network
- The density is in line with other developments in the area. The calculation took into account the commercial floor space
- There were three principal options available to the Committee – accepting the existing proposal, deferring it, or approving it with a roll over concerning viability



- The landowner issues remained difficult. Current vehicular access could be made outside the area indicated by the red line on the map

Committee members made the following comments:

- This is the sort of brownfield site that the Committee should be supporting. The proposed level of affordable housing was good. The concerns relating to the density of the housing and transport had been met. This seemed an excellent scheme and should be approved with a condition of rolling viability previews. Other schemes submitted by Goram Homes had been approved
- The advantages of the scheme were the heat network, the fact that it was on a brownfield site and that it improved existing bus transport. Therefore, it should be supported
- Developers were urged to resolve their existing differences with the owners of the Paintworks site
- Officers and members of the public were thanked for their comments. The application had previously been called in due to concerns about the lack of community space. However, it had significantly changed including a reduction in the number of units and in height and should therefore be supported

Councillor Eddy moved, seconded by Councillor Paul Goggin and upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED: (unanimously) – that the application is approved in accordance with the recommendation set out in the report including the required conditions.

10 Date of Next Meeting

The Committee noted that the next meeting is scheduled to be held at 2pm on Wednesday 15th December 2021 in the Council Chamber, City Hall, College Green, Bristol.

The meeting ended at 6.55 pm

CHAIR _____

