

Bristol City Council

Minutes of Development Control Committee A

27th July 2016 at 6.00 pm



Members

Councillors: Lesley Alexander, Harriet Bradley, Fabian Breckels, Stephen Clarke, Mike Davies, Kye Dudd, Steve Pearce, Jo Sergeant, Clive Stevens, Chris Windows and Mark Wright

Officers: Gary Collins, Peter Westbury, Charlotte Sangway, Kevin Morley, Norman Cornthwaite.

13. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

There were none.

14. Declarations of Interest

The following declarations were received and noted:

1. Councillor Sergeant – 15/01681/F – Queen Victoria House. Has had conversations about the project but has not expressed a view and remains open minded about.
2. Councillor Stevens 15/01681/F – Queen Victoria House. Has submitted a Public Forum Statement and will not take part in the Item.
3. Councillor Wright – 15/01681/F – Queen Victoria House. Has had conversations about the project but has not expressed a view and remains open minded about.

15. Minutes of the Meeting held on 15th June 2016

Councillor Stevens, referring to Declarations of Interest asked the sentence stating that “he was not open minded” be qualified to include “in respect of this application”. This was agreed.

Resolved – that the Minutes be agreed as a correct record of the Meeting and signed by the Chair, subject to the agreed amendment.

16. Appeals

The Representative of the Service Director, Planning introduced the report and summarised it for everyone.

Resolved – that the report be noted.

17. Enforcement



The Representative of the Service Director, Planning introduced the report and summarised it for everyone.

Resolved – that the report be noted.

18. Public Forum

Statements

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. *(A copy of the public forum statements are held on public record in the Minute Book).*

19. Planning and development.

15/01681/F – Queen Victoria House

(Councillor Stevens who had already presented a Public Forum Statement sat in public gallery and did not participate in this item.)

An Amendment Sheet was provided to the committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The Representative of the Service Director, Planning introduced the report, summarised it and gave a presentation of the application. He explained that the Covenant was not a planning matter.

During the debate and questioning the following issues were highlighted:

- There were clear positives relating to this scheme – a much needed type of housing, saving a historic building that is in a bad state of repair and is not listed so could be demolished; the changes to the scheme were welcomed
- However concerns were expressed about the loss of trees, lack of renewable energy, loss of gardens for public use and the impact on neighbours
- There were also concerns about the design - the blocks were considered to be big and ugly
- The view was expressed that Members should not be pressured into approving an application that they are not happy with, especially if there was an underlying cost issue for developers
- It was noted that whilst Members had expressed views about what they would like the development to be, the Committee could only make a decision on the application before them

Councillor Clarke moved that the Conditions be amended to include a requirement that the developer be required to produce a Certificate certifying a BREEAM rating of Very Good for the



scheme. This was seconded by Councillor Wright and on being put to the Vote was Carried - voting 7 for and 3 abstentions.

Councillor Davies then moved the recommendation in the report, as amended. Councillor Dudd seconded this and on being put to the Vote it was

Resolved – (7 for, 3 against and 1 abstention) that planning permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in the report and the additional agreed condition.

16/003666/FB – Whitehall Primary School

An Amendment Sheet was provided to the committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The Representative of the Service Director, Planning introduced the report, summarised it and gave a presentation of the application.

The Representative of the Service Director, Transport summarised the Highways issues relating to the scheme.

During the debate and questioning the following issues were highlighted:

- The number of parking spaces would be increased from 17 to 46; the number of pupils increased to 420 plus those attending the nursery; the number of staff would increase from 60 to 80
- Concerns were expressed about the number of parking spaces being provided not being adequate for the number of staff who would be employed; this would lead to staff parking in adjacent streets outside people's house – this will cause problems and lead to conflict
- The parking situation would be made worse by parents parking as near to the school as they could get to drop off and collect children – parents often park on zig zag lines; this again will cause problems and lead to conflict
- Concerns were also expressed about the Traffic Management proposals and that residents, staff and parents should be consulted about them
- It was noted that the developer had already carried out consultation on the proposals and that there would be further consultation in relation to the TRO, however it was considered that this further consultation should go beyond the statutory consultation required under TRO Regulations
- It was noted that the TRO will be enforceable

The Representative of the Service Director, Planning reminded Members of the Committee that Bristol City Council is under a legal obligation to provide school places for children who live in the City and this development is forms part of BCC fulfilling that obligation. The need for the enlargement of the school is clear.

Referring to the consultation and the TRO, he stated that Condition 7 could be amended and suggested something along the following, with the exact wording to be agreed after the Meeting



– “Notwithstanding the submitted Highways Plan, a General Arrangement Plan is to be submitted and this will be the subject of consultation with residents, staff of the school and parents.”

Councillor Stevens moved this amendment. It was seconded, Voted on and Carried – voting 11 for, 0 against.

Councillor Bradley then moved the recommendation in the report, as amended. Councillor Stevens seconded this and on being put to the Vote it was

Resolved – (11 for, 0 against) that planning permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in the report and the additional agreed condition.

16/01156/F – Cotham School

An Amendment Sheet was provided to the committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The Representative of the Service Director, Planning introduced the report, summarised it and gave a presentation of the application.

During the debate and questioning the following issues were highlighted:

- It was noted that an all weather pitch is like a real grass pitch
- It was noted that floodlights would not be provided and that if floodlights are required these would be subject to planning approval; it was also noted that the lack of floodlights would limit community use
- The conditions relating to the community use were clarified

Councillor Breckells moved the recommendation in the report. Councillor Windows seconded this and on being put to the Vote it was

Resolved – (11 for, 0 against) that planning permission be granted subject to conditions as set out in the report.

The Meeting finished at 8.50pm

CHAIR _____

