

Public Forum

D C Committee B (P/F)

Statements submitted for Meeting on 14th September 2022)

12th October 2022 at 2.00 pm



1. Members of the Development Control Committee B

Councillors: Ani Stafford-Townsend (Chair), Lesley Alexander, Marley Bennett, Fabian Breckels, Andrew Brown, Lorraine Francis, Katja Hornchen, Philippa Hulme (for Cllr Hornchen), Guy Poultney and Chris Windows.

2. Officers:

Gary Collins - Development Management, Peter Westbury, Matthew Cockburn, Luke Phillips, Stephen Rockey.



Application	State ment No.	Request To Speak Made Where Indicated S = Speaker	Name
22/02677/COND - Romney House, Romney Avenue			NONE
22/00632/PB- Bristol City Council Depot, Dovercourt Road	1	S?	Susan Harris-Ford
	2	S?	CLlr Heather Mack
	3	S?	CLlr David Wilcox
22/01608/FB - Garages Bell Close			NONE
21/05341/F - 21 Oak Road			NONE

Application No 22/00632/PB

Dear Sirs,

Whilst I agree housing is important, I fail to see how in this is beneficial to our Area. At the moment, many new houses are being built and as an already over populated estate I see no relevance. Our community is in need of Doctors Surgeries and Dentist, these areas are really struggling already. The traffic and parking will become a nightmare. Building yet another 140 new homes will just increase the chaos of an already over populated area. The site would be better as a parking lot.

Mrs S Harris-Ford

Cllr Heather Mack

Hello,

Bristol needs affordable housing and we need more housing quickly. Lockleaze ward has felt this pressure and has been expected to provide the space and infrastructure for many of these new houses. When we are considering these new developments we really need to consider the road, public transport, school and GP surgery capacity for all these new residents. I have not seen enough evidence of this happening. So I have concerns.

I support this development being 30% affordable, and I hope it will be 50% as many of the other projects in the area are. I also hope that these houses can be built to the highest environmental standards, including solar panels and low/zero carbon heating.

I congratulate the local residents for protecting the important green space next to the development, and I was glad to support them on this, and glad that the developers listened to local concerns on this and emergency access. I would love to see access via Petherbridge way, but not at the cost of having any affordable housing on site.

The main concerns and issues for local residents are around cars, parking and the local road safety and capacity. There's a commitment in this proposal to necessary traffic calming and road adaptations around the development. In my view many changes would need to be made so that these extra vehicle movements do not make the surrounding roads unsafe.

I can support this outline planning with a lot of hesitation. I would like the developers to know that I expect a real commitment to spending on the local roads if they would like my support when the full proposal comes to planning. How about a low or no car development so it has less impact on the surrounding area?

Cllr David Wilcox

Hi Dem Services

I would like to lodge an objection as a councillor to the Dovercourt Planning Application 22/00632/PB, I tried to submit it via the portal, but despite being logged in as a councillor it is logged as public anonymous comment. My objection is below:

I would like to consider development in terms of the Weca Placemaking Charter <https://www.westofengland-ca.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/West-of-England-Placemaking-Charter.pdf>, which was recently launched and endorsed by Cabinet Member for Housing.

It has 5 factors that can be used to define developments.

1. Future Ready

1. According to the sustainability statement, final construction has not been decided. Energy generation, i.e. solar panels, only needs to provide enough energy to offset the use of Heat Pump Technology. Every building that the council builds needs to have solar panels if we are to meet our climate change targets.
2. I'm not convinced that a development that has 170 parking spaces for 140 homes is enabling a low-carbon lifestyle. Designs for community space and the sustainable urban drainage plan do seem adequate for a development of this size.

2. Connected

1. Public Transport is accessible from Muller Road, and Digital Inclusivity is well catered for.
2. I am very concerned that the sole entrance/exit road is not fit for purpose with the possible 360 vehicle movements from dwelling-based vehicles alone and being able to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle movements during peak times.
3. No consideration is being given to pedestrian movements south out of the site to Muller Road and to the supermarkets. Constructing a fence to block this desire line is also incompatible with delivering a low-carbon lifestyle.
4. There is a huge opportunity to re-assess the route of the Concorde Way cycling and walking route. This doesn't seem to be in scope for this development which is disappointing.
5. There is no mention of connecting to the Strategic Heat Main - part of the City Leap Project - building this functionality in now will save a lot of disruption in later years.

3. Biodiverse

1. The proposals for community space and the retention of trees are actually quite good - now that the proposals for the Emergency Access Route have been removed as a result of community engagement.

4. Characterful

1. It is noted that both Goram Homes and Keepmoat have committed to building this site; any consideration for the look and feel of the homes will have to come at the reserved matters stage of planning. The illustrative designs suggest that they will have a different character to both existing house stock and other recent developments in the ward. I would hope that the shade of brown brick that has been used in the Bonnington and Shackelton Heights developments is not used in this development.

5. Healthy and Inclusive

1. The site plans include a commitment to provide a number of wheelchair-accessible homes, which is good.
2. I do have reservations about the lack of multi-modal transport features. Providing cycle parking, wide pavements and lots of street trees is expected, but having access through one exit/entrance route choke point does promote car or vehicular use.

I do see the need for affordable housing in both Lockleaze and across the City, and this development might deliver at least 42 out of 140 homes in a mixture of houses and apartments. The other issue for Lockleaze is that because of the nature of all of the recent developments in the ward, they have attracted the absolute minimum of CIL and S106 payments because of the affordable housing component. Subsequently, Lockleaze has not had its fair share of infrastructure investment in things like Bus Services, Active Travel and even spaces in Health centres. The area committee system does not have the budget to match this shortfall.

However, I cannot support a development that is not fit for purpose by it having a single access route onto Dovercourt Road - this application is, after all, titled - *Application for Outline Planning Permission for up to 140 residential dwellings. All matters except means of access to the site reserved.* The access issues outweigh the other considerations. It is too narrow and will lead to collisions on Dovercourt Road or the access road itself.