

## Public Document Pack

# Bristol City Council Minutes of the Development Control A Committee

21 December 2022 at 6pm



### Members Present:

**Councillors:** Richard Eddy (Chair), Paul Goggin, Fi Hance, Farah Hussain, John Geater, Tom Hathway, Philippa Hulme, Ed Plowden, Andrew Varney

**Officers in Attendance:** Gary Collins – Head of Development Management, Relevant Case Officers, relevant Transport Development Officers, Steve Gregory – Democratic Services

### 1. Welcome, Introductions and Safety Information

All parties were welcomed to the meeting.

### 2. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions.

No apologies received, committee noted that Councillor Farah Hussain arrived after the meeting had commenced and was not present during public forum business or the start of the officer introduction to the report for agenda item 9a and so was unable to take part in the debate and decision for that item.

### 3. Declarations of Interest.

Councillor Geater declared an interest in agenda item 9a, Footway Bridge, as this was in his electoral ward, and although he had actively worked for the opening and restoration of the footbridge, he came to the meeting without a decision in mind.

### 4. Minutes of the previous meeting held on 16 November 2022.

**Resolved – That the minutes of 16 November 2022 be agreed as a correct record and signed by Councillor Eddy.**

### 5. Action Sheet.

Councillor Eddy confirmed that DC A Committee's lead members had been consulted on the Colston Yard draft Construction Management Plan. A number of comments had been made to the case officer and lead members were broadly in favour of it.



## 6. Appeals

The appeals report was noted.

## 7. Enforcement.

There were two notices, both were noted accordingly. Arising from a question the Head of Development Management explained that there was 28-day window for compliance before any legal action was taken. If the notices were appealed against then this would appear on the next appeal report. If not, then each notice would be required to be complied with.

Noted that HMOs had a longer period to comply, and the planning enforcement team would also take into consideration the impact on tenants, this would mean looking at the tenancy agreement with a view to matching enforcement action with it to minimize the impact on tenants. If compliance failed, then the next step would be to apply to the Magistrate Court for a prosecution. This was a lengthy and sometimes costly process, but in these circumstances, it would be the only option open to the enforcement team.

## 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.

### 9a 22/02249/FB & 22/01149/LA : Footway Bridge Over Kings Weston Road Bristol

Councillor Farah Hussain did not take part in the debate or decision for this application.

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

The Officer summarized the report as follows:

The applications had been brought to the Committee due to the significance of the proposal to the entire city.

The purpose of the applications was to secure the repair and reinstatement of the iron Kings Weston footbridge and reduce the risk of vehicle traffic damage to the listed structure in the future.

The footbridge had been struck by an HGV in 2015, resulting in a section of the bottom rib on the north-east side being damaged. The bridge was closed to the public and a scaffold was erected to support the bridge. In 2017, BCC commissioned CH2M to conduct a Principal Inspection Report and identify a solution to prevent future structure strikes. In April 2018, the bridge was again struck by an HGV, destroying both spandrels on the western side of the bridge and detaching the south-eastern spandrel from the abutment.



The bridge would be reinstalled 1.074m higher than its current level as the required safe headroom for an existing structure, adjusted for the curve of the carriageway and the deflection on the bridge, was 5.49m. New concealed foundations would be installed and dressed in coursed rubble stonework to match adjacent road cutting walls. Steps would be added, 12 on the west side and 9 on the east side. Anti-slip resin step treads would be added to the front of each step.

No alterations would be made to the highway itself and the bridge would be reinstated as a footpath/footbridge and the width of the bridge would not be altered. Noted that the footbridge was not wide enough to comfortably accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists.

The officer recommendation was to approve the applications as it would facilitate the vital repair of an important listed structure and bring a public right of way back into use.

The following points arose from questions and debate:

- Regarding access to the footbridge a ramp was not considered as it was not a realistic option with the land available and would require a large area and a steep approach, it would also be more costly. The steps were also considered to be a more sympathetic option on aesthetic grounds and to comply with heritage aspects.
- Members noted that a previous application for the footbridge had been made in 2019, which had proposed ramps for access, but the land take was considered to cause harm regarding the site's heritage, on the advice of the highway team the application was withdrawn. Although this was not a formal decision this had been formally submitted as an application and had led to the steps option which was supported on heritage grounds.
- A cyclist's rail to assist pushing bikes up steps was not considered for this application as it was for a footbridge and not a cycle track and also for reasons of safety.
- Height restrictions could be emphasized by allowing signage to inform road users, although outside the remit of this application it would be possible to include this as a recommendation via an Advice Note. Noted that the bridge would be raised by 1.074m to avoid further collisions with high vehicles in accordance with new regulations.
- A suggestion to lower the road itself was considered a very expensive option which had not been formally called for and was outside of the remit of the current application.
- Local access groups had been fully consulted on the proposal and where there had been no response these were further chased up, it was emphasized that of the 97 letters sent out the vast majority were in support, with 36 in support and only 2 objections.
- Regarding Historic England's (HE) request for a s106 agreement to rebuild the bridge, members were advised that as BCC was the applicant it was not possible to have a legal agreement with itself, the best that could be achieved was a memorandum of understanding between BCC and HE.

Having regard to all the comments made Councillor Eddy moved that the applications be granted subject to an advice note regarding road signage about the height of the footbridge, this was seconded by Councillor Goggin.



On being put to the vote there were 8 for, none against and no abstentions.

**RESOLVED – That the applications be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and the inclusion of an advice note regarding road signage about the height of the footbridge.**

#### **9b 22/00805/F – 155-165 West Street Bedminster Bristol**

The application was referred to Committee due to the significant public interest it had received and was heard at Development Control Committee A on the 16 November 2022. The item was then deferred for Officers to further report on the suitability of student accommodation at the location of the development.

The scope of the update report was therefore limited to the matter of the location of the development and should be read in conjunction with the previous committee report. The recommendation made to Members was the same as the previous report, namely that the application be recommended for approval subject to a s.106 Agreement and conditions.

The Case Officer summarized the report as follows:

- Planning permission was sought to demolish existing buildings at the site, to facilitate the construction of student accommodation (19no. flats: 12no. studios, 7no. cluster flats) and a replacement employment unit Use Class E(g). The existing site was composed of a vehicle repair workshop and a car showroom.
- The development had been questioned on the grounds of student accommodation being located outside of the city centre, the proposal's location was also a key concern expressed by Members at the November Committee.
- The application complied with the general criteria of policy DM2 and would not harm the amenity and character of the locality, and nor would it create or contribute to a harmful concentration of student uses within the locality.
- The redevelopment site was on a brownfield site in an accessible location close to good public transport routes and the sustainable nature of the site's location was also recognised by the Council's future plan-making approach for South Bristol.
- The proposal met the expectations of policy BCS18, as it would help to diversify the housing stock in the area and adapt to a changing population where student numbers were expected to rise.
- The proposal would also reduce pressure on existing housing stock and contribute to Bristol's housing supply.
- Concerns about unacceptable levels of on-street car parking in the locality had been reviewed by Transport Development Management and it had been confirmed that there was sufficient capacity in the locality to safely accommodate any car parking associated with the development. A management plan had been provided to give reassurances to local residents regarding noise and disturbance.

The application was recommended for approval, subject to a s.106 Agreement and conditions.

The following points arose from questions and debate:



- Regarding affordable housing currently there was no policy about affordable rents for student accommodation however this would be considered during the Local Plan review.
- The West Street Neighbour Group was not involved at the original consultation stage as it was an informal self-serve group, not a listed formal designated group, such groups were not routinely notified in advance.
- Regarding the flat roof space for solar panels and the possibility for more to be included to reduce co2 output, members were informed that the target in the policy was for a 20% co2 reduction. With the developer's current proposal for heat pumps and solar panels they had already achieved a 38.4% reduction in co2 so it was not possible to insist on a higher standard, however the developer could be requested to provide more.
- Regarding active frontages the developer had done enough for an active frontage and had met design expectations.
- The building could perhaps be repurposed for other types of accommodation in the future such as a typical residential flat, but it was not possible to comment on the structural aspects of this at the current time.
- Space standards for students was not a consideration for this application but in future it was expected that space standards would be drawn up via national policy and SPG's. Also, the new local plan could consider this, consultations for the Local Plan would commence next year.
- On street parking and noise issues had been fully considered and a survey showed that there were 21 spaces available and the highest estimated figure regarding this development was 15 vehicles. A quality management plan, including 24/7 contact lines, would help mitigate noise issues and this had been successfully demonstrated on other similar developments.

Having regard to the comments made Councillor Eddy moved, seconded by Councillor Varney, that the application be granted subject to Conditions and a s106 agreement.

On being put to the vote there were 8 for and 1 against.

**RESOLVED – That the application be approved subject to Conditions and a s106 agreement.**

## **10. Date of Next Meeting**

1 February 2023 at 2pm (This meeting was subsequently cancelled).

The meeting ended at 7.10 pm

**CHAIR** \_\_\_\_\_

