

Bristol City Council
Minutes of the Development Control B Committee
Meeting
10th May 2023 at 2.00 pm



Members Present:

Councillors: Ani Stafford-Townsend (Chair), Lesley Alexander, Lorraine Francis (part), Katja Hornchen, Guy Poultney, and Chris Windows

Officers in Attendance:

Peter Westbury (Team Manager, Development Management) Presenting Officers (Development Management) and Norman Cornthwaite (Democratic Services)

1 Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information

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



2 Confirmation of the Chair

It was confirmed that Cllr Ani Stafford-Townsend had been appointed Chair of the Committee.

3. Confirmation of the Vice-Chair

It was confirmed that Cllr Chris Windows had been appointed Vice-Chair of the Committee.

4. Membership of the Committee

The Membership was noted.

5. Terms of Reference

The Terms of Reference for the Committee were noted.

6. Dates of Future Meetings

The dates of future Meetings of the Committee were agreed.

7. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllrs Ali, Breckels and Classick.

8. Declarations of Interest

None were received.

9. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 5th April 2023

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were agreed as a correct record.

10. Action Sheet

There was nothing to report.

11. Appeals

The Team Manager, Development Management introduced the report.

12. Enforcement



The Team Manager, Development Management introduced the report.

13. 22/05943/X - (Bathurst Basin Bridge Commercial Road) Land Between the A370 Long Ashton Bypass in North Somerset and Cater Road Roundabout

The Team Manager, Development Management explained that this item had been removed from the Agenda at the request of the applicant to enable all options for the site to be considered.

14. 21/03767/F - 102 Gloucester Road, Bishopston

(Cllr Francis arrived at the Meeting during this item and did not participate in it.)

The Presenting Officer introduced the report, summarised it for everyone and gave a presentation.

The application is for the construction of 17 apartments following part demolition of building replaced with new build and conversion of existing first floor and loft spaces. Retention of retail at ground floor. (Major).

The following answers were provided to questions:

- It was confirmed that there is a filling station opposite the site on Berkeley Road
- It was confirmed that Bristol Waste have agreed to the proposed arrangements for the collection of waste from the development
- The turning circle for delivery tankers was explained
- It is proposed to provide two additional on street parking spaces, but it may be possible to provide a third one depending on traffic regulations
- The Transport Development Manager confirm that the parking proposals are indicative and are not confirmed, but that any changes under S 278 would be governed by highway safety requirements
- Arrangements for the tanker deliveries are not a planning matter and when the TRO procedures are triggered it will necessitate a road safety audit and it may be necessary to ask the filling station to consider changing its arrangements for the tanker deliveries
- Future residents would not be entitled to any parking permits; there is an Advice Note relating to this
- National Planning Policy is to encourage the use of sustainable locations and this is one of the more sustainable locations in the city; there is a frequent bus service and it is assumed that not every occupant of the flats will own a car, and there is adequate cycle storage within the site
- The units have been assessed and meet the required space standards taking into account the size of the bedrooms; only separate rooms and rooms with ventilation and outlook can be considered as bedrooms; the top floor flats have more space but have sloping roofs; room widths and storage areas are also taken into account; it is accepted that the scheme may not meet every element of the assessment but overall it is considered to be acceptable



- It is difficult in urban locations to always provide dual aspect units so it is accepted that urban developments will often tend to be single aspect units
- In the Urban Living SPD a minimum density of 50 dwellings per hectare is sought; this scheme proposes 95 dwellings per hectare

Debate

- Concerns about space standards and the high density of the scheme (It was noted that the original scheme included a large retail area and the new proposal includes a smaller retail area but more residential units as the chapel is now included in the scheme.)
- As the previous scheme was approved it would be difficult to refuse this on density and floor space
- The non-availability of parking permits for residents will help address parking concerns
- Concerns about the recommendation to approve; area very well known; very busy junction; the filling station with a car wash is opposite the site; this proposal is overdevelopment; the single aspect is not good; will not support approval

In response to questions and comments about the parking spaces that are proposed, the Team Manager, Development Management advised that the scheme is not dependent on the provision of the parking spaces and it would not be refused if the three possible parking spaces could not be provided. It is an acceptable scheme.

The Conditions to be attached to any planning approval were summarised for everyone.

Councillor Stafford-Townsend moved the Officer Recommendation to Grant the application.

There was no seconder for the motion so it Fell without being voted on.

- Concerns about the density, space standards and the design; however there were also concerns about BCC losing an appeal if the application were to be refused

The Team Manager, Development Management advised that the application has been assessed and the Officer view is that there are sufficient grounds to grant the application. Officers have been mindful of meeting housing requirements. It is a previously developed site. It is accepted that at times it is impossible to meet all the required standards. The building is unoccupied. The previous scheme was approved. Some employment areas have been given over to residential. There will be other schemes like this that do not meet all the required standards. It is an acceptable scheme. If it is not acceptable, it has to be refused, but Officers would have difficulties in finding reasons for refusal.

- The space in the new application is more than in the previously approved scheme
- Although it was suggested that a decision on the application be deferred pending a site visit, it was noted that site visits are not always well attended, it was also not clear what a visit to this site would achieve



Councillor Windows moved Refusal of the application on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site, concerns about road safety and the limited aspect for the residents.

Councillor Hornchen seconded the motion.

On being put to the vote it was

Resolved Voting 3 for (Cllrs Alexander, Hornchen and Windows) and 2 against (Cllrs Poultney and Stafford-Townsend) – that the application be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site, concerns about road safety and the limited aspect for the residents; and that a further report on the reasons for refusal be brought before the next Meeting of the Committee.

14. 22/06080/FB - Capricorn Place Pontoon Hotwell Road BS8 4SX

The Presenting Officer introduced the report, summarised it for everyone and gave a presentation.

The scheme is for the construction of pontoon infrastructure to deliver a mooring facility including storage facilities and amenities building and installation of floating reed beds.

The following answers were provided to questions:

- Consultation with residents had taken place by letter and site notice, as well as various pre application discussions with the Harbour Office
- A Statement of Community Involvement has been submitted; there were Drop In Sessions that took place in October/November 2022 attended by 25 residents
- The Harbour Office has clauses relating to requiring riggings to be made secure when the boats are moored; there has been no wind impact assessment as it is not a residential application
- The moorings will be for leisure boats, not residential; the maximum length of boats would be 11 metres
- There are strict By Laws concerning the mooring of vessels and ensuring that they are secure; the licences for mooring the boats that have to be obtained from the Harbour Master, which include strict conditions about the mooring of boats
- The nearby moorings are also near residential properties
- The application is only for infrastructure which does not in itself generate noise
- Only leisure licences will be issued
- The Air Quality Officer has been consulted and the development does not fall under the Clean Air Zone that relates to vehicles and highways
- There will be electrical connections for the boats and the use of solid fuels will not be permitted
- There are adjacent car parks but the development is not expected to generate a lot of vehicle movements



- The application is only for 34 moorings
- An indicative drawing shows a boat with a 12 metres mast; this would not block anyone's view or light
- In relation to residential amenity and noise, the structure itself does not generate noise and there has been no issues raised by Pollution Control concerning noise impact; riggings are required to be tied up as part of the licence conditions; noise that comes from boats that are tied up cannot be assessed and are not part of the planning regime, they relate to the operation of boats which is not a planning matter
- There are By Laws relating to fire precautions and fire safety is the responsibility of the Fire Service and the Harbour Office
- The Ecologist has confirmed that there will be no adverse effects on any bats that live in the vicinity; bats are used to living in this type of environment

Debate

- Although not a material consideration, the development will help with viability of the harbour going forward
- Concerns about the consultation and the impact that a grant of the application may have on the residents and with the hope that this can be mitigated
- It was noted that many of the concerns raised by residents did not relate to planning issues, but to the licensing of the boats for the use in the harbour
- In response to comments about the appearance of the pontoon, the Presenting Officer showed a photo of Brunel Quay and described what the proposed pontoon would look like
- The adjacent pontoon looks like a marina and looks lovely at present
- There is a height difference between the boats and the flats so anyone on the boats could not look into the flats
- In response to comments about the consultation process, the Team Manager, Development Management confirmed that consultation had taken place in October/November 2022 with stakeholders invited to take part; residents' comments were taken into account when the Committee report was prepared; residents also made representations at this Meeting; the entire consultation process has been done in accordance with the legal requirements
- Concerns about residential amenity in relation to the noise generated by the boats' masts; there are also concerns about the pollution generated by the boats' engines
- It was noted that only material planning issues can be taken into account when making a decision on the application
- The Team Manager, Development Management confirmed that the consultation had included Drop In Sessions to which residents were sent invitations; 25 residents attended; the Statement of Community Involvement accompanied the planning application; there were also opportunities for residents to comment on the planning application as well as being able to submit Public Forum Statements for today's Meeting



- In response to comments about material planning considerations, the Team Manager, Development Management confirmed that noise and residential amenity are both material planning considerations and have been taken into account in the Committee report; issues about boats are not material planning considerations and are the responsibility of the Harbour Office

Councillor Stafford-Townsend moved the Officer Recommendation to Grant the application

Councillor Hornchen seconded this motion.

The result of the Vote was 3 for (Cllrs Francis, Hornchen and Stafford-Townsend) and 3 against (Cllrs Alexander, Poultney and Windows).

The Chair, Cllr Stafford-Townsend used her casting vote to vote for the motion and it was

Resolved – that the application be Granted subject to Conditions.

The Meeting ended at 5.20 pm.

The next Meeting of the Committee is on 13th June 2023 at 6.00 pm.

Chair _____

