# **MINUTES**

OF THE MEETING OF THE

### CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

HELD AT CITY HALL ON

## TUESDAY 20<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2018

#### **Members Present:**

Quentin Alder Victorian Society (Chair)

Mike Bone Avon Industrial Buildings Trust and Bristol Industrial Archaeological Society

Linda Edwards Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society
Andrew Kenyon Redland and Cotham Amenities Society
Julie Laming Neighbourhood Planning Network

David Martyn Bristol City Council

Tony Mason Montpelier Conservation Group
Jeremy Newick Kingsdown Conservation Group
Richard Pedlar Society of Bristol Architects

Margaret Cartledge Observer

#### 1 Apologies for absence:

Izaak Hudson, Roger Leech, Stephen Wickham

#### **2** Declarations of Interest:

JML 1-13 & 15-19 Stokes Croft 18/00695/F

#### **3** Minutes of previous meeting:

Roger Leech should be added to the list of those present

4. **Matters arising:** None

**5. Policy Items:** None

#### 6. Pre Application Enquiries and Consultations:

#### 6.1 2-16 Clifton Down Road

The Panel was surprised and disappointed that consent for demolition had been granted several years ago without an approval for a new building or a signed building contract. The pre-application consultation documents were somewhat

limited in scope and information. They failed to include a context drawing showing the proposed building within the setting of the street scene, and specifically in relation to the buildings on either side. The viability of several of the retail spaces with very small floor areas at ground floor level, particularly on Kings Road is questionable. A generous public realm was described but could not be found on the drawings. The position of the front boundary was questioned.

The Panel referred to the reason for refusal of the previous application (14/04500/F) which were still relevant as follows:

The proposed development would be unacceptable by reason of its failure to deliver high quality urban design and to contribute positively to the Clifton Conservation Area's character and identity, creating and reinforcing local distinctiveness. The proposals would fail to enhance the elements of the Clifton Conservation Area that contribute to its special character and appearance.

Specifically, the development would fail to: respect or restore the local pattern and grain of development, including the historical development of the area; to respond appropriately to the scale, massing and proportion of existing buildings; to reflect locally characteristic architectural styles, rhythms, patterns, features and themes taking account of their scale and proportion and to be arranged in a coherent way that contributes positively to the overall design approach of the building. It would fail to ensure that all of the materials proposed would be high quality and of an appropriate texture, colour, character and appearance that would contribute positively to the area.

The proposals would be contrary to Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policies BCS21 and BCS22 of the Bristol Core Strategy and Policies DM26, DM29 and DM31 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document.

The proposals would also fail to preserve the setting of the adjacent nearby listed buildings of and would fail in this respect to be in accordance with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Policy BCS22 of the Bristol Core Strategy and Policy DM31 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document.

#### 7 Planning and Listed Building Applications:

#### **7.1 11-13 and 15-19 Stoke Croft -** 18/00695/F

The Panel supports this application.

The application is welcomed and the positive response to the pre-application submission is reiterated. The Panel welcomed the modest scale and proposed lively uses for the area although there was scope for a further increase in height in this location. Good use had been made of the existing building fabric and it was considered that the new build elements were acceptable. The slight change of internal arrangement was not considered to have an impact on the latest scheme.

#### **7.2 80** Park Street - 18/00545/LA

The Panel supports this application.

The reinstatement of the upper floors to self contained residential dwellings is welcomed. The removal of the front staircase is welcomed, however the quality and scope of the building audit is somewhat flimsy. A more thorough assessment needs to be undertaken before a decision can be made on the scale of alterations to the building. In particular it fails to note the presence of original doors, which are apparent in photographs of the 1st and 2nd floors. All original features should be retained as these are historically significant.

#### **7.3 35d Lower Redland Road -** 18/00251/F

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel was concerned that the proposal would be an over-intensification of the site. The outlook from the new kitchen would be onto the bin/bike store area. If the new upper storey were visible from Evans Road it would have an adverse effect on this part of the conservation area. The public benefit generated by an increase in the size of the residential unit does not outweigh the harm caused. It is contrary to relevant heritage policies and the NPPF.

#### 7.4 Land to the rear of 103 Whiteladies Road - 18/00509/LA

The Panel supported this application.

The Panel recognised the amendments to the previously withdrawn application. The reduction in the number of bedrooms was welcomed and the gable to Hampton Lane at 2.5 storeys high was more appropriate. The proposed standing seam metal roof was not considered appropriate as it would be visible from the rear of listed building on Whiteladies Road and should be natural slate.

#### **7.5 90 Hotwell Road -** 17/06842/H

The Panel objects to this application.

The application proposal is completely unacceptable.

#### **7.6 8 Ivywell Road -** 18/00220/F

The Panel objects to this application.

The proposed additional storey is unacceptable within the context of the conservation area. This carriage house is an important part of the character of the conservation area. The increase in height would unbalance the appearance of this range of small scale buildings. The harm caused to this heritage asset is not outweighed by any public benefit. As such it is contrary to relevant policies and the NPPF.

#### 7.7 Former Shirehampton Social Club, Station Road, Shirehampton - 17/06965/F

The Panel objects to this application.

The Panel recognised there was an extant planning permission on the site. However, this is for maximum of a three storey height development. The new scheme raises most of this to four storeys which results in the loss of any coherence from the earlier permission. The design of narrow coloured gables does not relate to the character of the conservation area. The end north elevation is unacceptable.

The previous permission required walling stone to be retained and re-used in the new structure. This should be maintained.

The quality of this scheme does not accord with the quality and character of this part of the conservation area. The public benefits associated with residential development in this location does not outweigh the significant harm caused to the conservation area. As such it is contrary to relevant heritage policies and the NPPF.

#### 7.8 Former Bob's Gym, Bus Depot, Avonmouth Road - 18/00687/LA

The Panel is neutral.

The Panel welcomes the re-use of this building.

However, the cutting of windows into the main doors of this listed building is unacceptable. Not only would this adversely affect the appearance and character of the heritage asset but it could also adversely affect the structural integrity of the doors. Natural light can be provided with more roof lights in the rear roof slope which is not visible from Ayonmouth Road.

The mezzanine structure would be acceptable if freestanding and independent of the existing structure. It must also be set back from the front wall so that the doors can continue to be operated. Rather than accepting the existing condition of the doors the owner should ensure they are maintained in working condition.

#### **7.9** The Coach House, Stoke Hill - 18/00673/F

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel notes that this is a resubmission of a lapsed permission, granted in 2014.

#### **7.10 26 Baldwin Street -** 18/00274/F

The Panel object to this application.

The Panel does not support the alterations to this locally listed building and its adverse impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. The public benefits associated with this scheme do not outweigh the harm caused to relevant heritage assets and is contrary to policy and the NPPF.

#### **7.11 111 Whiteladies Road -** 18/00918/LA

The Panel objects to this application.

The scale, siting, form, mass and overall design of the proposed infill extension is unacceptable. It detrimentally alters the established plan form, particularly the original rear reception room and remaining courtyard space at the rear of the building. It removes the lower stage of the existing privy wing and obstructs and covers the existing original rear window. It would result in the removal of curtilage listed pennant stone boundary walls and incorporate unsympathetic materials (UPVC). Taken together this causes substantial harm to the building, associated Grade II listed terrace and the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. This significant harm is not justified nor outweighed by any identified public benefits. It is contrary to relevant heritage policies and the NPPF.

#### 7.12 Blaise Castle House, Henbury Road - 18/00365/LA

The Panel supports this application.

The Panel has no objection to the proposal, but would urge that the building be occupied in order to protect it from vandalism.

#### **8** Any Other Business:

Update on the BRI application - this was recently refused at planning committee. In 2012 both the hospital and chapel were not listed. However the Chapel has now been listed. Unite has submitted a further application for immunity from listing of the wider Hospital building. Historic England is currently looking at this application.

#### 9 Future Meetings:

17<sup>th</sup> April, 15<sup>th</sup> May, 19<sup>th</sup> June, 17<sup>th</sup> July, 21<sup>st</sup> August, 18<sup>th</sup> September, 16<sup>th</sup> October, 20<sup>th</sup> November & 18<sup>th</sup> December