

Bristol City Council
Minutes of the Development Control A
Committee
24 July 2024 at 6pm



Members Present: Katja Hornchen - Chair, Al Al-Maghrabi, Sarah Classick, Ani Stafford-Townsend (substitute), Ellie Freeman, Zoë Peat, Serena Ralston Richard Eddy & Jenny Bartle (substitute)

Officers in Attendance: Jonathan Dymond – Deputy Head of Planning, Pip Howson – Transport Development Manager, Allison Taylor – Democratic Services

1 Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information

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

2 Apologies for Absence

These were received from Councillors Rob Bryher with Jenny Bartle as substitute and George Calascione with Ani Stafford-Townsend as substitute.

3. Declarations of Interest

There were none.

4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting.

Resolved – That the minutes of 5 June 24 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting.

5. Action Sheet.

There were no outstanding actions.



6. Appeals

The following was noted:-

1. Item 12 – Keynsham Garden Centre, Brislington – This would now be a full Public Inquiry starting in October 2024;
2. Officers were looking into recent appeal decisions and analysing why there had been a high number of appeals allowed.

7. Enforcement.

It was reported that a further Enforcement position update would come before the September Committee.

8. Public Forum.

The Committee noted written statements and heard from those submitters who wished to speak.

9. Planning and Development.

The following application was considered by the Committee.

9A. 22/01583/F - Rhubarb Tavern 30 Queen Ann Road Bristol BS5 9TX.

The Committee had regard to the contents of the Amendment Sheet.

The report was summarised for the benefit of the Committee and the following points arose from questions and discussion:-

1. Conditions would require the applicant to submit a Method Statement detailing how they would restore the pub and a site contract to show work on the pub prior to first occupancy;
2. There were trigger points at each stage should work on the pub not progress. Non-compliance would result in investigation as an enforcement matter;
3. It was noted that CAMRA did not support the application and disputed the applicant's viability report;
4. The pub had been closed for 5 years after the last landlord could not pay the rent as it was no longer viable. It has since fallen into disrepair and the costs of bringing it into use increased all the time;
5. It had been marketed in the last 5 years and there had been interested parties but there had been no other offers since January 24;
6. DM6 was not relevant as the pub was not being lost and was not therefore a material planning consideration;



7. The loss of some of the garden would equate to £1500 per week, but the increase in garden covers on the revised plans would approximately half this. Also, the landlord would now live above the pub so not incur costs elsewhere;
8. The value of the refurbishment cost was not a material planning consideration but had been considered by officers in the overall balance, which included looking at the potential for it to happen and giving it the best chance of not falling into disrepair. Officers were mindful of having a deliverable decision;
9. An independent study had found that the only way to make the pub viable was through development;
10. The Public Rights of Way team were content that the nearby PROW be extinguished as it ran into a brick wall and would be a place for crime or ASB. There were safer routes to walk around that area;
11. There would still be up to 54 covers in the garden if redeveloped;
12. The development would also shield nearby flats from noise which had previously caused harm;
13. Less than 10 dwellings did not meet the threshold for affordable housing;
14. The new flats would be subject to the Agent of Change provisions so that occupiers were clear in advance they could not complain;
15. The quality of insulation was acceptable and would mitigate noise concerns;
16. 1 flat would have a private garden and the other 5 would share a communal garden. There was good Bio Net Gain. Tree shrubs and planting was included which would increase shade and the development would provide a 20% reduction in carbon emissions;
17. An ecology report was deemed not necessary as there was not much ecology there. A condition could be included regarding protecting species and moving them to a wildlife corridor;
18. The application was supported. The development would revitalise the area, retain a community pub, provide desperately needed homes and provide jobs. The proposed landscaping was welcomed;
19. It was important to get the pub back in use and this appeared to be the only means of making it viable. There were not sufficient strong reasons to vote against it;
20. The application was supported on balance. The concrete conditions to ensure the pub was brought back into use eased concerns;
21. The strong community voice was noted. However, the concrete conditions regarding the phasing of the pub meant there were insufficient reasons to refuse;
22. The conditions were appreciated but there was concerns that once redeveloped the pub might prove not viable and DM6 then kicked in. It would not be supported;
23. The development would revitalise the community, bring housing and a pub and was to be supported. The concerns of residents was understood;
24. CAMRA's objection was strong and there was concern it would mean the loss of pub by stealth and was therefore not supported.

Discussion being complete the Chair moved the officer recommendation and it was:-

Resolved – (7 for, 2 against) That the application be granted subject to condition(s) including an additional condition regarding the protection of species and moving them to a wildlife corridor.

10. Date of next meeting.



2pm 4 September 2024.

The meeting ended at 7.10pm

Chair _____

