

Committee 4th September 2024

Public Forum Response

Roger Sabido

1. *The Lawrence Weston Community Pub CBS, a community benefit society formed by residents to operate the Giant Goram, has never been approached by either the owners, or Development Management to explore mediating a solution. How aware are Development Management that the residents' CBS, closely supported by the Plunkett Foundation with both fund raising and business advice, has a well-developed business plan based on the Plunkett widely proven "More Than A Pub" model for urban community-owned facilities?*

We cannot answer for the owners on not approaching the Lawrence Weston Community Pub CBS as that would be a decision left to the owners. It is beyond the remit of Development Management to mediate a solution between the owner and the community group, we can only determine the application before us.

Development Management are aware that the site was made an asset of community value in June 2018 however was removed from the register in December 2020 following the expiry of the 18 month protected moratorium period. In January 2022, Hawkfield Homes (Bristol) Limited again notified Bristol City Council of their intent to dispose of the property as the 18 month moratorium period had expired, and no acceptable offer had been made.

2. *Were the Planning Officers made aware of the Owner's disgraceful action in removing the roof of this Locally Listed building and registered Asset of Community Value, which can and should be constituted as starting the demolition works?*

Whilst the site is locally listed it has no statutory protection from alteration or demolition. It appears that there has been no breach of planning control at the site.

3. *Did the Planning Officers take into account the ongoing Enforcement action against the Owners for failing to secure the site, removing the ground floor window & door shuttering, so leaving the site site and building open, and inviting vandalism?*

Planning applications have to be determined on their own merits, and any enforcement investigation is not material to the determination of the application. There is no current planning enforcement case at the site.

Jon Mackenzie

- 1 *How many reports did BCC receive regarding the property, and what action has been taken?*

It is not clear what 'reports' are being referred to, but there is no current planning enforcement investigation relating to this site.

2. *Why do the Planning Officers recommend the approval of the application when the application is clearly contrary to Bristol Local Plan Policy DM6, to the Planning Practice Note to DM6, and when the situation has not changed materially from previous planning application refusals, including the Decision by the Planning Inspectorate dismissing the Appeal against refusal of consent for 19/05311/F,*

The current application is materially different from the previous appeal decision as it now includes the provision of a micro-pub. The officer report provides an assessment against policy DM6, and also the other benefits that development would provide, and makes a balanced recommendation on that basis.

CAMRA

1. *The LW NPG is a formally recognised Neighbourhood Planning Forum under the Localism Act 2011 and is the author of the formally made Lawrence Weston Neighbourhood Development Plan.*

The Forum submitted a detailed, cogent, and authoritative objection to this application, published on 30th July 2024.

Why has the Case Officer ignored the very existence of this objection, claiming on page three that the Forum had not submitted an objection?

The objection was omitted in error and has been included in the amendment sheet circulated to Members before the meeting.

2. *Policy DM6 states that where applicants seek change of use for an established public house, 'the council will submit the viability assessment for independent validation, with any reasonable costs for the validation process met by the applicant'*

No such independent validation appears to have been sought or published – can the Case Officer please explain why?

As set out in the Officer Report, Officer's were not satisfied that sufficient evidence regarding viability had been submitted, and therefore considered that there was limited value in submitting what had been submitted to independent assessment. The recommendation on the applicaion was made following consideration of all of the material issues.

3. *With regards viability, the Case officer states on page 6 that 'In terms of fully responding to the criteria of the VT [Viability Test] the submission is considered unsatisfactory and would need more detailed consideration to meet all criteria as set out in the test'.*

With regards to Marketing, on page 7 the Case Officer concludes that 'sufficient evidence has not been provided the pub was marketed at a realistic price the robustness of the marketing campaign has not been proven'.

With regards to Alternative Provision, despite the error in giving the correct walking distance, the Case Officer admits on page 8 that 'given the location of the site and the lack of alternative provision in the locality within a reasonable walking distance, it is considered that criterion (ii) of Policy DM6 cannot be met in terms of alternative local provision'.

As set out above and in the Officer's Report, the recommendation has been made taking account of all of the material issues, including the provision of alternative accommodation for a micro-pub.