

**Bristol City Council**  
**Minutes of the Development Control A**  
**Committee Meeting**  
**5<sup>th</sup> July 2023 at 6.00 pm**



**Members Present:**

**Councillors:** Richard Eddy (Chair), John Geater, Fi Hance, Tom Hathway, Philippa Hulme (Vice Chair), Farah Hussain, Chris Jackson, Ed Plowden and Andrew Varney.

**Officers in Attendance:**

Peter Westbury (Team Manager, Development Management), Presenting Officers (Development Management), Pip Howson (Transport Development Manager), Jim Cliffe (S106 and CIL Project Manager) and Norman Cornthwaite (Democratic Services)

**1 Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information**

Councillor Eddy welcomed everyone to the meeting and issued the safety information.

**2 Apologies for Absence**

There were none.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

None were received.

**4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2023**

It was agreed that consideration of these Minutes be deferred until a future Meeting of the Committee.

**5. Action Sheet**

The progress relating to each of the items was noted.



## 6. Appeals

The Team Manager, Development Management introduced the report.

## 7. Enforcement

The Team Manager, Development Management introduced the report.

## 8. 22/03924/P - Broadwalk Shopping Centre Broad Walk Bristol BS4 2QU

Councillor Eddy reminded everyone that the item had been adjourned from the last Meeting and that the Public Forum Statements received for that Meeting would be taken into account. He also reminded the Members that the item had been debated at great length at the previous Meeting and it would not be appropriate to rerun the same debate at this Meeting. The debate at this Meeting should concentrate on the update report presented by Officers with the Spokespersons summarising as previously agreed with them.

The Team Manager, Development Management introduced the report, summarised it for everyone and gave a presentation. He confirmed that there had been no amendment to the application and that Officers were suggesting reasons for refusal which could be debated and voted on. No final decision on the application had been taken.

The application is for Outline Planning Permission with some matters reserved - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed use scheme comprising residential units (Class C3), commercial floorspace (Class E), community use (flexible Class E/Class F2), library floorspace (Class F1), cinema/ theatre floorspace (Class sui generis), vehicle parking spaces, cycle parking, and associated landscaping, public realm, access and servicing arrangements, and circulation space. All matters reserved except for access. (Major)

The following answers were provided to questions:

- The level of affordable housing to be provided is policy compliant as it has been through a viability assessment; the application could not therefore be refused on the grounds of lack of affordable housing
- The scheme would provide 9.8% affordable housing through the planning system if it were to be approved; more affordable housing could be provided through for example Homes England Grant or other funding mechanisms, above that required by the planning approval
- There cannot be any control over or guarantees on the provision of more than 9.8% affordable housing; there will be ongoing viability reviews – to assess if the economic viability of the development has improved - carried out throughout the life of the development to see if any further affordable housing can be provided through the planning system, but there can be no guarantees about the required level of affordable housing being increased; the S106 Agreement



can only require a level of 9.8% affordable housing, even though the developer has indicated that they may be able/prepared to increase the level of affordable housing

- Should planning approval be given to this application, the issue of affordable housing could not be considered again in relation to reserved matters as it will have been dealt with in relation to this application for outline approval

## Debate

- Cllr Eddy stated that he had spoken in favour at the last Meeting will continue to support the application as he has great concerns about the future of Broadwalk Shopping Centre; this mixed use scheme is an opportunity to give certainty about the future of Broadwalk Shopping Centre and regenerate the area with the large investment proposed by this application; this scheme would bring a large financial investment into the area and create a substantial number of jobs; he acknowledged that there are major concerns about the scheme but noted this is an outline application and the height and massing do not exceed what was granted planning permission two years ago; Members need to consider very carefully the proposed grounds for refusal and decide if they are strong enough to win an appeal; he also acknowledged the concerns about the level of affordable housing being offered; he would be voting for the application as he considers on balance the merits of the scheme outweigh the disadvantages of the scheme; he is concerned that refusing the application would be very detrimental to Broadwalk Shopping Centre and could leave it without a future
- Cllr Hulme stated that she agreed with what Cllr Eddy has said and that having read the papers and listened to the Officer presentation, the planning balance has shifted more in favour of approval of the application; there are a lot of gains to be had from the scheme and many of the businesses in the area are in favour of the development; she acknowledged that the living conditions could be better with a lower density but this may be difficult to achieve on this site; the development would help regenerate the area and there are sustainability gains to be had in terms of energy efficiency and carbon reduction; there would be facilities provided for community use; the 9.8% affordable housing is not ideal but it is hoped that if the scheme is approved the applicant would work hard with partners to increase the level of affordable housing; will support the grant of the application as although it is not ideal it is best that be achieved
- Cllr Varney stated that the scheme has a lot of positive aspects to it, but the central objection of an over intensive development remains; will vote to refuse
- Cllr Hance stated that there had been a unanimous vote at the previous Meeting in terms of the Committee being minded to refuse the application dependant on Officers providing viable planning reasons for refusal and nothing has changed with the application, meaning the development would still be over intensive; will vote to refuse

Cllr Hance moved the Officer Recommendation that the application be Refused.

Cllr Varney seconded this Motion.



The Vote was 4 for (Cllrs Hance, Hathway, Plowden and Varney), 4 against (Cllrs Eddy, Hulme, Hussain and Jackson) and 1 abstention (Cllr Geater). Councillor Eddy then used his second (or casting) vote to vote against the Motion. The Motion was therefore LOST.

Cllr Eddy moved that the application be Granted subject to Conditions.

Cllr Jackson seconded this Motion.

The Vote was 4 for (Cllrs Eddy, Hulme, Hussain and Jackson), 4 against (Cllrs Hance, Hathway, Plowden and Varney) and 1 abstention (Cllr Geater). Councillor Eddy then used his second (or casting) vote to vote for the Motion. The Motion was therefore CARRIED.

It was therefore

**Resolved – that the application be Granted subject to Conditions.**

### **9. 22/01548/F - Christadelphian Meeting Room Church Hill Bristol BS4 4LT**

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

The application is for a change of use of a place of worship (Class F) to a ten-bedroom House in Multiple Occupancy (Sui Generis).

The following answers were provided to questions:

- The S106 contribution is required as it may be necessary to do some traffic management in the area in relation to the application, although this would not be agreed until the technical approval stage of the S278
- It was noted that the bus service mentioned in the report is no longer running but that there are alternative services on the adjacent A4 Bath Road
- Although the site is in the flood zone the Environment Agency do not have concerns about the risk of flooding due to the topography of the site
- The space plans have been assessed against HMO requirements including the measuring of head height in relation to the floor areas and assessing the space standard for each bedroom in relation to the licensing requirements
- The Management Plan was submitted after the report was completed and is referenced on the Amendment Sheet; Pollution Control have commented on it to ensure that there are no noise issues

Debate

- The application is policy compliant
- There have been reassurances provided concerning the Traffic Regulations



- The building has been unused for a number of years and nobody has come forward to make use of it; the building remaining empty will have a negative impact on the Conservation Area

Cllr Eddy moved the Officer Recommendation to Grant the application.

Cllr Varney seconded this Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

**Resolved – (Voting 9 for (Cllrs Eddy, Geater, Hathway, Hance, Hulme, Hussain, Jackson, Plowden and Varney), 0 against and 0 abstentions) that the application be Granted subject to Planning Agreement.**

#### **10. 22/03645/F - Basement Flat 4 Elliston Road Bristol BS6 6QE**

(Cllr Eddy advised Members that Cllr Poultney had been unable to submit a Public Forum Statement to support his referral of the application to Committee.)

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

The application is for a detached single storey structure to the rear of the property for use as gym/home office, erection of a boundary wall to the rear, and bin storage.

The following answers were provided to questions:

- There were no objections to the previous application
- It was confirmed that buildings are sometimes constructed without planning permission resulting in the permission having to be applied for retrospectively; however this at a developer's own risk as permission may not be granted

Debate

- The application is policy compliant

Cllr Eddy moved the Officer Recommendation that the application be Granted.

Cllr Jackson seconded the Motion.

On being put to the Vote it was

**Resolved – (Voting 9 for (Cllrs Eddy, Geater, Hathway, Hance, Hulme, Hussain, Jackson, Plowden and Varney), 0 against and 0 abstentions) that the application be Granted subject to Conditions.**



The Meeting ended at 7.25 pm.

The next Meeting of the Committee is on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2023 at 2.00 pm.

**Chair** \_\_\_\_\_

