

**Bristol City Council**  
**Minutes of the Development Control A**  
**Committee**  
**20 September 2023 at 6pm**



**Members Present:**

**Councillors:** Richard Eddy (Chair), John Geater, Fi Hance, Tom Hathway, Philippa Hulme (Vice Chair), Fabian Breckels (substituting for Chris Jackson), Farah Hussain, Paula O'Rourke and Andrew Varney.

**Officers in Attendance:**

Simone Wilding – Chief Planner, Roy Pinney – Legal Services, Pip Howson - Transport Development Manager and Allison Taylor - Democratic Services

**1 Welcome, Introduction and Safety Information**

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

**2 Apologies for Absence**

These were received from Councillor Jackson with Councillor Breckels substituting.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

None were received.

**4. Minutes of the Previous Meeting.**

Councillor Eddy proposed that as there had been Public Forum submissions for the minutes of 31 May & 9 August these would be heard in advance of consideration of the minutes and this was agreed. It was also agreed that the minutes be considered in the order as set out below.

**9 August 2023.**

**SCAN – Supplementary Question – ‘When might the webcast of 9 August be reinstated onto BCC’s website?’**



**Response from Councillor Eddy – ‘I am working behind the scenes to reinstate this webcast as soon as possible in order to review what was said in relation to SCAN’s query. In the meantime I move that the minutes be deferred to the next DC A Committee on 1 November 2023’**

This was seconded by Councillor Varney and was accepted by the Committee without requiring a vote.

### **31 May 2023.**

The Committee heard statements in relation to the Broadwalk Shopping Centre Minute.

The Committee’s Legal Advisor stated that the wording of the resolution was an accurate representation of the protocol, namely a ‘cooling off period’, followed by the LPA where an application was recommended by officers for approval but where a Committee wished to refuse the application. The absence of the minutes being agreed did not change the legal effect of the decision to grant planning permission on 5 July 2023.

There was discussion regarding the accuracy of the resolution and Councillor Eddy moved an additional 2 bullet points which would act as a clarifying note to the resolution as follows:-

- *Members were unanimously minded to refuse but could not take a formal decision as the reasons for refusal were not before them.*
- *The process of deferral is a matter of procedure, as the formal decision could not take place until the application had returned to Committee at a future meeting.*

This was seconded by Councillor Hulme and on being put to the vote it was lost 3 for, 5 against, 1 abstention.

Councillor Varney then moved an amendment to the wording of the resolution as follows:-

*‘Resolved – (Unanimously) – That the application be refused on the grounds of the proposed density of housing per hectare and that the application be returned to a future meeting to consider the officer’s suggested reasons for refusal’*

This was seconded by Councillor Hance and on being put to the vote it was:-

**Resolved – (6 for, 1 against & 2 abstentions) that the minutes of 31 May 2023 be agreed subject to the following amendment:-**

**Minute 14b – 22/03924/P Broadwalk Shopping Centre Resolution – ‘Resolved – (Unanimously) – That the application be refused on the grounds of the proposed density of housing per hectare and that the application be returned to a future meeting to consider the officer’s suggested reasons for refusal’**



## 5 July 2023.

A Councillor wished it to be noted that she did not think the Committee's procedures were sufficiently transparent and had not met the expectations of the public.

The Committee's Legal Advisor stated that the minutes were an accurate representation of process and confirmed that there had been a proper discharge of BCC planning functions.

Councillor Eddy moved approval of the minutes and this was seconded by Councillor Varney and being put to the vote it was:-

**Resolved (6 for, 3 abstentions) – That the minutes of 5 July be agreed as a correct record of the meeting.**

## 5. Action Sheet.

Councillor Eddy stated that Actions 1 & 3 on Enforcement were the same. The Chief Planner reported that a recent survey had been carried out by the Royal Town Planning Institute on Enforcement (Link to survey provided below). 90% of Local Authorities (LA's) responded that they were struggling to resource enforcement cases, 70% of LA's were finding it difficult to recruit enforcement officers. Her team were under resourced and very stretched. Councillor Eddy agreed that it would not be helpful to take up officers limited resources with reporting on enforcement but instead to report back in 6 months' time. Items 1 & 3 could therefore be removed from the Action Sheet.

[RTPI | Almost 90% of Local Authorities surveyed struggling with backlog of planning enforcement cases](#)

Item 2 – Wyevale Garden Centre – The Chief Planner reported that 3 of the 4 appeals had been dismissed. A reissue notice was being pursued for the final appeal. This outcome was testament to the quality of work of the team. The team was now working with the applicant to force the notices and she was not aware of any time limit

## 6. Appeals

Item 67 – East Dundry Road – It was noted that this appeal had been allowed due to non-determination. The Chief Planner confirmed that this was related to the backlog of applications to process. The Committee heard that applications were not processed sequentially but prioritised on a number of criteria such as public interest & community & economic impact.

## 7. Enforcement

There was nothing further to report.



## 8. 23/01693/F - 27A Stonebridge Park Bristol BS5 6RP

An Amendment Sheet was provided to the Committee in advance of the meeting, detailing changes since the publication of the original report.

The Case Officer summarized the key aspects of the application for the benefit of the Committee and the following points arose from questions:-

1. It was acknowledged that there was no material planning consideration for refusing the application but there were residents' concern about residential amenity. The Case Officer confirmed that it would be necessary to accept on face value that the applicant would manage the development closely;
2. It was noted that there were also concerns around construction disturbance but it was understood that part of the development would be pre-fabricated which would help in reducing the construction time;
3. It was not clear if the Management Plan was a new or adapted one. As the development was single storey there was no impact on neighbouring properties in terms of shadowing or overlooking. There had been no objections from Pollution Control in respect of noise and disturbance from the existing premises. CCTV was proposed;
4. Details of the bin storage can be secured by condition.;
5. Secured by design condition could be imposed;
6. It was noted that the scheme was not ancillary to the open space so it was contrary to policies BCS9 & DM17. It was understood that that the open space would contribute to tenants mental wellbeing;
7. Substantial weight was given to the need for housing;
8. The Management Plan condition could become an enforcement action should there be non-compliance;
9. The Committee needed to consider whether the possibility of ASB on site could be controlled with what the applicant had put forward. Pollution Control had indicated they were satisfied and the Police had no objections.;
10. The development was in a sustainable location;
11. A condition would be attached to the permission which required 56 trees to be planted to ensure compliance with BNG net gain.

The following points arose from debate:-

1. The need for housing was very important. The location seemed sustainable and there was an understanding of the open space rationale. Tree standard numbers were being met. Secured by design condition should be imposed to protect nearby residents and the Management Plan needed to be as robust as possible to support residents. The application was supported;
2. The need for housing should be given great weight. There was concern regarding ASB for local residents and it was hoped that the operator would work to improve relationships with residents. The application was supported;



3. The Management Plan should be stronger than the current one and enforceable in order to protect residents and allow them to feel safe. There was a housing crisis. The application was supported;
4. There were no objections from Statutory Consultees and significant material considerations to support the application subject to conditions for bin storage a robust Management Plan and Secured by design being imposed;
5. All debate concluded Councillor Eddy moved the officer recommendation including the conditions for enclosed bins, a robust Management Plan and Secured by design. Councillor Breckels seconded the motion and on being put to the vote it was:-

**Resolved (Unanimous) – That the Committee delegate authority to grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the report after the public consultation period has expired and if no further significant objections were raised and subject to the additional conditions in the Amendment Sheet and the following conditions imposed by the Committee:-**

- Bins to be enclosed within the development;
- Secured by design;
- A robust Management Plan.

**9. Date of next meeting.**

1 November at 2pm.

The meeting ended at 8pm.

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

