

**Bristol City Council**  
**Minutes of the Development Control A**  
**Committee**  
**15 November 2023 at 2pm**



**Members Present:**

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

**Officers in Attendance:**

Simone Wilding – Chief Planner, Transport Development Management Officer 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 Hulme with Councillor Breckels as substitute and from Councillor Hussain with Councillor Rippington as substitute.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

None were received.

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

The minutes of 9 August 2023 & 20 September 2023 were agreed as a correct record.

**Resolved - That the minutes of 9 August 2023 & 20 September 2023 be agreed as a correct record of the meeting.**



## 5. Action Sheet.

Item 2 could be removed as the action was complete.

## 6. Appeals

The following appeals were discussed:-

- 1. Item 68 – The Dower House, Henbury.** The Committee heard that this had been appealed because of non-determination and had been allowed by the Inspector as the applicant had produced additional information which had not been available at the time of submission to the LPA and which overcame concerns. It was also noted that when an appeal was submitted for non-determination the LPA could no longer determine the case as it had been taken out of their hands;
- 2. Items 51 & 52 - Arley Hill.** A Councillor expressed concern that an appeal against an enforcement notice had been allowed and asked for further details on the items and it was agreed that the Chief Planner report back outside of the meeting.

## 7. Enforcement.

Councillor Eddy noted that there were no notices listed and hoped to see some in the near future.

## 8. Public Forum.

**Mark Ashdown – Supplementary Question 1** - Is there any way to oblige the club to hold the 6-monthly meetings with the community as if not conditioned they may not happen?

The Chief Planner responded that officers could only condition what is necessary in planning terms. However it was in the club's interests to improve its relationship with the community given they wish to bring more planning applications in the future.

**Mark Ashdown – Supplementary Question 2** – To what extent is a Landscape Ecological Management Plan capable of being enforced if the club decided not to comply?

The Chief Planner responded that this was a unilateral undertaking, which is a legal contract, and therefore was enforceable.

Councillor Eddy, referencing a comment in Mark Ashdown's Public Forum Statement, asked officers to clarify the status of the documents released on the planning portal today in respect of this application. He was informed that the documents were minor revisions to existing documents and were in line with the report and provided updates on what was further progressed (in line with what had been indicated in the report). These



were therefore not raising new matters or presenting anything materially different. The Committee was reassured by this response and it was agreed to proceed.

### **9. 23/03826/F - The Memorial Stadium, Filton Avenue.**

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 stated that the application was for replacement of the current South and South- West Stands with a new improved facility to improve the number of seats within the Memorial Stadium, and new toilet facilities and concession stalls. It had been brought before the Committee as it had received 169 objections.

The following points arose from questions:-

1. It was anticipated that the regeneration of the Memorial Stadium would be in three stages. The current Travel Plan was appropriate for this application but would require updating for future applications;
2. It was not considered that painting the structure white was necessary to reduce the impact on light in some of the nearby properties;
3. The Transport Development Officer confirmed that there was scope for a Residents Parking Scheme as part of the Travel Plan should expansion continue and this would require parking surveys on match days and non-match days to gauge the need. Councillor Eddy noted that this option would need to be considered by a future administration after May 24 elections;
4. A Conservation Covenant to allow the public access to the habitat area was not possible as to do that the Secretary of State would need to designate "responsible bodies" (LPAs, NGOs, and others) to enter into them with the developer. Bristol City Council had neither been designated as one, nor applied to be one. Access to the area could be seen as a negative impact on biodiversity. It was for the Club to agree any access arrangements;
5. Ward Councillors and the community would be consulted as part of the Event Management Plan;
6. The reduction in light being considered minor was not an opinion but was an industry standard BRE compliant assessment;
7. It was not considered that a site visit would be beneficial to the Committee in determining the application;
8. The noise impact from outside the grounds on match days had not been considered as there was always people moving about in the area and there was background noise from traffic. Environmental health colleagues had not raised it as an issue. The Club would need to engage the Events Management Plan in order to manage and control all events;
9. The Biodiversity net gain calculations were based on pre-ground works commencing.



The following points arose from debate:-

1. It was noted that the Club wished to bring the grounds into the 21<sup>st</sup> century with modern facilities which was understandable. This naturally brought challenges within a dense urban environment with potential impacts on residential amenity, overshadowing of properties and gardens, loss of sunlight and noise pollution. However, there was reassurance with the Events Management Condition, the proposed community involvement and that only a small number of properties were affected by a minor light reduction. A longer term solution regarding transport and parking would be needed as the Club developed as part of a future active travel plan. The Club was encouraged to contribute to public transport. It was a positive scheme and the officer recommendation was supported;
2. It was regrettable that the Club had started development works before planning consent was obtained as they should set an example of high standards to the community. It was also regrettable that there had not previously been community engagement and it was hoped this would now improve. Public access to the habitat area might placate residents. Sustainability could be better but there was no reason not to support the officer recommendation;
3. Residents had been treated badly and it was unedifying to commence works before planning consent had been granted. Planning policies had been met and the officer recommendation would be supported;
4. The need for community engagement was echoed but there was no reason not to support the officer recommendation;
5. The Club should have done better in respect of community engagement. There was no material reason not to support the officer recommendation;
6. In respect of impact on neighbours' Residential Amenity and the usefulness of a site visit it was noted that a site visit would normally be considered before the application was due for determination. Councillor Eddy accepted this was an option but was not convinced that it would materially inform members;
7. There was broad support but unease in respect of lack of community engagement, documents going online today, impact on neighbouring houses. A site visit was supported;
8. There was some concern regarding the increase in noise and transport issues with an increased capacity but it was noted that the increased capacity had been there since 2018 and it was rarely met. On balance the officer recommendation was supported;

The proposal for a site visit was tested. It was moved by Councillor O'Rourke and seconded by Councillor Geater and on being put to the vote it was lost – 2 for, 7 against.

Councillor Eddy moved the officer recommendation and it was seconded by Councillor Varney and on being put to the vote it was:-

**Resolved – (8 for, 1 abstention) That the application be granted subject to Planning Agreement.**



**9. Date of next meeting.**

6pm 13 December 2023.

The meeting ended at 3.15pm.

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

