

**PORTISHEAD & NORTH WESTON TOWN COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 2006**

The meeting was held in two parts –

**PART 1**

**PRESENT** Councillor Mrs Lord - in the Chair

Councillors Mrs Bickley, J S Clark, J H Clark, Mrs Cruse, Gething,  
Johnston, Howells, Mrs Mason, Pasley, Walters  
Mrs R Tranter – Assistant Clerk

Jonathan Gall – North Somerset Council’s Cycling Officer  
Alan Mathews – Portishead Railway Group

**APOLOGIES** Councillors Miss Griffiths, A McMurray, J McMurray, Miers  
Gordano Councils’ Transport Group

The Chairman informed the Committee of the order in which items would be dealt with and introduced the first item.

**PORTISHEAD TO BRISTOL CYCLE ROUTE –  
PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS**

North Somerset Council Cycle Officer, Jonathan Gall gave a short presentation on the proposed improvements utilizing the existing railway bridges at Royal Portbury Dock Road and Marsh Lane.

The proposals are to run the cycleway alongside the existing railway line under the road bridges avoiding the need to provide Tucan crossings on the roads above. The cost of the two Tucan crossings would be £100,000. There is also a considerable amount of money needed to provide maintenance for the lights (£2,500 per year) and their lifespan in approximately 15 – 20 years. There is no money available in the present budget for this work. This scheme on the table is a short-term solution and would cost between £10k - £25k. It will therefore pay for itself in 5 years against the maintenance costs of the lights.

In answering questions from councillors Mr Gall confirmed that –

- All parish councils were being consulted. Easton-in-Gordano Parish Council had already offered its support to the scheme. Further consultation would take place with user groups and Bristol Port Company.
- If the railway were to open there may be an option of the railway line and the cyclepath running alongside each other, separated by a fence. However clearance levels and Health & Safety issues would need to be studied.
- The pathway could be used by pedestrians and horses as well as cyclists as it was a multi-user route.
- The terms of Sustrans’ lease ensure that should the railway be opened the lease expires. The railway would not be compromised.

- Some existing sections of the cycleway which would be used considerably less if the plan goes ahead will continue to be maintained by North Somerset Council.
- This Route is well used by approximately 100 cyclists per weekday.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Standing orders were suspended to allow members of the public to address the committee.

Mr John Rickard, a member of the Portishead Railway Group addressed the committee. He was concerned that as no accidents had been reported at the two bridges where the alterations were to be made that this scheme was a waste of both North Somerset Council's officer's time and money. He also had concerns that when a previous scheme for diverting the cycleway under the M5 bridge was proposed (and then implemented), it was stated that discussions for an alternative route would be initiated for when the railway might re-open. These do not appear to have been progressed.

Reyna Knight, 15 Cabstand, asked about the costings for the proposed scheme and the need for the Town Council to ensure that safeguards for the railway were in writing.

Standing orders resumed.

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Mrs Bickley

- Personal Interest in Portishead to Bristol Cycle Route - Proposed Improvements  
Reason – Member of the Portishead Railway Group

Councillor Johnston

- Personal Interest in Portishead to Bristol Cycle Route - Proposed Improvements  
Reason – Member of Sustrans.

Councillor Mrs Lord

- Personal Interest in Portishead to Bristol Cycle Route - Proposed Improvements  
Reason – Member of the Portishead Railway Group

### **Declaration by members who serve on both the Town and District Council**

Councillors J H Clark, Gething, Johnston, Walters stated that any views they expressed on matters to also be considered at North Somerset Council would be provisional and based on the facts currently known. They would be exercising their rights to reconsider the matter afresh when the matter went before North Somerset Council.

## **SECTION 1 – CONSIDERED BY PLANNING COMMITTEE**

This item was dealt with first by the Committee.

### **PORTISHEAD TO BRISTOL CYCLE ROUTE – PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS**

The Committee discussed this item and took the opportunity to ask The Cycling Officer to clarify a few further points.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The Town Council welcome the safer route for those who wish to cycle, subject to the following –

- The route for the proposed railway is safeguarded by legally binding conditions, so that any permission for the railway bridges to be utilized is immediately rescinded once the track is needed for the railway re-opening.
- The financial cost of reinstating the route should not fall back on the railway.

The Chairman thanked Mr Gall for attending the meeting.

Part 1 of the meeting closed at 7.50pm.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **PART 2**

This meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

**PRESENT** Councillor Mrs Lord - in the Chair

Councillors Mrs Bickley, J S Clark, J H Clark, Mrs Cruse\*, Gething,  
Johnston, Howells, Mrs Mason, Walters\*  
Mrs R Tranter – Assistant Clerk

Councillors Mrs Cruse and Walters left the meeting at 9.25pm after the  
Planning Application 06/P/2436/F Essex House, 111 High Street

**APOLOGIES** Councillors Miss Griffiths, Pasley, A McMurray, J McMurray, Miers

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were approximately 30 members of the public present.

Standing orders were suspended to allow two members of the public to address the Committee.

Mr John Smith, 10 Springfield Road, Portishead spoke against the application made by Linden Homes to develop the site at 32 West Hill, Portishead, the site of Vale Vets. Mr Smith informed the Committee that he was speaking on behalf of 46 residents of the area surrounding the development site. The main concerns were –

- Demolishing a late 18<sup>th</sup> century landmark building – part of Portishead's heritage.
- Devastating a green habitat for wildlife.
- Massive disruption, noise and dust during the building phase.
- Creating a huge parking problem, as existing residents use Springfield Road for parking and this will now be restricted.

- Increased traffic hazard on a narrow section of West Hill where Springfield Road forms a blind junction.
- Loss of light, sunlight and privacy to the Springfield Road terraced houses. The development proposed is 4 storeys above the road and will tower over the existing houses.
- The proposed buildings are out of keeping with their surroundings.
- Risk of damage to the water table, springs and foundations of existing properties and St Joseph's Church.
- Increasing global warming as trees and greenery are being removed from the site. More houses will also create more heat and use non-renewable energy supplies.

Mr Smith also added that a more modest but sympathetic development involving renovation and conversion of the existing building preservation of trees and wildlife could provide an acceptable alternative to Portishead Residents.

Mr B Ford, 6 Conference Close, Portishead spoke on behalf of local residents against the application made by Linden Homes for developing the site at Moor, Farm, Portbury. The residents of Conference Close, which lies within The Vale boundary have a number of concerns –

- 56 Dwellings are proposed on a 1.1 hectare site giving a density of 56 per hectare. This contravenes PPG3 which recommend 35 per hectare.
- The increase in traffic out on to Sheepway.
- Removing 6 metres of mature hedgerow in 2 places to form access ways for the development. This is contra to DEFRA 1997 guidelines.
- Loss of Privacy - this is not acceptable for residents as there will be overlooking from the 2/3 storey blocks towards those properties which already exist on The Vale.
- Noise disturbance.
- Connecting drains to the existing drains in The Vale where there are already problems.

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor J H Clark

- Personal Interest in Planning Application 06/P/2436/F, Essex House, 111 High Street, Portishead  
Erection of a first floor balcony with fire escape  
Reason – acquainted with applicant.

Councillor Gething

- Personal Interest in Planning Application 06/P/2247/F 32 West Hill, Portishead  
Demolition of existing building and erection of 14 dwellings, car parking, landscape and associated works  
Reason – the site is close to his residence.

Councillor Johnston

- Personal Interest in Planning Application 06/P/2436/F, Essex House, 111 High Street, Portishead  
Erection of a first floor balcony with fire escape  
Reason – acquainted with applicant.

## **Declaration by members who serve on both the Town and District Council**

Councillors J H Clark, Gething, Johnston, Walters stated that any views they expressed on matters to also be considered at North Somerset Council would be provisional and based on the facts currently known. They would be exercising their rights to reconsider the matter afresh when the matter went before North Somerset Council.

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Both the applications made by Linden Homes, 32 West Hill and Moor Farm, were dealt with out of order as they were of interest to the members of the public present at the meeting.

### **06/P/2247/F                    32 WEST HILL, PORTISHEAD**

Demolition of existing building and erection of 14 dwellings, car parking, landscape and associated works

Members noted that several documents submitted as part of the planning application contained incorrect information.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Object to the planning application on the following grounds –

- Incorrect information provided by the developer;
- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Detrimental to the amenity of the neighbours and wild life;
- Concerns with highway access and parking; and
- Out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Comments on the Transportation Document and the Tree Survey circulated to councillors will be attached for North Somerset Council.

The decision of the Committee was unanimous.

### **06/P/2389/RM                    MOOR FARM, SHEEPWAY, PORTISHEAD**

Submission of reserved matters of layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping for residential development of 56 dwellings with access roads, parking, conversion of barn and associated hard and soft landscaping pursuant to outline approval

Members noted that this application is within the parish boundary of Portbury and already has outline permission. Members were very concerned about the very high level of housing density. Although this site is outside the boundary of The Ashlands guidelines had been adhered to within The Ashlands to ensure that the density alongside the boundaries was lower. This would give a rural feel to the development. This application conflicted with these guidelines.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Object to the planning application on the following grounds –

- Overdevelopment of the site;
- Not in accordance with the outline permission;
- No Eco Rating given.
- No sustainability;
- Egress onto a minor road which is a designated cycle route;
- Does not integrate with The Vale; and
- Is within the curtilage of a Listed Building.
- Surface drainage by soakaways is intended, yet the Flood Assessment forbids this.

Note: There are also discrepancies with the information supplied as part of the application including the maps not showing all of The Vale.

The decision of the Committee was unanimous. The Committee asked that a copy of the response to the application is sent to Portbury Parish Council for their information.

**06/P/2226/F                      DEVELOPMENT SITE, HARBOUR ROAD/ SPINE ROAD,  
PORTISHEAD**

Two storey office development with associated car parking

The Committee had some difficulty locating the site within the development area.

**RECOMMENDATION**

No objection to the planning application but would comment on the blandness of the design. There is also a lack of sustainability and some concerns with the sight lines for egress from the development.

**06/P/2310/F                      PORTISHEAD FOOTBALL CLUB, BRISTOL ROAD,  
PORTISHEAD**

Proposed floodlighting for the football pitch

The Committee noted that the floodlights proposed were in addition to those existing. They were to be sited around the “first pitch” and were a long way from the residents’ properties.

**RECOMMENDATION**

No objection – subject to a condition being applied that lighting should only be permitted between the hours of 8.00am and 10.00pm. The lighting should avoid unnecessary light pollution, and use low energy light sources.

The Committee makes no comment on any permission needed from Portishead & North Weston Town Council as landlords.

**06/P/2312/F                      THE ASHLANDS, PORTISHEAD**

Deletion of condition 9 of planning permission 06/P/1069/F.... “No development shall be commenced until full details, including drainage details, of WC facilities to serve the public open space hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in accordance with the approved details before the public open space hereby permitted is brought into use.”

Members noted that the developer was taking this item to Appeal.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Object to the removal of Condition 9. Would also comment that a high standard of design and anti vandal fittings should be used.

#### **06/P/2327/F                    NOREWOOD LODGE, 72 NORE ROAD, PORTISHEAD**

First floor extension for 5 no bedrooms with en-suite toilets (total area 158m<sup>2</sup>)

#### RECOMMENDATION

No objection – but regret the loss of some parking spaces.

#### **06/P/2331/O                    2 WOODHILL PARK, PORTISHEAD**

Erection of a single storey dwelling to include layout details (Outline)

The Committee noted that as part of this application lies within a conservation area the application needs to be registered as a “Full” application not “Outline”. The necessary additional plans have now been received by North Somerset Council. These will be issued as an amendment shortly but will only have 14 days for re-consultation. In view of the unusually high number of objections the Chairman suggested that the Committee give a recommendation on the plan as existing.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Object to the planning application on the following grounds –

- Inappropriate development in a conservation area;
- Detrimental to the amenity of the existing neighbours.

#### **06/P/2378/F                    58 HIGH STREET, PORTISHEAD**

Change of use from office to taxi booking office and erection of radio mast

The Committee discussed the effect of the aerial attached to the side of the building and of main concern was the parking to the rear of the property which is close to sheltered housing.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Object to the planning application on the following grounds –

- Detrimental to the amenity of local residents (Nuisance, anti-social hours, car-parking close to sheltered housing);
- Detrimental to the amenity value of the High Street.

#### **06/P/2390/F                    107 AVONWAY, PORTISHEAD**

Conversion of 2 storey extension of existing 3 bed dwelling into 3 one bed and one two bed flats

Members were concerned that this development which consists of several flats is alongside a semi-detached house. It is therefore likely that living rooms could be alongside family accommodation.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Object to the planning application on the following grounds –

- Overdevelopment of the site. Too many households which would affect neighbouring family accommodation.
- Garages are small and unlikely to be used for cars resulting in insufficient off street parking for the development..

#### **06/P/2436/F                      ESSEX HOUSE, 111 HIGH STREET, PORTISHEAD**

Erection of a first floor balcony with fire escape

#### RECOMMENDATION

Object to the planning application on the following grounds –

- The fire escape element of the application is out of keeping in the conservation area.

#### **06/P/2416/RM                      THE ASHLANDS, PORTISHEAD**

Master Plan for Area 5

The Committee noted that this is the Master Plan for 650 dwellings with a density of 38.6 per hectare.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Object to the planning application on the following grounds –

- Does not comply with the Replacement Local Plan.
- An eco-rating of “Good” for these homes is not acceptable.

### **SECTION 2 –DELEGATED DECISIONS**

Decisions made by the Chairman of the Planning Committee under delegated authority were noted.

Finally the Chairman told the Committee that she would be on holiday for the next meeting. Whilst she would be dealing with plans until her departure Councillor Mrs Bickley had agreed to then take over and chair the next meeting in December.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.40pm.

## **SECTION 2 – DELEGATED DECISIONS**

### **PLANNING APPLICATIONS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING CHAIRMAN**

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
06/P/2165/F	4 Beach Hill Portishead	Erection of a single storey front lean-to extension after demolition of existing porch	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours
06/P/2199/F	65 Brock End, Portishead	Conversion of garage to family room	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours
06/P/2201/F	29 St Peter’s Road	Erection of a detached double garage and store room	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours
06/P/2234/F	Café Eden 24 High Street Portishead	To change from Internet Café to cafe	No objections
06/P/2254/F	St Joseph’s Church West Hill, Portishead	Erection of covered porch to the east elevation and single storey connecting extension to the proposed church hall previously granted (05/P/3002/F)	No objections
06/P/2257/F	2a Glebe Avenue Portishead	Change of use from double garage	Object to the planning application on the following grounds – <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An earlier application was refused on grounds of location and design. The location is unchanged.</li></ul>
06/P/2290/F	49 Beach Road West Portishead	Conversion of loft including front and rear dormers and a door/window with balcony to side elevation. Erection of a rear extension following the demolition of existing conservatory and garage	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours

06/P/2330/F	7 Finisterre Parade Portishead	Conservatory	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours.
06/P/2306/F	3 Brock End, Portishead	Conversion of ground floor attached garage into dining room	No objections - subject to no valid objections from neighbours.
06/P/2314/F	2 Nore Road, Portishead	Single storey side extension	No objections - subject to no valid objections from neighbours. Note: We believe this property and its neighbours are serviced by a private drain. Any construction should not damage this.
06/P/2337/F	69 Drakes Way, Portishead	Removal and replacement of rotten soil retaining planks to boundary of 69 and 67 Drakes Way and extend to contain soil and provide a level garden.	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours.
06/P/2346/F	172 Merlin Park Portishead	Erection of a two storey side extension after demolition of existing garage	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours.
06/P/2355/F	30 Lower Down Road, Portishead	Erection of single storey rear and side extensions following demolition of existing conservatory	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours.
06/P/2356/F	Land at 89 Hillside Road Portishead	Erection of a new dwelling to rear of existing house	Object to the planning application on the following grounds - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the concerns of North Somerset Council to the siting of the proposed dwelling and driveway in an earlier application (06/P/0229/F refers) have not been addressed by this new application.</li> </ul>
06/P/2359/F	8 Little Halt Portishead	Erection of a two storey rear extension and conservatory	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours.

06/P/2371/F	Brixtone Cottage Bristol Road, Portishead	Conversion of garage to form granny annexe	Object to the planning application on the following grounds – • This is development by stealth in the Green Belt.
06/P/2377/F	54 Phoenix Way Portishead	Conservatory	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours
06/P/2382/F	Tudor Cottage, Battery Lane, Portishead	Revision to original planning permission 06/P/0779/F. Omit first floor window at rear and replace with pair of doors and window and dormer construction with Juliette balcony	No objections.
06/P/2391/F	6 Denny Close, Portishead	Erection of a single storey rear conservatory	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours
06/P2398/F	39 Valley Road Portishead	Construction of new vehicular access to property including the relocation of existing drop kerb	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours
06/P/2404/PDT	Land at Hydrex Harbour Road	Erection of a 15m high slim-line lattice telecoms tower with 6 no antennas, 2 no dish antennas , 2 no radio and associated ancillaries	Concerns about moving 10metres closer to a development, the far side of Newfoundland Road, the nature of which is not yet determined (industrial or residential).
06/P/2437/F	80 Brock End Portishead	Conservatory	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours
06/P/2441/F	39 Sally Hill Portishead	Erection of a rear conservatory	No objections – subject to no valid objections from neighbours

### **PLANNING APPLICATION AMENDMENTS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING CHAIRMAN**

04/P/1407/F	Brackenwood Garden Centre Site Nore Road, Portishead	Demolition of existing buildings and development of 14 dwellings and garage building	
-------------	--	--	--

		<i>(Amendment dated 25 September 2006, comprising – provision of hardstanding comprising 3 car paring spaces together with revised landscape planting within the immediate area of the ‘Grasscrete’ hardstanding area)</i>	No objections
06/P/1619/ADV	13 Stoke Road, Portishead	Display of freestanding sign <i>(Amendment dated 21 September 2006 comprising –</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>One sign removed</i></li> <li>• <i>Sign lowered by 18 inches)</i></li> </ul>	No objection – this is less obtrusive than the original application.

**WORKS TO TREES PLANNING APPLICATIONS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING CHAIRMAN IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE TREE WARDEN**

<b>APPLICATION NO.</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
06/P/2333/TPO	105 Nore Road Portishead	T1 – Conifer – Fell T2 – Crab Apple – Fell T3 – Beech – Crown reduction T4 – Larch – Fell T5/6 – Plum – Fell T7 – Ash – Pollard T8 – Ash - Fell	This site is a very large garden extending up into woodland along Nore Road. These are large trees forming the edge of the woodland. Our Tree Officer cannot see any obvious safety reasons for the work. Good arboricultural practice is mentioned without further justification. For these reasons we object to the application until overriding safety considerations are demonstrated.
06/P/2334/WT	13 West Hill Portishead	Ash x 1 – Fell	This is a very substantial and prominent Ash. Application talks of problems getting subsidence cover from insurance company as tree is 2.5m too close to house. Our tree officer does not believe this is a strong enough reason for felling a tree with excellent amenity and wildlife value. The application also mentions shading neighbour’s garden.

			Tree is some distance from the neighbour's house so no loss of light. No sufficient reason given for felling. If some works are needed to keep tree in control would suggest crown reduction and lift would be appropriate.
--	--	--	---