

**PORTISHEAD & NORTH WESTON TOWN COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON SATURDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 2004**

PRESENT Councillor Daisy Bickley – in the Chair
Cllrs JH Clark, JS Clark, Mrs Cruse, Gething, Miss Griffiths, Johnston,
Mrs Lord, Miers

Councillor Daws attended as an observer for part of the presentation on
the Landmark Building

Euan Cresswell and Richard Keogh from Westmark
George Ferguson and Roger Goodliffe from Acanthus Ferguson Mann

Astra Morton, North Somerset Times and six members of the public

APOLOGIES Councillors Mrs Mason, Rigby

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Standing Orders were suspended to allow a presentation to be made about application
04/P/1992/RM, site L, land north of Harbour Road, “the landmark building”

Mr Cresswell and Mr Keogh from Westmark gave some background to the company. They
had been invited by Crest to be the developer for this site which led to the next phase. Their
design would be crucial in attracting employers. They then discussed the factors that had
been considered when drawing up their proposal. Mr Ferguson spoke about his philosophy
for designing buildings for spaces, while Mr Goodliffe demonstrated how this building related
to that.

The original Masterplan was drawn up to provide cohesion and a rigorous approach to design
so that piecemeal, unrelated development would not take place. It envisaged a landmark
building of 9 –10 storeys at the head of the dock that would provide a beacon for the whole
development and a point of orientation from a distance. The Plan however has to be flexible
to changes over its lifetime.

The East Portishead Masterplan saw the landmark building being 3-4 storeys higher than
anything else, and this proposal must be seen in the context of the further development of the
east side of the dock, again with buildings of height and substance.

- The plans show a flexible A3 business use at street level plus 12 one-bed and 53 two-
bed apartments, secure semi-basement parking space for 85 with another 15 off-street.
There is a public piazza at the dock edge with steps and ramps, with an arcade facing
the proposed square to the east. The western side forms part of the public realm
walkway around the whole dock.
- Detailed studies of ground conditions, the marina water table, wind flow, sun-path
shadowing and light pollution had been done.
- The present proposals were consistent with an Eco-rating “Good”, they were working
to upgrade to “Very Good”, which would make it the first high-rise building in the
country to achieve this rating.

- The building needs to front the shop areas and neighbouring dockside square, but also open up the seaward view along the dock and give access to the pedestrian route. These criteria defined the directions of the walls of the building, which will point towards the High St. Everything in the building, the profile and materials used contributes to a sense of place, the mix of residential and commercial provides vitality.
- The nature of “landmark” means that it should be memorable, the limited amount of coloured render provides definition. Height is an issue, it needs to be a certain height to achieve the landmark role, the proposed 13.5 storeys fulfils this.
- A scale model and a series of computer-generated pictures helped to understand how this building will be located within the landscape.

Mr Moore, 24 Beach Road East, queried the need for a greater height, saying that neighbouring buildings were only 4 storeys, he was also concerned about the shadow effect. *The reply quoted the Richard Rodgers report on Renaissance for Towns where a 1:6 ratio (height to water distance) for waterside buildings may be appropriate. Most of the shadow will fall on the dock and the Parish Wharf car park.*

Dr Greenham, 3 Fircliff Park was concerned that if this change to the Masterplan was allowed then other buildings may also adjust upwards; he spoke for others who felt that five stories extra was too much. *The reply reiterated that the landmark building was to be the highest and that putting 65 apartments in a 9-storey building would require a much greater footprint and that they had tried to be moderate in the increase.*

Dr Greenham then asked about fire risk and was assured that the design team included a fire engineer. *The building would have a fire-protected core and met all current regulations – which had been made much stricter since 9/11.*

Mrs Hoare, 30 Beach Road East, asked for details of the finish. *A board with examples of the materials to be used, showed buff-coloured brick, terracotta render and red cedar (weathering to silver-grey) to be the main elements used. At ground level there would be some stone.*

Mr Jones-Gerrard, 31 Beach Road East, commented that the semi-basement parking on Port Marine was very under-used, with cars parked on the road, and how could people be persuaded to use this facility. *Well-designed, well-lit secure space with lift access, such as @Bristol, might be more successful.*

Councillor Miers asked if fewer apartments could be built, if 65 in a lower building increased its “stodgy” nature. *The answer was that 50 would be uneconomic given the costs of underground parking and the podium.*

Councillor JH Clark wanted the building to be impressive, not oppressive. It should be timeless and he felt that buff will date. *They were open to further discussion over colours.* Councillor Clark also mentioned the loss of a very useful coach layby: the replacement bus stop was just where their proposed entrance was, could this be looked at to ensure the stop is retained.

Councillor Gething was worried about the loss of the current soft access at the head of the dock, used for launching boats. *The reply was that Pill Park, adjacent to the leisure centre would provide this facility.*

Councillor Gething also asked why employment was not included and was there any possibility of the top floor being open as a community benefit – overlooking the whole area. *Employment is included elsewhere in the Masterplan; there are practical (regulations) and economic reasons why there cannot be a public use.*

Councillor Mrs Lord was concerned that the perspective view looking from Wyndham Way down Serbert Way showed the building to be lower than it actually was, compared with the tallest apartment blocks. *The position of the computer-generated building superimposed on a photograph had been carefully checked; the bottom of the building was not actually visible.*

Councillor Mrs Cruse said that although the perspective from the dockland was attractive, it was less so from the Gordano valley – we do not want a repeat of some Bristol projects. *Agreed to look at alternative colour options.*

Councillor JS Clark commended the presentation and the parking provision but wondered about the possibility of a car club. *The history is that they do not work for commuters.*

Councillor Johnston asked about the long-term ownership of the building, arials on the roof and extractor fans for restaurants. *They own the freehold, which would be transferred to a management company. Apartments and shops to be held on long leases. There would be a ban on Vodaphone arials or satellite dishes on the roof and stringent conditions on tenants of commercial units not to cause any problems with noise/fumes.*

Councillor Johnston also asked about the potential for problems with efflorescence and water-staining. *This would be covered under the building and material specifications.*

Councillor Miss Griffiths said she liked the design but felt the colours needed to be muted and elegant.

The committee thanked the representatives from Acanthus Ferguson Mann and Westmark for their interesting and informative presentation.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

“Councillors JH Clark and Gething 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

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

04/P/1992/RM SITE ‘L’, LAND NORTH OF HARBOUR ROAD, PORTISHEAD

Erection of 65 apartments A3 uses to the ground floor and car parking

Having listened to the presentation and subsequent questions, the majority decision was to

Recommend APPROVAL, subject to a further consideration of the colours to be used

04/P/2061/O 4 ACRE SITE LAND ADJACENT TO 72 BRISTOL ROAD PORTISHEAD

Removal of outline 03/P/3018/O condition no. 10 “vehicular movements”

Recommend REFUSAL, condition 10 should remain

04/P/2173/F

THE RECTORY, CHURCH ROAD SOUTH, PORTISHEAD

Demolition of existing rectory. Construction of 13 no. dwellings with new access road and garages

There was some discussion, noting for example that only the front row of houses had chimney stacks, and that some gardens would include large mature trees. The committee were also concerned about the future management of the woodland and the maintenance of the various boundaries, in particular the stone wall facing Church Road South and that to the west.

Recommend APPROVAL with a condition that materials from the demolished buildings be re-used on site and satisfactory arrangements be put in place for future maintenance of woodland and boundaries.

04/P/2195/F

LAND ADJOINING 1 CHARLTON VIEW, PORTISHEAD

Erection of two dwelling houses

Noted that the plans do not fully comply with the conditions imposed after granting Outline Approval for one dwelling house.

This application which would extend the existing terrace to provide two 2-bedroom houses and 3 off-road parking spaces was felt to be acceptable.

Recommend APPROVAL

04/P/2230/F

102 BROCK END, PORTISHEAD

Conservatory and 2 no. side dormers

Noted that the 2 dormer windows would be a prominent feature in the street scene.

Recommend APPROVAL

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

STREET NAMING – THE ASHLANDS

Recommendation -

1. That a wildflower theme for Area 6 be accepted and the following names were felt to be most suitable, with “Lane” being one appropriate suffix.

Campion, Cranesbill, Foxglove, Gorse, Periwinkle and Teasel.
There was less support for Celandine and Thistle.

2. The various sections of the Spine Road could be allocated names from an alphabetical list of islands found around the British coast. Councillor JH Clark to provide a suitable list.

GREATER BRISTOL STRATEGIC TRANSPORT STUDY

The chairman presented members with a draft response, based on questionnaires filled in by 9 members, which after slight amendments was accepted.

Response

Portishead and North Weston Town Council welcome the opportunity to contribute to the Greater Bristol Strategic Transport Study.

The main problems faced by residents of Portishead are caused by:

- dependence on a single main road out of the town towards the M5 and Bristol, leading to problems at peak travelling times
- a bus service that is perceived to be inconvenient, infrequent and uncomfortable
- poor access to Bristol airport by public transport
- no railway

Although all routes into Bristol and Bath are subject to delays, in our area junctions 17 and 19 on the M5 and the A370 coming out of Weston are particularly bad at certain times.

The Council is concerned about the poor road conditions that can be seen across the whole area.

The most important issues relating to the current modes of transport are Air Quality and Road Safety.

Central Bristol and all routes in are congested. This pressure can be relieved by improving services on the WSM/Nailsea line and re-opening the Portishead line. There is widespread support for re-opening the railway which would provide residents with an alternative to the car that could be used for work, school/college, shopping and leisure.

Provision of a local Park & Ride with improved buses would encourage more people to use an alternative to the car, as would integrated ticketing, improved quality of bus/rail services and cheaper public transport. It is recognised that these measures may not help those with non-standard working hours.

Comments made by individual councillors

An additional lane reserved for HOV would ease problem at J19

The use of public transport often depends on price, must be subsidised by e.g. company car park tax etc.

Questions 2, 7 do not mention other reasons for travel within the Greater Bristol area, for example, to hospitals or other health care.

A rail service to Portishead as indicated by GOSW over the years prior to the present redevelopment.

There being no further business the chairman closed the meeting at 12.15pm

SECTION 2 – DELEGATED DECISIONS

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING CHAIRMAN

APPLICATION NO.	LOCATION	PROPOSAL	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
04/P/1499/O	Land at Moor Farm, Portbury	Residential development	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The land in question is a buffer zone for the farm;• The development would not extend beyond the main line of the East Portishead development;• If this application is allowed it could provide a lower density more rural edge to The Vale.	-
04/P/1930/F	20 Bristol Road Portishead	Add conservatory at rear	Opaque/obscure side panels may be necessary – no information given re nature of boundary fencing to 18 and 22 Bristol Road	Approval
04/P/2044/F	75 Brampton Way Portishead	Single storey rear/side extension		Approval
04/P/2098/F	87 Eastcliffe Portishead	Erection of rear conservatory	No information given concerning boundary wall/fence at rear	Approval subject to valid objections from neighbour. Obscure glass in side windows may be needed
04/P/2108/F	13 St Peter's Road Portishead	Erection of single storey rear and first floor side extension	No objections	Approval

04/P/2179/F	1C Bristol Road Portishead	Erection of a detached double car port		Approval. Commend the design and materials used
04/P/2182/F	3 Down Close Portishead	Erection of a rear conservatory	Hedge boundary needed to retain privacy	Approval subject to no valid objection from neighbours

PLANNING APPLICATION AMENDMENTS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING CHAIRMAN

APPLICATION NO.	LOCATION	PROPOSAL	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
03/P/2287/RG3	Steps at Portishead Seafront (Located near The Windmill Inn, 58 Nore Road, Portishead)	Proposed replacement steps of existing steps with new galvanised steel steps <i>(Amendment dated 19 august 2004, comprising proposed reduction in the size of the gabion wall/ The gabions will be filled with imported local stone to match the existing cliff face)</i>		Approval subject to approval by structural engineer
03/P/2565/F	21 Beach Road West Portishead	Erection of third floor extension to rear, pitched roof to existing side dormer and single storey rear extension <i>(Amendment dated 13 August 2004 comprising alteration to style of top window in the rear elevation)</i>	No objections	Approval
04/P/1549/F	5 Beach Road East Portishead	Erection of a rear single storey extension <i>(Amendment dated 9 August</i>	No objections	Approval

		<i>2004, comprising – the roof of the proposed single storey rear extension has been hipped on both ends as to alleviate any potential impact of any loss of light to the neighbour)</i>		
04/P/1566/F	4 Hillside Road, Portishead	Alterations to pitched roof over existing front lounge extension, new window to side elevation and removal of existing side elevation window <i>(Amendment dated 12 August 2004 comprising – The amendments are to fill in the existing side elevation window and to insert another window of the same size in the side elevation of the proposed extension. The drawings also include a set of existing elevations as was not included in the original submission)</i>		Approval
04/P/1283/F	14 Tydeman Road, Portishead	Erection of a single storey side and rear extension <i>(Amendment dated 13 August 2004, comprising reduction in the width of the rear extension by 1.5 metres. Also introduce rooflights in side extension and alterations to the rooflights in rear elevation)</i>		Approval

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

APPLICATION NO.	LOCATION	PROPOSAL	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
04/P/1960/WT	Rear of 33 West Hill Portishead	Works to trees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lilac – Fell and remove • Bay – Crown reduction thinning approx 20% • Lilacs T3-T6 – Crown reduction 15% 	No objections	Approval
04/P/2082/TPO	40 Woodhill Road Portishead	Works to trees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horse Chestnut T1 • Sycamore T2-T5 • Sycamore T6-T8 • Oak T9 	Shading of garden and loss of views should not be a deciding factor in approving work for this important group of trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T1 –Approve • T2 –T5 -Minimum works to maintain healthy trees • T6-T9 – The quarry edge should be examined by appropriate specialists to determine the effect of the these trees on its long term stability
04/P/2113/WT	67 Woodhill Road Portishead	Works to trees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yew T1 – Carry out balanced crown reduction as before (about 4 years ago) 	No objections	Approval

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS – FOR INFORMATION

PLANNING INQUIRY

ENFORCEMENT ACTION AGAINST MR M R W EAMES 33 BEACH ROAD, PORTISHEAD (APPEAL REFERENCE APP/DO121/C/04/1155422)

Unauthorised change of use of land from dwelling house with residential garden to use as dwelling house with yard for the storage of building materials and equipment

It was noted that notification has been received of an Appeal to the Planning Inspectorate acting on behalf of the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, against enforcement action by North Somerset Council for the above breach of planning control within the last 10 years. It was also noted that a copy of the appeal decision has been requested.