

**PORTISHEAD & NORTH WESTON TOWN COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD ON SATURDAY, 8 JANUARY 2005**

PRESENT

Councillor Mrs Bickley – in the Chair

Cllrs Miss Griffiths, Johnston, Mrs Lord, Mrs Mason, Terry

Also present Mr Yates (Hammond Yates partnership) and about 30 members of the public

APOLOGIES

Cllrs Mrs Cruse, JS Clark, Pasley

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Local residents attended to express their concerns about three applications that were due to be considered by the Committee. After hearing the various representations these applications were dealt with first.

04/P/3234/RM LAND ADJACENT TO 43 COMBE AVENUE, PORTISHEAD

Mrs Andrews (applicant) and Mr Yates (local architect) reviewed the history of the site and described the changes that had been made. Removal of the turret now meant the street elevation had a similar mass and roof height to the adjacent property; additional windows (white not grey), a rendered banding feature and a muted colour had softened this aspect. Additional walling on the side balcony would prevent over-looking. They hoped that by making these changes it would not be necessary to go to appeal on the original application. Mr Leaker, representing a number of other residents, reminded councillors that the original outline permission had been granted with an indicative sketch showing a conventional dormer bungalow. They considered that the changes to the original application did not address their concerns.

04/P/3286/F 20 SEAVIEW ROAD, PORTISHEAD

Mr and Mrs Ainsworth of 18A, Seaview Road explained that their property had kitchen, dining and conservatory side windows which would now be close to a 2/3-storey gable. Mr Cleeve submitted a written list of concerns and computer generated pictures indicating that the proposed properties would be out of keeping with neighbouring bungalows. He cited:

- Roof height more than 2 metres higher than 18A
- 3 floors whereas all others are one or two
- Balconies on two levels at the rear, overlooking gardens and into bedrooms of Hillcrest Road
- First-floor windows at front now looking across into lounge windows opposite, with a concomitant loss of view for that property
- More cars parked on road

Mrs Dicks of Hillcrest Road spoke as one of those who would be overlooked from above; she would have no privacy at the rear of her property, nor in her kitchen, bathroom and bedroom.

04/P/3331/F & 04/P/3332/F FORMER COUNCIL YARD, BRAMPTON WAY,

Copies of letters to NSC from Mr and Mrs Hitchcock of 36 Albert Road and Mr and Mrs Gill 89 High Street were passed to the chairman, as was a written objection from Mr Burkinshaw of 87 High St.

Mr Hitchcock spoke about his concerns that the windows from the first and second-floor flats would overlook his currently private garden. There are no other 3-storey buildings in the vicinity; a Pegasus brochure showed that they have previously built 2-storey structures. He

was also concerned about the extra traffic and parking problems that will be caused during the construction of the building (St Peter's Lodge construction vehicles had caused problems) and when completed the access for emergency and delivery vehicles.

Mrs Gill (and others from High St properties) spoke about the type of accommodation that was proposed – the living rooms of the apartments on the 1st and 2nd floor apartments would be occupied throughout the day, overlooking rear windows and gardens. Mr Burkinshaw (87 High St) said there would be 13 such apartments which gave an indication of the scale of the loss of privacy.

Mrs Thomas (155 Brampton Way) spoke on behalf also of her neighbour at 157 and two affected houses in Halletts Way. Their outlook would now be completely changed, the living quarters of the two top storeys would look into their bedrooms and gardens. Parking was already a problem on market days and at school times, concerned that not enough had been provided for social and care visitors.

Mr Lauders (85 High St) also raised the question of the new sub-station – was it safe so close to houses? Would the developers be using sufficiently robust fencing materials?

Residents accepted that there would be development of the site. Their concerns can be summarised as:

- Three-storeys in this location is overdevelopment
- Insufficient parking
- Loss of privacy
- Intensification of retirement developments along the High Street

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

04/P/3286/F 20 SEAVIEW ROAD, PORTISHEAD

Cllr Mrs Mason – personal interest – acquainted with neighbour at 18A Seaview Road

04/P/3292/F 7 BEACH HILL, PORTISHEAD

Committee members asked that it be recorded that the applicant is closely related to a fellow member of the town council.

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

Councillor Terry stated that any views he expressed on matters to also be considered at North Somerset Council would be provisional and based on the facts currently known. He would be exercising his rights to reconsider the matter afresh when the matter went before North Somerset Council.

SECTION 1 – CONSIDERED BY PLANNING COMMITTEE

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

04/P/3234/RM LAND ADJACENT TO 43 COMBE AVENUE, PORTISHEAD

Submission of reserved matters for external appearance, siting, design and landscaping for the erection of a new dwelling pursuant to outline planning permission 03/P/0111/O

The committee discussed the changes that had been made and felt that the softer colour and extra detailing of the render were acceptable and while recognising that the design was not to everyone's taste, would:

Recommend APPROVAL

04/P/3286/F 20 SEAVIEW ROAD, PORTISHEAD

Demolition of bungalow and erection of 2 split level dwellings

The committee were unanimous in rejecting this proposal

Recommend REFUSAL the height and scale are not in keeping with neighbouring properties. There will be an overbearing effect on 18A, even with obscured glass to the new landing windows. The balconies and height to the rear will affect the privacy and amenity of residents in Hillcrest Road.

**04/P/3331/F & 04/P/3332/F FORMER COUNCIL YARD, BRAMPTON WAY,
PORTISHEAD**

For ease of comparison the committee were informed that the newly-built St Peter's Lodge included 54 apartments on 0.37 hectares with 21 parking spaces. This site was 0.44 hectares, included 31 1 bed and 23 2-bed apartments with 28 spaces.

No materials had been indicated on the plans although the elevations showed stone quoins and decorative bargeboards – these were to be finalised after discussions with NSC and input from the town council. The accompanying paperwork indicated that the company would be making a contribution to affordable and recreational facilities elsewhere in the town as well as a commuted sum for the ongoing maintenance of the relocated and rebuilt fire station.

In the discussion there was disappointment that the affordable housing mentioned in the original proposals would not now be built in this location. There was concern over the 3rd storey and access for emergency vehicles through the archway. The end gables were blank, members felt that some sort of decorative finish would enhance their appearance. Brick and muted coloured render were felt to be suitable materials with a mixture of finishes to break up the length of the street elevation. They would like to see more tree screening.

Recommend REFUSAL because of the effect of the height and mass on the neighbouring properties, inadequate parking and concern over access for emergency vehicles.

Relocation and rebuild of Fire Station

This forms part of the proposal with building details complementing the immediately adjoining apartment. Services will need to be provided.

There was unanimous support for the relocation and rebuild, but the town council would point out that a decision on the usage and management of the building had still to be made.

04/P/3058/F 16 HIGH STREET, PORTISHEAD

Alterations to shop front replace windows

Recommend APPROVAL but have reservations about the use of marble tiles

04/P/3158/RM 12 HOLLIS AVENUE, NORTH WESTON, PORTISHEAD

Proposed new house adjacent to 12 Hollis Avenue

Recommend APPROVAL

04/P/3172/F 59 SLADE ROAD, PORTISHEAD

Alterations and two storey extension

Recommend REFUSAL, previous concerns have not been addressed. Note also that the rear windows are of modern design, not in keeping with the rest of the house.

04/P/3205/F LAND AT 70 MENDIP ROAD, PORTISHEAD

Erection of a dormer bungalow

Noted that the height had now been reduced and the building moved further away from no. 70

(Note: the Agenda note should have stated that the Town Council had Approved the previous application, subject to no highways objections. See Minutes from Aug. 11th)

Recommend APPROVAL

04/P/3233/F 126 SLADE ROAD, PORTISHEAD

Erection of a two storey side extension to include replacement integral garage and annexe.

Erection of a rear conservatory

Noted that the extension over the garage was now similar to that of the adjoining property. Previous concerns have now been addressed.

Recommend APPROVAL

04/P/3241/O BLACKNORE HOUSE, 86 NORE PARK DRIVE, PORTISHEAD

Demolish existing garage and erection of detached house (outline)

The discussion centred on the position of the new access cutting through the existing group of trees and bushes.

Recommend APPROVAL subject to clarification of which trees can be felled.

04/P/3287/F 227 DOWN ROAD, PORTISHEAD

Erection of a detached dormer dwelling

Recommend REFUSAL. The tree on the boundary between 227 and 229 has recently been the subject of an appeal against Refusal to fell. The inspector ruled that this tree should be retained. The plans indicate that it will be felled and it is not easy to see how the tree roots can be protected from damage during the erection of the new building if it were to be retained.

04/P/3292/F 7 BEACH HILL, PORTISHEAD

Retrospective application for erection of rear conservatory and double gates to rear drive

The committee commented that the design of the conservatory was uninspiring.

Recommend APPROVAL

Change of use to Indian Takeaway

Recommend REFUSAL – loss of non-food retail unit in this area.

REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY AND GREATER BRISTOL STRATEGIC TRANSPORT STUDY

Consultation on sub-regional proposals.

The chairman informed members that she had discussed a possible response with the chairman of the Gordano Councils Transport Group, to ensure that areas of mutual concern were covered. Mrs Lord also spoke about the response that PRAG would be making. There was agreement amongst all that improvements in transport infrastructure needed to be made now to alleviate existing problems before any new developments took place.

Scenario 1 showed development somewhere in the Easton-Portbury-Abbots Leigh area. The river, gorge and general topography meant that any new development would not meet the criterion of being close to the city centre and would completely overload the existing 2 roads (A369 and M5) that led to central and north Bristol.

Recommendations

Portishead & North Weston Town Council have considered the development and transport strategies as set out in the documents “Directions for Change” and GBSTS consultation November/December 2004, and comment that:

1. Scenario 1 as proposed by the West of England Partnership will:
 - Address the current imbalance between employment and housing
 - Improve access to the airport
 - Major new development in the Easton/Portbury/Abbots Leigh area is not consistent with sustainability

The environmental impact of loss of Green Belt must be minimised and can only be justified if the existing communities will benefit from an improved quality of life including local employment and access to facilities.

2. Theme 2 out of the list of measures proposed by GBSTS will:
 - Improve the quality of life for many
 - Provide a local source of funding, although we recognise that charging will be unpopular and its positive results have to be well-publicised.

It is also necessary that improvements be made to strategic routes, to minimise gridlock from motorway closures and to upgrade access to Bristol airport, bearing in mind that the current road network does not provide appropriate heavy freight routes in this area.

3. Re-opening the Portishead line to passengers fits in well with the future vision.

There being no further business the chairman closed the meeting at 12.45pm