

**PORTISHEAD TOWN COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY 7TH DECEMBER 2016**

PRESENT: Councillors Burden - in the chair

Councillors Cottrell, Oyns, M.Cruse, R.Cruse, Lord,
Koops, Mason

S.Sherborne - Assistant Clerk

APOLOGIES: Councillors Pasley and Mitchell

There were 13 members of the public present.

Councillor Burden opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and explained that due to an IT problem the plans for discussion could not be projected onto the screen. Unfortunately the local planning authority only consults with the Town Council electronically, so there were no hard copies of plans available to view.

PL496 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor R Cruse
Personal Interest
16/P/2736/F
5 Meadows Close, Portishead, BS20 8BU
Reason: Acquainted to the neighbour opposite

Councillor M Cruse
Personal Interest
16/P/2736/F
5 Meadows Close, Portishead, BS20 8BU
Reason: Acquainted to the neighbour opposite

Councillor P Burden
Personal Interest
16/P/2736/F
5 Meadows Close, Portishead, BS20 8BU
Reason: Acquainted to the neighbour opposite

These Minutes summarise what was said during public participation and were views expressed by the speaker named, not the Town Council.

1. Mr R Bull referred to a copy of a statement that he had provided by email via the Assistant Clerk prior to the meeting relating to improving road safety around High Down School. He understood that North Somerset Council is now not going to install double yellow lines opposite the entrance to The Downs and around the Tower road area following the intervention of Councillor David Jolley, who had received comments from one property. He questioned why the :
 - a. comments made by one household should take precedent over a petition of 400 people who were calling for the double yellow lines?
 - b. town council did not support High Down school's recommendations for double yellow lines via councillor Mason?
 - c. Highway Code was not followed as it clearly states that you should not stop or park near a school entrance, at a bus stop or on the approach to a junction?

Councillor Burden advised that the Town Council could not respond at the present time, it would need to get back to Mr Bull as it is not the highway authority. He felt that one or two district Councillors might pick the matter up too.

2.1 Mrs Hennessy reported to the meeting that she and Mr Chris Holman had met with Sue Mountstevens (Avon & Somerset Police & Crime Commissioner), Superintendent Paul Richards, Sue Mountstevens Assistant and many residents last Friday to discuss Avon Way. She felt it had been a successful meeting and had got some recognition that the road is dangerous. She felt disappointed that Portishead Town Council did not do more for Mr Holman after promising in previous years to act on his behalf.

2.2 Mrs Hennessy raised the matter of having to ask for Planning Minutes from last month to be corrected and thanked the Town Council for amending the record relating to Councillor Oyns and the declarations relating to Lake Road. She gave her disappointment in the way in which Councillor Burden responded to her during the last Town Council meeting regarding the matter. Mrs Hennessy confirmed that she had in her possession a signed copy of the councillor's declarations of interest and Lake Road is declared as a beneficial interest in the land. She asked for councillors to check with the Monitoring Officer or their own Declarations of Interest if they are in any doubt. Furthermore she expects that councillors should have received information from the Monitoring Officer in respect to Dispensations.

Councillor Burden took the time to explain to Mrs Hennessy that it is down to a member to give an interest if they see it appropriate and not for the Monitoring Officer or members of the public to intervene.

The action for not declaring a pecuniary interest is a criminal offence and therefore the police should be informed.

Mrs Hennessy questioned therefore why the Town Council were writing to the Monitoring Officer to clarify the matter.

Councillor Burden confirmed that a road outside of a members house is not classified a pecuniary interest.

Mrs Hennessy referred Councillor Burden to the signed declarations of interest that Councillor Oyns has signed.

3. Mr Crabb spoke against planning application 16/P/2554/F. He referred to the proposed relocation of the wall contrary to restrictions on the Title Deeds. It was also noted that despite several other homes facing the site only one neighbour received notification about the planning application. He believed that health and safety would be compromised if the wall(s) around the property are relocated/increased in height.
4. Mrs Davey asked if Portishead Town Council had received a response from North Somerset Council regarding the putting green and skate park plans? She understood that in May they were told that the skate park would be a priority.

Councillor Cottrell responded that as far as she is aware North Somerset Council is still being chased on the matter. Councillor Lord referred to the details that were noted at a recent meeting and passed for the next meeting relating to the length of the leases at the Lake Grounds, which may have been part of the initial enquiries. Councillor Cottrell confirmed that no response from North Somerset Council had been received specifically relating to the putting green or the skate park.

5. Mrs Jenny Cochrane spoke against planning application 16/P/2554/F. Again she is a neighbour and had not been notified of the planning application despite her home being within 20m of the site. She asked if the Town Council had seen sight of all the objections from neighbours on line and if the committee would support them when making its comments to North Somerset Council. Furthermore Mrs Cochrane believed that the planning application does not correspond to the plans submitted.

Councillor Burden explained that if the comments are on the website as a matter of process the Case Officer will contact the Ward District Councillor (in this case Councillor Burden) before determining the application. He confirmed that he is yet to be contacted.

- 6.1 Mr Geoff Hardman spoke in respect to South Road. He understood that all the landlines in the area have been down for three and a half weeks and they will need to cross the recently resurfaced road to make the repair. He further commented that Wessex Water are currently digging the road up.

6.2 Mr Hardman stated that he had received no formal reply to his official complaint regarding Councillor Pasley not giving his apologies when he fails to attend a Planning and Regulatory meeting of which he is a core member. He asked when he is likely to receive a response?

Councillor Burden confirmed that the meeting had received Councillor Pasley's apologies for 07/09/16. Councillor Burden was not able to confirm where a complaint should be made regarding councillors not attending meetings. The rule is clear if you do not attend a relevant council meeting for six months you are deemed not to be a councillor (1 meeting in 6 months is deemed acceptable). Councillor Oyns understood that Councillor Pasley was recovering from an operation earlier that day.

Assistant Clerk note: *Portishead Town Council may wish to formally agree to recognise that Councillor Pasley may be absent from meetings until further notice due to illness following a recent operation and hospitalisation.*

PL498

SECTION 1 – TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE PLANNING & REGULATORY COMMITTEE

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Chairman changed the order of the meeting.

16/P/2554/F 28 EXETER ROAD, PORTISHEAD, NORTH SOMERSET, BS20 6YF

Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and position of garden wall moved.

Councillor M.Cruse proposed that a meeting is held on site (28 Exeter Road) at 9.00am on Monday 12th December 2016, following which a formal response can be put before and approved by the Town council at its meeting on Wednesday 12th December 2016.

Councillor Burden agreed to call the application to committee if the Town Council could not meet the consultation deadline. Also, any members who could not attend should visit site before the Town Council meeting.

Councillor Mason seconded the proposal but offered her apologies for Monday morning's on site meeting.

Vote recorded: all in favour

RESOLVED THAT

A meeting is held on site (28 Exeter Road) at 9.00am on Monday 12th December 2016, following which a formal response can be put before and approved by the Town council at its meeting on Wednesday 14th December 2016.

16/P/2446/F 9 BRUTON AVENUE, PORTISHEAD, BS20 8BW

Front porch extension, single storey side extension, widening of garage, raising of ridge height of bungalow roof in part only with pitched roof over current flat roof and velux rooflights to create first floor living space

Councillor Mason proposed objecting on the grounds of:

- overdevelopment in terms of the street scene
- that it would be overbearing and take light from no. 20 Denny View due to the gradient of the land
- loss of a bungalow

Councillor Cottrell seconded the proposal.

Vote recorded: all in favour

RESOLVED THAT object on the grounds of:

- overdevelopment in terms of the street scene
- that it would be overbearing and take light from no. 20 Denny View due to the gradient of the land
- loss of a bungalow

16/P/2531/F 30 BEECHWOOD ROAD, PORTISHEAD, BS20 8EP

Erection of a single storey extension to the front elevation, and balcony with glass balustrade to front and rear elevation. Conversion of garage and loft to living space

The meeting noted that there were no online objections.

Councillor Lord proposed no objection subject to no valid objections from neighbours.

Councillor Koops seconded the proposal.

Vote recorded: all in favour

RESOLVED THAT no objection subject to no valid objections from neighbours.

**16/P/2566/F LAND TO THE REAR OF 7 WOODHILL ROAD,
PORTISHEAD, NORTH SOMERSET, BS20 7EU**

Erection of a detached bungalow with construction of rear access to Battery Lane

The meeting noted that planning consent lapsed in June 2016. Complaints have been received in terms of the increase in traffic on the lane, which is very narrow. A letter from a local resident, Mrs Sidoli, had previously been circulated to members. Also, the Town Council office has received correspondence that a retaining wall is collapsing along Battery Lane and a street lamp has been smashed.

Councillor Lord proposed objecting on the grounds of the difficulties in driving along Battery Lane, which is scarcely two vehicle width, particularly at the site location.

Councillor Cottrell seconded the proposal.

No vote was recorded.

Councillor Lord proposed objecting on the grounds that the narrowness of Battery Lane makes it unsuitable for further residential development, particularly with the need for access of emergency and refuse vehicles.

Councillor Cottrell seconded the proposal.

Vote recorded: all in favour

RESOLVED THAT object on the grounds that the narrowness of Battery Lane makes it unsuitable for further residential development, particularly with the need for access of emergency and refuse vehicles

**16/P/2581/F SANDSTONES, BELTON ROAD, PORTISHEAD, BS20
8DR**

Erection of a two storey rear with balcony and single storey side extensions, a new detached garage and alterations to access from highway following the demolition of attached garage

The meeting noted the two objections online in terms of overlooking and a restrictive covenant.

Councillor Cottrell proposed objecting the two storey roof line will have an overbearing and intrusive roof and have an adverse impact to the residential amenity of no. 66.

Councillor Lord seconded the proposal.

Vote recorded: all in favour

RESOLVED THAT objects the two storey roof line will have an overbearing and intrusive roof and have an adverse impact to the residential amenity of no. 66.

**16/P/2593/F THE ANNEXE, 34A CLEVEDON ROAD, PORTISHEAD,
BS20 6TQ**

Access and drive way

Councillor Lord proposed objecting on the grounds that the access to the property via the proposed driveway is immediately adjacent to the bus stop and unacceptable in terms of highway safety.

Councillor Cottrell seconded the proposal.

Vote recorded: all in favour

RESOLVED THAT objects on the grounds that the access to the property via the proposed driveway is immediately adjacent to the bus stop and unacceptable in terms of highway safety.

**16/P/2666/F 10 BLOCK D, MERCHANT SQUARE, PORTISHEAD,
BS20 7PD**

Conversion of garage to living space

Councillor Lord reported that she had asked for this plan to come to committee as she felt it set a precedent in an area of congested parking and one parking space will be lost in the development.

Councillor Lord proposed objecting on the grounds of a loss in parking space within a congested area.

Councillor Cottrell seconded the proposal.

Vote recorded: all in favour

RESOLVED THAT objects on the grounds of a loss in parking space within a congested area.

16/P/2736/F 5 MEADOWS CLOSE, PORTISHEAD, BS20 8BU

Retrospective application for a variation of condition Nos. 2 and 3 attached to application 15/P/2056/F and 15/P/2416/MMA. (Erection of a side extension with parking area in front garden following the demolition of a detached double garage and side porch to bungalow) to allow the fence and landscape to be shown as built

The meeting noted that there is also an enforcement case pending on this site in respect to the siting of a shed. There were no online objections to consider.

Councillor Cottrell proposed objecting, she was unhappy with the development.

The proposal was not seconded.

Councillor Lord proposed no comment.

Councillor Koops seconded the proposal.

Vote recorded: 2 in favour, 2 against

Councillor Cottrell proposed objecting as the development will be out of character with other properties in the street.

Councillor R.Cruse seconded the proposal.

Vote recorded: majority in favour

RESOLVED THAT objects the development will be out of character with other properties in the street.

16/P/2755/F 36 HIGH VIEW, PORTISHEAD, BS20 8RF

Erection of a two storey side extension and alterations to front porch

The meeting noted that the application had been called to this committee as it was not available on North Somerset Council's website for consideration when the Planning agenda was being finalised.

Councillor Lord proposed no objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours.

Councillor Koops seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED THAT no objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours.

SECTION 2 – PLANNING MATTERS (RECOMMENDATIONS TO TOWN COUNCIL)

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

5.1 PORTBURY WHARF NATURE RESERVE

Councillor Burden reported that efforts are currently being made to arrange a meeting between North Somerset Council and the Friends of Portbury Wharf Nature Reserve.

5.2 HIGH DOWN ROAD TRAFFIC / ROAD MARKINGS

The meeting discussed that they had been unaware of a petition that had been submitted to North Somerset Council by local residents to support the road safety improvements on Down Road, in particular double yellow lines opposite the entrance to The Downs, when it recently wrote to ask that only restricted parking be enforced at that particular location. The Town Council may have made a different decision had it been aware of the petition.

Councillor Lord proposed that Portishead Town Council writes to North Somerset Council asking for a timescale in terms for installing the restricted parking on Down Road opposite the entrance to The Downs.

RECOMMENDATION Portishead Town Council writes to North Somerset Council asking for a timescale in terms of installing the restricted parking on Down Road opposite the entrance to The Downs.

Assistant Clerk note: update - as per Minute No. PL491, North Somerset Council responded (31.10.16) and advised that the restricted parking proposal '*would be included in this year's Portishead review and that Portishead Town Council will be consulted as a formality when proposals are detailed*'.

5.3 CAR PARKING

There was no report offered.

5.8 AVON WAY – HIGHWAY

The Assistant Clerk reported to the meeting that the Town Council had yet to receive a response from Councillor Elfan Ap Rees, North Somerset Council's Deputy Leader. Portishead Town Council wrote on 28th November requesting a meeting to discuss the highway safety of Avon Way and its impact on users and local residents.

The meeting understood, as reported earlier in public participation, that one meeting has already taken place with the police and residents.

5.9 NORTH SOMERSET SITES AND POLICIES PLAN PART 2 SITE ALLOCATIONS

The meeting discussed the report from Councillor Cottrell and members thanked her for the comprehensive report, which they accepted as detailed below.

RECOMMENDATION Portishead Town Council responds to the consultation, as follows:

North Somerset Council's (NSC) Site Allocations Plan (SAP) identifies 5 schedules which have been applied to Portishead: Portishead Town Council (PTC) is content to accept some but is totally against others as follows.

Schedule 1 Portishead Site Allocations

PTC does not understand why Old Mill Road is being considered for redevelopment as mixed use to include 20 residential units. It should be in Schedule 3 as a safeguarded employment site as it is a very successful employment site. Portishead has made a huge contribution to NSC's required housing allocation but adding 20 units on this site is counter intuitive. PTC expects this site to be reassigned to Schedule 3.

Schedule 2 Site location Hectares allocated for B use classes

PTC is content that Gordano Gate has been identified as available for B use classes

Schedule 3 safeguarded employment sites

PTC is content with its safeguarded employment sites and is pleased to note that the Severn Paper Mill site is included in this. Again we reiterate that Old Mill Road must also be included in this schedule.

Schedule 4 Local Green Space

PTC is content with the identified areas that include the Golf Course, Kilkenny Fields, Battery Point and the Lake Grounds plus many other green spaces which make Portishead the town it is.

Schedule 5 Schedule to Policy SA 10 Proposed sites for community facilities eg schools, halls, allotments, cemeteries, public open space

PTC is disappointed that there have been no proposed sites for community facilities identified in Portishead although our schools are bursting at the seams. We believe that this needs to be reconsidered.

5.10 WEST OF ENGLAND JOINT SPATIAL PLAN AND JOINT TRANSPORT STUDY (JSP/JTS)

The meeting discussed the report compiled by Councillors Cottrell, Koops and Mitchell. They felt it was a very thorough and comprehensive report, which they proposed the Town Council should adopt as its formal response.

RECOMMENDATION Portishead Town Council responds to the consultation as follows:-

Joint Transport Study

Question 1 – Is the level of ambition for the Transport Vision about right?

No, it is not because the future of Portishead depends on improvements at Junction 19 of the M5. Every day between approximately 4pm and 7pm there is a dangerous bottleneck of vehicles on the southbound slip road at points stretching back to Cribbs Causeway. We understand that this is the responsibility of Highways England and would be very costly but we believe some changes would improve the situation enormously at a reasonable cost: change the access to the Services so traffic exits the slip road sooner leaving that lane available for A369 users and freeing up the other 2 lanes for Portishead and Portbury Docks; re-entry from the Services then relocated further along Martcombe Road which would reduce the blockages on the roundabout as lorries leave the Services to go north in particular; and build new services for northbound users between Portbury Hundred and the M5 before Junction 19 which would further alleviate congestion on the roundabout.

Question 2 – Do you think we are proposing the right mix of public transport investment (bus, rapid transit, park and ride and train)?

We agree in principle but are concerned to note that there is no specific mention (in the text) of the new train line from Portishead to Bristol. Again this is crucial for the continued vitality of Portishead.

We do not understand why no metro bus link is being proposed for Portishead. This would provide an alternative to the train and we believe would be equally used. There is currently available land, which is blighted by overhead cables, to accommodate such a development including the necessary car parking between The Finches and Portbury Wharf Nature Reserve.

Question 3 - To what extent do you agree with the principle of diverting non-local traffic, including onto new roads, to accommodate public transport and cycling schemes?

We agree in principle.

Question 4 – To what extent do you agree with the concept of a light rail (tram) solution on some rapid transit corridors?

This would have been an alternative idea for Portishead but the train will provide greater capacity and is therefore the best option.

Question 5 – To what extent do you agree with using financial incentives and financial demand management at a local level to raise funds to help pay for the transport vision?

We would agree in principle. We suggest that new northbound services at Junction 19 has enormous commercial success potential and at the same time would deliver more employment opportunities plus an increase in business rates for North Somerset Council.

Question 6 – What kind of schemes would be most appropriate to deliver an upgrade to sustainable travel between the East Fringe and Bristol city centre?

Not relevant to Portishead.

Question 7 – We'd like to know how much you agree with the following elements of the package:

Marketing and education to change travel behaviour – agree
Area packages of improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and buses – not clear what is meant by this
Strategic cycle routes – agree
Park and Ride – agree but must be co-ordinated with other transport options
Bus network improvements – see answers to questions 1, 2 and 3
Expansion of the MetroBus network – see answer to question 3
Light rail routes – see answer to question 4
Rail improvements – see answer to question 2
New railway stations – see answers to questions 2 and 8
Road improvements – see answers to questions 1 and 8
New road connections - see answers to questions 1 and 8
Freight management - see answers to questions 1 and 8

Question 8 – Are there any other schemes you would like to see in the package?

The future of Portishead depends on improvements at Junction 19 of the M5. Every day between approximately 4pm and 7pm there is a dangerous bottleneck of vehicles on the southbound slip road at points stretching back to Cribbs Causeway. We understand that this is the responsibility of Highways England and would be very costly but we believe some changes would improve the situation enormously at a reasonable cost: change the access to the Services so traffic exits the slip road sooner leaving that lane available for A369 users and freeing up the other 2 lanes for Portishead and Portbury Docks; re-entry from the Services then relocated further along Martcombe Road which would reduce the blockages on the roundabout as lorries leave the Services to go north in particular; and build new services for

northbound users between Portbury Hundred and the M5 before Junction 19 which would further alleviate congestion on the roundabout.

We are concerned to note that there is no specific mention (in the text) of the new train line from Portishead to Bristol. Again this is crucial for the continued vitality of Portishead.

We do not understand why no metro bus link is being proposed for Portishead. This would provide an alternative to the train and we believe would be equally used. There is currently available land, which is blighted by overhead cables, to accommodate such a development including the necessary car parking between The Finches and Portbury Wharf Nature Reserve.

Question 9 – Do you have any other comments about the proposed transport vision?

There is a desperate need for ‘joined up thinking’: page 15 of the document spares just one paragraph to discuss how these 2 plans are inter-related. Portishead is a classic example of how residential use has outstripped infrastructure creation with its consequent problems. We need to ensure that the right infrastructure is in place alongside employment creation as an integral part of the development of the West of England.

Joint Spatial Plan

Question 1 – Does the proposed strategy make adequate provision to address the housing needs of the West of England?

Yes in principle but it must be related more clearly and closely to the Joint Transport Study. Our answers to questions 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9 of the Joint Transport Study consultation identify the needs of Portishead.

Question 2 – How can we increase the delivery of homes, in particular much needed affordable homes, in the West of England?

There is a need for varied housing stock to enable appropriate downsizing but giving planning permission for retirement apartments is not the best way forward. The over 55s who may want to downsize do not necessarily see themselves in retirement complexes. Portishead has a desperate need for genuinely affordable housing so we would suggest that involving/engaging with non-profit development organisations which could provide affordable private rental accommodation in perpetuity would be a better way forward.

Question 3 – Does the proposed strategy make adequate provision to address the economic and employment needs of the West of England?

We see little evidence of a commercial strategy in fact quite the reverse in the suggestion that Old Mill Road in Portishead should be redeveloped for mix use and incorporate 20 dwellings. Currently this is a thriving retail and commercial area employing a significant number of people and this is the type of area which is needed in Portishead. We do not see the need or rationale for changing this nor do we need another 20 dwellings in the town.

Question 4 – Does the Preferred Spatial Strategy and the locations identified meet the plan’s strategic priorities and vision?

On the map on pages 24 and 25 Avonmouth has been identified as a Strategic Employment Location but this fails to take account of transport links/access issues to and from the M5. On page 28 Table 2 identifies locations considered and not put forward for inclusion in the emerging spatial strategy of which Portishead is one. It states “..... very constrained in terms of transport Whilst there is opportunity afforded by Portishead line rail re-opening there are major capacity constraints at the M5 J19”. Once again we reiterate our answers to questions 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9 of the Joint Transport Study consultation.

Question 5 – Are there any reasons why this strategy or identified locations could not be delivered?

On the map on pages 24 and 25 Avonmouth has been identified as a Strategic Employment Location but this fails to take account of transport links/access issues to and from the M5. On page 28 Table 2 identifies locations considered and not put forward for inclusion in the emerging spatial strategy of which Portishead is one. It states “..... very constrained in terms of transport Whilst there is opportunity afforded by Portishead line rail re-opening there are major capacity constraints at the M5 J19”. Once again we reiterate our answers to questions 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9 of the Joint Transport Study consultation.

Question 6 – Is the Preferred Spatial Strategy the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives?

Page 3 states “Our intention is to have a completely joined up approach supporting infrastructure to meet local needs.” This is a very worthy statement but does not appear to us to be borne out by the content of this consultation document nor that of the Joint Transport Study. We are not given the reasonable alternatives so are unable to comment fully or properly on this question.

5.11 NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL – WESTON-SUPER-MARE TOWN CENTRE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD)

The meeting noted the draft supplementary planning document (SPD) that has been prepared for the regeneration of Weston Town Centre;

- Sets out a Masterplan to guide future planning of the town centre;
- Identifies the key development sites and infrastructure projects which the council are proposing
- Helps to remove barriers and positively encourage investment

RECOMMENDATION that Portishead Town Council makes no comment in response to the consultation.

5.12 BT – PUBLIC PAYPHONES

The meeting noted the proposals received for British Telecom to withdraw the two telephone boxes in the town; Link road and Mendip road. It noted that the telephone box on Mendip Road has been used to make 168 calls in the last twelve months, this equates approximately to three calls a week. It was proposed that Portishead Town Council ask British Telecom to retain its telephone box on Mendip Road in view of the high usage but accepts that British Telecom will close and remove the telephone box on Link Road.

RECOMMENDATION Portishead Town Council responds and writes to British Telecom asking British Telecom to retain its operating telephone box on Mendip Road in view of the high usage but accepts that British Telecom will close and remove the telephone box on Link Road.

PL500 SECTION 3 – DELEGATED CHAIRMAN DECISIONS

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING & REGULATORY CHAIRMAN

TREE APPLICATIONS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING & REGULATORY CHAIRMAN

Delegated decisions made by the Planning & Regulatory Chairman on the attached tables under delegated powers were noted.

PL501 OTHER PLANNING MATTERS – FOR INFORMATION ONLY

1. Notifications/acknowledgements from North Somerset Council

- A. ENFORCEMENT CASES
- B. DELEGATED DECISIONS – NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL
- C. PLANNING CONSENT GRANTED
- D. PLANNING CONSENT REFUSED
- E. PLANNING APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN
- F. APPEAL DECISION
- G. LICENCE APPLICATIONS
- H. ROAD CLOSURE

i). HOUSEHOLDER APPEALS SERVICE (HAS)

2. BRISTOL WATER

3. OFFICE FOR NUCLEAR REGULATION

PL502 MATTERS FOR THE NEXT MEETING

PL500 SECTION 3 DELEGATED CHAIRMAN DECISIONS – FOR INFORMATION

PLANNING APPLICATIONS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING & REGULATORY CHAIRMAN

APPLICATION NO.	LOCATION	PROPOSAL	RECOMMENDATION
16/P/2482/HHPA	11 Redpoll Drive, Portishead, BS20 7JZ	Prior approval request for the erection of a single storey rear extension with a pitched roof that would 1) extend beyond the rear wall of the original house by 4.0 metres; 2) have a maximum height of 3.5 metres and 3) have eaves that are 2.5 metres high	Portishead Town Council understands this application is being withdrawn
16/P/2488/F	9 The Park, Portishead, BS20 6LT	Single story rear extension and conversion of loft to living space	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours.
16/P/2493/F	14 The Bramleys, Portishead, BS20 7LL	Erection of first floor extension to the side, front and rear of the dwelling, replacement of windows with French doors and formation of a balcony on front elevation	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours.
16/P/2507/F	8 Haliwell Road, Portishead, BS20 8JP	Erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of existing rear play/sun room	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours.
16/P/2513/F	31 Albert Road, Portishead, BS20 6PP	Erection of a single storey extension to rear elevation following demolition of existing single storey extension	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours.
16/P/2541/LUP	5 Thatcher Close, Portishead, BS20 6UU	Certificate of lawfulness for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours
16/P/2603/F	166 Merlin Park, Portishead, Bristol, BS20 8RW	Two storey side extension over rebuilt single garage and single storey rear extension	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours

16/P/2609/F	22 Albert Road, Portishead, BS20 6PP	Erection of a 2 storey rear extension following demolition of existing single storey rear extension, infill of front porch and internal alterations.	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours
16/P/2622/MMA	149 High Street, Portishead, BS20 6QL	Minor Material Amendment to permission 14/P/1865/F (Erection of 7 no. dwellings with new road access, associated external works, works to trees and provision of a landscape buffer) to vary condition 2- approved drawings- to allow substitution and re-positioning of house type on Plot 7	No objection
16/P/2642/F	12 Ashdown Road, Portishead, North Somerset, BS20 8DP	Erection of single storey side extension to enlarge kitchen.	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours. Portishead Town Council notes that the applicant is one of its own contractors.
16/P/2645/LUP	15 Wetlands Lane, Portishead, BS20 6RA	Certificate of Lawfulness for a proposed loft conversion with rear and side dormers	No comment.
16/P/2654/F	8 The Russets, Portishead, BS20 7LP	Single storey rear extension with two new side windows to West elevation	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours
16/P/2673/F	Unit 1 (Part of (1no.ground floor room) 92 Nore Road, Portishead, BS20 8DX	Removal of condition no. 2 of planning permission 1585/93 (change of use from retail to office use (class B1) of one ground floor room) to allow a change of use from office to residential	No objection subject to 1. no valid objection from neighbours 2. the two parking spaces allocated to this ground floor room are retained.
16/P/2701/F	22 South Avenue, Portishead, BS20 7EP	Erection of a rear extension, part single storey and part two storey	No objection subject to no valid objection from neighbours

16/P/2780/F	91 Hillside Road, Portishead, Bristol, BS20 8LJ	Erection of a front garage extension with terrace over, rear extension to house and erection of a double garage to rear of house with new vehicular access	No objection subject to this application being a resubmission of planning application 13/P/0733/F, which was approved by North Somerset Council on 16/07/13
-------------	---	--	---

TREE APPLIATIONS AS REPORTED BY THE PLANNING & REGULATORY CHAIRMAN

APPLICATION NO.	LOCATION	PROPOSAL	RECOMMENDATION
16/P/2492/TPO	69 Brampton Way, Portishead, BS20 6YT	Oak x 1 - fell	“No objection – it is understood that the tree is diseased and could cause damage to nearby properties. As with all trees felled that are covered by a Preservation Order, another suitable tree of appropriate size and species should be planted at the same place within six months of the felling. The Oak tree is in a prominent place visible to members of the public.”
16/P/2605/WT	St Peters Church, Church Road North, Portishead, BS20 6PS	T1 and T2 lime - re-pollard	No objection subject to the approval of North Somerset Council’s Tree Officer
16/P/2615/TPO	Land within and to rear of 33 Beechwood Road, Portishead, BS20 8ER	T1 cherry trees - reduce by approx 2m; T2 cherry - fell; T3 oak - reduce (pollard) by approx. 3m; T4 assorted species - reduce by approx. 1.5m	No objection subject to the approval of North Somerset Council’s Tree Officer

PL501

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

1. THE FOLLOWING NOTIFICATIONS/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS FROM NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL WERE NOTED:

A. ENFORCEMENT CASES

Latest report dated 28th November 2016.

B. DELEGATED DECISIONS – NORTH SOMERSET COUNCIL

A report was not been received

C. PLANNING CONSENT GRANTED

Delegated reports in relation to the following consents:

16/P/2393/F 66 Combe Avenue, Portishead, BS20 6JS

Erection of a single storey rear and two storey side extensions

16/P/2100/O Land off Elm Walk, Battens Orchard, Portishead, BS20 6SX

Outline planning application for erection of up to 14 dwellings and associated car parking and access, vehicular access to be provided by existing site entrances with appearance, layout, scale and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval.

D. PLANNING CONSENT REFUSED

No reports have been received.

E. PLANNING APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN

No reports received.

F. APPEAL DECISIONS

No reports received.

G. LICENCE APPLICATIONS

No reports received.

H. ROAD CLOSURE

No reports received.

i). HOUSEHOLDER APPEALS SERVICE (HAS), APP/DO121/D/16/3158803

22 ST PETERS ROAD, PORTISHEAD, BS20 6QT

Following an email distributed to Town Councillors on 24th November, Portishead Town Council declined to withdraw the comment it made in respect to 16/P/1048/F – *no objection subject to no valid objection*.

2. BRISTOL WATER

Letter from Bristol Water dated 2nd November 2016 explaining the changes within the water industry to support deregulation and choice for businesses and other non-household customers with effect from April 2017.

3. OFFICE FOR NUCLEAR REGULATION

Literature received on 6th and 27th November 2016 regarding Regulatory Issue ABWR 00001 closed and GDA progress report published, respectively.

PL502 MATTERS FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Car parking
Portbury Wharf Nature Reserve
High Down Road Traffic

Meeting closed 8.48pm