

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee of  
Wrington Parish Council  
held in the John Locke Room at 6.30pm on Tuesday 30 August 2022**

<b>Present:</b>	Cllr B Taylor (Chair)	Cllr D Yamanaka
	Cllr M Abdul-Wahab	Cllr L Vaughn
	Cllr J Steinbach	Cllr J Coffey
	F Burke (Clerk)	

---

**1 Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Bigg, Ward and Neve.

**2 Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were received.

**3 Public Participation**

There were no members of the public present.

**4 Minutes of the previous meeting and matters arising**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 August 2022 were reviewed and adopted as a true record.

**5 NSC Planning and Regulatory Committee**

No Committee meeting had taken place since the last Planning meeting.

**6 Decision Notices issued by NSC**

These were noted.

**7 Planning Applications**

A list of planning applications had been circulated prior to the meeting.

**22/P/1863/AOC – BRISTOL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, NORTH SIDE ROAD, FELTON, BS48 3DY**

The Council agreed that this application is wholly incompatible with the contents and conditionality of the appeal decision and wish to object to the application for the following reasons:

1. On 2 February 2022, the Planning Inspectorate granted Bristol Airport Limited (“BAL”) planning permission for the expansion of its operations to 12 mppa and related matters (planning application reference 18/P/5118/OUT and appeal reference APP/D0121W/20/3259234). The planning permission is subject to 39 conditions, four of which, conditions 8, 9, 10 and 11, are the subject matter of planning application 22/P/1863/AOC.
2. BAL is required to submit to North Somerset Council within six months of 2 February 2022 under Condition 8 an air quality action plan (“AQAP”), under Condition 9 a carbon and climate change action plan (“CCCAP”), under Condition 10 a scheme for the installation of rapid electric vehicle charging points at the

airport and under Condition 11 a strategy for the phased introduction of electric vehicles into the airport's contracted taxi fleet.

3. In planning application 22/P/1863/AOC, BAL applies for the discharge, with the substitution of a combined emissions and climate change action plan ("ECCAP"), of Conditions 8 and 9 and for the discharge, without substitution, of Conditions 10 and 11.
4. The ECCAP was prepared by BAL's environmental consultants Wood. It is a revised version of a draft carbon and climate change action plan ("CCCAP") prepared by them in support of the planning application for expansion. That draft was available to the Planning Inspectors and extensively reviewed at the Planning Inquiry. If the Planning Inspectors had taken the view that the CCCAP addressed adequately the issues arising from national emissions as well as local air quality issues, they would have said so. They did not.
5. Instead, they imposed a condition, in paragraph 210 of the appeal decision, for the submission of the CCCAP in its final form and a further condition, in paragraph 317 of the appeal decision, for the submission of an AQAP "to reduce the impact of BA operations on local air quality". These conditions are set out in detail in sections 8 and 9 of the schedule of conditions to the appeal decision.
6. Condition 8 lays down contents requirements for the AQAP including targets, timescales, target monitoring and an independent third-party review. Condition 9 lays down a detailed and meticulously timed regime for the submission, updating and independent verification of the CCCAP. The conditions cover discrete action points. The only common element is the role of the annual Airport Operations Monitoring Report.
7. BAL explains the proposed amalgamation of the AQAP and the CCCAP into the ECCAP in a single sentence on page 4 of the Wood report: *Given the common sources of carbon emissions and the emissions of pollutants that affect air quality, this combined ECCAP has been produced*". This is a totally inadequate explanation. The reality of BAL's approach to Conditions 8 and 9 is the convenience and cost saving of updating Wood's original CCCAP into a combined ECCAP to be issued and updated with the annual Operations Monitoring Reports.
8. Conditions 10 and 11 relate to the provision of rapid electric vehicle charging stations, but from the documentation submitted by BAL, the programme proposed is unchallenging, unambitious and does little to address the use of private combustion-engine cars driven to and from the airport by its clientele. There is no incentive to reduce the use of such vehicles and to encourage electric powered vehicles, even allowing for the 'generous' offer of having a service available to meet returning travellers with their fully charged vehicles upon return to the designated airport parking area. It does however enable the airport to charge its own surface vehicles and those of its contracted taxi fleet, though the number of stations to be provided is lightweight when compared to the number of cars in the respective car parking areas. It would also have been appropriate to enhance its ambitions by the provision of a life-cycle analysis by way of good practice, for its own fleet. Once again, the proposed target of 75% of the

contracted taxi fleet to be fully electric or hybrid (by 2025) seems to be unambitious and unchallenging.

### **APPLICATION 22/P/1337/FUH – REDBERRIES, WINTERS LANE, REDHILL BS40 5SH**

Councillors agreed there were no objections to the proposed development but wished to offer the following comments:

- It was noted that the property sites within the Green Belt, outside of any Settlement Boundary and with the North Somerset and Mendip Bats Special Area of Conservation, Zone C.
- The proposal is to demolish a single storey existing garage and workshop with sloping roof and replace it with a new garage and workshop, including a double-pitched roof with roof lights, on the same footprint. The Application does not state whether the new building will accommodate a second floor within the increased height or not, as no such drawing has been submitted.
- As the property is within the Green Belt, any development is subject to NSC's Development Management Policy DM12 (and the NPPF Section 13). The former states that any extension to a property within the Green Belt should not exceed 50% of the Gross Floor Area of the original building and not be materially larger. The NPPF, Section 13, paragraph 149(d) permits that "*The replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger than the one it replaces*" will be acceptable.
- However, in this instance, and notwithstanding the guideline 50% referred to above in Policy DM12, there would appear to be a material increase in bulk and height proposed by the applicant. The Policy goes on to state that "*domestic outbuildings and garages within existing residential curtilages are not considered to be inappropriate development and should be of a scale and height subordinate to the original dwelling and should not adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt*".
- The design of the proposed replacement building would appear to conform with the guidelines set out within NSC's Policies DM 32 (High Quality Design) and DM38 (Extensions to Dwellings), and this Council is of the opinion that the proposed replacement, because of the local topography, does not affect the openness of the Green Belt and remains subordinate to the existing dwelling.

### **APPLICATION 22/P/1868/TPO – WEBBSBROOK, SILVER STREET, WRINGTON, BS40 5QL**

The Council agreed to object to the application until a visit from the Tree Officer has clarified the proposals and has visited the site. The reasons for objecting were as follows:

- At the outset, it is unclear whether this Application refers to Webbsbrook House, or Webbsbrook Cottage, since the tree works proposed appear to relate to trees sited on both properties and also may impact upon No.35, Garstons Close. In the circumstances, this Council remains unsure as to whether the permission of all affected landowners has been obtained.
- The Planning Application does not include a detailed tree survey or arboricultural report justifying the actions proposed, and therefore there appears to be no justification for the proposed works to the trees which carry the protection of a TPO No.633 dated 26 April 1990. The detailed proposals also cause confusion by the dual use of 'T4' to describe (a) a Norway Maple and also (b) a cherry (see Application Form, page 5).
- The proposals to fell 3 ash trees which, it is claimed, are suffering from ash die-back disease will not be opposed by the Council if the Tree Officer feels that is the only course of action available, but the works proposed to crown lift and crown reduce several other trees which are not claimed to be dead or dying would appear to be somewhat drastic, given that a TPO is in place designed to protect them. Where trees are to be felled, for whatever reason, then a commitment should be obtained to plant replacement specimens in order to protect the visual amenity for the future.

The Council will be guided by the Tree Officer's recommendations.

**APPLICATION 22/P/1950/FUL – THE HYALL, LYE HOLE LANE, REDHILL, BS40 5RN**

Councillors agreed there were no objections to the proposed development.

It was noted that the property is in the Green Belt and outside of any Settlement Boundary and is therefore subject to the constraints set out in NSC's Policies DM12, DM32 and DM38, as well as the Residential Design Guidelines, Section 2.

**APPLICATION 22/P/2031/AOC – GATCOMBE FARM INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, WEST HAY ROAD, WRINGTON, BS40 5GF**

The Council discussed the proposals put forward to seek discharge of Conditions 28 and 29 of Planning Permission 21/P/0019/OUT and resolved to lodge objection to the current Application for the following reasons:

- **Condition 28** requires that the Construction Environmental Method Statement includes "*details of the method of works, including siting and installation of services such as drainage...*" and also *...include measures for storage and disposal of waste.*" This appears to have been omitted from the Statement submitted for approval.
- **Condition 29** requires the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) to "*include details of the legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer*

*with the management body responsible for its delivery.*” This information is missing from the LEMP submitted and leaves open the possibility that any ‘management company’ set up may itself fail and without appropriate protection by, for instance, an indemnity or guarantee` from the developer to ensure its continued funding or alternative to ensure its continuity.

## 8 Other Planning Issues

- **Hinkley Point C Connection Project – Development Control Orders, formal submission to discharge requirements: 22/P/1899/DCM (10, Replacement Planting for Stage 2.2.** These were noted.  
Cllr Steinbach wished it to be noted that Hinkley Point C Connection Project was a well-run operation that made an effort to help and include local Communities in its operations.
- Bristol Airport’s application for Level 3 Coordination: Consultation deadline: 5 October.  
Cllr Steinbach agreed to respond to this consultation on behalf of the Council

The Meeting was closed at 7.33pm

**Chairman**