

# PORTBURY PARISH COUNCIL



Portbury Parish Council Meeting 1st October 2019

## Chairman's Report

### Finance – for item 5.

A further donation of £326 has been received from the Social Club arising out of fund raising by various skittles teams. This brings the total raised to nearly £1000.

### Crime and Disorder -for item 6

Nothing of note to report in Portbury although crime activity around us appears to be growing. Police resources are stretched and thus we do not always get priority attention for some of the more minor issues in the Parish.

### Planning – for item 7

#### (a) Barn at Honor Farm – 19/P/2069/CQA

This is a resubmission of a proposal at Honor Farm to convert an existing barn building to a residence. The current application has sought to address the issues raised in the previous application concerning the roof and cladding. The principle of converting the barn was not raised in the response to the previous application. Therefore, so long as the technical issues are considered to be resolved this application is likely to gain approval. No relevant comment can be made by PPC at this stage and thus it is recommended that no response is required.

#### (b) Elm Tree Park – a visit by the NSC Housing officer has confirmed that the new units currently being erected on site are within the existing permission for the site. Furthermore, it has been established that the construction of Park Homes does not require Building Regulations approval. Residents who have attended PPC on this matter have been kept informed by e-mail of this and the Chair of the Residents' Committee is reported to have been informed also. No further action is deemed appropriate at this stage.

#### (c) 2(c) Priory Road – [19/P/2207/FUL](#) - replacement building/annexe to form new accommodation.

The applicant attended a previous meeting in order to pre-notify of his intention to submit this application. At the time we pre-warned of the fact that it was a possibility that PPC would not be able to support this due to the loss of a garage and thus off-street parking. The Neighbourhood Plan is very clear on this point, section 12. Moreover, the double window proposed at the front of the proposed building will not be in keeping with the street-scene of the whole of the rest of Priory Road. It is thus proposed to object to this proposal. Councillors are already in receipt of a draft objection letter and are thus requested to consider lodging this with NSC.

- (d) 27 Caswell Lane – [19/P/2442/FUH](#) – This application seeks to improve and develop an existing storage/workshop on the site. There is no reason in principle to raise any objections to this proposal. However, given the recent, belated approval to the conversion of an existing garage to a residential annexe, it is proposed to comment that the building should have a specific restriction limiting its use to that of a garage/workshop only, as would be common with this type of proposal.
- (e) Shipway Farm – Land owned by Royal Portbury Dock – [19/P/2536/EA1](#)  
This application is a prelude to a future further step requesting planning permission for development. This first step is to seek an opinion as to whether an environmental impact assessment is required to be carried out. Given the sensitivity of the site, in the Green Belt, it is proposed that we make a strong case for there to be an EIA.
- (f) Paddock Lakes – Sheepway, demolition of a shed and construction of a permanent barn. [19/P/1030/FUL](#).  
This application is yet to be decided, despite the representations made already it appears to be moving towards approval. It is proposed to write to NSC to set out a number of conditions that might safeguard the site from further transgression of approvals.

Mill Close – Broken Bench - item 8(b) maintenance.

The current bench is beyond useful repair; it is proposed to renew it. Options for its replacement include one made from recycled plastic. A minimum cost for this type of bench would be approximately £300. Councillors are invited to set a budget for the task of procuring a new bench, to include fittings and labour to secure it to the ground.

#### Council Administration/Correspondence – for item 9

9(a) – task monitor – for information to Councillors, I have begun using a new software application with Mrs Drower to record and track task items. It is proving very useful. If Councillors would like a regular update on the whole list, then this can be printed out from the system. It is hoped that this will make it much easier for Mrs Drower to keep track of the multitude of items that come into the office via various routes. At present only the Chair and Mrs Drower can add or complete tasks.

9(b) – Speeding on Mill Lane. A resident on Mill Lane wrote to Liam Fox concerning excessive speeds of cars on Mill Lane. Cllr Ashton has followed this up and has requested if it is appropriate to install a recording speed camera. This is being looked at by the Highways Dept in NSC.

9(c) – Portishead NSC, West of England Joint Spatial Plan.

For information to Councillors, the final letter from the Planning Inspectorate to the 4 authorities involved in the plan has now been made public, [here](#). It is a long document which explains in detail why the Inspector is now suggesting that the plan be re-written. We await the formal response of the 4 Councils to this letter.

Having now read the detail I can now give Councillors a brief overview of what I have gleaned from the letter so far that I think we should take note of.

1. As reported at the last meeting the Inspector does not believe that sufficient work has been done on some of the specific sites that would produce a large part of the

104,000 new residences required of the plan. The Nailsea site is specifically mentioned. This does not mean that there will be additional homes needed overall, although their location might change.

2. The Inspector is not satisfied that sufficient work has been done to avoid building on Green Belt land.
3. Building houses in, say, the BANES area in order to satisfy demand in other areas is questioned.
4. The letter raises concerns about the ability to provide land and sites for the 82,500 additional jobs projected in the plan. Specifically, it questions how the Port Authority will be able to grow.
5. There were representations during the hearings that the figure of 104,000 new homes was insufficient, but we don't know which body this came from. The Inspector does not call into question the initial figure but asks for more evidence to support the conclusion that this number is appropriate.

Any speculative reports in the press prior to the 11<sup>th</sup> of September, when this letter was published, should be disregarded at this stage until we see the response of the 4 authorities. It seems that a considerable delay has been caused to the adoption process, although presumably areas of no contention in the plan could still proceed.

#### 9(d) Community Emergency Shelter Scheme

The Church and Village Hall have responded positively to the use of their premises as emergency shelters, this will be fed back to NSC.

#### 9(e) Pavement Survey

The initial response to our report on pavements has not given rise to any priority for work to be done. Even our worst areas are not bad enough to be considered for the current 3-year programme. Councillor Cooke and I will now meet and discuss what might need to be tackled in 3 to 10 years from now, we will then re-submit our report.

After receiving a negative response from the Asset Management Team, I also wrote to relevant Councillors on the matter. They acknowledge our clear report, not questioning our conclusions, but of course funds are limited. However, we have succeeded in getting the spotlight to shine on this long-term problem and I am assured that it will be taken up with Central Government.)

9(f) – Nature Reserve – artwork repositioning. There is an artwork, called “the Splash” on the Nature Reserve that is not positioned very well and is becoming overgrown and thus not very visible. Given that this is a Public Asset in our Parish a representative of Portishead Town Council asked me informally if it could be re-positioned. A formal letter has now also been received. This is likely to entail removing it from the reserve and placing it somewhere on the current Art Trail. I have asked Mr Summerfield to look at the artwork and report back on this suggestion. I await a response. In the meantime, we await a formal request from PTC on the matter. Cllr are asked to consider this request from PTC and to determine if we wish to (a) agree to moving the artwork, (b) to removing it from the

reserve, and (c) who should fund this.

9(g) Parking at Moor Gate. A resident contacted PPC about inconsiderate parking habits at Moor Gate. We have requested a visit from our PCSO. In the meantime, Cllr Cooke has visited the area to assess the situation.

MAP 30<sup>th</sup> October 2019