

Appendix – Agenda item 2 Backwell Parish Council responses to planning applications agreed at the Planning Committee Meeting on 16th April 2026

2. Planning

2.1.b)i) 26/P/0668/AOC Land West Of Rodney Road

Request to discharge condition 28 (Car club scheme) on application 20/P/1847/OUT
Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council agreed to support with suggested conditions.

Backwell Parish Council wishes to support this condition providing that the one car provided by the car club is of sufficient size and quality and that the car provided is an 'extended range' EV model. This information was not obvious from the submission, yet it makes sense for our future residents to have a quality EV at their disposal.

2.9. To agree a response to the following planning applications:

a) 26/P/0449/FUH 3 Rushmoor Grove Backwell BS48 3BW

Demolition of the existing shed and existing front porch and proposed erection of a first- floor front extension and two-storey side extension, with a new single-storey entrance porch, alterations to existing external openings, and internal re-configurations

Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council supports this application with suggested conditions.

There are two sets of proposed floor plans. As all the necessary accompanying elevations have been submitted to match the floor plans dated 19/01/2026, it is assumed that the applicant is applying based on these, and not the alternative plan shown in the Design Statement. If this is not the case, the Council requests clarification so that comments can be made accordingly.

Massing and Design:

This property is a family home in need of modernisation and renovation. Backwell Parish Council shares some concerns about the disproportionate scale of this build; however, notes that the proposals sit well within the curtilage of the plot which could accommodate a large extension. It is also recognised that, if approved, this would constrain further applications.

Increased Footprint and Impact on Neighbours:

There is no meaningful comparison available in the vicinity, which could suggest the proposal is out of character. However, the plot's size and design limit overshadowing and are sensitive to the amenity of neighbouring properties. The house is set back from the street, with mature shrubs and trees reducing negative impact. Modernizing the windows and adding a porch is sensible for energy efficiency.

Being adjacent to a conservation area and some of the oldest properties in Backwell, a street scene illustration would provide helpful reassurance on this matter. Backwell Parish Council requests that the officer double-check the proposed grey flat tiles, which appear inconsistent with neighbouring

properties; a more sympathetic color could be considered by the applicant.

The three parking spaces (plus a garage) are suitable for a five-bedroom property. However, the provision of two secure cycle parking spaces, plus a designated refuse and recycling storage area are not provided. This is required under the Residential Design Guidelines.

Flood Risk and Surface Water Displacement:

PC is concerned about increased flood risk or the contribution to cumulative surface water impacts within the wider area of the village. Given the scale of this application and the increased surface water volume from the roof, Backwell Parish Council requests that, if the officer is minded to approve, the applicant provides a simple drainage plan demonstrating how surface water runoff will be appropriately managed and mitigated. This could include a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) or an on-site soakaway. The plan should be conditioned to safeguard both the property and neighbouring properties, as well as to future-proof the site.

Construction Traffic

Rushmore Grove has a narrow access road, which is unsuitable for large vehicles and does not always allow two vehicles to pass. The Design and Access Statement references a spacious frontage and generous parking arrangements; therefore, Backwell Parish Council requests that, if approved, construction vehicles be required to park on-site.

Backwell Parish Council highlights the cumulative impact of multiple construction projects in the village, both large and small. The constraints of this area make this request an important safety measure, given its proximity to the A370, the narrow lane, and its status as a walking route to school. Additionally, Backwell Parish Council notes that the hedge on the site bordering the pavement is encroaching onto the footpath and reduces visibility for vehicles exiting the driveway. This hedge should be reviewed and cleared by an accredited Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) to check for nesting birds, and then cut back prior to the commencement of construction to ensure safe access and better visibility.

Ecological Conditions

In addition to the nesting birds mentioned in reference to the hedge, Backwell Parish Council requests that the Tree Protection Plan be submitted to the Tree Officer for examination and approval. Backwell Parish Council endorses the concept of a Tree Protection Plan (TPP).

b) 26/P/0551/FUH 35 Church Lane Backwell BS48 3PH

Proposed replacement of existing single-storey rear extension with a flat-roof extension and deck/terrace above

Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council supports the application with suggested conditions.

Backwell Parish Council wishes to support in principle a like for like replacement but would like to raise some early concerns about this application.

Design and Character

While a replacement single-storey extension has merits in modernizing and future-proofing the building, the design must be sympathetic to the unique historic character of Farleigh Combe Manor House, its estate, and the surrounding historical landscape. Backwell Parish Council requests a site visit from the appropriate NSC Officer and the views of the Heritage Officer.

Although there are no nearby neighbours, Backwell Parish Council understands that there are several tenants on the property and requests a site visit to assess the possible impact of the extension on both the tenants and the heritage setting.

Ecology and Bats.

The property is set within extensive grounds, within 2 miles of the Brockley Hall SAC, which supports lesser and greater horseshoe bats. The property grounds provide rich wildlife habitat, making a pre-construction bat survey essential.

Backwell Parish Council is concerned that the proposed glazing may cause nighttime light spillage detrimental to bats in this sensitive area. Any lighting on the terrace should be prohibited unless fully detailed and approved, following model condition ECO007as below:

- (i) details of the type and location of the proposed lighting.**
- (ii) existing lux levels affecting the site;**
- (iii) the proposed lux levels; and**
- (iv) lighting contour plans have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any external lighting shall be installed and operated in accordance with the approved details.**

Other properties within the Parish have been asked to redesign proposals to remove or reduce light spillage and have been conditioned with bat-friendly lights featuring downward-facing splays and appropriate lux requirements.

If these issues can be resolved, Backwell Parish Council will fully endorse the scheme.

c) 26/P/0648/S73 41 Station Road Backwell BS48 3LN

Section 73 application to vary condition 2 (Plans) attached to permission 25/P/0484/FUH (Proposed erection of a single storey side extension, extension of existing roofing above rear extension and hip-to-gable loft conversion including with 2no. front dormers and a flat-roof rear dormer. Creation of raised rear patio, installation of PV Panels and fenestration alterations to all elevations including the removal, replacement and installation of windows and doors. Expansion of existing hardstanding and installation of EV charging point.) To allow for the use of Natureclad wood effect cladding on the new gable ends and front dormers and elevational alterations to include the removal of 4no windows and 2no. sets of doors to the rear to be made into 1no. set of 4m sliding doors

Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council objects to the application. It is surprising that there is yet another application, albeit an S73 in relation to the same project on this property. This ongoing situation is not easy for the neighbours to manage.

Backwell Parish Council objects to this S73 application. There are too many amendments for it to be considered a non-material change. Significant changes to the roof elevations and designs, as well as the addition of the porch, constitute a tipping point. If all these changes are required, they should be submitted as a full planning application.

This property was previously refused a larger extension 24/P/1171/FUH, and that refusal was upheld at Appeal. This S73 feels that it is trying to achieve aspects of the refused application via other means, this is unacceptable.

The S73 is a material change, creased volume and elevations is clearly over development of a bungalow in a small corner plot. Approving this would contradict the Inspector's previous report.

If the officer is minded to approve the application, Backwell Parish Council has no objection to the change of the doorway to a sliding mechanism.

Regarding the cladding, while similar materials have been adopted elsewhere in the area and could be supported in principle, the choice of this vibrant or "loud" color is not in keeping with the character of the area and should be amended to a more muted tone in line with neighbouring properties. As currently proposed, it would be visually prominent and stand out negatively.

There are multiple legitimate grounds for objecting to this S73 application based on the proposed changes. In addition to the previously approved conversion from a bungalow, several substantial modifications necessitate a full application due to their significant material impact. However, if the officer is familiar with this property, they will know that it is uniquely placed on a corner plot, however in terms of visual impact and street view it affects two roads, Station Road and Westfield Road, it therefore has the equivalent of two frontages and impact on two street scenes. These excessive proposals do not fit the area, and changes to the fenestration at higher elevations would have a substantial negative effect.

The Inspector's report dated 10 December 2024 highlights the context:
"The appeal site relates to a detached bungalow on the corner of the junction of Station Road and Westfield Road. Station Road has a mix of detached bungalows and 2 storey houses, but the dwellings either side of the appeal site and to its rear on Westfield Road are bungalows which thus define the character of the immediate area.

The land around the appeal site slopes upwards away from Station Road. Consequently, the front garden at the appeal property is set behind retaining walls and the house is above the level of the road. Other corner properties close to the appeal site, on the other side of Westfield Road and opposite on the junction with Blackwell Common, sit behind high fences and mature hedges and are largely screened from the road. Whereas the appeal property is bounded by a low close board fence and highly visible from the road and pavement.

Policy DM 38 of the North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 (2016) (NSSPP1) permits extensions which respect the character of the existing property Appeal Decision APP/D0121/D/24/3349884

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate> 2 in terms of its scale, mass and design, and do not harm the street scene.....It would be out of keeping with neighbouring bungalows and, due to the prominence of the site and its elevated position, it would be more visually intrusive because of its additional height and mass.

The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CS12 of the North Somerset Core Strategy (2017) (CS), Policies DM32 and DM38 of the NSSPP1 and the North Somerset Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document - Section 2: Appearance and Character of house extensions (2014) which require development to be sensitive to local character."

Backwell Parish Council requests that the S73 application be refused or withdrawn by the applicant. Future applications should be assessed in the context of previous planning decisions, as there have been no changes to the area, its character, or North Somerset Council's Residential Design Guidance.

Although this matter does not pertain to S73, Backwell Parish Council has also advised the LPA and Highways Authority that Westfield Road is a narrow, one-way area close to West Leigh Infants School.

For future applications, Backwell Parish Council again requests that construction vehicles remain within the property boundaries to ensure safe access for neighbours and residents, especially during school hours. Residents have occasionally resorted to placing cones or cardboard boxes across driveways to maintain safety, which should be unnecessary.

Thank you for your attention

d) 26/P/0464/OUT Land At Poplar Farm West End Lane Nailsea Outline

Application for the development of up to 130 dwellings (Class C3) with associated landscaping, access and infrastructure. Details of the principal vehicle access from Leighwood Drive provided in detail, with matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale are reserved for subsequent approval.

**Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council objects to the application.
26/P/0464/OUT Land At Poplar Farm West End Lane Nailsea.**

Dear John

Re: Application Ref: 26/P/0464/OUT – Land at Poplar Farm, West End Lane, Nailsea Backwell Parish Council (BPC) wishes to formally object to the above outline planning application for the following reasons:

1. Impact on Rural Character and Landscape

The proposed development would result in the erosion of the rural character of the area of the West End Nailsea. Development here would contribute to coalescence and urban sprawl without the infrastructure and resources to support it, contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS5 (Landscape and the Historic Environment) and CS19 (Green Infrastructure), which seek to protect landscape character and maintain settlement separation. This is also inconsistent with the principles set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular paragraph 180, which seeks to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

2. Highway Safety and Traffic Impact

West End Lane is a narrow rural winding road with pinch points and limited capacity to accommodate increased traffic. The proposed single entry into the site via Leighwood Drive is constrained, and the site will generate a significant number of additional vehicle movements, which would exacerbate existing safety concerns for motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians. West End connects Nailsea moors and the ancient causeway to Clevedon, but these roads are now overloaded with traffic, which they were not designed to handle. BPC is not satisfied that the current road infrastructure can safely support this level of development, nor has the transport strategy for LP3 within the emerging Local Plan adequately understood or addressed the demands and routes of Nailsea traffic. This conflicts with Core Strategy Policy CS10 (Transport and Movement) and Development Management Policy DM24 (Safety, Traffic and Provision of Infrastructure, etc. Associated with Development). Furthermore, paragraph 115 of the NPPF is clear that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or if the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. BPC considers that this threshold is likely to be met when this development is assessed in combination with other committed growth in the area. Sites such as

Netherton Grange and just across the fields Grove Farm must be considered alongside other major developments in Nailsea and Backwell.

3. Pressure on Local Infrastructure and Services (Including Cumulative Impact and Transport Constraints)

Local infrastructure, including schools, healthcare provision, and public transport, is already under significant pressure. The application does not provide sufficient evidence that these services can accommodate the increased demand arising from the proposed development. Crucially, BPC is concerned that the application fails to properly consider the cumulative impact of this development when taken together with the substantial number of recently consented, for example 400+ Netherton Grange, 515 Grove Farm plus ongoing housing developments in Nailsea and Backwell. While the impact of this scheme may be presented as acceptable in isolation, the combined effect of multiple large-scale developments will place a far greater and potentially unsustainable burden on local infrastructure and services; this must be fully assessed as part of this stand-alone application. The emerging Local Plan 2041 currently has no funded or deliverable plans in place to significantly improve infrastructure in Nailsea and Backwell to meet this combined demand. This concern is particularly acute in relation to public transport provision. This site will be wholly car-dependent and therefore unsustainable. Local bus provision is limited in both capacity and coverage. Connectivity between key routes such as A370 and A38 corridors, is typically operated using single-decker buses, which inherently restrict passenger capacity and are unlikely to accommodate the increased demand arising from cumulative development. Indeed, First Bus has just cancelled the X7 as a single decker, it was proving to be unviable. There is little provision at the West End of Nailsea. The promise of a bus service sounds encouraging yet Backwell has just been through this with the Grove Farm allocation, a diverted bus was promised at outline consent has now been withdrawn by the independent bus company, First, withdrawn service as unviable. Highways problems must be properly devised, planned, feasible and viable post development, otherwise Poplar Farm will be just another car dependent site. There are no safe pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure at West End Nailsea, roads are narrow, winding and lack pavements. In this context, BPC considers that the proposal fails to comply with:

- NPPF paragraph 114, which requires that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds where the cumulative impacts are severe.**
- NPPF paragraph 116, which requires development to give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements and facilitate access to high quality public transport; and**
- NPPF paragraph 117, which requires developments to be located and designed where practical to minimise the need to travel and maximise sustainable transport use. Given the constraints identified, these requirements are not met. The cumulative impact cannot be adequately**

mitigated through site-specific measures alone and must be given significant weight in the planning balance. The application therefore fails to demonstrate that adequate infrastructure improvements will be delivered, contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS3 and CS10, and Development Management Policy DM25.

4. Environmental Concerns

The site is in proximity to areas of ecological value. Development risks harm to local wildlife habitats and biodiversity. The Parish Council considers that insufficient detail has been provided to demonstrate how these impacts would be mitigated. This is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS4 and Development Management Policy DM8, and is also inconsistent with NPPF paragraph 186, which seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity.

5. Flood Risk and Drainage (Significant Constraint to Development)

BPC has serious concerns regarding flood risk and drainage, which represent a fundamental constraint to the suitability of this site for development. Whilst part of Poplar Farm is on a rise, the fields surrounding it are known to be extremely wet during the autumn, winter and early spring months due to surface water related issues. Government flood risk mapping for planning indicates that the land at Poplar Farm is extensively affected by flood risk when climate change allowances are applied, with projections for the period 2070–2125 showing that much of the site falls within areas at risk of fluvial flooding. The Environment Agency (EA) fluvial surface flood water maps are regarded as indicative and have not been calibrated or validated. While this is acknowledged in the Crest Nicholson Flood Risk and Evacuation Plan “The site is shown to be impacted during the 2070 – 2125 climate change event.” (Table 1) with most of the site predicted to be inundated (figure 1, page 8), the significance of this in relation to the NPPF and recent climate change forecasts for the UK is ignored. The UK Climate Change Committee reported in 2025 (Progress in adapting to climate change: 2025 report to Parliament) that “The UK’s preparation for climate change is inadequate”. Flooding of properties has a major impact on those affected which is compounded by the inability to obtain flood insurance as highlighted in the recent documentary on ITV Floods: New Build Nightmares!: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P_YdjNloZek. This flood risk was also identified by the Environment Agency who although did not object advised that “it is for you, the LPA, to determine whether or not the Sequential Test is required.” In addition, the SFRA clearly states “The sequential test is undertaken based on undefended scenarios for flooding from rivers and the sea and must include an appropriate allowance for climate change.” “Following application of the Sequential Test, if it is not possible to locate development taking into account its flood risk vulnerability classification it becomes necessary to apply the Exception Test.” This raises significant concerns regarding the long-term safety and resilience of any development proposed on this site. What is the predicted

depth of the expected flood water when fluvial and surface water are considered together during the lifetime of the development (100 years)? Should home buyers in addition to being advised of flood evacuation plan be advised that their properties will become uninsurable against future flooding? In accordance with the NPPF, development should be directed away from areas at highest risk of flooding through the application of the Sequential Test (paragraphs 170–171) Furthermore, where development is proposed in areas at risk of flooding, the Exception Test must be satisfied (paragraph 172), including demonstrating that the development will be safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Any approval of this site should specify who bears liability in a flood event and whom future residents can claim against, as local knowledge on the existing flood risk here is clear. With the amount of development which has taken place at West End and the unquantified (depth and extent) flood risk identified by the indicative Environment Agency hydraulic modelling - pre and post development hydraulic modelling must be conducted. This will ensure that the flood risk and any proposed mitigations are accurately assessed as required by the SFRA in order to ensure that the FRA is NPPF compliant. As such, the current proposal is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS3 and Development Management Policy DM1, as well as NPPF paragraphs 173 and 175, and the North Somerset SFRA which require that development should not be at risk of flooding and should not increase flood risk elsewhere.

6. Ecological Consideration

This is an environmentally sensitive area, with wider heritage consideration within a rural landscape with a thousand or more years of agricultural heritage. The cumulative impact of 'some environmental damage' must be fully assessed, Poplar Farm must be considered in its rural context for the negative impact to be understood. BPC objects to the proposal due to its proximity to the Brockley Hall Stables Maternity roost for Greater and Lesser Horseshoe bats, a Special Area of Conservation, which is designated for its internationally important population of horseshoe bats. This site forms part of a wider network of habitats used by these protected species for commuting and foraging. The proposed development has the potential to result in increased disturbance, habitat fragmentation, and light pollution, all of which are known to have significant adverse effects on horseshoe bat populations. Reduced grazing and increased artificial lighting and traffic movements can disrupt established flight paths and reduce the suitability of surrounding foraging habitat. Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, the competent authority must undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to determine whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the integrity of the SAC, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. BPC is not satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to rule out adverse effects, particularly when considering the cumulative impact of development

across Nailsea and Backwell. In the absence of clear and robust evidence demonstrating that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC, the application is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS4 and Development Management Policy DM8, as well as NPPF paragraph 186, which affords the highest level of protection to internationally designated nature conservation sites. 7. Prematurity and Planning Strategy Whilst it is accepted that Poplar Farm is an allocation within the draft NSC Local Plan 2041 as part of LP3, this plan has yet to be examined by the Planning Inspectorate. BPC and Nailsea Town Council have submitted a robust objection to this allocation; the outcome of the emerging Local Plan is not a foregone conclusion. North Somerset Council has not yet fully assessed or addressed the issues associated with this allocation. Granting outline permission at this stage would therefore be premature and could undermine the plan-led system and therefore inconsistent with NPPF paragraph 15, which states that the planning system should be genuinely planned. To conclude there are surface water flood risks that have not been adequately assessed when accounting for climate change, its reliance on constrained and inadequate transport infrastructure, and its cumulative impact when taken together with other committed development in Nailsea and Backwell, would result in severe residual impacts on the local highway network, put the existing road uses including pedestrians and cyclists at risk. Another 130 houses at West End Nailsea places an unacceptable pressure on local services and infrastructure. In the absence of robust evidence demonstrating that these impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated, the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies CS3, CS5, CS10 and CS19 of the North Somerset Core Strategy, Policies DM1, DM24 and DM25 of the Development Management Policies, and the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 15, 114–117, 170–175 and 180. The adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.