



Appendix 1 – Planning Applications

Backwell Parish Council Planning Committee Meeting 18th June 2026

Agenda item 2.1

B)

I) To note the Council's response to the Construction, Demolition, and Traffic Management Plan (CDTMP) for Farleigh Fields West.

This response should be read alongside BPC's previous comments submitted to NSC on CDTMP Rev C dated 10.6.26, Part 1 and Part 2, the latter addressed the RSK Geoscience drainage response and Drainage Condition 20. BPC trusts that these documents are reviewed by all parties. **The Drainage approach from Rev C remains unchanged in Rev D, therefore BPC's comments from 16th June remain current and valid.**

Summary of BPC's overall position: The traffic element of Rev C was moving in the right direction. However, some of key issues unresolved in Rev D.

Summary of BPC Comments on Rev D CDTMP

BPC welcomes the new Appendix J, which reflects dialogue between NSC Enforcement, CC/PH and BPC. However, this document fails to address some key issues which remain vital to the safe functioning of the village. BPC requests consideration by CC/PH, LPA, HA & Streetworks.

Phasing and methodology: The CDTMP still requires clear uncontradictory sections covering enabling works, demolition of 23 Dark Lane, Dark Lane mitigation, drainage works, internal road construction, parking, turning, unloading and site access. **Is document J the overriding agreement?**

Consistency between the main document and appendices: In several places, the main CDTMP and its appendices do not align and appear to contradict Appendix J, the conversation table with NSC Enforcement. **Is document J the overriding agreement?**

Early-stage access and parking: Appendix B should clarify how many vehicles will be required, how many on-site spaces will be available, and how HGVs, plant and deliveries will access the site, park, unload, turn and leave before the internal road and turning area are built.

HGV waiting and parking: Appendix G. BPC considers the proposed HGV no-parking radius map unacceptable. HGVs must not wait or park anywhere in the village, including Dark Lane, neighbouring roads, Backwell Lake, the leisure centre or other local amenities. No waiting in the village has been the established approach has been maintained for Farleigh Fields West and Rodney Road, and BPC asks NSC to support the same standard here.

Plan G appears to permit parking on the A370 and near Rodney Road in the village centre, despite sustained efforts over the past two years to prevent such impacts.

Dark Lane i(DL) s a more constrained site than Rodney Road and Farleigh Fields East off the A370 which both have clear no-waiting, in DL **a one-in, one-out approach is therefore essential**. With several construction sites operating concurrently, **the village cannot function safely without further support from NSC LPA and NSC Highways**. Rev D undermining the safety progress already achieved.

HGV turning: The CDTMP must clearly explain how HGVs will turn during each phase. BPC's position is that turning at the top of Dark Lane is unrealistic; previous attempts have shown it to be impractical, in Rev D 9.1 introduces a new impractical and dangerous feature of turning at the top of Dark Lane into Church Lane. **Appendix J refers to HGVs driving onto the site and either turning or reversing within it with a banksman present. 9.1 contradicts this and must be removed. The definitive contractor route E and access map must be identified by appendix reference.** 9.8 appears to contradict paragraph 9.1, this confusion leaves wriggle room for contractors.

Pedestrian safety: BPC welcomes the proposed 1m pedestrian route but asks that the **CDTMP** explicitly confirms that it will remain on Dark Lane, be protected by barriers, be maintained throughout the build and be supported by banksmen where required. **A new and worrying reference in appendix J, suggests that at any point CC/PH may ask to remove the footpath and expect the HA to concede. This is wholly unacceptable to the village.**

Signage and pavement obstruction: Construction signage must not obstruct narrow pavements, particularly on Dark Lane. Signs should be placed sensitively, such as on lamp columns where possible, and contractors must be briefed accordingly. Appendix E shows these signs in the layby or on the 1m pavement, BPC has previously suggested signs at height on street furniture.

Communications: **BPC welcomes the resident-update website referred to in Appendix J. However, residents should be able to sign up for updates rather than having to check the website repeatedly. Timely replies to resident queries and concerns are also essential.** BPC therefore assumes that the FAQ and resident information will be available on this platform and advertised through the letter drop 3 weeks before commencement. BPC welcomes the commitment to a FAQ but asks for a draft in good time, especially if works are intended to begin during the school summer holidays.

Accountability and enforcement: The CDTMP still does not explain the consequences for contractor or subcontractor non-compliance, including speeding, poor conduct, route breaches, unsafe parking, waiting, pavement obstruction or environmental breaches. BPC asks that clear consequences and enforcement procedures are included, as other contractors publish this information; this has proved necessary in the past 18 months.

S278, TRO and TTO information: BPC is still waiting for updated S278, TRO and TTO information, together with clearer Dark Lane mitigation plans showing house numbers, resident access arrangements, and whether raised tables or traffic cushions will affect driveway access. Residents remain poorly informed because the houses are faint and not numbered on the drawings. **BPC also asks whether the issues raised by its highways expert have been addressed.** Some suggested measures are included under constraints. **BPC**

offered suggestions to CC/PH in October 2025 which appeared to be acceptable, without an updated design BPC is unsure if these safety issues are addressed.

Appendix D programme: Appendix D is useful but needs clarification, including cumulative timings, total periods for road closures and temporary traffic lights, and clearer links to the CDTMP text. Are all these days/weeks **concurrent or consecutive**, they will need to be the latter to ensure that our children and adult pedestrians remain safe. **What is the timescale and dates on the expected national grid and Bristol Water works? How will these fit into appendix D.**

In addition, **how does NSC HA plan for the DIVERSION using Church Lane** to work with **HGVs attempting to pass each other on a narrow road**, the same width as Dark Lane, **without vehicles mounting the single pavement and putting pedestrians at risk**. Church Lane is a small resident street one pavement for the most part with street parking. The nearby **Coles Quarry development, NSC Civic Amenity site and Cheston Coombe light industrial** site will be limited to this route, the use of Church Lane East which is even narrower, devoid of passing places and pavements through a conservation area is an unsuitable diversion route.

Appendix F drawings: The Dark Lane phased drawings are welcomed but are too faint and need to be clearer before approval. They should show resident access, plates where needed and the barriered pedestrian route.

Road sweeping and pavement cleaning: Commitments must be specific, not vague. BPC asks for cleaning before the morning school run, before the afternoon school run, at close of day, and continuously during muck-shift activity where needed. **Following resident falls on Farleigh Road and Rodney Road**, residents are highly alert to fall risks. Dark Lane is also on a hill, so **skid risk** must be treated as a serious safety concern. **Acting after the fact is too late, the constrained Rodney Road site has a sweeper every day.**

No burning on site: The **reference “burn” must be removed**. BPC states that burning brash or waste on site must not be permitted in the CDTMP because **the site is close to homes and a school**. NSC has been clear about the negative impact of fires on residents.

Noise and vibration: **BPC asks for advance website notifications** of noisy works, such as pile driving, including expected timings and duration. The CDTMP should also address shouting, foul language, reversing alarms and wider contractor conduct.

ERROR ON 4.5 Copy-and-paste errors: Remove references to Fairfield School; these appear to be residue from another document and must be corrected to refer to Dark Lane, Summerlands, Farleigh Road and all three Backwell schools as appropriate.

Workforce parking and behaviour: Workforce parking must be on site, not on Dark Lane, Summerlands, St Andrews Road, Church Lane or other local roads. BPC also asks for practical arrangements to reduce lunchtime traffic and poor parking behaviour around food outlets. A copy of the CC/PH staff code of conduct was requested in April has not yet been received.

Site welfare compound: **Appendix A** must provide a clear timescale for the **temporary compound near residents**, including how long it will remain, how disturbance will be minimised, and how contamination of surface-water run-off will be prevented. The RSK document indicates that the compound should not be located here at all. BPC asks that

CC/PH to calculate how long the spine road will take to install and review the compound location accordingly.

Demolition: improved clarity in Appendix J is welcomed.

Spills and environmental incidents: BPC asks that residents are notified where spills are adjacent to properties or environmentally significant, in addition to NSC and BPC.

Access route: The approved HGV route must be clearly communicated at tender stage to contractors and subcontractors, and **Appendix E** should be amended where the arrows risk misleading readers about traffic movement at the top of Dark Lane.

Appendix E in relation to other HGV users: BPC asks NSC to explain how it will communicate and enforce any HGV one-way system for HGV users not associated with CC/PH. Is the intended arrangement now up Church Lane West and down Dark Lane? This requires explicit clarification.

Boundary access and green corridor: BPC notes residents' evidence of longstanding 1m access rights and suggests maintaining a 1m maintenance corridor, which may also support biodiversity and future green-corridor protection. Sample deeds can be provided on request. BPC understands that these access rights are widespread, so a 1m maintenance corridor would be consistent with residents' existing rights. CC/PH agreed to this in the regular October meeting.

Cumulative effect must be considered by NSC, Highways and Street works prior to approving this CDTMP.

BPC is concerned that, without detailed local knowledge, all parties may underestimate the pressures already affecting Backwell and misunderstand how the village functions day to day. It is essential that the LPA and Highways Authority fully understand these constraints. The Land off Dark Lane site will not be an easy build, but much can be done collaboratively to avoid foreseeable problems and plan properly for predictable risks.

It is vital that safety measures are put in to place before commencement to protect a safe and smooth build out but also ensure that resident's safety is prioritised.

Background.

Backwell's recent safety record demonstrates the need for considerate constructors, a robust CTMP for each site, and meaningful support from the **LPA, Highways Authority and Street Works** through enforceable restrictions. BPC's research suggests that no other NSC community has experienced this level of tragedy, anxiety and disturbance which has adversely affected wellbeing. The Head of Planning, Jason Beale, has stated that Backwell requires special attention due to the cumulative effect of construction planned over the next 10 years in Backwell; that attention is needed now. Given this history described below, failing to plan effectively would be irresponsible.

Backwell is already affected by several domestic construction sites causing pavement and highway obstructions. Despite BPC repeatedly identifying predictable problems at application stage, the village receives little practical assistance, and its concerns are too often overlooked by Highways and planning officers.

BPC is clear that, while this site is operating, the following concurrent sites and activities will further limit highway capacity and increase risks to village safety.

1. Farleigh Fields East A370 will continue.
2. Land West of Rodney Road will continue
3. Coles Quarry will continue
4. Long Lane will continue
5. Family Shopper at the junction of Dark Lane & Farleigh Road will start converting an old building to a takeaway– obstructing the pavement
6. Just around the corner on 7 West Town Road is currently extending a house with constant pavement and A370 obstruction
7. 5 recent applications/consents for extensions in church town which is the conservation area at the top of Dark Lane and Church Town which is off Church Lane West, this will obstruct the alternative detour route for locals; these areas are mostly paved.
8. Several applications/Consents off station road which will take more strain when DL is out of action.
9. 3 houses on Dark Lane, numbers 15, 17 & 19 have just sold, each of them is preparing renovation/planning applications which will overlap with this project.
10. Grove Farm is starting Reserved Matters and therefore the build out will overlap.

Other known constraints to which considerations must be given;

Summerlands, is an elderly persons' cul-de-sac off Dark Lane. Residents always require reliable access to their homes.

A Residents with mobility issues live close to the development site on Dark Lane itself, they will require safe pedestrian access and motor-vehicle access throughout the works.

Both groups have **frequent ambulance visits**, so uninterrupted access is essential. Parking or waiting that obstructs traffic flow cannot be accepted.

St Andrews, off Dark Lane, provides rear access to the doctors' surgery and dentists. It is therefore busy during working hours and is also used for parking associated with those amenities.

The lay-by on Dark Lane is heavily used by residents, shoppers, commuters and, regrettably, airport parking. Appendix E appears to place signage along the lay-by, which BPC considers unacceptable. The pavement being used for signage is also unsuitable as Wheelchair users and parents with buggies, street furniture could be used more effectively. The village is already restricted by development-related signs and cones on parts of Farleigh Road, Rodney Road, Embercourt and Station Road.

Dark Lane already queues daily at peak times and during the school run. Additional double yellow lines are required opposite the lay-by, between Summerlands and St Andrews, to maintain traffic flow, protect vehicular and pedestrian sightlines, and preserve access for residents next to the lay-by. As the new site access reduces parking on Dark Lane, pressure will move elsewhere; residents beside the lay-by, who are already often obstructed, will therefore require H-bars. **BPC requests Street works discusses these measures with BPC who have conducted a needs analysis before giving a blanket refusal.**

Equally BPC has raised that the **displaced parking will have implications for Church Lane West, therefore parking restrictions will be required, particularly if HGVs are to be diverted this way.** Displaced traffic from this development must be planned for. **Church Lane West** will require single yellow lines with parking restrictions Monday to Friday and Saturday 8am–1pm.

Cheston Coombe industrial park uses Dark Lane for access, some of the companies use HGVs and larger vehicles

NSC Civic Amenity Site open daily except Wednesdays and Thursdays – yet on the days this is closed to the public their large vehicles access is via Dark Lane

Backwell Junior School – Dark Lane is a main pedestrian and vehicular route to school and already comes to a standstill during the school run, as does Church Lane West.

All Backwell schools – Dark Lane is the main vehicular and walking route from approximately 500 homes on the south side of Backwell to the village schools. A pedestrian diversion via Church Lane West would be too long for young children, elderly residents and those with mobility issues. A safe pedestrian route must therefore be always maintained. The new NSC table appendix J appears to suggest that CC/PH may seek to close it, but BPC notes that during the two-week Easter closure pedestrian access was maintained throughout, including during surfacing, by moving the pedestrian pathway as required. This demonstrates that continuous pedestrian access is achievable. **A pedestrian route is always required.**

Coles Quarry Businesses – in addition to construction and the Quarry Gym

Concrete company operating –despite a CTMP they still using DL to access its compound both ways

CJSheppard –despite a CTMP they still using DL to access its compound both ways

A38 and Airport access – Dark Lane is busier than people expect. According to the NSC BSIP team, Dark Lane and the surrounding rural-lane network carry traffic levels comparable to Brockley Coombe Road. During the build, some traffic is likely to continue using Dark Lane, while other vehicles may divert via Backwell Hill and Church Lane, placing further pressure on roads that are not designed to withstand it.

Stancombe Quarry at Flax Bourton means that even without multiple construction sites Backwell has a disproportionate number of HGVs in the village which creates additional vulnerabilities on the A370, this is exacerbated by randomly parked construction HGVs or deliveries. **Stancombe Quarry lorries already create issues waiting or using local amenities to the detriment of the businesses and locals, this cannot be exacerbated by appendix G.**

Safety history in Backwell over the past three years

Coles Quarry Enforcement – this was a major case involving up to 150 HGV movements a day on Dark Lane and, at times, Church Lane, including during the school run. Residents provided extensive photographic and video evidence of inconsiderate and dangerous driving. The muck-shift activity extended into a third year.

Long Lane Enforcement – this resulted in a similar volume of lorry movements through rural lanes and Dark Lane, supported by numerous resident logs, including police reports.

Coles Quarry – uncovered loads and dangerous driving have been documented. Three incidents were logged between December 2025 and March 2026, including an eight-foot piece of metal bouncing from a CJ Sheppard lorry in front of a car, and two separate incidents of HGVs mounting pavements during the school run and narrowly missing young children.

Death of a teenager on West Town Road, Backwell, which has a limited 1m pavement like Dark Lane. 'The collision happened on West Town Road around 7:30 pm on September 28, 2023. She was taken to the hospital with serious injuries and sadly passed away a few weeks later October 15, 2023.' © BBC

Death of a pedestrian on Station Road, Backwell, 20th September 2025. 'Officers were called shortly before 10.30am to the collision involving a lorry and a pedestrian in Station Road, near the junction with Station Close. The pedestrian, a woman aged in her 70s, was taken to hospital with life-changing injuries.' She later died from her injuries. © Somerset Live.

Pedestrian crash with cyclist on shared path by Backwell Lake, Station Road, 25 October 2023. 'Injuries sustained by the woman were described as "potentially life-threatening". A man who was with her at the time was also injured, according to Avon and Somerset Police who said that his injuries are not thought to be as serious.' © Somerset Live.

Vehicle-to-vehicle collision at the junction of Church Lane West and St Margaret's Lane. This occurred where three domestic extensions were taking place within a few metres of each other, with approximately 15 construction staff vehicles obstructing the visual splay on 3rd February 2026. The following quote was received from a resident, with photographic evidence: "9.10am Car Collision 3rd Feb 2026 - Dangerous and Illegal Parking - Contractors on Church Lane/St Margaret's Lane Junction."

'I've just had a collision with another vehicle who was exiting St Margaret's Lane onto Church Lane, they didn't see me because multiple contractors working on two different sites had parked illegally (Highway Code Rule 243) dangerously and inconsiderately all around the junction.' © Backwell resident.

Two pedestrian falls due to mud on the road in relation to building sites have also been documented.

Tarmac lorry crashes into a stationary XI on A370 bus full of passengers on 9th July 2025, with one passenger thrown from the bus, multiple injuries. 'Saini told a district judge he couldn't really explain why he crashed. He was fined and banned for a year after admitting driving without due care and attention.' © Somerset Live.

Conclusion on road safety issues in Backwell

This catalogue of disruption and tragedy has left residents anxious and beleaguered, hypervigilant to what might happen next.

Residents believe Backwell's previously strong safety record has been seriously undermined by the volume of construction-related activity. This is why **BPC**, on residents' behalf, is seeking a robust **CTMP**, appropriate **TTOs on Dark Lane and Church Lane**, **H-bars** and parking restrictions to keep the village functioning safely. Given the recent incidents and the continuing pressure from construction traffic, residents' concerns are genuine,

evidence-based and entirely understandable. There is a real fear that further poorly managed construction activity could create avoidable risks for pedestrians, school routes and everyday village access.

Conclusion: BPC wishes to continue to work collaboratively with CC/PH, NSC and NSC HA to achieve a safe and efficient build-out while protecting residents, school routes, pedestrians, biodiversity, local roads and village amenities. BPC thanks those involved in advance for your support and consideration.

Thank you for everyone's attention and support to date. BPC appreciates the work that has taken us to this point. A few final key amendments alongside NSC Highways and Street works support will put us in a much safer place to proceed with this project.

Agenda item 2.7

a) 26/P/0693/FUH – Fallowfield, Backwell Hill, Backwell, BS48 3EJ

Proposed creation of a first-floor with rear balcony, erection of a two-storey side extension with external stairway and canopy porch to the East elevation

Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council objects to this application.

This objection is made having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), in particular its requirements for development to achieve well-designed places, protect Green Belt land, conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment, address flood risk and drainage, and ensure safe and suitable access. It is also supported by North Somerset Council's adopted Core Strategy and Sites and Policies Plan Part 1: Development Management Policies, including policies on flooding and drainage, conservation areas, nature conservation, landscape, Green Belt, highways safety, parking, high quality design and extensions to dwellings.

Scale, Height and Design Clarity

This property has undergone significant changes to date. It is noted that there is a history of six previous applications, this being the seventh and the second in three years. BPC supported the 2023 application. However, this is a substantial proposal with a volume increase of over 100% which on its own is concerning. Backwell Parish Council (BPC) requests the officer to look carefully at the height and scale when determining this application. From the diagrams the proposal is huge, out of character for the area.

The site itself whilst in a sizable plot, is not private, with low hedges it will be fully visible from its neighbours and beyond.

What is the impact of the balcony, this has not been fully assessed through the application, a drawing showing views from the proposed first floor would have been helpful.

Policy support: NPPF chapter 12 requires planning decisions to support high quality design and ensure development is sympathetic to local character, including scale,

height and massing. North Somerset Policy DM32 requires proposals to respect site characteristics and surroundings, including form, scale, height, massing, detailing and impact on potential use of this property beyond that of domestic amenity, thereby impacting neighbouring properties. Policy DM38 on extensions to dwellings is also relevant because the extension should remain subordinate, appropriate in scale and compatible with the host dwelling and its setting.

Conversions of this sort elsewhere in the village for example, Station Road and Westfield drive have been refused, therefore there is a precedent set.

Green Belt Considerations

This property is also in Green Belt which should not only be a consideration related to consent but construction methods.

It is also in a conservation area.

Policy support: NPPF chapter 13 gives substantial weight to protecting Green Belt land and requires careful assessment of whether development is appropriate in the Green Belt. North Somerset Policy DM12 is directly relevant to development within the Green Belt. As the property is also within a conservation area, NPPF chapter 16 and North Somerset Policy DM3 require the proposal to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and to avoid harm to heritage significance unless clearly justified.

Bat and Ecology Survey

The bat and ecology survey, although from a trusted source, is almost four years old and is therefore unacceptable as the sole ecological basis for determining this application. Since the survey was undertaken, North Somerset Council has adopted the updated North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC Supplementary Planning Document, which is now a material consideration in planning decisions. The updated guidance reflects new scientific evidence that greater and lesser horseshoe bats travel further to feed and forage, expands consultation zones, strengthens survey and mitigation requirements, and requires lighting information to be considered earlier in the planning process. This is particularly important because the property lies in proximity to Brockley Hall Stables SSSI, a designated site known for its greater horseshoe bat interest, and within the wider ecological context of the North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC.

Policy support: NPPF chapter 15 requires planning decisions to conserve and enhance biodiversity, minimise impacts on protected species and give appropriate weight to designated ecological sites. North Somerset Policy CS4 and Policy DM8 require development to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity and to provide sufficient ecological information to assess likely effects. The North Somerset and Mendip Bats SAC SPD, adopted in April 2026, provides detailed guidance for assessing effects on greater and lesser horseshoe bats, including roosts, commuting routes, foraging habitat, lighting impacts and mitigation. Given the age and timing of the submitted survey, the proximity to Brockley Hall Stables SSSI and the revised

SAC guidance, BPC considers that an updated bat and ecology assessment is required before the application can be properly determined.

An application for a major extension in this location must include a lighting and Lux level strategy for Bat mitigation, this application falls short in this regard.

Need for Additional Drawings

It is difficult to assess the increase in bedrooms, and the impact of the first-floor plans are very busy, difficult to read and overlaid on top of the original floor plan. To fully assess the application, a drawing showing just on the proposed first floor would have been helpful. BPC requests the officer to ask for an additional drawing for transparency to make an informed decision.

Policy support: NPPF decision-making principles require applications to provide sufficient information for the local planning authority to determine the proposal properly. North Somerset Policy DM32 requires consideration of scale, height, massing, layout and amenity impacts. Clear and accurate drawings are therefore necessary to assess the proposal against both national and local design policies.

Use Restrictions and Highway Impact

This dwelling is car dependent with the nearest bus stop being near the George Public House.

Due to the size of the proposal and its proximity to Bristol Airport, BPC requests conditions to limit the use of this property of Air BnB or any other potential HMO, the road is a narrow country lane in green belt and a conservation area, it will not cope with the extra traffic associated with an House with Multiple Occupancy, (HMO) of any sort. BPC requests a condition to limit this factor. Backwell Hill has become an Airport and A38 rat run. NSC Highways Authority through the BSIP team identified that Backwell Hill is now as busy as Brockley Coombe, being half the size of Brockley Coombe, devoid of signage and safety features, efforts must be made not to exacerbate the hazards on our rural lanes. Backwell Hill and the southern rural lanes of Backwell have become notably busier. They are now so heavily used by motorised vehicles that walking and cycling along these rural lanes no longer feels safe due to the frequency and speed of passing vehicles. These are not roads designed for heavy two-way traffic. Cars, delivery vans and other large vehicles meet each other with few passing places or pull-ins. Hedges and gateways are being damaged, and the character of these ancient high-hedged country lanes is being eroded.

Policy support: NPPF chapter 9 requires development to provide safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. North Somerset Policy DM24 requires development to be assessed against highway safety, traffic and infrastructure impacts, while Policy DM28 and the Parking Standards SPD are relevant to parking and vehicle movements. The concerns about

intensified use, visitor turnover, delivery traffic and HMO or short-term-let use are therefore material considerations in this constrained rural lane location.

Construction Traffic Management Plan

Due to the highway constraints, a CTMP is required. NSC Officer Jason Mak supported BPC's concerns by conditioning a simple CTMP on another property on Backwell Hill. As a thoroughfare and rural by nature, it is single-track lane unsuitable for HGVs and low loaders. Smaller vehicles will be required for deliveries and construction. Two-way passing or turning is almost impossible so vehicles would need to be on a one-in-one out basis with no waiting nearby. Many of our lanes nearby have been damaged and underlined by small construction sites, Highways and NSC Planning Enforcement are aware of this which has created safety issues for residents and road users, hence more care is being taken on these constraints sites to condition construction traffic movements carefully. For example, all construction vehicles must be parked on site. Care must be taken to avoid deliveries and traffic movements at school opening and closure times when the lanes are busier, including with cyclists and pedestrians. BPC requests that construction and work on site is limited to 8pm to 5pm Mon to Friday and 8pm to 1pm on Saturdays with no machinery or work undertaken outside of these hours. No work on Sundays or Bank Holidays. This will help preserve the tranquility of the area. Thank you.

Policy support: NPPF chapter 9 and North Somerset Policy DM24 support the use of appropriate planning conditions where necessary to make development acceptable in transport and highway safety terms. A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be a proportionate condition in this location to control delivery size, timing, routing, contractor parking, turning, waiting and pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Surface Water Drainage and Flood Risk

Backwell has significant issues related to surface water runoff, receptors in the village are at risk due to volume of water coming off Backwell Hill. Given the scale of this application with the increased surface water displacement BPC is concerned about the increase flood risk or contribution to cumulative surface water impacts within the wider area. The Batch is on an incline with challenging topography. The proposed roof will be larger, which is likely to result in faster water displacement and increased surface water volume. The Parish Council therefore requests that if the officer is minded to approve the applicant must provide a simple drainage plan arrangement demonstrating how surface water runoff will be appropriately managed and mitigated. This could include a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) approach or an on-site soakaway solution to ensure no increase in runoff from the site. This should be conditioned to avoid safeguard and future proof the property and the neighbours. Again this has been conditioned in other properties on Backwell Hill and in the village itself where the increased water run off needs to be slowed through a soakway and/or storm drain arrangement.

Policy support: NPPF chapter 14 requires development to take account of flood risk, drainage and climate resilience. North Somerset Policy DM1 requires development to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere and to incorporate

appropriate drainage measures. The request for a drainage plan, SuDS or soakaway solution is therefore directly supported by national and local policy, particularly given the local topography and cumulative surface water issues on Backwell Hill.

Recycling and Waste Storage

Backwell Parish Council requests that details of recycling and waste storage which have been omitted by the application, are secured by condition, in line with local planning policies and waste management requirements, to ensure adequate provision

Policy support: Adequate waste and recycling storage is part of good design and residential amenities. This is consistent with NPPF chapter 12 and North Somerset Policy DM32, which require development to be functional, well-designed and capable of operating without unacceptable harm to the character or amenity of the area.

Committee Referral and Required Conditions

If the officer is intending to approve this application without substantial changes and additions in terms of improved drawings, BAT and Ecology Survey with appropriate mitigation in terms for example lux levels a commitment for onsite wildlife biodiversity enhancement BPC will request that this is called into committee.

A simple drainage scheme should also be conditioned along with a simple CTMP as conditioned on a similar property on the same road.

Policy support: Planning conditions would be necessary to secure compliance with the relevant NPPF chapters and North Somerset policies identified above, including DM1, DM3, DM8, DM12, DM24, DM28, DM32 and DM38. Without updated ecological evidence, clearer drawings, drainage details and construction traffic controls, the application cannot be properly assessed or made acceptable through the current submission.

Conclusion

To conclude, BPC contends that the concept described in this application has merit; however, due to the sensitivity and constraints of the site, including its Green Belt location, conservation area setting, ecological context, highway constraints and drainage risks, it cannot be supported without the additional information and safeguards described above. If however additional information is provided as requested, BPC requests the officer provide the additional material for review and comment. If consent is granted, BPC requests robust conditions to secure updated ecology and bat information, appropriate biodiversity enhancement and lighting controls, clearer plans, a drainage scheme, waste and recycling provision, restrictions on intensified residential or short-term-let use, and a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Thank you for your consideration.

b) 26/P/1042/LDP – 20 Chapel Hill, Backwell, BS48 3PP

Certificate of lawful development for the proposed erection of a single-storey rear extension

Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council supports the application with reservations only, and asks that North Somerset Council undertakes full due diligence before reaching a decision.

BPC notes that this is a retrospective application for work that has been carried out without consent in a conservation area. BPC supports the application with reservations only, and asks that North Somerset Council undertakes full due diligence before reaching a decision. The retrospective nature of the application should not reduce the level of scrutiny applied: the proposal must still be assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework, the adopted North Somerset development plan, and relevant supplementary planning guidance.

BPC is aware of a similar application in this vicinity that has been refused. For consistency and to avoid future challenge, the officer report should clearly explain how this proposal has been assessed against the same policy tests, particularly in relation to neighbour amenity and the conservation area setting.

Policy context: NPPF chapter 12 requires high quality design that is sympathetic to local character, while chapter 16 requires development in conservation areas to conserve or enhance the significance of the historic environment. North Somerset Policy DM3 requires development in conservation areas to preserve or enhance their character or appearance. Policy DM32 requires proposals to respect local character, scale, layout and neighbour amenity, including avoiding unacceptable overshadowing, overbearing impact or loss of outlook. North Somerset's Residential Design Guide is also a material consideration and confirms that proposals which significantly reduce daylight or sunlight to habitable rooms, or create a significant overbearing impact, are likely to be unacceptable.

It is disappointing that the block plan does not show either the historic building line of the extension or the proposed building line in relation to neighbouring properties. In a terraced conservation area context, this information should be provided so the Local Planning Authority, neighbours and consultees can properly assess the effect on the established rhythm, depth and pattern of development.

To fully assess the impact of this development, both existing and proposed building lines should be made available for meaningful public consultation. BPC requests that this omission is remedied before determination, including side elevations and drawings showing the relationship with adjoining properties, habitable room

windows and private amenity space. Without this information it is difficult to make an informed judgement on potential loss of amenity through tunnelling, overshadowing, enclosure, loss of outlook or an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties.

BPC notes that the new building extends 3m, which may be broadly consistent with North Somerset's Residential Design Guidance, with the side elevation stated as 3340mm. However, dimensional compliance alone does not resolve the planning issue. The key question is whether the extension causes unacceptable harm to neighbouring terraced properties, particularly through enclosure, loss of light, overbearing impact or loss of outlook. It is unclear whether similar applications have been approved on this Victorian terrace. No public comments are noted at the time of writing, but BPC is mindful that LPA notification letters often arrive close to the determination date, limiting the opportunity for residents to respond.

To avoid possible future challenge, particularly in light of other refusals in the area, BPC requests that the case officer undertake a site visit before determining the application. The officer should assess the extension from neighbouring properties where access is available, and from the rear and side relationship, to determine whether the impact on amenity and the conservation area is acceptable. If, following that assessment, the impact is found to be negligible, BPC would support the application with reservations, noting that approval may set a precedent for modest single-storey extensions in this conservation area and should therefore be carefully reasoned.

If NSC is minded to approve the application, BPC requests conditions requiring external materials, finishes and rainwater goods to match the existing dwelling, and confirms that no additional side-facing windows, rooflights or external alterations are inserted without further consent where these could affect neighbouring amenity or the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Many thanks

c) 26/P/1045/AOC – Backwell School, Station Road, Backwell, BS48 3BX

Request to Discharge condition 8 (Pitch Quality and Registration) on application 24/P/1406/FUL

Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council notes this application

d) 26/P/0686/OU2 – Bristol Airport, North Side Road, Felton, Wrington, BS48 3DY

Hybrid planning application (full and outline elements) with Environmental Statement for the expansion of Bristol Airport to enable a throughput of 15 million passengers per annum, operating within a rolling 12 month cap of 99,931 air transport movements and 4,974 night flights between the hours of 23:30 and 6:00

Backwell Parish Council submission is still being finalised.

e) 26/P/1088/FUH– 7 Rushmoor Grove, Backwell, BS48 3BW

Proposed erection of a first-floor extension above existing attached garage.

Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council support this application with suggested conditions:

Massing and Design:

BPC notes the height and scale of the proposal are compliant with NSC Residential Guidance being modest in its nature and sympathetic to its setting in Rushmoor Grove.

There have been several applications for extensions in this area in recent times, this application is in line with those which have been approved.

As the extension provides a larger master bedroom and ensuite, consideration for extra parking does not apply.

Flood Risk and Surface Water Displacement:

BPC is concerned about the increased flood risk or 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, BPC requests that, if the officer is minded to approve, the applicant must provide 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. This plan should be conditioned to safeguard both the property and neighbouring properties, as well as future-proof the site. Other developments approved in Backwell have included conditions relating to surface water management, and BPC considers such a condition appropriate in this case.

Construction Traffic

Rushmoor Grove has narrow access roads unsuitable for large vehicles and not always allowing two vehicles to pass. The Design and Access statement makes reference to spacious frontage and generous parking arrangements and therefore BPC requests that if approved construction vehicles are required to park on site. BPC highlights the cumulative impact of multiple construction projects in the village, large and small, the constraints of this area make this request an important safety feature being near the A370, on a narrow lane and on a walking route to school. This is particularly relevant in this confined area which now has several consents likely to cause a cumulative impact on pedestrian safety and thoroughfare. Elsewhere in the village where this has happened the poor visibility inadvertently caused visibility splay issues and resulted in a vehicular road traffic accident.

BPC has raised these issues with Jason Beale and David Ditchett recently; further consideration is required to help the village operate safely in view of the unprecedented number of major and minor developments occurring concurrently.

Thank you for your consideration.

f) 26/P/1124/DEA - Core Hill Cooks Bridle Path Backwell BS48 3DJ

Application to determine if prior approval is required for the proposed demolition of existing dwelling, Core Hill Cottage, Cooks Bridle Path, Backwell, BS48 3DJ

Resolved: Unanimously Backwell Parish Council objects to the application.

Backwell Parish Council (BPC) Notes Bristol Airport Ltd (BAL) prior notice to demolish Core Hill Cottage on Cooks Bridle Path.

BPC wishes to record on record the prematurity of this notice, 26/P/0686/OU2 has not yet been decided; therefore, this notice of intent feels cynical and undemocratic.

The reasons for demolition appear cynical in the face of a housing crisis, this could be a home until such a time at some unknown date in the future is given. This home has been allowed to fall into disrepair.

Nor has BAL explained the purpose of this scheme for the sake of transparency with the community, this ought to be stated. The master plan is a business concept; it is not a given.

BPC appreciates the detailed demolition method statement which accompanied the consent however there is little in the document that recognises that as well as next to an airport this constrained site is part of the Hamlet of Downside, as a consequence there are some key points which need including that are standard practice within the Parish of Backwell which is currently facing a negative impact from the cumulative effect of concurrent developments largely associated with construction and related HGV traffic. Further attention is required to consider the 'human' and environmental elements, which is just as important as the regulations for asbestos removal.

BPC requests that the following arrangements are included and the CMS amended accordingly. A CDMTP for this demolition includes;

- 1. No noise or machinery in use on site for 8am, thus making this CDMTP consistent with other works within the Parish, any earlier is unreasonable and detrimental to the wellbeing of neighbours.**
- 2. No deliveries or HGV movements between 8am and 9am, 3pm and 4pm. This will allow the children of Downside who must walk on an unpaved road and stand on this road to be collected and dropped off by bus. BAL know about**

this, our concerns are well documented by staff members Tracy Comer, Harry Ellis and indeed Matthew Sharp. Reducing construction traffic at these times is essential to avoid additional hazards.

3. Site equipment and arrival for set-up must occur between 9am and 3pm only.
4. A strict one-in-one policy for HGVs must be in place; this is an extremely constrained area with already too much traffic for the infrastructure.
5. No vehicles waiting in Downside or Backwell Village, perhaps BAL can create an area on their curtilage for waiting HGVs. The same goes for staff vehicles, wherever possible sustainable travel should be used and all vehicles must be parked on site. How many will be needed? Parking must be highlighted on a site map.
6. BPC notes your routes for HGVs and asked that contractors are specifically told to keep to these routes with some form of accountability noted in the CSM/CDTMP; other developers use the one in one out policy.
7. Core Hill Cottage is situated on a plateau known as Broadfield Down, the land consists of an ancient a limestone aquifer which by its nature filters rainwater and surface water; therefore, robust measures must be in place to protect the ground of this site prior to demolition to avoid contamination to surface water and potential supply.
8. Core Hill Cottage is in Green Belt and therefore environmentally sensitive, an ecological survey must inform any agreed CDTMP/CMS, the survey must be current in the event of an extended period before demolition the survey would need to be repeated. Before any soft stripping an ecologist must conduct a recent inspection and any trimming back of vegetation must be conducted outside of the nesting period, namely works must be limited
9. Core Cottage is located surrounded by environmentally sensitive areas including Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), being only 2 miles from Brockley Hall Stables Maternity roost the property is in bat zone B, this is prime area for foraging the endangered greater and lesser horseshoe bats. A bat survey must be conducted before a single plank or bricks is lifted! Where evidence of bats is found mitigation must be put into place before work can start.
10. Sweeping, clearing to keep Cooks Bridle Path and Downside Road clear is not mentioned and must be. Daily inspection and sweeping must be written in.
11. Due to the cumulative effect of building a number of major sites, Stancombe Quarry and the NSC Civic amenity site, BPC requests that traffic route avoid the A370 which will give the village of Backwell some respite to the egregious numbers of HGVs that is putting safety at risk.

To conclude, BPC thanks the officer for consideration in these matters. The list above has developed from too many issues and near misses in the past 2 years. BPC requests that the Officer speaks with Mark Wormersley who is best placed to give you an overview of the constraints due to multiple build outs in the village, in fact Jason Beale is clear that the Parish of Backwell requires consideration when making decisions with knock on effects.

Signed.....Chairman

18TH JUNE 2026 PLANNING COMMITTEE APPENDIX