

## DELEGATED REPORT

<b>Application No:</b>	18/P/3919/AIN	<b>Target date:</b>	24.08.2018
<b>Case officer:</b>	Mike Cole	<b>Extended date:</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b>	Consultation request under the provisions of Part 8 (Class F) of The Town And Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2015 for proposed staff waiting area comprising of a modular single storey building and internal road configuration. THIS IS NOT A PLANNING APPLICATION		
<b>Site address:</b>	Bristol Airport, North Side Road, Felton, Wrington		

## SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATION

### The Site

The site for this facility is located within the south eastern corner of the Silver Zone car park on the site of the former reception building.

### The Proposal

The submitted drawings show the erection of a new waiting room for staff who will be parking in the Silver Zone whilst needing to get to the Northern part of the Airport to their places of work. A number of other alterations are shown to the road layout serving this part of the Silver Zone, to accommodate the new Admin building that was subject to consultation No. 18/P/3206/AIN.

### Consultation

The Council does not (because they have no statutory obligation) undertake external consultation on 'Part 8, Class F' consultations. Part 8, Class F consultations do however appear on the planning register. However observations have been made by Wrington Parish Council as indicated below:

### Wrington Parish Council

Are concerned over the number of public parking spaces which appear to be lost as a result of the development. Whilst acknowledging that these proposals are permitted development, they would consider that the Airport should show where these lost spaces are to be replaced in the airport boundary

### Consideration

The only matter for consideration is whether or not the proposal is ‘permitted development’.

For new buildings at an airport to be ‘permitted development’ they must be (1) an ‘Operational Building’; (2) be carried out by a relevant airport operator and on operational land; (3) be for the provision of services and facilities at an airport, and (4) not be a type of development listed within Paragraph F.4 of Part 8, Class F. It must also not be a type of development exceeding the thresholds listed in Paragraph F.4(b).

These points are considered below.

(1) Is the Proposal an ‘Operational Building’

Sub-section ‘O’ of Part 8, Class F says:

***“operational building” means a building, other than a hotel, required in connection with the movement or maintenance of aircraft, or with the embarking, disembarking, loading, discharge or transport of passengers, livestock or goods at a relevant airport”.***

The building and re-configured road layout proposed would certainly be considered to be within the ‘operational building’ category.

(2) Is the development to be carried out by a ‘relevant airport operator’ and on ‘operational land’?

The extent of ‘operational land’ at Bristol Airport was first identified in the 1990’s following the grant of planning permission for the new (current) passenger terminal. This was consolidated in Drawing BIA-P-42 which was approved as part of the 2011 planning permission (Reference Number 09/P/1020/OT2). The proposed works are within the operational land.

The proposed development will be carried out by Bristol Airport or its agents (appointed contractors) and Bristol Airport is a ‘relevant airport operator’ as described in paragraph O of Part 8, Class F of the GPDO 2015.

(3) Is the proposal in connection with the provision of services and facilities at a relevant airport?

The proposed development is considered to be a facility required in connection with the provision of services and facilities at the airport. The provision of a waiting room for staff waiting to be transferred over to their place of work elsewhere within the Airport complex is considered to be an essential service that enables the smooth running of the airport. This test is therefore considered to be complied with.

(4) Is the proposal for a type of development listed within Paragraph F.1 of Part 8, Class F?

Development is not “permitted” (and would therefore require planning permission) if it falls in the following categories found in Paragraph F.1 of Part 8, Class F: These are set out below with the officers comments in italics:

•

(a) The construction or extension of a runway;

*The proposal does not involve the construction or extension of a runway.*

(b) The construction of a passenger terminal the floor space of which would exceed 500 square metres;

*The proposal does not involve the construction of a passenger terminal.*

(c) The extension or alteration of a passenger terminal, where the floor space of the building as existing at 5th December 1988, or, if built after that date, of the building as built, would be exceeded by more than 15%;

*The proposal does not include such works*

(d) The erection of a building other than an operational building;

*The proposed building is within the definition of ‘operational buildings’*

(e) The alteration or reconstruction of a building other than an operational building, where its design or external appearance would be materially affected.

*The proposed building is within the definition of ‘operational buildings’.*

Based on the above, the proposal including the other elements of work described at the start of the report is considered ‘permitted development’ as a matter of fact and by consulting the Council of the proposal, the applicants have fulfilled the requirements of Paragraph F.2 of Part 8, Class F.

(5) Is the Development listed in paragraph F.4?

**Paragraph F.4** of Part 8, Class F says development falls within this paragraph if—

•

a) it is urgently required for the efficient running of the airport, **and**

b) it consists of the carrying out of works, or the erection or construction of a structure or of an ancillary building, or the placing on land of equipment, and the works, structure, building, or equipment do not exceed 4 metres in height or 200 cubic metres in capacity.

“Urgently required” has been held to mean to development that is essential in the interests of air traffic safety or public safety at an airport. There is no suggestion the works in this proposal are “urgently required for the efficient running of the airport”. Paragraph F.4 (a) does not therefore apply to this proposal. Consequently Subsection b) only applies if (a) is triggered (hence the emphasis above to the word “and”) which it is not.

The comments by the member of the public are noted but are not considered to be relevant to the case as this is not proposed to be a building to which the public have access.

### **Recommendations**

That the proposal is permitted development but the Airport should be requested to show where the lost public parking spaces will be provided to replace those lost as a result of this development.

### **Reason for Overriding Parish Council comments (if appropriate)**

n/a

In recommending this application, I have taken into consideration the relevant policies of the Development Plan and the comments made by the consultees and other interested parties and the:

- Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006
- Crime and Disorder Act 1998
- Human Rights Act 1998.

Signed: Mike Cole