

From: Richard Kent
Sent: 29 May 2020 11:11
To: Claire Courtois
Cc: Michael Reep; Chris Nolan
Subject: FW: Airport parking

Hi Claire

I know we have airport flagged as an issue we need to address in the new local plan but please can we make sure this includes a full consideration with relevant members about offsite car parks.

Before then, an internal discussion would be good between you, me, Michael and Chris about what the options might be.

Richard

Richard Kent
Head of Planning
Development and Environment
North Somerset Council

Tel: 07584 607222

Web: www.n-somerset.gov.uk

Our response to Covid-19

We are currently operating a reduced service. Whilst we will do our best to progress applications, they are likely to take longer than usual to be decided. To help us reduce delays and prevent the spread of the virus, please note the following:

New applications

Applications should be submitted via the Planning Portal. The Government encourages planning applications to be submitted electronically, to enable remote processing to continue as far as possible and support the latest social distancing guidelines. You can find out how to send planning applications to us on our [website](#). In addition, please include photographs that show the site in relation to adjacent properties. This will allow us to progress your application without visiting the site.

Site Notices

We now ask applicants to put up the site notice, to help us prevent the spread of the virus and allow the consultation period to start. This helps to reduce delays.

Meetings

All meetings with our planning officers will, for the foreseeable future, be undertaken online only. No meetings in person will be held.

We appreciate your patience and cooperation as we strive to keep our staff customers safe, while also continuing to provide essential services. Whilst we will try to keep delays to a minimum, we may have to ask for more time and therefore would appreciate your agreement to such requests.

From: Backwell Parish Clerk <clerk@backwell-pc.gov.uk>
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 1:43 PM
To: Richard Kent <Richard.Kent@n-somerset.gov.uk>
Subject: Airport parking

Caution: This email originated from outside North Somerset Council.

Only click on links or open attachments if you recognise the sender
and if you are certain that the content is safe.

Dear Richard

Backwell Parish Council recently met to discuss their planning applications, during these conversations the illegal car parking situation came up again and was hotly debated and brought about a change or shift in the Parish Council's viewpoint that they wish to communicate with North Somerset Council, which may help steer future decisions.

If you remember 2 or 3 years ago when it was at its worst, BPC suggested that they would find the funding to support NSC to engage a legal clause that would allow their enforcement people to close down the offenders activities from day one instead of the normal 28 days, putting an end to the time when the offender would just move the cars to another field so delaying any further legal action. Invariably these fields that were then vacated were, and still are, left in a terrible condition many left as a quagmire for months, and destroying the small scenic joys that the area can enjoy. These activities caused distress for the residents and the widespread area with enormous car parking areas constantly on the move, completely unofficial and avoiding any revenue for the council.

Following on from that, works that both BPC and NSC have done has meant the situation appears to have changed recently as we believe some 20 to 30 enforcement notices have been served to suspected offenders, we applaud this initiative and support NSC in closing down the large unregulated, untaxed operations that exist.

What we would like to flag is that some of these are residents who have approved Bed and Breakfast business, that operate successfully and are well run and maintained properly. This small cottage industry has been highlighted having worked with the residents of the Downside area who are often forgotten due to their larger Airport neighbour. There is an increasing awareness that this smaller scale activity actually benefits the area and the residents and provides a life blood to what previously would be dominated by either the airport or worse the larger illegal parking activities that is costly to NSC to police and maintain on a regular basis. The point we would like to make is prior to these recent notices there are genuine farmers and small businesses who have established a credible and beneficial businesses allowing small scale parking alternatives to Bristol Airport (who themselves are using Greenbelt area to park cars on a regular basis).

With the newly created council what we are asking for is help in achieving a balanced approach, not in support of the industrial sized off-airport car parks, just that for our law abiding residents and local farmers that they get to be allowed to continue and maintain their small businesses operations and generate legal and taxable incomes that benefits all parties in the process.

Yours sincerely

Jane Stone

Clerk to Backwell Parish Council

Victoria Watkins

From: Karen Bartlett
Sent: 18 June 2020 09:13
To: Claire Courtois; Richard Kent; Chris Nolan; Terry Karampini; Michael Reep; Neil Underhay
Subject: off site airport parking

Dear all

I thought I'd share this policy note ahead of our meeting this morning which explains the rationale of where we are today. I'm sure some of you would be aware of it anyway.



ED12-explanato...

Karen

Karen Bartlett
Principal Planning Enforcement Officer
Development & Environment
North Somerset Council

Tel: 01275 888811
E-Mail: Karen.Bartlett@n-somerset.gov.uk
Post: Town Hall, Walliscote Grove Road, Weston-super-Mare, BS23 1UJ
Web: www.n-somerset.gov.uk

Use our online [contact service](#) to get a response within five working days.

Other services available online

[Planning advice](#) (pre-application, discharge conditions, research etc)

[Look at applications](#) (view and submit comments about planning applications)

Building Regulations

For independent oversight of the key stages of construction use [North Somerset Building Control](#), a local service backed by national expertise.

Our response to Covid-19

We are currently operating a reduced service. Whilst we will do our best to progress applications, they are likely to take longer than usual to be decided. To help us reduce delays and prevent the spread of the virus, please note the following:

New applications

Applications should be submitted via the Planning Portal. The Government encourages planning applications to be submitted electronically, to enable remote processing to continue as far as possible and support the latest social distancing guidelines. You can find out how to send

planning applications to us on our [website](#). In addition, please include photographs that show the site in relation to adjacent properties. This will allow us to progress your application without visiting the site.

Site Notices

We now ask applicants to put up the site notice, to help us prevent the spread of the virus and allow the consultation period to start. This helps to reduce delays.

Meetings

All meetings with our planning officers will, for the foreseeable future, be undertaken online only. No meetings in person will be held.

We appreciate your patience and cooperation as we strive to keep our staff customers safe, while also continuing to provide essential services. Whilst we will try to keep delays to a minimum, we may have to ask for more time and therefore would appreciate your agreement to such requests.

Victoria Watkins

From: Simon Earles <Simon.Earles@bristolairport.com>
Sent: 15 September 2020 11:06
To: Richard Kent
Subject: Fwd: Airport parking

Caution: This email originated from outside North Somerset Council.

Only click on links or open attachments if you recognise the sender
and if you are certain that the content is safe.

Richard,

In light of Lucy's absence, I wonder if you could consider and respond on potential next steps on parking enforcement matters?

As you know, we have previously requested a bi-lateral meeting to jointly consider next steps on Parking Summit actions sitting with Bristol Airport and North Somerset Council, which I would ask you to consider this again.

Regards,

Simon

Simon Earles
Planning & Sustainability Director
Bristol Airport
Bristol, BS48 3DY

T:+44(0)1275 473642
M:+44(0)7739 899769
www.bristolairport.com

Amazing journeys start here

From: Simon Earles

Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2020 9:55:17 AM

To: Lucy Shomali <Lucy.Shomali@n-somerset.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Airport parking

Lucy,

Please see below.

I would be grateful if we could pick this up again with your team and agree which actions from the Parking Summit we will be taking forward, and those we are not, so we can communicate this to stakeholders. Perhaps a meeting would be helpful?

Many thanks

Regards,

Simon

Simon Earles

Planning & Sustainability Director

Bristol Airport

Bristol, BS48 3DY

T:+44(0)1275 473642

M:+44(0)7739 899769

www.bristolairport.com

Amazing journeys start here



From: clerk@winfordpc.org.uk <clerk@winfordpc.org.uk>

Sent: 01 September 2020 13:15

To: Simon Earles <Simon.Earles@bristolairport.com>

Cc: Paul Hatherell <paulhatherell@btinternet.com>; Pete Longden <peterlongdenpgl@gmail.com>; Gill Patch <patch.kingdown@btinternet.com>; Hugh Gregor <hugh.gregor@n-somerset.gov.uk>; Steve Thorne <Steve.Thorne@n-somerset.gov.uk>; David Bailey <David.Bailey@n-somerset.gov.uk>

Subject: Airport parking

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Simon

I understand that Paul Baker has now left Bristol Airport and that you will be taking over his portfolio. As you will be aware, Paul was working closely with ourselves and North Somerset Council officers to try to find solutions to airport parking related problems in our villages. At our last meeting it was left that the airport and NSC would go away to look at various solutions to the issues identified. Unfortunately, at the time we were unable to engage the help of the North Somerset Councillors responsible for the district-wide parking review, and I am trying to get them to take an interest now that the problem has returned.

I would be grateful for your thoughts on how the issues raised by the Parking Summit can now be taken forward please. The Parish Council has received several complaints over the past few weeks regarding various airport-related parking issues. The latest email is below for your information/thoughts.

Best wishes

Paula Shelley

Clerk to Winford Parish Council

Serving Winford, Felton and Regil

Tel: 01761 453046

Website www.winfordpc.org.uk

From: personal information

Sent: 28 August 2020 16:18

To: hugh.gregor@n-somerset.gov.uk

Cc: clerk@winfordpc.org.uk

Subject: Airport

Dear Mr Gregor

As soon as the airport resumed flights so did all the anti social activities we have endured, for some years.

personal information

personal information

Many thanks for any support and advice you are able to give.

Kind regards

personal information

Sent from Samsung tablet.

Simon Earles
Planning and Sustainability Director
Bristol Airport
Bristol
BS48 3DW
0117 457 5078

www.bristolairport.co.uk



ED12: EXPLANATORY NOTE ON OFF-AIRPORT CAR PARKING

Introduction

The local planning policy on off-airport car parking (OACP) has evolved between 2004, when it first appeared in the RLP Second Deposit Draft, and 2015, when it was expressed as Policy DM30 of the DMP Publication Version. This note summarises the process.

North Somerset Replacement Local Plan: First Deposit Draft (September 2002)

In this document, the policy for Bristol Airport (Policy T/12) made no reference to OACP. Officers were at this time dealing with a number of enforcement cases relating to OACP in the Green Belt and considered that a specific policy reference to the issue would assist in handling any future cases. Wording was therefore drafted for inclusion in the Second Deposit Draft.

North Somerset Replacement Local Plan: Second Deposit Draft (March 2004)

In this document, OACP was the subject of a sentence added to the end of Policy T/12:

“Car parking for the airport will be limited to on-site provision; airport-related parking in other locations will be resisted.”

This approach was set in the context of the Airport Surface Access Strategy (SAS), which formed Appendix B to the 2000 Local Transport Plan and which sought to promote public transport to encourage modal shift from cars. Para. 9.135A of the Second Deposit Draft explained that:

“The provision of off-airport parking could undermine the SAS and will be resisted. It is also desirable in terms of containing its impact on the openness of the Green Belt that airport-related development should be accommodated within the airport complex where possible and not on other Green Belt sites.”

North Somerset Replacement Local Plan: Further Pre-Inquiry Changes (March 2005)

In November 2004, Full Council considered proposed amendments to the Second Deposit Draft in the light of representations received. These Further Pre-Inquiry Changes (FPICs) were published for consultation in March 2005. Two changes, Vol/1/FPIC/041 and Vol/1/FPIC/055, related to OACP and reversed the policy that had been introduced at Second Deposit.

Council considered Policy T/12 to be over-restrictive in relation to OACP in that it would exclude the possibility of parking provision in otherwise acceptable locations.

It supported replacement of the last sentence with new wording stating that, except within the Green Belt, OACP will be permitted where there are no unacceptable consequences for environmental, local amenity, landscape, highways or traffic considerations.

For consistency, Council also supported replacement of the second sentence of para. 9.135A with new wording stating that:

“It is desirable in terms of containing its impact on the openness of the Green Belt that airport-related car parking within the Green Belt should be limited to on-site provision. This is in line with Policy RD/5 [development in the Green Belt]. Elsewhere, such parking will be permitted subject to detailed considerations.”

North Somerset Replacement Local Plan: Council’s Proof of Evidence (July 2005)

Officers gave further consideration to the issues raised by objectors to the FPICs. The FPIC wording, creating a presumption in favour of development outside the Green Belt, would not have been consistent with the Airport Surface Access Strategy. It was not considered by the relevant officers or by Counsel to be defensible.

A revised wording was agreed by the Council’s Executive Member for Strategic Planning and, signed-off by the Director of Development and Environment, this formed the basis of the Council’s evidence to the Inquiry. This wording sought to define more precisely what locations, besides the airport, were acceptable locations for airport-related parking. In doing so, it sought to maintain the Council’s position that parking should not be restricted exclusively to the airport but equally is not to be encouraged in areas where unacceptable environmental harm could result. Read in conjunction with all other Plan policies, the further amended wording was considered to provide adequate environmental safeguards. The wording *“will be resisted”* was preferred to *“will not be permitted”*, the former being more positive without being laissez-faire.

The further amended wording put forward for discussion was:

“Car parking for the airport will be resisted except in the following locations:

- (a) within the airport operational area;*
- (b) in association with overnight accommodation, where the number of customer parking spaces on-site does not unreasonably exceed the number of bedrooms (in no case by more than three times the relevant parking standard specified by Policy T/6) and there is a demonstrable relationship between the two;*
- (c) within the settlement boundary of Weston-super-Mare or within the Weston Regeneration Area, where the provision is planned as part of an integrated transport strategy for the town and its surroundings that contributes to the creation of more sustainable travel patterns.”*

“9.135A The provision of off-airport parking could undermine the ASAS and needs to be tightly regulated. It is also desirable in terms of containing its impact on

the openness of the Green Belt that airport-related development should be accommodated within the airport complex and not on other Green Belt sites. Policy T/12 recognises that limited opportunities for off-airport parking exist that are compatible with this approach. There may be opportunities associated with the regeneration of Weston-super-Mare that contribute towards improved public transport between the town and the airport.”

Clause (b) was developed in discussion with the Council’s highways development control officer. It acknowledged Members’ concerns that the airport should not have a parking monopoly but that any exceptions to the rule should not harm the Green Belt or discourage the use of public transport where it might otherwise be a viable option.

The figure of 3x was originally related to the maximum car parking standard in Policy T/6. In the Second Deposit Draft, the standard for C1 uses (hotels, boarding and guest houses, motels) was 0.9 space per bedroom plus 1 per 3 staff (subject to a series of negative multipliers producing a series of lower standards in the towns that was related to their public transport accessibility). The proposed wording of T/12 would therefore have produced a maximum of 0.9 x 3, or 2.7 spaces per bedroom, plus any allocation for staff. The schedule to Policy T/6 states that *“Provision is normally to be limited to the number of whole spaces resulting from the calculation, disregarding any additional fraction.”* Applying this rule, the maximum provision would therefore have been 2 spaces per bedroom, apart from any staff spaces that were under-used and therefore available for customer use. The rationale for this is that, at any one time, 1 space would be used by customers present in the accommodation and 1 would be used by other customers to park whilst away on a flight. A more relaxed interpretation would regard this policy as an exception to the ‘normal’ disregarding of fractions. In that case, 3 spaces would be available, 2 of them for absent customers. Assuming that customers stay one night at the beginning and one night at the end of their journey by air, and that absences are on average for around one week, this equates to six overnight bookings per week. OACP provision beyond this would therefore be unlikely to be able to establish a demonstrable relationship to the number of bedrooms.

North Somerset Replacement Local Plan: Inspector’s Report (April 2006)

The Local Plan Inspector’s final report had the following to say about OACP:

“48.1 The Council has received opposing counter-representations each time it has sought to change the draft plan in response to representations on successive Deposit Drafts and Proposed Changes. Initially, in the First Deposit, the issue was not addressed, but in response to representations that the plan should contain a basis for the enforcement action that has been pursued against scattered airport-related parking sites in the vicinity of the airport, a rider was attached to policy T/12 supported by a new paragraph 9.135A. This attracted objection that the policy would represent a fundamental interference in the operation of the free market by in effect giving BIA a monopoly of provision and in FPIC/055 the Council proposed a relaxation to accept off-site parking outside the Green Belt. In turn this attracted objection not only from BIA but also from local community interests.

48.2 Clearly, a policy that would have the effect of interfering with the operation of the free market cannot be lightly countenanced, but it seems to me that the proposed supporting text gives two very good reasons for seeking to concentrate parking, namely to further the Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) and to minimise harm to the visual amenities of the Green Belt. I put it that way as if the car parking were all to be provided as surface parking the land area lost to the Green Belt around the airport would be the same whether on-site or nearby. However, I have earlier supported the main thrust of the Council's case for encouraging the maximum extent of multi-storey parking that can be reasonably achieved in the valley north of the terminal. To the extent to which surface parking is still required, in my judgement, extensive landscaping and screening is most likely to be achievable if it is provided in a concentrated form.

48.3 Even if some pockets of parking might be able to be located elsewhere on land that is already well-screened or within existing buildings, a scatter of sites will inevitably hinder the strategy of minimising vehicular movements on the approaches to the airport and particularly that on unsuitable minor roads. Only where parking away from the terminal is on a large scale, as on the south side of the airport, will it be efficient to transfer users to/from the terminal or airport place of work by bus. I agree with the Council that Messrs Pearce appear to misunderstand the operation of Green Belt policy. If re-use of a building is involved this would not normally constitute inappropriate development as is made clear in paragraph 3.8 of PPG2. Demonstration of very special circumstances would not therefore arise. However, the objection in relation to the ASAS would be likely to remain. This would be the situation with regard to the re-use of the former Avon Cattle Market at Winford considered in chapter 8 under policy H/2 sites. Thus, even if an allocation is not strictly precluded by the terms of PPG2 in relation to the re-use of an existing building, I do not consider that such an allocation for airport parking would be warranted.

48.4 In Mr Robins' Proof CP/0034, the Council put forward further compromise proposals both for the rider to policy T/12 and the supporting text in Paragraph 9.135A. Broadly speaking these were accepted by the local community interests appearing at the Inquiry and by BIA in so far as they now only accept off-site provision at hotels or at Weston. BIA and Mr Glynn question the feasibility of the latter. I find it difficult to contemplate how securing appropriate land would be achieved at a location where urban development values would be anticipated of a scale to accommodate the 1000 or more spaces estimated by BIA to be necessary to justify a dedicated bus service. The Weston Vision Plans do not make this clear as yet. However, conceptually as Weston is expected to provide residence for many airport workers and it is intended to seek to enhance bus services between Weston and the airport it would seem wrong to rule out the possibility if a means of bringing it to fruition can be devised. Consequently, I shall recommend insertion of the text essentially as finally put forward by the Council subject only to the clarification and simplification discussed at the Inquiry. I consider that the requirements of policy T/12 itself and other relevant policies will provide sufficient environmental safeguards.

Recommendation

48.5 I recommend that the rider to policy T/12 be modified to read as follows:

“Car parking for the airport will not be permitted except in the following locations:

- a) within the airport operational area or any agreed extension thereto;*
- b) in association with overnight accommodation, provided that the number of parking spaces on site does not exceed three times the number of bedrooms;*
- c) within the settlement boundary of Weston-super-Mare or within the Weston Regeneration Area, where the provision is planned as part of an integrated transport strategy for the town and its links with the airport that contributes to the creation of sustainable travel patterns.”*

48.6 I recommend that Paragraph 9.135A be modified so that it reads as follows:

“The provision of off-airport parking could undermine the ASAS and needs to be tightly regulated. It is also desirable in terms of minimising impact on the openness of the Green Belt that airport-related development should be accommodated within the airport complex and not on other Green Belt sites. policy T/12 recognises that there are only limited opportunities for off-airport parking that are compatible with these objectives. There may be opportunities associated with the regeneration of Weston-super-Mare that contribute towards improved public transport between the town and the airport.””

North Somerset Replacement Local Plan: Proposed Modifications (June 2006)

The Inspector’s Report was considered by Full Council in June 2006.

The recommended amendment to the policy was accepted, subject to changing (a) to read *“within the Green Belt inset at Lulsgate, subject to iii) [landscape impact] above”* and at the end of (c) to read *“creation of more sustainable travel patterns”*. These changes were made for consistency with the Inspector’s recommendation for a Green Belt inset and to confirm application of the landscape test to car parking within the inset; (c) was changed because sustainable travel patterns are relative, not absolute.

The recommended amendment to para. 9.135A was accepted, subject to changing *“airport complex”* to *“Lulsgate inset”* and inserting a comma between *“other”* and *“Green Belt sites”*. These changes were made for consistency with the Inspector’s recommendation for a Green Belt inset.

North Somerset Replacement Local Plan: Adopted Plan (March 2007)

The final wording of T/12 as adopted includes the following statement on OACP, which incorporates the Proposed Modifications:

“Car parking for the airport will not be permitted except in the following locations:

- a) within the Green Belt inset at Lulsgate, subject to iii) above;*

- b) *in association with overnight accommodation, provided that the number of parking spaces on site does not exceed three times the number of bedrooms;*
- c) *within the settlement boundary of Weston-super-Mare or within the Weston Regeneration Area, where the provision is planned as part of an integrated transport strategy for the town and its links with the airport that contributes to the creation of more sustainable travel patterns."*

The reasoned justification is now at para. 9.110:

"The provision of off-airport parking could undermine the ASAS and needs to be tightly regulated. It is also desirable in terms of minimising impact on the openness of the Green Belt that airport-related development should be accommodated within the Lulsgate Inset and not on other Green Belt sites. Policy T/12 recognises that there are only limited opportunities for off-airport parking that are compatible with these objectives. There may be opportunities associated with the regeneration of Weston-super-Mare that contribute towards improved public transport between the town and the airport."

The published edition is in error in not including the comma between "other" and "Green Belt sites".

North Somerset Core Strategy: Adopted Plan (April 2012)

The Core Strategy introduced a new policy, CS23, for Bristol Airport. This is a strategic policy and does not supersede T/12. Para. 3.295 states that:

"The policy relates to the development of Bristol Airport only. Off-site car parking is regulated separately (Replacement Local Plan Policy T/12) and the Core Strategy proposes no change to this approach."

North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan: Consultation Draft (February 2013)

This document proposed two new policies – DM30 and DM54 – to replace T/12. DM30 is the policy dealing with OACP:

"Airport-related car parking additional to that approved at Bristol Airport or acceptable under Policy DM54 (Bristol Airport) will only be permitted in association with overnight accommodation located on the same site, provided that the number of car parking spaces does not exceed three times the number of bedrooms."

This wording rolled forward the RLP approach, omitting references to Weston-super-Mare, where opportunities have now been discounted. It also tightened the definition of 'on site' to clarify that the site used for OACP must be the same as the site containing the accommodation.

North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan Part 1: Development Management Policies: Publication Version (February 2015)

This document confirmed the inclusion of the two new policies – now numbered DM30 and DM50 – to replace T/12. DM30 is the policy dealing with OACP. The wording is now revised as follows (substantive changes from the Consultation Draft are underlined):

“Outside of the Green Belt, airport-related car parking additional to that approved at Bristol Airport or acceptable under Policy DM50: Bristol Airport will only be permitted in association with existing overnight accommodation located on the same site, provided that the number of car parking spaces does not exceed three times the number of bedrooms.”

The adopted North Somerset Parking Standards SPD (November 2013) sets out the Council's current parking standards and is considered more up-to-date than RLP Policy T/6. For C1 uses, it sets a required standard of 1 space per bedroom plus 1 space per 3 staff. The relationship originally created with T/12 and now to the emerging DM30 is therefore preserved. OACP provision allows the required standard per bedroom to be trebled, beyond which point the policy acts as a cap on further provision.

DR/18.09.15

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Neil Underhay** <Neil.Underhay@n-somerset.gov.uk>

Date: Fri, 25 Jun 2021 at 16:02

Subject: Planning Application reference number 20/P/1438/FUL - Proposed Park & Ride Car Park at Heathfield Park, Puxton

To: Amanda Sutherland <amanda@sutherlandpls.com>

Cc: James Wigmore <James.Wigmore@n-somerset.gov.uk>, Richard Allard <Richard.Allard@n-somerset.gov.uk>, Roger Willmot <Roger.Willmot@n-somerset.gov.uk>, Cat Lodge <Cat.Lodge@n-somerset.gov.uk>, Simon Bunn <Simon.Bunn@n-somerset.gov.uk>

Dear Ms Sutherland,

Thank you for your email and your contributions at the meeting. I have reflected on the discussions and I have re-read the application documents. I said I would summarise my views within a week of the meeting and I set these out below. These address 'Matters of Principle' and 'Detailed Issues'.

Matters of Principle

I note your observations on the limitations of Policy DM30. The Council will doubtless decide whether this policy is sufficient going forward, but a future review does not undermine the current status of DM30. The transport objectives underpinning DM30: which is to prevent an oversupply of airport parking and reduce reliance on car travel and increase sustainable travel options, are, however, consistent with paragraphs 103, 108 and 110 of the NPPF. I give DM30 significant weight.

In my view, the key principle to be considered for your client's application is its impact on sustainable travel and the Air Surface Access Strategy. There are several aspects to this:

- Whether OACP proves a transport demand for 3,000+ more spaces.
- The reliance on BAL's Parking Demand Study, and whether this demonstrates a need for the quantum of parking in your clients application
- The transfer of passengers to/from Bristol Airport from the proposed Park & Ride Site

During last week's discussion and in your email below, you say you can supply details of 17 of the known 30 operators of current OACPs using PD rights. I would be interested to see the breakdown of these spaces in terms of the numbers at each site, and the length of time and dates when each of these car parks were/are operating. The current planning application does not suggest that spaces at other OACP's will be reduced by the proposed additional spaces in this application.

At the meeting you suggested several times that the current OACP's proves that there is a need for 3,101 additional spaces. I don't agree this proves a demand for 3000 spaces, let alone 3,000 more spaces. The take-up of these spaces may exist simply because they are there, advertised, and competitively priced. If it is too easy for passengers to drive and park, that is exactly what they will do. Since these spaces are not subject to the critical review of a planning application, which will look at need

in the round in relation to the ASAS, it does not prove that they are needed to meet a shortfall of airport parking.

That your client's justification for 3,101 more spaces is based on BAL's Car Parking Demand Study/ addendums for the 12 mppa planning application is a weakness of the current application. The Council refused that application and its recently published transport evidence for impending appeal contends that BAL has not demonstrated a proven case for the level of additional car parking in that application. The Council considers that BAL underestimate the percentage of passengers travelling to/from BA public transport (based on commonly used CAA data), and that they under-provide public transport improvements up to 12 mppa. This exaggerates the level of additional car parking needed for 12 mppa. The Council also disagrees with BAL's argument that most additional car parking in the 12 mppa appeal is needed ahead of 10 mppa being reached, which is also your client's case. The Council further disputes that BAL has proven the claimed 95% occupancy levels in its car parks, and that it disagrees with the contention that there is an over-riding need for more surface level parking. These matters will be examined at the Inquiry, but unless further information is presented that leads the Council to a different conclusion, or the appeal is allowed, the Council is not going to change its position.

The consideration of the 10 mppa planning application in 2011 acknowledged that OACP was a long ongoing matter for the Council and this was likely to continue, which has proved to be the case. The ASAS approved as part of that application did, for the first time, take significant steps to substantially increase public transport services within key passenger catchment areas. The primary objective of the ASAS is purposely to change passenger travel habits by making it easier to travel to and from BA by bus and coach services and not over-provide car parking. The increase in the percentage of passengers now using these services over the subsequent years (before Covid) shows that this investment works, and the council is committed to ensure this trend continues in the future. OACP's that operate outside the ASAS are only encourage more passengers to drive from source, which is the opposite of the ASAS, and piecemeal OACP's with no critical regard to its impact on the ASAS is more likely to harm sustainable travel than compliment it.

If more people are choosing to drive from source and park at or near to Bristol Airport than was planned for in the 10 mppa planning permission, including transport investment and parking infrastructure in that permission, the reasons for this needs to be understood and then addressed comprehensively through an updated ASAS. As this application is not based on an assessment of its impact on ASAS, there is no proven context for the number of spaces proposed in the application. That the final leg of the journey is proposed by a fleet of electric buses is positive by itself, but this is likely to be a comparatively short part of the overall journey, which would not mitigate the added passenger travel from source.

The harmful impact of piecemeal airport car parking on the ASAS has been a key issue in the outcome of recent planning enforcement appeals at Birds Farm and Coles Garage. It is acknowledged these sites are in the Green Belt, and the merits of those proposals are different in some respects to your client's application. The harm to the Green Belt, by reason of inappropriateness, in those cases contributed heavily to those appeal decisions. However, it is also clear from those decisions that

independent proposals for airport parking which do not tie in with the wider Air Surface Access Strategy, are likely to undermine it, and this has been treated by Inspectors' as a significant material consideration against those cases. In my view, the same applies to your clients application.

At the meeting we discussed the option of transport officers setting out S106 contributions towards public transport improvements to mitigate the impacts of the development on the ASAS. Having reflected on this, that would be a potential option if your client's application had justified the level of additional parking in the context of its impact on the ASAS. Since this has not been done however, I do not see how the Council could reasonably justify the scope or sum of planning obligations having regard to Regulation 122(2) of the 'CIL' Regulations 2010.

My view from what I have read and heard so far on the application, is that the application is contrary to Policy DM30 of the North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan and it fails to demonstrate a need for the quantity of additional airport parking that is proposed. Moreover, the proposed development will encourage more passengers to undertake most of their journey to and from Bristol Airport by private vehicle. This is not conducive to sustainable travel and it will undermine the Airport Air Surface Access Strategy. This contrary to Policy CS1 and CS10 of the North Somerset Core Strategy; Policy DM24 of the North Somerset Sites and Policies Plan Part 1: Development Management Policies and at least paragraphs 103 and 108a of the NPPF.

I am happy to give your client time to consider my views and respond, but as matters stand, I cannot support the principle of the application, even allowing for it being an alternative the BAL's additional Green Belt parking proposal in the Green Belt.

In this context, any further time and resource that your clients may decide to put into the separate detailed points discussed last week (summarised below), should be undertaken in the knowledge that I do not feel it will have outweigh an objection to the principle of the proposal. To be clear, I am highly likely to recommend that the application is refused, regardless of whether other issues can be resolved. I nevertheless summarise the status of the other issues as below:

Detailed Issues

Road Access

A stage 1 RSA will be needed to further advance consideration of the Council's current objection to the proposed road junction i to the site. This should also clarify the extent street lighting.

Levels

At the meeting you understood that an updated version of the existing levels survey had been sent to the Council. At time of preparing this email, this has not been received. I am not therefore unable to review site levels and its impact on the flood zone/need or otherwise for a flood risk sequential test. Proposed finished levels are also required to complete an assessment of the landscape impact.

Impact on living conditions of nearby residents

The proposed use is intended to operate 24 hours a day 7 days a week. It would involve a high turnover of vehicles entering and leaving the site, which are then manoeuvred to and from block parking areas. The applicants PDAS (para 7.5) says there will be two arrival peaks at 04.00am and 11.00am, with a lesser distribution at other times. The combination of arrival numbers and times has a clear potential to cause noise disturbance, particularly at night, to nearby residents (at Heathfield Park, Moorland Park and other nearby houses) through the revving and idling of vehicle engines, tyres moving on gravel, remote locking and alarm sounds, opening and closing of car doors / boots, wheeling or luggage to/from the reception building and people noise. The Council's adopted Scoping Report referred to 'sensitive receptors' as "people at home" and "adverse changes to noise and air quality should be assessed". This should be provided.

In terms of air quality, you consider the proposal would take airport bound cars arising off the road further from the airport and to that extent an improvement in air quality would ensue. That may be the case, if this was a straight replacement for BAL proposed additional surface parking in the Green Belt, but the proposal will instead concentrate 000's of vehicle trips at your clients site, and so the issue is not removed but simply diverted to an alternative location. The implication does not assess the impact of this on air-quality, which Richard Allard advised that it should do.

Flood Risk Assessment

We didn't cover this at the meeting, but the Council's Flood Risk Management Team published comments (dated 6 April 2021) advise that insufficient information is provided to date to assess the site-specific flood risk assessment. This will need to be resolved.

Biodiversity

I have emailed Simon Bunn (see below) who currently oversees Ecology, suggesting that a discussion is held between the applicants Ecological Consultant and the Council's Consultant Ecologist to discuss the scope and duration of Bat surveys. If you can reply to me and copy in Simon Bunn providing your client's details, this can be set up.

Archaeology

I have spoken with Cat Lodge and I made Cat aware of the previous planning permission and the resulting landfill that took place from that permission. This has not changed Cat's view that her request for further information is still needed. That a past planning permission, which pre-dates the NPPF, was not accompanied by a similar assessment is noted, but I don't see this is a reason not to request it now, since Cat considers that it is needed to reach to make a reasonable and informed assessment of the potential archaeology affecting the site.

Scope of the ES

The scope of your client's ES appears to be based on comments in the Council's EIA Screening Reply rather than the subsequent adopted ES Scoping Opinion. This is not acceptable for the reasons set out in my email to you dated 21 April. The Council can request further information under Regulation 25 of the EIA Regs. Because this will involve significant extra work, delay and costs to your client, and I do not consider this will address the more fundamental concerns officers have regarding matters of principle, it would be unreasonable not to give your clients the opportunity to consider this. Please raise this with your clients and confirm whether they intend to adhere to the adopted Scoping Opinion and supply the additional information for inclusion in the ES, if requested by the Council.

Please note I am on leave until 6 July, but I will attend to your reply on my return.

Kind regards

Neil

Neil Underhay
Principal Planning Officer
Place Directorate
North Somerset Council

Tel: 01275 888811

Web: www.n-somerset.gov.uk

Home improvements

Get practical advice at www.labcfrontdoor.co.uk.

Covid-19

All meetings with our planning officers will, for the foreseeable future, be undertaken virtually only. No meetings in person will be held.

We are also currently experiencing an unprecedented increase in the number of applications and enquiries being submitted. Unfortunately, this means we will take longer to deal with some requests. While we will try to keep delays to a minimum, we may have to ask for more time and therefore would appreciate your agreement to such requests. We appreciate your patience and cooperation.

Email security

To protect our systems from cyber-attacks, we use firewalls and other measures to identify and block emails and files that could contain some form of malware or phishing links. To ensure that your emails are delivered to us, we recommend that you: 1) use good quality anti-virus protection systems; 2) don't add attachments that are password protected; and 3) always use delivery receipt, so that you know it was received.

From: Amanda Sutherland <amanda@sutherlandpls.com>
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2021 11:03 AM
To: Neil Underhay <Neil.Underhay@n-somerset.gov.uk>; Jessica Lomax <jessica.roberts@sutherlandpls.com>
Subject: Airport parking - Heathfield

Caution: This email originated from outside North Somerset Council.

Only click on links or open attachments if you recognise the sender and you are certain that the content is safe.

Dear Neil

Thank you very much for your time on Friday, I felt it was a very useful discussion and has given us a clear route forward in terms of working through the statutory consultees comments and providing the evidence required to demonstrate that this is an excellent site to deliver airport car parking in a sustainable (and future-proofed) manner.

During our meeting, you mentioned policy DM30 of the Sites and Allocations Plan Part 1 a number of times. This policy only allows the creation of airport-related car parking when offered in conjunction with overnight accommodation.

As we discussed, I disagree with policy DM30 and find it to be overly restrictive in failing to consider sustainable OACP operations. I referred you to the paper created by Karen Bartlett in 2016 which was reconsidered by Richard Kent last year and the commitment to review the policy Richard made to the local Parish councils. Of course, I recognise that you can not simply disregard the policy as it forms part of the development plan and is, therefore, a material consideration. To provide you with a planning justification I wish to set out paragraph 12 of the NPPF 2019:

"12. The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed."

Paragraph 12 gives you, the decision-maker, the ability to weigh up the planning balance and if material considerations allow it you may deviate from the Local Plan Policy. In this instance, we have a demonstrated need for car parking of this quantum, with Bristol Airport applying for a similar number in the Green Belt. I would note that Bristol Airports Green Belt car parking would

also fail DM30 and DM50 so if it is accepted their site is required as per policy then such consideration can also be given to this site. I understand that the LPA recommended approval of the BAL proposal prior to refusal at committee on this basis. You were concerned to ensure we had adequately considered the Policy and I was able to confirm that if you did retain a concern about the site not offering accommodation as per DM30, we would propose a hotel at the site to address this but had hoped to do that as part of our forward plan in 2-4 years given the investment required and the current market following Covid tending more towards the staycation opportunity.

As part of the application, we have advanced an identified need; whilst I appreciate that the LPA position at inquiry is that the BAL proposal has not correctly identified the need in their Parking Demand Study (as updated), we are able to provide details of 17 of the known 30 operators of current OACPs demonstrating in excess of 3000 spaces are currently offered across these sites using GPDO rights. It is clear that we can demonstrate a need over and above the BAL study and in support of the LPA aim to reduce OACP in the Green Belt. We have already discussed as part of our submissions to the BAL inquiry, that the sequential testing for the proposed extension of parking at the airport cannot meet the sequential test requirements as our site is available and deliverable. The site will remove cars from the A roads, villages and towns of North Somerset and also improve air quality in these villages by removing vehicles and using electric buses to transfer passengers to the airport. As such there are clear advantages to an approval at this location.

With regards to the other matters raised in the meeting, you have kindly allowed the sub-consultants to liaise directly with each other so I will respond in due course - once they have come to agreement on their relative areas of expertise.

I look forward to your response and comments with regards to policy DM30 and the principle of the application.

Kind Regards

**Amanda Sutherland LLb(Hons) PG Dip LPC
Planning Solicitor**

Sutherland Property & Legal Services Ltd
First Floor Offices
11E Radford Park Road
Plymstock
Plymouth
PL9 9DG

Tel: 01752 403983 or 07747 084630
Email: amanda@sutherlandpls.com
Website: <https://www.sutherlandpls.com/>

Opening hours : Monday - Friday, 9am - 5pm. (Closed - bank holidays)

COVID-19 Update - April 2021

Following the Government's latest announcement we have now begun working from the office again. Please note that at this time we are still unable to undertake face to face meetings, this should change in the coming months. Should anyone have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

This email is confidential and may contain privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient it may be unlawful for you to read, copy, distribute, disclose, or otherwise make use of the information herein. If you have received this email in error please contact us immediately. Sutherland PLS Ltd will accept no liability for the mis-transmission, interference, or interception of any email and you are reminded that email is not a secure method of communication. Please note that whilst we try to ensure that all inbound and outbound emails are virus free, we cannot accept liability for viruses or computer problems which may occur as a result of this email and/or any attachments thereto

Keeping in touch

Visit www.n-somerset.gov.uk for information about our services

Council Connect: for all streets, open spaces and environmental protection enquiries visit www.n-somerset.gov.uk/connect

Care Connect: for all adult social services enquiries visit www.n-somerset.gov.uk/careconnect

Out of hours emergencies: 01934 622 669

Privacy and confidentiality notice:

The information contained in this email transmission is intended by North Somerset Council for the use of the named individual or entity to which it is directed and may contain information that is privileged or otherwise confidential. If you have received this email transmission in error, please delete it from your system without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error by reply email. Any views expressed within this message or any other associated files are the views and expressions of the individual and not North Somerset Council. North Somerset Council takes all reasonable precautions to ensure that no viruses are transmitted with any electronic communications sent, however the council can accept no responsibility for any loss or damage resulting directly or indirectly from the use of this email or any contents or attachments.

Date: 11 September 2020
Our ref: 2961080
Contact: Victoria Watkins
Email: victoria.watkins@n-somerset.gov.uk



Ms Amanda Sutherland
Sutherland Property & Legal Services Ltd
1st Floor
1 Stamford Fort Cottages
Stamford Road
Plymouth
Devon
PL9 9SQ

Development and Environment - Information requests
North Somerset Council
Town Hall
Weston-super-Mare
BS23 1UJ

DX 744900 Clevedon

Dear Ms Sutherland

Environmental Information Regulations 2004

I am pleased to provide some of the information you have requested. I have enclosed copies of the information. Please accept my apologies for the delay in our response.

I can confirm that the remainder of the information you have requested is held by North Somerset Council. However, this information is covered by an exemption.

As confirmed on 4 August we do hold internal correspondence which falls within the scope of your request. These records are exempt from disclosure under Regulation 12(4)(d) of the Environmental Information regulations (EIRs). The information consists of material which is still in the course of completion, unfinished documents including drafts or incomplete data.

The council recognises the public interest in accessing information about planning and development matters. However, there is also a public interest in officials having a working environment that provides a 'safe space to think' – i.e. the space to discuss matters and arrive at a position without automatic public scrutiny of those workings – especially where the final position will be made public.

It is considered that the greater public interest therefore lies in not providing the information at this time. In coming to that conclusion, the public interest in providing the information has been carefully weighed against any prejudice to the public interest that might arise from withholding the information; in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

This response therefore acts as a refusal notice under regulation 14 of the Environmental Information Regulations.

North Somerset Council now considers that it has complied with your request. However, you have a right to appeal if you are dissatisfied with our response. Requests for an internal review must be made in writing, and within 40 working days of this response being issued to you. When requesting an internal review, please include your reference number, the date of your original request and your contact details. Please also include an explanation of why you are dissatisfied with our response. Requests for an internal review should be sent to foi@n-somerset.gov.uk

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:
The Information Commissioner's Office, Wycliffe House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF.
Phone: 0303 123 1113
Website: www.ico.gov.uk

I will now close your request as of this date.

Yours sincerely

Victoria Watkins

| <u>Operator</u> | <u>Spaces</u> | <u>Employees</u> | <u>Annual turnover – 19/20</u> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| A | 50 | 4 | £121,000 |
| B | 100 | 8 | £285,000 |
| C | 10 | 2 | £274,000 |
| D | 200 | 9 | £640,000 |
| E | 10 | 2 | £38,000 |
| F | 30 | 4 | £110,000 |
| G | 100 | 6 | £310,000 |
| H | 50 | 4 | £175,000 |
| I | 200 | 8 | £620,000 |
| J | 700 | 14 | £700,000.00 |
| K | 200 | 8 | £600,000 |
| L | 800 | 18 | £998,477.00 |
| M | 800 | 17 | £738,000 |
| <u>13 KNOWN OACP</u> | <u>3250</u> | <u>104</u> | <u>£5,609,477</u> |