

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

Development Control Committee

Date

**OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE PREPARATION OF THE MAIN
AGENDA**

ITEM

ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Item No.	Application No.	Address
1	13/04456/FUL	Temple Inn Main Road Temple Cloud BS39 5DA

Further objection received from Mr. Michael Dean:

In connection with planning application 13/04456/FUL, to be heard on the 22nd October 2014, we would still like to object strongly on the following grounds:

Mainly CP6 Environmental Quality: 1. Three Storey Town Houses, Four Bedrooms with only two parking spaces each represents **insufficient parking**. There are too many accesses to driveways in Temple Inn Lane on this side of the road which the school children use.

2. The design of these houses are more like inner town houses than village houses, and they are not in any way in keeping with any surrounding houses – **there are no three storey houses in this area**.

3. With the refurbishment of the Public House and the building of the 10 bedroom hotel block there is definitely **insufficient parking** and if cars do park in Temple Inn Lane as has been suggested by the developers, it will be utter chaos, with the 40 foot HGV'S and school coaches which use this road.

To alleviate the above problems, we feel as though the two town houses should be forfeited to create extra parking and also a small area given over to a garden, which a country pub needs for success, and the access for this created through the existing site, i.e. cutting out all access from Temple Inn Lane. This would also alleviate the problems with vehicles leaving the car park late at night, with car headlights shining into houses opposite. This would be a lot more environmentally friendly.

Further comments from Kate Atkinson – Chair of Cameley Parish Council commenting in a personal capacity:

A major reason for the refusal of the application on the Temple Inn Lane site (13/03562/OUT) was concerns about the junction of A37 and Temple Inn Lane; decision copied below.

The traffic generated from this proposal would use the junction of Temple Inn lane with the A37.

By virtue of the high traffic levels and congestion problems on the A37 and substandard visibility splays, the junction is considered unsuitable to accommodate the increase in traffic from this development and would be likely to lead to additional hazards and conflict with all users of the highway. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to saved policies T.1 (2) and T.24

(i) of the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan including minerals and waste policies Adopted

October 2007 and the guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Temple Inn proposals envisage a pub car park for only 4 vehicles, if the letting rooms and pub are occupied, exiting close to the junction with the A37. Additional parking along Temple Inn Lane close to the junction mentioned above has been suggested as the car parking area for the pub. Two four bed houses with no garages and only two off-road parking spaces each are also included very close to this junction.

The current proposals will make the traffic situation at the junction much worse and it is hard to see how the current proposals can be accepted in the light of the Dev. Cttee's decision shown above.

Removing the two houses fronting onto Temple Inn Lane and replacing them with additional car parking and some outside space for the pub would seem to provide a solution. As the developers already own the site the land costs involved must be considerably smaller than an outside developer would face and contributions asked for by BANES via S106 are minimal. So it does not seem likely removal of the semi-detached houses would make the scheme unviable, although I accept it may be less profitable.

Item No. 2 Application No. 14/02887/FUL

Address

Lower Tunley Farm
Stoneage Lane
Tunley
Bath
BA2 0DS

The report refers to the proposed building being sited further to the south than the AGRN building. This should however refer to being sited further to the north.

Item No. 3 and 4 Application No. 14/03180/FUL and 14/03181/LBA

Address

Cleveland House
Sydney Road
Bathwick
Bath
BA2 6NR

Further comments/correspondence received following re-consultation.

ENGLISH HERITAGE - We have no further comments to make on this proposal. I would add that I assume that the Planning Application description has also been altered to reflect the change of use. If so our comments on the planning application also still stand.

BATH PRESERVATION TRUST – (updated comment of objection)

This further revision now seeks permission for an upper level garden and balustrade which was omitted from the approved application, at an increased height. On balance we found that the previously approved application, which was revised in response to objections from both BPT and the Georgian Group, presented a scheme which minimised harm to the heritage asset and wider conservation area while at the same time ensuring the use of this building for the future.

We object to the increase in height of the extension and glass balustrade, which at a higher level would have an intrusive impact on the architectural composition of the listed building, and have a particularly uncomfortable relationship with the level of the string course. In order to retain subservience the height of the extension should be well below the string course.

We reserve judgement on the suitability of a roof terrace on the side this building which is felt to be somewhat inappropriate.

We still have serious concerns over the use of one of the blind windows as a stone door to provide access to the roof terrace. Our reservations are founded in an understanding that the blind windows are features of high architectural and historic significance as part of the intended design and ought to be retained. This intervention, the increase in depth and impact on the string course, therefore disrupts the historic fabric and design of this elevation and results in unacceptable harm to the historic fabric.

A stone clad access door would be somewhat unauthentic. We would ask for any examples where this approach has been used successfully to be submitted in support of this application prior to any approval. We are particularly concerned about durability and potential damage which may lead to a degraded appearance over time. We would be interested to know what

alternative access arrangement could be provided if this intervention proved unacceptable and unfeasible?

The current proposal would cause the loss of important architectural features and composition, historic fabric and character, and would lead to substantial harm to the listed building. The height of the extension proposed would be harmful to the setting of the listed building, and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of Bath Conservation Area. For these reasons the proposed works would fail to preserve the architectural or historic interest and character of the heritage asset contrary to Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the NPPF.

Should the application be approved the use of dressed natural Bath Stone ashlar in construction must be secured by Condition, and the appearance of the roof terrace must be managed by Condition or covenant to restrict the placement of potted trees, parasols and drying washing, which would amount to visual clutter and have a harmful effect on the setting of the listed building.

CLLR DAVID MARTIN – wrote to inform that he wishes to speak on this application at the DCC meeting on 22 October