

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

Development Control Committee

26 October 2011

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE PREPARATION OF THE MAIN AGENDA

ITEM 10

ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Item No	Application No	Address	Page No
02	10/04867/FUL	Kingsmead House, James Street West, Bath	37

An additional comment has been received from the Council's Development and Regeneration Team. They note that the emerging Core Strategy seeks significant provision of office space within central Bath.

They advise that they have undertaken an assessment of likely office space provision within Bath which shows at the current rate that there will be an undersupply of office floorspace compared to Core Strategy targets. The loss of a further 4,822sqm at Kingsmead House would significantly add to this undersupply and run contrary to the provisions in Core Strategy policies potentially make it more difficult to defend further losses of space in central Bath. The Development and Regeneration Team therefore advise that they would prioritise the retention of office accommodation over new hotel accommodation.

OFFICER COMMENTS: Policy B2 of the emerging Core Strategy does seek a large increase in office accommodation within the central area to 2026. The same policy also makes allowances for the release of sites comprising in total up to 15,000-30,000sqm within the central area which are least suitable for continued occupation. The Officer's report highlights the inadequacies of Kingsmead House for continued occupation. Appraisal evidence has also been assessed which demonstrates that it would be unviable to refurbish or redevelop the site for office accommodation. The emerging Core Strategy may only be attributed limited weight at this point and the employment policies in the Local Plan should be given primacy. In this case it has been demonstrated that the site is no longer capable of offering office accommodation or an adequate standard and the development is considered to comply with Policy ET.2.

It is also worth reiterating that the emerging Core Strategy seeks the provision of 500-750 additional hotel rooms within the city. The provision of such accommodation therefore likewise represents an aspiration of the Core Strategy.

An additional letter has been received from the Bath Preservation Trust in respect of the revised drawings. They comment that they regret that there has not been a more pro-active approach towards pre-application consultation and that a redevelopment brief for the wider area is not in place.

Advise that the Trust is supportive in principle of proposals to redevelop the site. They are concerned though that the building is overscaled and that the glazed penthouse floors would be visually intrusive and incongruous both in the immediate and wider context, especially at night.

The trust welcomes the idea of a colonnade. The step down of the upper storey to the east also reduces the monolithic effect of the building. The return of the building to the original, larger footprint of the site whilst reducing the height, to maximise available accommodation within the roof line, is also sensible. However, the number of storeys crammed in to this height is unacceptable since it neither conforms to the Georgian proportions to which the eye is so accustomed in Bath, nor produces a new set of harmonising proportions.

They advise that they have serious concerns about the use of Bath stone cladding and question its durability as a thin veneer. The Trust advise that the development will have a detrimental impact on the character, appearance and setting of the Conservation Area and adjacent listed buildings, and would compromise the authenticity and integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage Site.

OFFICER COMMENTS: These design points have been addressed within the Officer report. In summary the scale of the building is considered to be appropriate and whilst the upper glazed storey may not be characteristic of Georgian Bath it serves to give the upper storey/s a more lightweight treatment. In respect of the point regarding the visibility of the glazed floors at night this is not considered to be too problematical because lighting in hotel rooms is typically limited, blinds or curtains would also be used within the rooms.

The concerns regarding the use of Bath stone cladding is noted however this is an approach which is commonly being employed around Bath and samples of the materials will be secured prior to development commencing should the application be permitted.

Item No	Application No	Address	Page No
03	07/02424/EOUT	Closed Polestar Purnell Factory Site, Access Road to Works, Paulton	73

PARISH COUNCIL

A response has been received from Paulton Parish Council in relation to the revisions to the proposed variation. This states:-

- i) supports the reduction in the total percentage of affordable housing on the site from 35% to 20% on condition that the affordable housing is “pepperpotted” throughout the site
- ii) supports the variation in the Section 106 Agreement to retain the requirement for the 26 place pre-school nursery but remove the requirement to provide land for a further 26 places.

UPDATE ON THE PROPOSAL

The applicants have been in discussion with the Council’s Housing Team and have agreed that the proposal is to provide a minimum of 20% affordable housing without subsidy, but with the developers using reasonable endeavours, in conjunction with the Council, to secure funding to increase the percentage of affordable housing, up to a maximum of 35%.

Item No	Application No	Address	Page No
05	10/04399/FUL	Folley Farm, Folley Lane, Stowey	84

This application has been withdrawn from the Agenda.

Item No	Application No	Address	Page No
06	11/03877/FUL	11 Old Newbridge Hill, Newbridge, Bath	89

BATH PRESERVATION TRUST

The attached representation has been received from the Bath Preservation Trust since the application was referred to the Development Control Committee. This representation raises concern in relation to the visual impact of the development.

OBJECT

The Trust objects to this proposal which is considered to be of an insufficient design quality and would therefore detract from the appearance of the street-scene. While the dormer proposed to the rear will have only a limited impact upon the building and will not be widely visible from the Old Newbridge Hill, the proposed eastern side-dormer will appear as an unsympathetic addition to the existing dwelling and our objection applies principally to this addition to the property.

The appearance, form and design of the window fails to respond sufficiently to the appearance of the existing dwelling. The materials chosen, principally concrete pantiles cladding the walls, are unsympathetic and do not reflect the walling material to the rest of the property and does not engender a sense of cohesiveness to the building. The elevations presented imply that this dormer will be uncomfortably large, giving the dwelling an unbalanced appearance, particularly since it is a semi-detached property with an established sense of symmetry.

We are concerned that this roof extension may have a detrimental impact upon the street-scene and visual amenity of Old Newbridge Hill. Though there have been dormer additions to buildings along this route they have been confined to the rear of the properties, and have not been imposed upon the primary or side facades. As such the integrity of the original street scene, roof profile, and group value remains relatively intact. Permitting this development will threaten this integrity, and though

the aesthetic of the route is only of local significance or interest it is important to maintain and respect this.

This application in our view is therefore contrary to policies D2, D4, BH1 and BH6 of the B&NES Local Plan and should therefore be refused.