

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday, 9th April, 2025, 11.00 am

Councillors: Ian Halsall (Chair), Lucy Hodge (Vice-Chair), Paul Crossley, Sarah Evans, Fiona Gourley, Duncan Hounsell, Hal MacFie, Toby Simon, Shaun Hughes and Dr Eleanor Jackson

105 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

106 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

The following apologies for absence and substitutions were noted:

Cllr Duncan Hounsell substituting for Cllr Deborah Collins
Cllr Sarah Evans substituting for Cllr Tim Warren.

107 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Lucy Hodge declared an interest in item 1 - 24/03168/REG03 - Council Cleansing Depot, Locksbrook Road, Newbridge, Bath as the Cabinet Project Lead for Council Priorities & Delivery and for Neighbourhood Services and confirmed she would be withdrawing from the meeting during discussion of that item.

In relation to agenda item 6 - 24/01135/FUL - Kennet Lodge, Kennet Park, Bathampton, Bath, Cllr Toby Simon declared that he was acquainted with the speaker from Bathampton Parish Council and confirmed that this would not affect his judgement in relation to the application.

108 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was no urgent business.

109 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Democratic Services Officer informed the meeting of the process for public speakers to address the Committee.

110 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was moved by Cllr Toby Simon, seconded by Cllr Fiona Gourley

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 12 March 2025 be confirmed as a correct record for signing by the Chair.

111 **SITE VISIT LIST - APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION ETC FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE**

There were no site visit applications for consideration.

112 **MAIN PLANS LIST - APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION ETC FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE**

The Committee considered:

1. A report and update report by the Head of Planning on the applications under the main applications list.
2. Oral statements by members of the public and representatives. A copy of the speakers' list is attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes.

RESOLVED that in accordance with the delegated powers, the applications be determined as set out in the main applications decisions list attached as Appendix 2 to these minutes.

[Cllr Lucy Hodge withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of the first application.]

1. 24/03168/REG03 - Council Cleansing Depot, Locksbrook Road, Newbridge, Bath

The Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the change of use of an existing street cleansing depot and 24-hour car park ancillary to retain street cleansing depot with a new Recycling Centre and adjacent customer parking/drop off area with associated operational development including alteration of vehicular access; new pedestrian/cycle access; landscaping; and drainage works.

She gave a verbal update as follows:

1. Page 52 of the report referred to a Biodiversity Net Gain increase of 301.91% habitat units and should read 74% habitat units.
2. 4 additional objections had been received following the publication of the committee papers raising concerns in relation to the need for a like for like centre; location; transport and accessibility; environment impact; flooding; residential amenity; equalities; human health and pollution. These issues had already been addressed in the Committee report.

She confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Tim Wallace and Dr Steve Roccliffe, local residents, objecting to the application.
2. Chris Beaver, agent supporting the application.

Cllr Samantha Kelly was in attendance as ward Councillor and read a statement on behalf of herself and Cllr Michelle O'Doherty as summarised below:

1. The ward Councillors had asked that the application be determined by the

Planning Committee to allow concerns to be heard in public.

2. They acknowledged that the proposal had undergone changes to address objections, but concerns remained in relation to traffic, parking and accessibility.
3. In terms of traffic, the junction with Upper Bristol Road was a concern as there were already delays in that area. The booking system relied on full compliance, and it was likely that additional vehicles would turn up without booking. Reassurances were needed that the rules concerning pre-booking would be enforced.
4. There was a proposal for a residents parking zone, but until this was in place there were concerns about parking pressures in the area.
5. There were questions around how usable the site was for people with limited mobility.
6. There were also environmental impact concerns due to the close proximity to the River Avon and flooding and drainage needed to be monitored.
7. If the Committee was minded to approve the application, assurances were needed about these concerns.

Cllr George Tomlin was in attendance as adjacent ward Councillor and read a statement on behalf of himself and Cllr Paul Roper as summarised below:

1. They recognised that a centre was part of a strategic plan to provide facilities but there was a need to address impacts.
2. The junction with Upper Bristol Road was a key area of concern, most traffic would be turning right onto this road out of the site and this was already difficult to navigate.
3. If approved, the operation needed to be closely monitored, and enforcement action taken if necessary.
4. If the Committee was minded to approve, it was important to ensure the concerns of residents were taken seriously.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The comparison with the existing site at Midland Road and its imminent closure were not material considerations, each application had to be considered on its merits.
2. Fire safety would operate in accordance with requirements and on-site equipment and procedures would be in place.
3. In terms of noise, there would be a mitigation boundary around the operation side and noise associated with reversal alarms and rollers on skips would be set to a minimum.
4. There would be no risks from hazardous waste as this would not be accepted at the site.
5. The application was in accordance with the Development Plan.
6. A highways assessment had been carried out in relation to the junction at Locksbrook Road and Upper Bristol Road the junction at Locksbrook Road and Station Road.
7. The site would operate during traffic off-peak periods and so there would not be a significant impact on junctions. There would be double yellow lines on site to prevent parking in restricted areas.
8. The car parking bays would be big enough for large cars. Vans and cars with trailers would be prohibited from the site. There had not been a swept path

analysis in relation to articulated lorries as this did not form part of this application.

9. HGV vehicles would enter the site to remove move skips when they were full. There would be an estimated 4-6 HGV movements per day.
10. In relation to issues such as air quality, odour, noise and gulls, there had either been found to be no requirement for mitigation or that impact could be addressed by mitigation.
11. There was limited potential for odour emissions as the skips would be emptied frequently.
12. The height of the bins was 2.6m and there was a 1.5m staggered ramp. Staff would also be available to assist any users who had difficulty accessing the facilities.
13. There was space for 5 vehicles to queue within the site and additional parking bays were also available.
14. Pedestrians and cyclists could access the site. There was a pedestrian access and cycle parking. Pre-booking was only required for vehicles and not for pedestrians/cyclists.
15. The site was in flood zone 2 and 3, but there would be a slight reduction in hardstanding area as a result of the development and the flood risk assessment had shown that it wouldn't increase flooding.

The Chair opened the debate and emphasised the requirement for the Committee, as a regulatory body, to make a decision on the application as submitted in the context of the relevant planning policies and not to comment on the appropriateness of alternative sites.

Cllr Duncan Hounsell stated that the application was in accordance with planning policies and there was a need for waste disposal facilities in the city of Bath. He moved the officers' recommendation to permit the development subject to the conditions set out in the report. Cllr Toby Simon suggested that the motion be "delegated to permit" to enable officers to include any additional conditions as appropriate to address concerns of local residents. The Chair suggested an additional condition to monitor the operational statement for a certain period of time. This was accepted by Cllr Duncan Hounsell as mover of the motion and seconded by Cllr Toby Simon.

Cllr Eleanor Jackson expressed concern about over development of the site.

Cllr Shaun Hughes agreed with the need for a facility in Bath but questioned whether this was the right location and stated that residents would still need to travel to Keynsham or Midsomer Norton to dispose of some waste products. He also raised concerns about the impact of traffic using the site.

Cllr Hal MacFie spoke in support of the motion and stated that the impact could be minimised by the booking system which would control the use of the site.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (6 in favour and 3 against).

RESOLVED that officers be delegated to permit planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the report and an additional condition to monitor the operational

statement.

[Cllr Lucy Hodge returned to the meeting]

2. 24/04206/OUT – The Wildland, Church Lane, East Harptree, Bristol

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an outline application for the erection of 3 houses following demolition of the existing 4-bedroom house.

She confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Diana Martin, local resident, objecting to the application.
2. Mark Cains, architect, supporting the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. In view of the revised NPPF published in December 2024, it was likely that the Council would not be able to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply from April 2025, although the housing trajectory for the year 2025-2026 had not yet been calculated or published. This was a material consideration, but in any case, the officer view was that there was no reason to refuse the application.
2. The Chew Valley Neighbourhood Plan encouraged, rather than demanded 2-3 bed-dwellings. The Local Plan encouraged a housing mix. Officers had considered housing mix but the scheme was outline would be further assessed at the detailed stage. The officer view was that the application did not conflict with the Chew Valley Neighbourhood Plan.
3. This was an outline planning application and only access and scale were being considered at this stage with all other matters reserved.
4. There was no requirement for affordable homes for a development of 3 dwellings. The dwellings would need to be considered as market housing.
5. The appearance would be determined at the reserved matters stage, but the heights were set by the outline application.
6. Landscaping was a reserved matter and the hardstanding area in the plans was indicative.
7. Layout was also reserved but the view of officers was that the development could be achieved to satisfy residential amenity.
8. In relation to bat mitigation, a European Protected Species licence would be required prior to demolition to allow the works to proceed legally and safeguard bats.

Cllr Duncan Hounsell referred to the changes in NPPF and spoke in support of this scheme which would replace 1 dwelling with 3. He moved the officers' recommendation to permit the development. In seconding the motion, Cllr Paul Crossley stated that it was important for the bat mitigation scheme to be taken seriously.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (10 in favour and 0 against - unanimous).

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in

the report.

3. 24/02838/TPIP - Land to south of 2, The Orchard, Stanton Drew, Bristol

The Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for a technical details consent for the erection of three "Passivhaus" dwellings and private allotments with associated access, drainage and hard/soft landscape works, pursuant to Permission in Principle reference 22/02743/PIP.

He gave a verbal update to recommend that officers be delegated to permit the development subject to the conditions set out in the report and additional conditions relating to landscaping and the removal of landscaping strategy proposals from the plans list.

The following public representations were received:

1. Stanton Drew Parish Council, objecting to the application (statement read in absence).
2. Rebecca Morgan, agent, supporting the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The ecology zone had been widened to protect the badger sett and there would be badger proof fencing where the zone bordered the allotment.
2. The inclusion of allotments was part of the Permission in Principle and there would be a condition for an allotment management plan to ensure appropriate maintenance.
3. It would not be justified to ask the applicant to fund double yellow lines on the hammerhead junction as part of this application.
4. There needed to be a certain mass of form to be a Passivhaus. The size of the dwellings was consistent with other buildings in the street.
5. The proposed dwellings were considered Passivhaus homes due to the level of ventilation, layout, solar panels and insulation. Passivhaus buildings were not necessarily constructed off site.
6. It would be possible to attach an additional condition requesting further details and samples of materials to be submitted in advance.

Cllr Toby Simon spoke in support of the application and moved the recommendation that officers be delegated to permit the development with the suggested conditions and an additional condition to request further details and samples of materials to be submitted in advance. This was seconded by Cllr Fiona Gourley.

Cllr Paul Crossley spoke against the motion and expressed the view that the application constituted over development of the site.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (9 in favour and 1 against).

RESOLVED that officers be delegated to permit the development subject to:

1. the conditions set out in the report.
2. additional conditions relating to landscaping and the removal of landscaping strategy proposals from the plans list.
3. an additional condition to request further details and samples of materials to be

submitted in advance.

4. 23/02825/FUL - Parcel 1172, Radford Hill, Radford, Bristol

The Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the change of use of the land to a single caravan pitch for a gypsy and traveller family including the siting of one static caravan, 1 touring caravan and dayroom and associated access and hardsurfacing (Part Retrospective).

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Dan Foster, agent on behalf of local residents, objecting to the application.
2. Emily Temple, agent on behalf of applicant, supporting the application.

Cllr Liz Hardman was in attendance as ward Councillor and read a statement on behalf of herself, Cllr Grant Johnson and Paulton Parish Council.

1. Supportive of the general principle of providing sites for the travelling community, but there were specific concerns in relation to this site.
2. The access was not satisfactory.
3. The entrance to the site was in flood zone 3 and the proposed dwelling was in close proximity.
4. The proposed development was out of keeping with the rural setting. It was a change in the land use and the quality of materials did not reflect the neighbouring area.
5. There would be an impact on the nearby Grade II listed building.

Cllr Shaun Stephenson McGall was in attendance and read a statement as adjacent ward Councillor and also on behalf of Timsbury Parish Council as summarised below:

1. Timsbury Parish Council had raised 4 objections to the application:
 - a. Highways and safety concerns.
 - b. The setting and nearness to the Grade II listed building.
 - c. The position of the entrance in flood zone 3.
 - d. Detrimental to rural characteristic of area.
2. He was disappointed that there was not a 5-year land supply of sites for gypsies and travellers.
3. In response to concerns about highways safety, he advised that he had secured funding in the Council's budget to implement a speed reduction through the hamlet of Radford from 60mph to 20mph.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. There were objections from Highways and the Conservation Officer as statutory consultees, but the lack of a 5-year land supply for gypsy and traveller sites was a significant material consideration which tilted the balance in favour of permitting the development. It was also noted that although objectors had raised concerns about highways safety, the Highways Officers' objection was about the lack of sustainable transport options and not about safety.
2. The proposal to reduce the speed limit from 60mph to 20mph was not a material

consideration as the Traffic Regulation Order was not yet in place.

3. Although the access was in flood zone 3, the living accommodation would be situated in flood zone 1.
4. Any gate could be installed as permitted development as long as it was less than 1 metre in height. In terms of permitted development, there would not be the usual rights associated with a dwelling due to the nature of the application.
5. It would be reasonable to include an additional condition to ensure the land was restored to its original use in the event of a cessation of use.
6. There would be a condition to limit the use to 1 pitch. The site was not large enough to accommodate additional pitches.
7. There was space to accommodate a washing machine in the day room and there were facilities for water and electricity on site.
8. There was a condition to screen the caravan from the views of the adjacent listed building.

Cllr Duncan Hounsell opened the debate and stated that officers had addressed concerns about highway safety, impact on the Grade II listed building and flooding, rural landscape and he recognised the significant weight of providing a pitch for the travelling community. He confirmed that he was minded to support the application.

Cllr Fiona Gourley spoke in support of the application as there was a need to provide homes for people in villages.

Cllr Eleanor Jackson moved the officers' recommendation with an additional condition to ensure the land was restored to its original use in the event of a cessation of use. This was seconded by Cllr Lucy Hodge.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (10 in favour, 0 against - unanimous).

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the condition set out in the report and an additional condition to ensure the land was restored to its original use in the event of a cessation of use.

5. 25/00409/FUL - 41 Freeview Road, Twerton, Bath

The Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for a change of use from a 3-bedroom dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a 6-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4) with rear extension and provision of bike store.

She confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

There were no statements from members of the public.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The bedroom size exceeded the minimum standard of 2.51m²
2. The property was link attached to the neighbouring property, which was also an HMO, but there would not be sandwiching of residential properties between HMOs and so the application it was policy compliant.

The Chair confirmed that he had agreed to the request for the application to be brought to Committee as the increasing number of HMOs was an ongoing issue for certain wards and it was important to be transparent about the policy context.

Cllr Shaun Hughes questioned whether such applications should be brought to Planning Committee when they complied with current policy as it was not within the remit of the committee to rewrite policies.

Cllr Paul Crossley asked the Chair to write to the Cabinet Member for Built Environment, Housing and Sustainable Development, Cllr Matt McCabe on behalf of the Planning Committee to request a review of current policy relating to HMOs. He suggested that the limit in a 100m radius be reduced from 10% to 5%. He expressed concern that the increase in HMOs, which were often used as student accommodation, was resulting in less housing being available for families. He also stated that universities should be responsible for providing more student accommodation.

Members also raised the following general points in relation to HMOs:

1. There was a need for up-to-date information on the number of HMOs, recognising that some were not registered.
2. The demand for family housing was reflected in the number of families on the waiting list for housing.
3. The HMO policy should be extended beyond the city of Bath to the rest of the B&NES district.
4. HMOs were often an affordable alternative for students to purpose built accommodation and allowed them to integrate in the community.
5. HMOs were not just for students; they were also an affordable housing option for young professionals.

In relation to the application, Cllr Toby Simon moved the officers' recommendation stating that it was policy compliant. This was seconded by Cllr Eleanor Jackson.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (8 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention).

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

6. 24/01135/FUL - Kennet Lodge, Kennet Park, Bathampton, Bath

The Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the reconfiguration and alteration of an existing dwelling, including a single storey extension to the north of the property, and an additional storey of first floor bedroom accommodation to replace existing pitched roof of chalet bungalow.

The Case Officer confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Lin King, Bathampton Parish Council
2. Ian Dewey, on behalf of local residents, objecting to the application.
3. Sasha Berezina, agent, supporting the application.

Cllr Sarah Warren read a statement as ward Councillor summarised as below:

1. The application included a substantial side extension as well as a first-floor extension.
2. The original building was modest, it was not a chalet bungalow and did not previously have living accommodation above the ground floor.
3. The proposal was overbearing and intrusive to neighbours and would result in a loss of privacy and residential amenity.
4. The proposed extension to the footprint was out of proportion and out of line with provisions within Policy D7 supporting infill development.
5. There were concerns over the impact on watercourses.
6. The planning process had been long and drawn out with many submissions and revisions.

She asked the Committee to refuse the application, but if minded to permit, to ensure there were strong conditions to protect neighbouring properties.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. Although the Conservation Officer had objected to previous iterations, there was no longer an objection to the latest plans. Permission would not have been recommended if there was an outstanding objection from the Conservation Officer.
2. Officers had undertaken an analysis of overlooking and had visited neighbouring properties but had concluded that the impact would not be harmful.
3. The condition to remove permitted development rights was a cautionary approach to prevent further development.
4. The proposed roofing material would be slate tiles.

Cllr Eleanor Jackson proposed that a decision be deferred for a site visit to help understand the layout of the site and its relationship with adjoining properties. This was seconded by Cllr Lucy Hodge.

Cllr Paul Crossley spoke against the motion and stated that there was enough information in the officers' report to make a decision without the need for a site visit.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (6 in favour and 4 against).

RESOLVED that a decision be deferred pending a site visit.

113 **NEW PLANNING APPEALS LODGED, DECISIONS RECEIVED AND DATES OF FORTHCOMING HEARINGS/INQUIRIES**

Cllr Eleanor Jackson thanked officers for their work in defending appeals, especially in relation to 22/02169/EOUT - parcel 4234 Combe Hay Lane, Combe Hay Bath.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 4.17 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services