

---

# Bath & North East Somerset Council

---

## Improving People's Lives

**To: All Members of the Planning Committee**

**Bath and North East Somerset Councillors:** Matt McCabe (Chair), Sally Davis (Vice-Chair), Vic Clarke, Sue Craig, Lucy Hodge, Duncan Hounsell, Shaun Hughes, Eleanor Jackson, Hal MacFie and Manda Rigby

**Co-opted Voting Members:**

Chief Executive and other appropriate officers  
Press and Public

Dear Member

**Planning Committee: Wednesday, 10th March, 2021**

Please find attached a **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA DESPATCH** of late papers which were not available at the time the agenda was published. Please treat these papers as part of the agenda.

Papers have been included for the following items:

### **UPDATE REPORT**

Yours sincerely

Marie Todd  
for Chief Executive

<p><b>If you need to access this agenda or any of the supporting reports in an alternative accessible format please contact Democratic Services or the relevant report author whose details are listed at the end of each report.</b></p>
---

<p>This Agenda and all accompanying reports are printed on recycled paper</p>
---



**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

**Planning Committee**

**Date 10th March 2021**

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

ITEM

**ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
<b>002</b>	<b>20/00806/LBA</b>	<b>Keynsham Conservative Club</b>

Please note missing paragraph from the Officers Report;

*“There is a duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act to pay special attention to the preservation or enhancement of the character of the surrounding conservation area. In this case the windows will preserve the character of the conservation area and for this reason is recommended for consent.”*

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address:</b>
<b>003</b>	<b>20/04939/FUL</b>	<b>30A Lyncombe Hill, Bath.</b>

1no. additional comment has been received from Bath Preservation Trust as follows;

BPT objected to a previous iteration of the scheme in 2018 (see 18/04240/FUL). We additionally commented on resubmitted applications 20/03069/FUL & 20/03118/LBA in support of the improved fenestration details and simplified elevational treatment, whilst continuing to highlight the awkward interaction of the proposed mansard roof with the 1886 wing extension and partial obscuration of windows in the south elevation. Therefore, we maintain that the principle of development on this site is acceptable, subject to assessment of height, massing, and design, use of materials, and their associated impact on the listed building.

With regards to the unaltered design aspects of the application, we reiterate our previous comments as previously submitted to applications 20/03069/FUL & 20/03118/LBA as follows: “We are pleased to see that our previous comments have been positively incorporated into a revised design. In particular, the retention of the round windows and the insertion of French doors more in keeping with the established fenestration style of the 1886 wing extension has significantly reduced proposed visual harm to a listed building. We note the drastic reduction of the windows and doors on the proposed east elevation, and although they do remain considerable in size, the use of plain glazing is less visually distracting than the previously proposed crittal-style fenestration.

“We further note the improvements made to the roof in the change of zinc to slate, although we would recommend that the proposed type of slate is confirmed with the planning officer as part of this application. The dormer windows have an improved setting visually ‘grounded’ behind the parapet rather than ‘floating’ mid-way up the roof.”

Whilst the retained proposal of a mansard roof would continue to partially obscure the south elevation of the 1886 wing, the revised reductions in roof height and width are a notable improvement to the scheme and would better reveal the southern elevation’s windows. No material harm or intervention is proposed to the windows. The increased gap created from the 1886 wing means the proposal can be better read as a separate dwelling in close range views, whilst remaining suitably recessive in scale and design and without significant architectural conflict.

The landscape of Lyncombe Hill is characterised by its large Georgian and Victorian dwellings set into the hillside, with semi-detached townhouses and terraces designed to look like individually positioned villas in their wooded landscape setting. The panoramic views from Widcombe to the east are characterised by a medium density of designed, ‘standalone’ development in Bath vernacular such as Bath stone. The area’s roofscape is of particular visual prominence, of a mix of hipped or M-shaped pitched natural slate roofs with some instances of mansard roofs such as 30 Abbey Lodge. As a result, the proposed addition of a slate mansard roof would be more in keeping with the area’s roofscape and material context, although the consequent increased height of the building would result in an increased visual prominence in landscape views and a potential for harm.

However, it appears that the landscape visuals provided are outdated and instead show the previous, refused roofline as proposed. We suggest this is therefore updated to highlight how the reduction in roof height and scale appears within its wider landscape context for the benefit of the case officer.

**Members should note that the landscape visuals that are referred to in BPT’s comments have been revised and submitted by the applicants.**

In addition, it should be made clear that the neighbours objection comments are not fully printed in the report. They are repeated below in full to avoid further confusion;

Comment Reference: 312503

Nature of comment: Objection.

Comment: Further to our comments on the previous planning application, we continue to support the redevelopment of the current derelict building, 30A.

However, we remain concerned that once rebuilding works are complete, that the area between our house, no.32 and 30a could still potentially be used as a car parking space. While we were pleased to see on the plan that this area has a proposed bin and cycle storage, as timber constructions these could be considered temporary and therefore not prevent car parking in the area in the longer term. A railing is also marked on the floor plan which further gives us confidence. We would like to ensure that any building works, once complete, fulfil these plans.

However, we draw your attention to the letter from the Highway’s Agency which requests that the applicant submit a plan indicating a single off-street parking space for no. 30a. We cannot locate a plan showing any proposed off-street car parking arrangement and associated turning area and feel this request has not been supported in the planning application.

Our objection to a car parking space remains as there appears to be inconsistency between the letter from the Highway's Agency request for off-street parking to be on a plan and no such plan submitted as part of the planning application. Until this is resolved, we remain concerned that the area could be used as a car parking space. As outlined in our comments on the previous planning application, the risk of both injury to our children or ourselves while accessing our main door as well as damage to the corner stones of our home are of concern.

Otherwise, we have no objections to the proposed redevelopment of the building of 30A.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address:</b>
<b>005</b>	<b>20/04802/AR</b>	<b>Friends Meeting House Bath</b>

Members are advised that s66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 does not apply in this case, and it would also appear that paragraphs 193 and 196 of the NPPF may not apply either. The relevant law is the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) Regulations 2007. Regulation 3(2) states:

“(a)factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest;”

The NPPF states:

“132. The quality and character of places can suffer when advertisements are poorly sited and designed. A separate consent process within the planning system controls the display of advertisements, which should be operated in a way which is simple, efficient and effective. Advertisements should be subject to control only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of cumulative impacts.”

Therefore, the impact of the proposal upon the historic environment, specifically listed buildings, the conservation area and the World Heritage Site are material considerations to which great weight should be given and, to that extent, the analysis in the main report remains relevant.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
<b>007</b>	<b>20/04720/FUL</b>	<b>143 Calton Road, Lyncombe</b>

2 additional comments have been submitted after the Committee Agenda was published. They can be viewed in full on the website. The main points are summarised as follows:

- Access along Alexandra Road is unsuitable for larger vehicles as shown this week when OpenReach were undertaking works on Calton Road
- Pavement being used for construction vehicle parking will cause highway safety issues
- Parking for dwellings not provided but this is not a unequivocal denial of permits
- Concerns regarding the Construction Method Statement (retaining wall)
- Structural surveyors have questioned information within it

- Understand this may fall outside the scope of planning but raises questions about the integrity of the application

In addition, photos have been received from a resident who lives at one of the properties on St Marks Road, showing the view from their garden towards the site. These are dated 2<sup>nd</sup> March and are available to view online.