

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday, 8th February, 2017, 2.00 pm

Councillors: Sally Davis (Chair), Rob Appleyard, Jasper Becker, Paul Crossley, Matthew Davies, Eleanor Jackson, Les Kew, Bryan Organ, Caroline Roberts and David Veale

101 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

102 ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN (IF DESIRED)

A Vice Chairman was not required on this occasion.

103 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

There were no apologies for absence or substitutions.

104 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- Councillor Eleanor Jackson declared an interest in planning application number 16/05498/AR as she knew the Chair of the Parish Council, who was speaking on the item, due to her involvement in the Britain in Bloom competition. She stated that she would leave the meeting while this item was considered and therefore would not speak or vote.
- Councillor Bryan Organ declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in planning application number 16/05771/FUL - 6 Fairways, Saltford as he was the applicant. He stated that he would leave the meeting while this item was considered and therefore would not speak or vote.

105 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was no urgent business.

106 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS

The Democratic Services Officer informed the meeting that there were a number of people wishing to make statements on planning applications and that they would be able to do so when these items were discussed.

107 ITEMS FROM COUNCILLORS AND CO-OPTED MEMBERS

There were no items from Councillors or Co-Opted Members.

108 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2017 were confirmed and signed as a correct record subject to the following amendment:

Page 7 – paragraph 5 – Add the wording:

“Councillor Jackson stated that the proposal would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbouring properties.”

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

The Committee considered:

- A report by the Group Manager (Development Management) on various planning applications.
- An update report by the Group Manager (Development Management) attached as *Appendix 1* to these minutes.
- Oral statements by members of the public and representatives. A copy of the speakers' list is attached as *Appendix 2* to these minutes.

RESOLVED that in accordance with the Committee's delegated powers, the applications be determined as set out in the decisions list attached as *Appendix 3* to these minutes.

Item No. 1

Application No. 16/04535/FUL

Site Location: 33 Parklands, High Littleton, BS39 6LB – Erection of a dwelling following demolition of the outbuilding

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to grant planning permission.

The registered speaker spoke against the application.

Councillor Kew, local ward member, stated that whilst he appreciated the concern of residents he did not feel that the development would be too intrusive. He noted that the area was already quite densely populated.

Councillor Jackson stated that she had found the site visit very helpful. She stated that the concerns of the neighbours regarding being overlooked should be taken into account. They would suffer loss of amenity due to the drop in land levels. If permission were to be granted she felt that an additional condition relating to screening between the new property and 26 Parklands should be included.

Councillor Roberts agreed with the need to consider screening and moved that planning permission be granted subject to the inclusion of an additional condition to

provide sufficient screening. This was seconded by Councillor Appleyard.

The Team Manager, Development Management, explained that the Committee could delegate authority to officers to negotiate with the applicant to provide appropriate screening or to impose a condition. He stated that a fence could appear dominant in this location and that a hedge may be more appropriate.

Councillor Roberts and Councillor Appleyard agreed to amend the motion to delegate to permit including a condition to ensure that appropriate and reasonable planting/screening was provided by the applicant.

Councillor Kew agreed that a hedge would be more appropriate than a high fence. He suggested that the existing hedge could be retained and extended if necessary.

The motion was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** by 6 for, 2 against and 2 abstentions, to **DELEGATE TO PERMIT** the application subject to the conditions outlined in the report and an additional condition to provide appropriate and adequate planting/screening along the boundary between the new property and 26 Parklands.

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

The Committee considered:

- A report by the Group Manager (Development Management) on various planning applications.
- An update report by the Group Manager (Development Management), attached as *Appendix 1* to these minutes.
- Statements by members of the public and representatives. A copy of the speakers' list is attached as *Appendix 2* to these minutes.

RESOLVED that in accordance with the delegated powers, the applications be determined as set out in the decisions list attached as *Appendix 4* to these minutes.

Item No. 1

Application No. 16/04289/EFUL

Site Location: Ministry of Defence, Warminster Road, Bath – Erection of 6 apartment blocks to provide 87 new dwellings (Partial revision of application no. 14/02272/EFUL)

The Case Officer reported on the application and his recommendation to delegate to permit. He explained that the application would mean an increase of 39 units due to the replacement of some terraced housing with apartment blocks. He also pointed out an amendment to Condition 2 which changed the starting time for working hours on site (Mondays to Fridays) from 7.30am to 8am.

The registered speakers spoke for and against the application.

The local ward member, Councillor Matt Cochrane, spoke against the application.

In response to a question the Case Officer confirmed that the nearest properties to the development were approximately 35 metres away. He also confirmed that the land sloped away to the North.

Councillor Organ stated that he would like the Development Management Committee to be kept informed of progress on the various aspects of the Section 106 agreement if permission was granted.

Councillor Crossley asked a question regarding the affordable housing aspect of this scheme. The Case Officer explained that the scheme permitted in 2014 consisted of 40% affordable housing. The revised application consisted of 33% affordable housing. An independent viability appraisal had been carried out and the revised scheme would return a 19.33% profit (as opposed to 13% under the original scheme). The rent reduction programme had affected profitability along with some unknown development costs. The surplus £400k would be commuted to the Council to fund the off-site provision of affordable housing. Councillor Crossley remained concerned at the reduction in the percentage of affordable housing in the development. The Case Officer confirmed that there was no reduction in the number of affordable housing units which remained at 81.

Councillor Appleyard also expressed concern at the reduced percentage of affordable housing and pointed out that house prices were likely to increase once the scheme was completed. He questioned the viability process.

Councillor Veale stated that he felt the original scheme had been very good but that he could not support the revised application.

Councillor Jackson then moved that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- the development is an inappropriate development for the gateway to a world heritage site
- the height of the buildings would have an adverse impact on the amenity of the area
- the development would have an unacceptable impact on the vista of the city
- environmental reasons, such as light spillage would impact on wildlife; and
- the asymmetrical design is unacceptable so close to the road.

She also pointed out that the Urban Design Officer and Historic England had both made objections to the scheme which should be taken into account.

Councillor Appleyard seconded the motion as he felt the scheme was not policy compliant with regard to the percentage of affordable housing units. He also had concerns regarding the view of the development from the opposite side of the valley.

Councillor Kew stated that he did not believe that the application should be refused. This was an appropriate development that would provide 81 affordable housing units which were needed in Bath. The development would be on a brownfield site and the increased density was appropriate for the central Bath location. The height of the

buildings was not a great concern because the buildings would be set into the ground.

The Team Manager, Development Management, pointed out that the Committee was not considering the application afresh but only looking at the changes to be made to the original application. There were only minor changes to the footprint and if refused the level of harm would need to be clarified. The Ecologist had raised no objection to the proposals so it would be difficult to include ecological reasons for refusal and to demonstrate evidence of harm. The level of affordable housing could be affected by viability rules and if potential profits reduce then a development could be considered to be unviable.

The motion was then put to the vote and there were 5 votes for and 5 votes against. The Chairman then used her casting vote against the motion which was therefore **LOST**.

Councillor Kew then moved the revised officer recommendation set out in the update report to delegate to permit the application subject to completion of a s106 agreement and conditions. This was seconded by Councillor Organ.

The motion was then put to the vote and there were 5 votes for and 5 votes against. The Chairman used her casting vote in favour of the motion and it was **RESOLVED** to **DELEGATE TO PERMIT** the application subject to a s106 agreement and conditions.

Item No. 2

Application No. 16/05094/FUL

**Site Location: Beechen Cliff School, Kipling Avenue, Bear Flat, Bath BA2 4RE
– Extend bank southwards using existing on site spoil heap to create wider playing field**

The Case Officer reported on the application and his recommendation to permit. He explained that this was a partially retrospective application.

The registered speakers spoke for and against the application.

Local ward members, Councillors Ian Gilchrist and Mark Shelford, spoke regarding the application and asked the Committee to consider visiting the site.

Councillor Becker proposed that consideration of the application be deferred for a site visit. This was seconded by Councillor Appleyard.

Councillor Jackson stated that she did not feel that a site visit was necessary on this occasion.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 4 votes for, 4 votes against and 2 abstentions. The Chairman then used her casting vote in favour of the motion and it was therefore **RESOLVED** to **DEFER** consideration of the application pending a site visit.

Item No. 3**Application No. 16/04499/FUL**

Site Location: 17 Station Road, Welton, Midsomer Norton, BA3 2AZ – Erection of 6 new dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings (resubmission) – revised plans

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit.

The registered speaker spoke against the application.

Councillor Crossley asked a question regarding the inclusion of the building within the Midsomer Norton Conservation Area Character Assessment. The Case Officer explained that the building was not referred to in the 2004 Character Assessment but that this document was currently being updated, although the building was also not referred to in the latest draft.

Councillor Jackson was concerned regarding the impact of the development on nearby dwellings. She also asked whether there would be any impact on Welton Vale as the development was on higher ground. The Case Officer felt that there would not be a significant impact and that the development would not be detrimental to the local amenity.

Councillor Kew then proposed that a site visit take place to view the building and to consider whether it should be preserved. This was seconded by Councillor Jackson.

The motion was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** by 8 votes for and 2 votes against to **DEFER** consideration of the application pending a site visit.

Item No. 4**Application No. 16/04261/FUL**

Site Location: Unit 2, Lymore Gardens, Twerton, Bath, BA1 1AQ – Erection of 5 three bedroom, 2 two bedroom and 1 one bedroom flats following conversion and adaptation of warehouse

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit.

The registered speaker spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor June Player, local ward member, spoke against the application.

In response to a question the Case Officer explained that there were three entrances to the property, two of which were accessed via Lymore Gardens. She also confirmed that there had been attempts to market the property as a warehouse but that this had been unsuccessful. The white line road markings would be removed and there would be a dropped kerb to serve the garage.

Councillor Roberts stated that she understood the parking issues raised by the local ward councillor and regretted the loss of an industrial unit. However, there was provision for one parking space for each new property and cycle storage would be available. She moved the officer recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

Councillor Kew seconded the motion. He stated that he also had sympathy with the views put forward by the local councillor but noted that the industrial units had not been sold and therefore supported a change of use.

Councillor Becker queried whether the industrial unit could be demolished as it seemed ridiculous to be retaining it in a residential area.

Councillor Jackson supported the application and noted that the apartments would be suitable for young professionals.

The motion was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** by 7 votes for and 3 against to **PERMIT** the application subject to the conditions set out in the main agenda report and update report.

Item No. 5

Application No. 16/05453/FUL

Site Location: Box Bush, Bromley Road, Stanton Drew – Erection of 2 storey annexe and single storey extension following demolition of existing single storey annexe

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation for refusal. She explained that the property was outside the housing development area of the village.

The registered speakers spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Karen Warrington, the local ward member, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Jackson did not support the reasons put forward by the applicant in support of the proposal and moved that planning permission be refused as per the officer recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Appleyard.

Councillor Crossley asked whether a tie could be placed on the property stating that it could not be sold separately from the main dwelling. The Team Manager explained that although there could be a tie-in to the main property, due to the size of the proposal, it would be difficult to defend such an approach in policy terms. A legal agreement could be used but, again, this would be difficult to defend in this case.

The Team Manager went on to advise that the property was in a prominent location and would affect the visual amenity of the greenbelt due to the change from one storey to two storeys. Members were advised to consider whether it would affect openness and should take into account the policies relating to the greenbelt.

Councillor Appleyard stated that he understood the objectives for the proposed development but noted that guidelines and policies should be followed.

The motion was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** by 8 votes for and 2 votes against to **REFUSE** the application for the reasons set out in the report.

Item No. 6

Application No. 16/04960/FUL

Site Location: Beaumont House, Lansdown Road, Bath – Erection of three storey side extension to provide 3 residential apartments with associated parking and landscaping

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit. She informed the Committee that one further letter of objection had been received.

The registered speakers spoke in favour and against the application.

Councillor Jackson proposed a site visit; however this motion did not receive a seconder. She felt that the proposal was a radical change to the building which would alter the original concept.

Councillor Kew moved the officer recommendation that planning permission be granted subject to conditions. He felt that this was a good proposal, an excellent design and that it would enhance and balance the building. This would provide three new dwellings which were needed in this area. Councillor Appleyard seconded the motion.

The motion was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** by 9 votes for and 1 against to **PERMIT** the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Item No. 7

Application No. 16/05498/AR

Site Location: Bristol Water Visitor Centre and Tea Room, Walley Lane, Chew Magna – Display of 2 externally illuminated entrance signs to replace previous signs to the entrance to Chew Valley Lake picnic area and Salt & Malt Café and public car park (Resubmission)

The Case Officer reported on the application and his recommendation to refuse the application.

The registered speaker spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Liz Richardson, local ward member, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Crossley supported the Parish Council and felt that the signs should be permitted. He stated that the downlighting was acceptable and that the signage would help to advertise a local business and increase the usage of this enterprise. He then moved that consent be granted on the basis that the signs would enhance the economic viability of the enterprise and add to the visitor attraction. This was seconded by Councillor Appleyard who stated that the signs would support the business and assist motorists in finding the attraction.

Councillor Kew felt that the officer recommendation to refuse the application was correct. He was not opposed to a sign in this location but felt that the proposed design was not suitable for an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Protection Area. An improved design which was more in keeping with the area should be sought.

The Team Manager stated that the officer opinion was that the size and illumination of the proposed sign was unacceptable in this location but there was not an objection to a sign per se.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 4 votes for and 5 votes against. The motion was therefore **LOST**.

Councillor Kew then moved that consent be refused for the reasons set out in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Matthew Davies.

The motion was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** by 4 votes for, 2 votes against and 3 abstentions to **REFUSE** the application for the reasons set out in the report.

Note: Having declared an interest in this matter, Councillor Jackson left the meeting while the application was considered and did not speak or vote on this item.

(Councillor Roberts left the room at this point in the meeting).

Item No. 8

Application No. 16/05771/FUL

Site Location: 6 Fairways, Saltford, BS31 3HX – Erection of single storey front extension, installation of 2 windows to side elevations and construction of additional parking area

The Case Officer reported on the application and her recommendation to permit the application.

Councillor Jackson moved that planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report. This was seconded by Councillor Matthew Davies.

The motion was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** unanimously to **PERMIT** the application subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Note: Having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this matter, Councillor Organ left the meeting while the application was considered and did not speak or vote on this item.

Item No. 9

Application No. 16/05508/FUL

Site Location: 18 Upper Camden Place, Walcot, Bath BA1 5HX – Installation of proposed mansard roof and associated dormer windows to front and rear elevations

Item No. 10

Application No. 16/05509/LBA

Site Location: 18 Upper Camden Place, Walcot, Bath, BA1 5HX – Internal and external alterations to install mansard roof and associated dormer windows to front and rear elevations

The Case Officer reported on the applications and her recommendation to refuse. She drew attention to the update report which stated that the Ecologist had advised

that an ecology survey was required in support of the application. This information had not yet been received.

The registered speakers spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Kew stated that he was sympathetic to the applications and felt that there would be no significant harm. He noted that there were already some properties in the area with mansard roofs and felt that the street scene would be enhanced. He pointed out that there was already a mixture of roof types in this street. Councillor Kew then moved to delegate to permit the application subject to conditions, noting the need to deal with any outstanding ecological issues. Councillor Matthew Davies seconded the motion.

Councillor Jackson strongly opposed the applications and stated that the Committee should take into account the comments expressed by Bath Preservation Trust and Historic England. She felt that the internal staircase should not be lost. The proposed roof was too big and would be dominant and overbearing upon the street scene.

The Team Manager stated that listed building consent for a mansard roof had previously been granted for this property in 1988 and 1993; however, planning policies and guidance relating to listed buildings had since been strengthened. These policy changes now stressed the importance of preserving historic features. Historic England had raised objections in the light of current Council policy and the NPPF.

The Principal Solicitor advised the Committee that if they were minded to grant planning permission and listed building consent then they should defer their decision until the outstanding ecology information had been submitted and considered.

Members were also advised that this would give officers the opportunity to clarify whether the internal staircase would be retained or removed as there appeared to be some confusion on this point.

Following this advice Councillor Kew, with the consent of Councillor Matthew Davies withdrew his motion. He then moved that consideration of the applications be deferred pending a site visit and an ecology report.

The motion was then put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** unanimously to **DEFER** consideration of the applications pending a site visit and an ecology report.

(Councillor Roberts returned to the meeting room)

Item No. 11

Application No. 16/05059/FUL

Site Location: 5 Crown Hill, Upper Weston, Bath, BA1 4BP – Erection of single storey rear extension

Item No. 12

Application No. 16/05060/LBA

Site Location: 5 Crown Hill, Upper Weston, Bath, BA1 4BP – Demolition of rear extensions and construction of new single-storey extension, replacement of

dormer (front and rear) and casement (rear) windows and stone cleaning to front façade

The Case Officer reported on the applications and her recommendation to grant planning permission and listed building consent.

Councillor Crossley moved that planning permission and listed building consent be granted. This was seconded by Councillor Kew.

The motion was put to the vote and it was **RESOLVED** unanimously to **PERMIT** the application for planning permission and to **GRANT** listed building consent.

111 **QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT - OCTOBER TO DECEMBER 2016**

The Committee considered the quarterly performance report for the period from October to December 2016. Members queried the figure for the number of “invalid” applications which was quoted as being 41%. The Team Manager agreed to look into this and respond to members after the meeting.

RESOLVED to **NOTE** the report.

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

The Committee considered the appeals report.

RESOLVED to **NOTE** the report.

The meeting ended at 6.00 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

Development Management Committee

Date 8th February 2017

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

ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Item No.	Application No.	Address
01	16/04289/EFUL	Warminster Road, Bathwick,

Planning History

The planning history section of the main report makes reference to application (Ref: 16/01925/VAR) which sought to make a number of layout and design changes to the development as approved by the original permission. That application has now been permitted.

Representations

Two additional letters/emails of objection have been received since the main report was drafted. These objections relate to traffic concern, concern regarding the impact of air pollution, overdevelopment, increased danger for school children, no increased provision of community facilities, the land allocated to the school appears to have been reduced.

These additional representations have been taken into account and do not affect the original recommendation. Please note that the land to be transferred to the school is outside of the current application site and therefore is not affected by the current proposals. There is no proposal to reduce the size of this land.

S.106 Agreement Clarifications

The recommendation to delegate to permit is subject to the prior completion of a S.106 Agreement securing the matters listed in the main report.

The first requirement of the S.106 Agreement as listed in the report is '*the provision of affordable housing on-site as per the approved drawing*'. To clarify - the 'approved drawing' in question (should the committee be minded to permit) is the Unit Mix Plan Drawing No. 5688U/3-002 Rev I.

The obligations set out in the original S.106 Agreement will need to be carried forward to the current full application in order that those obligations continue to be secured should the original permission not be implemented – or should its implementation be delayed beyond the implementation of the current application (should it be permitted). As such it is recommended that the carrying forward of these obligations (in so far as they are still relevant, not discharged and not altered by the current application) forms an additional component of the recommendation.

For the avoidance of doubt, the original S.106 Agreement secured the following matters.

- 40% Affordable Housing including Lifetime and Wheelchair homes;
- Education contribution of £701,719.30 + 2,165 m2 of land for the adjacent primary school;
- £27,413.70 for youth service provision;
- Contributions of £32,907.60 for land purchase for POS;
- Contributions of £261,931.20 for construction costs of POS;
- Contributions of £344,452.05 for POS annual maintenance(10 years);
- Natural Green Space provision - on-site provision managed for a 10 year period or if not managed a contribution of £237,864.75 to cover this cost;
- Contributions of £8,063.55 to fund allotment land purchase;
- Contributions of £14,074.56 to fund allotment construction costs;
- Contributions of £16,257.42 to fund allotment maintenance over a 10 year;
- Public Transport, Walking and Cycling Provision and off-site highway works;
- £10,000 to upgrade the existing Bathampton bound bus stop to include a new shelter with Real time information;
- Contributions of £42,435 per annum for three years to subsidise the running of Service Number 4;
- Implementation of 1 car club space for 3 years to be reserved;
- Complimentary bus ticket provision as part of Travel Plan;
- Conservation Management Plan;
- Maintenance of Canal Towpath (£10,000)

Due to the number of permissions now affecting this site, and associated Deeds of Variation to the original S.106 Agreement it is further recommended that the S.106 Agreement contains a mechanism requiring the developer to clarify which permissions are being implemented (as some permissions overlap); this will enable the Council to effectively monitor the obligations. The Agreement should also require clarification of construction phasing.

Revised **RECOMMENDATION:**

Delegate to PERMIT

A, Authorise the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to secure:

1. The provision of affordable housing on-site as per Drawing No 5688U/3-002 Rev I (which taken together with the earlier permissions will represent 33% provision across the MOD Warminster Rd site as a whole);
2. The provision of fire hydrants on site in accordance with a scheme to be agreed with the local planning authority and a financial contribution of £1000 per hydrant to cover 5 years subsequent maintenance OR a financial contribution of £1500 per hydrant to fund provision and 5 years subsequent maintenance.

3. The provision of targeted training and recruitment as part of the construction phase;
 4. A financial contribution of £400k to enable the delivery of affordable housing within the District less the sum of financial contributions secured in relation to 2 and 3 above;
 5. Those obligations secured by the original planning permission (Ref: 14/02272/EFUL) that are yet to be discharged including alterations to triggers if necessary so that the obligations continue to be delivered in a timely manner, and any consequential changes.
 6. A mechanism requiring the applicant/developer to confirm which permission is being implemented in relation to each part/phase/plot of the development as well as clarification of phasing.
- B. Subject to the prior completion of the above agreement, authorise the Group Manager to PERMIT subject to the conditions listed in the main report (or such conditions as may be appropriate):

Item No.	Application No.	Address
05	16/04261/FUL	Unit 2 Lymore Gardens Twerton

Amended plans which correctly indicate the elevations of the building in line with the floor plans have been submitted. The Plans considered are as follows and replace those listed in informative 1

PLANS 001 002 003 004 005 006 007D 008C 009C 015B 010B 011B 012A 013B 014 017 018 019 020 and 016.

The first paragraph under the heading 'The principle of the conversion of this building to residential' within the officers assessment section of the report is replaced with the following text to provide further clarification in relation to the policies relevant to this change of use.

Unit 2 is currently a 464.5 square metres warehouse which was used for commercial purposes. The building is empty at present but the historic use as confirmed by information received is as a B8 warehouse. Saved local plan policy HG12 allows the conversion of a warehouse to residential subject to specified criteria which are outlined below.

Saved Local Plan Policy ET3 (3) seeks to retain small B1c B2 and B8 units but the policy recognises that where the continued use of the building would perpetuate unacceptable environmental or traffic problems the loss of the floor space may be acceptable. In this situation where the building is location immediately onto a residential street and the potential traffic generated and type of vehicles generated by this use it has been considered by the Highway Engineers that a warehouse use impacts on highway safety. The improvement in highway safety by this change of use in relation to the traffic

generated by a warehouse use in this specific location is considered to outweigh the desire to retain a warehouse unit of this size.

The NPPF requires planning policies to avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose and alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits. The NPPF also requires planning policies to be attributed weight in accordance with their compliance with the NPPF. ET3 is not seen to fully comply with the NPPF and therefore its weight is reduced.

The Placemaking Plan policy ED 2B which now carries substantial weight, stipulates that on non-strategic sites applications for residential development will normally be allowed. The exception to this is where there is a strong economic reason why this would not be appropriate.

In this situation the quantum of space to be lost is relatively small and as such it is considered unlikely that there is a strong economic reason why this would be inappropriate. It is recognised that the introduction of a non-employment use could impact on the remainder of the adjacent employment space and increase the risk that the whole site could be lost. This could, in the current demand/supply situation, potentially amount to a strong economic reason to resist the loss.

However, given the highway situation in respect of this proposal and the fact that this is an attractive old building which is considered worthy of retention and where this proposal will safeguard the future of the building this change of use is considered acceptable and seen to comply with the saved local plan policy ET3 the NPPF and Placemaking Policy ED 2B.

The Waste Officer has asked that details of the door to the bin store should be provided.

The following conditions are considered necessary.

{\b Waste storage area access details (Pre Occupation)}

Prior to the first occupation of these residential units details of the access to the waste storage area including door details and finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring the access to the storage area is acceptable and the appearance of the development is appropriate in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

{\b Roof construction details (Pre demolition of front boundary wall)}

Prior to the commencement of the demolition of the section of front boundary wall adjacent to Unit 4 details of the construction of the roof, including materials and finishes, over the entrance waste store and rear car parking space at a scale of 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring the design detailing and appearance of the development is appropriate in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

Additional advice in respect of ecology.

5-All species of bats and their roosts, and all birds, their nests and their eggs, are protected by law. Nests may not be disturbed while they are being built or used. A careful check for signs of active bird nests, bats, or other wildlife should be made of the interior and exterior of the building, prior to any works affecting these areas. Any active nests identified should be protected until the young have fledged. Works to the roof should be carried out by hand, lifting tiles (not sliding) to remove them, and checking beneath each one. If bats are encountered work should cease and the Bat Helpline (Tel 0345 1300 228) or a licenced bat worker should be contacted for advice.

The agent has clarified various matters in respect of the following details

The agent confirms the works will comply with the fire safety requirements. However should any doubts arise then there is the potential to install a sprinkler system as a catch-all solution.

Officer comment- The details in respect of fire safety will be covered by building regulations.

The neighbour's emergency access is retained as shown on the plans.

Officer comment- a condition in respect of this matter is included in the officers report.

The works as a whole are entirely within the applicant's ownership and will satisfy the separate legislation applicable to party walls etc. the use of an appropriate junction, as existing in these regards will ensure that run off is not materially changed.

Officer comment- The plans submitted indicate the land is all within the applicant's ownership.

The submitted plans show the reduction in the no parking zone where the white line is removed and a narrower dropped kerb results.

Officer comment- the plan indicating this arrangement is listed within informative 1.

The gates will be electronic as stated.

Officer comment- This is noted and the gates are referred to in the officers report.

Item No.	Application No.	Address
06	16/04960/FUL	Beaumont House, Lansdown

Following the publication of the report 13 further objections have been received on the application making the following additional comments;

The revised plans do not overcome the submitted objections

The revised landscaping plan does not overcome the concerns of neighbours.

Planting trees on the boundary could result in roots penetrating the wall of neighbouring properties.

There is the possibility of an underground water tank which could make the land less stable.

A parking bay has been located close to the window on one of the new flats which would be harmful to amenity.

The proposed new parking area will not provide enough parking for the site.

The applicants do not own the parking area to the east of the property.

Construction activities could encroach into the tree protection areas.

The parking survey is inaccurate some flats were unoccupied at the time of the survey

The existing car park cannot be used for construction activities.

The revised design will be overbearing to properties to the south of the site.

The additional cars will impact on the traffic flow outside of Beaumont

The parking plan does not take into account multiple occupancy.

The existing property is not currently fully occupied

The development will harm the world heritage site and Conservation Area

The proposal is overdevelopment of the land

The development will harm the amenity of the neighbouring properties

The development has not provided enough parking spaces and will cause harm to highway safety

The development will harm the amenity of residents to the south of the site within Sion Road.

The development will result in the loss of the communal area to the south of the building.

The construction activities will result in harm to the amenity of residents, the construction management plan condition is not sufficient.

The submitted information shows an area of land to be tarmacked outside of the applicants control.

A structural engineer should be required by condition to supervise the works

Officer comments:

The applicant has provided a parking survey to which the existing residents have raised concern that this is inaccurate. The parking survey has been taken over four days and includes two weekday evenings. The highways officer has raised no objection to the application and the council is satisfied that the development will provide a sufficient level of on site parking. Policy ST.7 of the emerging placemaking plan requires the provision of on site parking of two spaces for a two bedroom dwelling. However in this case the applicant has submitted a parking survey and the application site is located within a sustainable location. Therefore in this case the proposed parking level is parking is considered to be acceptable.

Concern has been raised that the proposed development will result in harm to the World Heritage Site and Conservation Area. The proposed extension has been designed to complement the design of the existing building. Matching materials will be used and the fenestration of the proposed building has been carefully designed to complement the existing building. The proposed extension will not be visually dominant within the streetscene so will preserve the character of the surrounding Conservation Area and World Heritage Site. The applicant has submitted a replacement landscaping scheme which will enhance the setting of the existing building. The proposed building is not considered to form part of the setting of the nearby listed building of the Royal High School.

Concern has been raised within the representations with regards to the structural integrity of the building. Paragraph 120 of the NPPF states that where a site is affected by land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.

Concern has been raised that the construction activities will harm the trees. A condition is proposed to be attached to any permission requiring provision of tree protection measures and an arboricultural method statement before work commences. A construction management plan will also be required.

Concern has been raised that the parking or cars in front of the proposed flats will be harmful to the amenity of future occupiers. The proposed parking space will not be located directly in front of the proposed ground floor flat. Given that the area to the front of the building is used for parking this does not warrant refusal of the application.

Concern has been raised within the representation that the development will harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers on Sion Road. As stated in the case officers original report the proposed development would extend the side of the building to the south towards the nearby properties of 1a, 1, 3 and 5 Sion Road. Number 1a, 3 and 5 would view the building from an oblique angle so that the development would not appear to be overbearing to the occupiers. Given the angle of development the proposed extension is not considered to result in increased overlooking that would warrant refusal of the application.

The view from number 1 would be of the side elevation. The applicant has revised the plans to reduce the width of the proposed extension. The extension will be 18m from the rear elevation of number 1. Whilst the extension will be visible to the occupiers of number 1 on balance the provision of the extension is not considered to cause harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers that would warrant refusal of the application.

Glazing has been located on the side elevation of the building. This will provide light to bathroom windows so will be obscure glazed and will not result in the overlooking of properties to the south of the site.

Concern has been raised that the development will result in the loss of a communal area to the south of the site. The proposed landscaping plan shows an area of grass to the south of the site will be retained and it is noted that part of this area is currently given over to concrete. This does not warrant refusal of the application.

Concern has been raised that the construction activities will harm the amenity of nearby residents. Any construction works will be temporary in nature. A condition has been attached requiring the submission of a construction management plan which will allow for control of working hours of the development and the management of vehicles.

Concern has been raised that the proposed works will include work to land outside of the applications control. The submitted revised landscape plan does not show tarmacking works outside of land within the applicants ownership.

Conclusion

The proposed extension is considered to respect and complement the host building and will not harm the character of the surrounding Conservation Area. The proposed addition of three flats is not considered to result in harm to highway safety and the development will not harm the amenity of residential occupiers.

Recommendation: Permit

Item No.	Application No.	Address
09 &10	16/05508/FUL & 16/05509/LBA	18 Upper Camden Place, Bath

Historic England:

Historic England has provided further comments regarding the proposed works to the listed building, confirming their objection to the proposal:

18 Upper Camden Place forms part of a Grade II terrace of 14 houses, which in turn is part of a longer stretch of terraces (separately listed), all within the Bath Conservation Area and World Heritage Site. They gradually step up Camden Road south to north and overlook their Lower Camden Place counterparts, likewise listed Grade II. The upper terrace is of late-18th, early-19th century, and is thought to be in part by John Eveleigh (an English surveyor and architect based in Bath). They take the form of three storeys with attics and basements; the list description specifying no.18 having 'paired windows to upper floors, canted bay to right with small central pediment and six-panel door glazed to top'. The heritage value derives from the more modest architectural set-piece terraces lining these streets, predominantly still uniform and repetitive in their form and appearance.

This application proposes a replacement roof to 18 Upper Camden Place. This will involve the loss of the original historic roof structure, its replacement with a mansard form and the introduction of staircase to access enlarged roofspace. To implement this scheme will require significant loss of historic roof fabric including chimney stacks, and a substantial elongation to the form of the three storey terraced dwelling.

The intended elevation terminates at the cornice and parapet, providing a strong architectural feature of stepped-up parapets and stacks. Cumulative alterations to the roof form along these terraces will incrementally change the historic character of this terrace.

As the application affects a listed building, the statutory requirement to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building, its setting and any features of special interest (ss.16, 62, Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) must be taken into account by your authority when making its decision. Under the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 it is a core planning principle to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations (para.17 NPPF). Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Where a proposal will lead to less than substantial harm of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (para. 134).

We do not agree with the Heritage Impact Assessment's conclusion that the historic significance of this heritage asset is the irregular architectural composition. Whilst there have been alterations to surrounding properties, the prevailing form is one of uniformity and repetition. The roof form remains consistent in its historic arrangement along this terrace, and the assessment that it 'will not be uncharacteristic nor will it disrupt the roof form or appearance of the terrace', is wholly disagreed with. Notwithstanding, the raised mansard roof will involve the loss of a harmful extent of this significant historic structural component. This will need to be weighed against the public benefit of providing one additional bedroom.

We consider that the application does not meet the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers para. 134, and cannot currently support this proposal.

These comments concur with that outlined in the officer report and the recommendation remains that of refusal

Ecology:

Following initial guidance and further assessment of the applications the Ecologist has advised that an ecology survey is required in support of the application. Without the relevant survey the Local Planning Authority would be unable to discharge their duty as a competent Authority to ensure that potential protected species are safeguarded. As no survey has been submitted with the application and there is a risk of protected species being present within the roof space an additional reason for refusal is required for both applications:

1. There is insufficient information to adequately demonstrate that protected species will not be affected by the proposed demolition of the roof and as such the application is contrary to policies NE.10 of the Local Plan and CP6 of the Core Strategy.

This page is intentionally left blank

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND REPRESENTATIVES WISHING TO MAKE A STATEMENT AT THE MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY 8 FEBRUARY 2017

A. SITE VISIT LIST			
ITEM NO.	SITE NAME	SPEAKER	FOR/AGAINST
1	33 Parklands, High Littleton	Derek Cole	Against

B. MAIN PLANS LIST			
1	Ministry of Defence, Warminster Road, Bath	Christine Hodder David Martin Phil Smart	Against (To share 5 minutes)
		Frances Firmstone Veronica Barbaro	For (To share 5 minutes)
		Councillor Matt Cochrane	Against
2	Beechen Cliff School, Kipling Avenue, Bath	Jeremy Boss (Widcombe Association) Margarida Dolan	Against (To share 3 minutes)
		Sean Turner (Beechen Cliff School)	For
		Councillor Ian Gilchrist Councillor Mark Shelford	N/A
3	17 Station Road, Welton, Midsomer Norton	Councillor Jane Lewis (Midsomer Norton Town Council)	Against

4	Unit 2, Lymore Gardens, Twerton, Bath	Simon Chambers (Agent)	For
		Councillor June Player	Against
5	Box Bush Farm, Bromley Road, Stanton Drew	Councillor Judith Chubb-Whittle (Stanton Drew Parish Council)	For
		Duncan Lawrence (Agent)	For
		Councillor Karen Warrington	For
6	Beaumont House, Lansdown Road, Bath	Rosalyn Trotman (Trings Solicitors - on behalf of Beaumont Maintenance Company)	Against
		Chris Beaver (Agent)	For
7	Bristol Water Visitor Centre and Tea Room, Chew Magna	Jon Wheatley (Chair - Chew Magna Parish Council)	For
		Cllr Liz Richardson	For
9	18 Upper Camden Place, Walcot, Bath	Chris Dance (Agent)	For (To share 6 minutes)
		Greg Beale (Heritage Officer)	

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

8th February 2017

SITE VISIT DECISIONS

Item No:	001	
Application No:	16/04535/FUL	
Site Location:	33 Parklands, High Littleton, Bristol, Bath And North East Somerset	
Ward: High Littleton	Parish: High Littleton	LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application	
Proposal:	Erection of a dwelling following demolition of the outbuilding	
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Airport Safeguarding Zones, Agric Land Class 1,2,3a, Coal - Standing Advice Area, Forest of Avon, Greenbelt, Housing Development Boundary, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,	
Applicant:	Mr Tiley	
Expiry Date:	20th January 2017	
Case Officer:	Samantha Mason	

DECISION Permit subject to conditions

This page is intentionally left blank

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

8th February 2017

DECISIONS

Item No:	01	
Application No:	16/04289/EFUL	
Site Location:	Ministry Of Defence, Warminster Road, Bathwick, Bath	
Ward: Bathwick	Parish: N/A	LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application with an EIA attached	
Proposal:	Erection of 6 no. apartment blocks to provide 87 no. new dwellings (Partial revision of application 14/02272/EFUL).	
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 1,2,3a, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Article 4, Article 4, British Waterways Major and EIA, British Waterways Minor and Householders, Conservation Area, Forest of Avon, Hotspring Protection, LLFA - Flood Risk Management, MOD Safeguarded Areas, Sites of Nature Conservation Interest, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, Water Source Areas, World Heritage Site,	
Applicant:	Hardrock Developments Ltd	
Expiry Date:	20th December 2016	
Case Officer:	Chris Gomm	

DECISION Delegate to permit subject to applicant entering into S106 Agreement.

Item No:	02		
Application No:	16/05094/FUL		
Site Location:	Beechen Cliff School , Kipling Avenue, Bear Flat, Bath		
Ward: Widcombe	Parish: N/A	LB Grade: N/A	
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Extend bank southwards using existing on site spoil heap to create wider playing field.		
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Article 4, Article 4, Article 4, Conservation Area, Forest of Avon, Hotspring Protection, MOD Safeguarded Areas, Sites used as playing fields, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, World Heritage Site,		
Applicant:	Beechen Cliff School		
Expiry Date:	16th December 2016		
Case Officer:	Chris Griggs-Trevarthen		

Defer for site visit - to allow Members to understand the context of the site

Item No:	03		
Application No:	16/04499/FUL		
Site Location:	17 Station Road, Welton, Midsomer Norton, BA3 2AZ		
Ward: Midsomer Norton North	Parish: Midsomer Norton	LB Grade: N/A	
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Erection of 6no. new dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings (resubmission) - revised plans		
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Coal - Standing Advice Area, Conservation Area, Contaminated Land, Forest of Avon, Housing Development Boundary, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,		
Applicant:	Flower And Hayes Ltd		
Expiry Date:	12th January 2017		
Case Officer:	Tessa Hampden		

Defer for site visit - to allow Members to understand the context of the site

Item No:	04	
Application No:	16/04261/FUL	
Site Location:	Unit 2, Lymore Gardens, Twerton, Bath	
Ward: Westmoreland	Parish: N/A	LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application	
Proposal:	Erection of 5No Three-bedroom, 2No Two-bedroom and 1No One-bedroom flat following conversion and adaptation of warehouse	
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Article 4, Contaminated Land, Forest of Avon, Hotspring Protection, LLFA - Flood Risk Management, MOD Safeguarded Areas, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, World Heritage Site,	
Applicant:	B Hammick	
Expiry Date:	10th February 2017	
Case Officer:	Christine Moorfield	

DECISION PERMIT

1 Standard Time Limit (Compliance)

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and to avoid the accumulation of unimplemented planning permission

2 Plans List (Compliance)

The development/works hereby permitted shall only be implemented in accordance with the plans as set out in the plans list below.

Reason: To define the terms and extent of the permission.

3 Sound attenuation (Prior to occupation)

On completion of the works but prior to any occupation of the approved development, the applicant shall submit to and have approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, an assessment from a competent person to demonstrate that the development has been constructed to provide sound attenuation against external noise in accordance with BS8233:2014. The

following levels shall be achieved: Maximum internal noise levels of 35dBLAeq,16hr and 30dBLAeq,8hr for living rooms and bedrooms during the daytime and night time respectively. For bedrooms at night individual noise events (measured with F time-weighting) shall not (normally) exceed 45dBLAmax.

Reason: To protect future occupants of the development from exposure to external noise.

4 Ground investigations /drainage (Pre commencement)

No development shall commence, except ground investigations and remediation, until an appropriate method of surface water drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and installed prior to the occupation of the development.

Reason: To ensure that an appropriate method of surface water drainage is installed and in the interests of flood risk management in accordance with Policy CP5 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

5 Contaminated Land (Compliance)

Prior to the commencement of development a Desk Study and Site Reconnaissance (Phase 1 Investigation) survey shall be undertaken to develop a conceptual site model and preliminary risk assessment. A Phase I investigation should provide a preliminary qualitative assessment of risk by interpreting information on a site's history considering the likelihood of pollutant linkages being present. The Phase I investigation typically consists of a desk study, site walkover, development of a conceptual model and preliminary risk assessment. The site walkover survey should be conducted to identify if there are any obvious signs of contamination at the surface, within the property or along the boundary of neighbouring properties.

Should any contamination be found then mitigation measures must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the measures as identified.

Reason To ensure that the land is suitable for the intended uses and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors and in accordance with section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6 Highways - Parking (Compliance)

The areas allocated for parking and turning on the submitted plan shall be kept clear of obstruction and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure sufficient parking and turning areas are retained at all times in the interests of amenity and highways safety in accordance with Policy T.24 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

7 Parking (Pre-occupation)

No occupation of the development shall commence until the parking space associated with that number unit has been provided on-site and must be retained permanently thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that adequate and safe parking is provided in the interests of amenity and highway safety in accordance with Policies T.26 and T.24 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

8 Materials (Compliance)

All work of making good shall be finished to match Unit 2 Lymore Gardens in respect of type, size, colour, pointing, coursing, jointing, profile and texture.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development and the surrounding area in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

9 Materials - Submission of Schedule and Samples (Bespoke Trigger)

No use of the garage area shall commence until details of the materials and finishes of the materials to be used in the construction of the sliding door have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development and the surrounding area in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

10 balcony materials and details - (Prior to first occupation)

Flats 1-5 shall not be first occupied until details of glazed screening to be placed across the balcony areas have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation of these units.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development and the surrounding area in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

11 Bicycle Storage and waste storage (Pre-occupation)

No occupation of the development shall commence until the bicycle storage and storage for waste bins has been provided in accordance with the details which have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The bicycle and waste storage shall be retained permanently thereafter.

Reason: To secure adequate waste storage on site and off-street parking provision for bicycles to promote sustainable transport use in accordance with Policy T.6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

12 Emergency Escape (Compliance)

The strip of land adjacent to car parking space 8 to the rear of the premises shall be kept clear of obstructions at all time in order to provide emergency egress from the neighbouring building.

Reason: To safeguard the exit from the adjacent building in the event of an emergency.

13 Waste storage area access details (Pre Occupation)

Prior to the first occupation of these residential units details of the access to the waste storage area including door details and finishes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring the access to the storage area is acceptable and the appearance of the development is appropriate in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

14 Roof construction details (Pre demolition of front boundary wall)

Prior to the commencement of the demolition of the section of front boundary wall adjacent to Unit 4 details of the construction of the roof, including materials and finishes, over the entrance waste store and rear car parking space at a scale of 1:20 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring the design detailing and appearance of the development is appropriate in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

Additional advice in respect of ecology.

PLANS LIST:

PLANS 001 002 003 004 005 006 007B 008B 009B 015B 010A 011A 012A 013A 014 017 018 and 016.

Condition Categories

The heading of each condition gives an indication of the type of condition and what is required by it. There are 4 broad categories:

Compliance - The condition specifies matters to which you must comply. These conditions do not require the submission of additional details and do not need to be discharged.

Pre-commencement - The condition requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before any work begins on the approved development. The condition will list any specific works which are exempted from this restriction, e.g. ground investigations, remediation works, etc.

Pre-occupation - The condition requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before occupation of all or part of the approved development.

Bespoke Trigger - The condition contains a bespoke trigger which requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before a specific action occurs.

Please note all conditions should be read fully as these headings are intended as a guide only.

Where approval of further information is required you will need to submit a conditions application and pay the relevant fee, details of the fee can be found on the "what happens after permission" pages of the Council's Website. You can submit your conditions application via the Planning Portal at www.planningportal.co.uk or send it direct to planning_registration@bathnes.gov.uk. Alternatively this can be sent by post to The Planning Registration Team, Planning Services, Lewis House, Manvers Street, Bath, BA1 1JG.

In determining this application the Local Planning Authority considers it has complied with the aims of paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Framework.

We would strongly advise the applicant to review the West of England Sustainable Drainage Developer guide.
http://www.bathnes.gov.uk/sites/default/files/sitedocuments/Planning-and-Building-Control/Planning-Policy/LDFGeneral/bd6457_woe_developer_guide_complete_72dpi.pdf

This document details the standards we would expect the developer to meet. In particular, at full application stage we would expect the applicant to have carried out an initial investigation into the existing surface water drainage system and an estimate of current brownfield runoff rates.

We would expect the applicant to have completed a 'Proof of concept' - see page 37 of the West of England Sustainable Drainage Developer guide.

Environment Agency surface water flood risk mapping suggests that for a 1in100 year rainfall event, flood depths on Lymore Gardens could be up to 0.15m. Given this risk of flooding on Lymore Gardens, the applicant may want to consider the level of finished floor levels and may wish to raise these to around 300mm above 1in100 depths. The applicant may also consider the influence of any drop curbs or driveways that may encourage flood water to enter the site.

We would encourage the applicant to explore what opportunities there are to green parts of the site so that less water discharges straight to the sewer system.

It is likely that the site currently drains surface water to a Wessex Water sewer. For any new proposed connections to the Wessex Water system, discharge rates and connection points must be agreed with Wessex Water.

All species of bats and their roosts, and all birds, their nests and their eggs, are protected by law. Nests may not be disturbed while they are being built or used. A careful check for signs of active bird nests, bats, or other wildlife should be made of the interior and exterior of the building, prior to any works affecting these areas. Any active nests identified should be protected until the young have fledged. Works to the roof should be carried out by hand, lifting tiles (not sliding) to remove them, and checking beneath each one. If bats are encountered work should cease and the Bat Helpline (Tel 0345 1300 228) or a licenced bat worker should be contacted for advice.

Item No:	05		
Application No:	16/05453/FUL		
Site Location:	Box Bush, Bromley Road, Stanton Drew, Bristol		
Ward: Clutton	Parish: Stanton Drew	LB Grade: N/A	
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Erection of 2 storey annexe and single storey extension following demolition of existing single store annexe		
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Airport Safeguarding Zones, Airport Safeguarding Zones, Agric Land Class 1,2,3a, Coal - Standing Advice Area, Forest of Avon, Greenbelt, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,		
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Strickland		
Expiry Date:	10th February 2017		
Case Officer:	Alice Barnes		

DECISION REFUSE

1 The proposed development is located within the Green Belt and outside of the housing development boundary where the principle of residential development is not accepted. It is therefore contrary to policy HG.10 of the Bath & North East Somerset Local Plan including minerals and waste policies - adopted October 2007 and policy RE.4 of the emerging placemaking plan

2 The proposed development by reason of its siting, scale and design will result in a replacement building which is materially larger than the existing building. The increased size and height of the building will harm the openness of the surrounding green belt being more visually prominent within the streetscene. In the absence of very special circumstances the development is considered to be contrary to policies GB.2 of the Bath and North East Local Plan, including minerals and waste policies, adopted October 2007 and CP8 of the Core Strategy and paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework and GB1 of the emerging placemaking plan

PLANS LIST:

Existing site plan 20
Existing plans 21
Existing elevations 22
Proposed site plan 23
Proposed annexe plans 24
Proposed sectional elevation (west) 25
Proposed road elevations 26
Proposed north elevation 27
Proposed south elevation 28

In determining this application the Local Planning Authority considers it has complied with the aims of paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Framework. The Local Planning Authority acknowledges the approach outlined in paragraphs 188-192 in favour of front loading and operates a pre-application advice service. Notwithstanding active encouragement for pre-application dialogue the applicant did not seek to enter into correspondence with the Local Planning Authority. The proposal was considered unacceptable for the reasons given and the applicant was advised that the application was to be recommended for refusal. Despite this the applicant choose not to withdraw the application, and having regard to the need to avoid unnecessary delay the Local Planning Authority moved forward and issued its decision.

Item No:	06	
Application No:	16/04960/FUL	
Site Location:	Beaumont House, Lansdown Road, Lansdown, Bath	
Ward: Lansdown	Parish: N/A	LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application	
Proposal:	Erection of three storey side extension to provide 3 no. residential apartments with associated parking and landscaping	
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Article 4, Conservation Area, Forest of Avon, Hotspring Protection, MOD Safeguarded Areas, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, World Heritage Site,	
Applicant:	Lynas And Potter	
Expiry Date:	10th February 2017	
Case Officer:	Alice Barnes	

DECISION PERMIT

1 Standard Time Limit (Compliance)

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and to avoid the accumulation of unimplemented planning permission

2 Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan (Pre-commencement)

No development shall take place until an arboricultural method statement with tree protection plan following the recommendations contained within BS 5837:2012 identifying measures to protect the trees to be retained, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement shall include proposed tree protection measures during site preparation (including clearance and level changes), during construction and landscaping operations. The statement should also include the control of potentially harmful operations such as the position of service runs and soakaways, storage, handling and mixing of materials on site and movement of people and machinery. This is a condition precedent because the works comprising the development have the potential to harm retained trees. Therefore these details need to be agreed before work commences.

Reason: To ensure that no excavation, tipping, burning, storing of materials or any other activity takes place which would adversely affect the trees to be retained in accordance with policy NE.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and CP7 of the Core Strategy and NE6 of the emerging placemaking plan

3 Arboricultural (Compliance)

No development or other operations shall take place except in complete accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement.

Reason: To ensure that the approved method statement is complied with for the duration of the development.

4 Highways (Compliance)

The areas allocated for parking and turning on the submitted plan 1612-AP(0)-12-B shall be kept clear of obstruction and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure sufficient parking and turning areas are retained at all times in the interests of amenity and highways safety in accordance with Policy T.24 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

5 Highways - Construction Management Plan (Pre-commencement)

No development shall commence until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall include details of deliveries (including storage arrangements and timings), contractor parking, traffic management, working hours, site opening times, wheel wash facilities and site compound arrangements. The development shall thereafter be undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that safe operation of the highway and in the interests of protecting residential amenity in accordance with Policies T.24 and D.2 of the Bath and North East

Somerset Local Plan. This is a condition precedent because any initial construction or demolition works could have a detrimental impact upon highways safety and/or residential amenity.

6 Ecology (Compliance)

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the recommendations on pages 12 and 13 of the approved Extended Phase 1 Habitat Ecological Survey by Stark Ecology dated May 2016. Any new external lighting shall be designed to operated only when required and to avoid light spill onto boundary vegetation and hedgerows.

Reason: To avoid harm to wildlife including bats in accordance with policy NE.11 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and NE3 of the emerging placemaking plan

7 Plans List (Compliance)

The development/works hereby permitted shall only be implemented in accordance with the plans as set out in the plans list below.

Reason: To define the terms and extent of the permission.

PLANS LIST:

OS plan 01 B
Existing site plan 02 B
Existing plans 03 A
Existing elevations 04 A
Existing roof plan 05
Existing parking arrangement and swept path analysis SPA02 B
Proposed site location plan 10 D
Proposed site plan 11 D
Proposed ground floor plan 12 C
Proposed first floor plan, second floor plan and roof plan 13 C
Proposed elevations 20 C
Proposed elevations 21 C
Landscape masterplan R001 PS
Proposed sections 30 C
Proposed parking bays SK01 B
Proposed parking bays swept path analysis SPA01 B

In determining this application the Local Planning Authority considers it has complied with the aims of paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Framework.

Item No:	07		
Application No:	16/05498/AR		
Site Location:	Bristol Water Visitor Centre & Tea Room, Walley Lane, Chew Magna, Bristol		
Ward: Chew Valley North	Parish: Chew Magna	LB Grade: N/A	
Application Type:	Advertisement Consent		
Proposal:	Display of 2no. externally illuminated entrance signs to replace previous signs to the entrance to Chew Valley Lake picnic area and Salt & Malt Cafe and public car park. (Resubmission)		
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Airport Safeguarding Zones, Agric Land Class 1,2,3a, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Coal - Standing Advice Area, Forest of Avon, Greenbelt, Land of recreational value, Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area, Site Of Special Scientific Interest (SI), SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, Water Source Areas,		
Applicant:	Mr Chris Eggleton		
Expiry Date:	10th February 2017		
Case Officer:	Martin Almond		

DECISION REFUSE

1 The proposed size, design, siting and external illumination of the signage is harmful to the rural character and natural amenity of the site, contrary to the requirements of Saved Policies BH.17, D.4 and NE.2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan (including mineral and waste policies) Adopted October 2007 and Policy NE2 of the draft Placemaking Plan 2016.

PLANS LIST:

This decision relates to drawings BLOCK PLAN, PROPOSED SIGNAGE, SIDE ELEVATION, TOP-DOWN ELEVATION, SITE LOCATION PLAN REVISED, SITE PLAN AND SITE LOCATION PLAN dated as received 10th November 2016.

In determining this application the Local Planning Authority considers it has complied with the aims of paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Framework. Notwithstanding informal advice offered by the Local Planning Authority the submitted application was unacceptable for the stated reasons and the applicant was advised that the application was to be recommended for refusal. Despite this the applicant chose not to withdraw the application and having regard to the need to avoid unnecessary delay the Local Planning Authority moved forward and issued its decision.

Item No:	08	
Application No:	16/05771/FUL	
Site Location:	6 Fairways, Saltford, Bristol, Bath And North East Somerset	
Ward: Saltford	Parish: Saltford	LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application	
Proposal:	Erection of single storey front extension, installation of 2no windows to side elevations and construction of additional parking area	
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Airport Safeguarding Zones, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Forest of Avon, Housing Development Boundary, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,	
Applicant:	Mr And Mrs B Organ	
Expiry Date:	10th February 2017	
Case Officer:	Emma Hardy	

DECISION PERMIT

1 Standard Time Limit (Compliance)

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and to avoid the accumulation of unimplemented planning permission

2 Plans List (Compliance)

The development/works hereby permitted shall only be implemented in accordance with the plans as set out in the plans list below.

Reason: To define the terms and extent of the permission.

3 Materials (Compliance)

All external walling and roofing materials to be used shall be as stated on drawing No. 1626/02 or shall match those of the existing building in respect of type, size, colour, pointing, coursing, jointing, profile and texture.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development and the surrounding area in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

4 Highways - Bound/Compacted Surface Material (Compliance)

The vehicular access and parking area shall be constructed with a bound and compacted surfacing material (not loose stone or gravel).

Reason: To prevent loose material spilling onto the highway in the interests of highways safety in accordance with Policy T.24 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

PLANS LIST:

Drawing No. 1626/01 (Existing Floor Plans and Elevations) and drawing No. 1626/02 (Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations) received 25/11/2016 and un-numbered 1:1250 OS site location plan received 29/11/2016.

Condition Categories

The heading of each condition gives an indication of the type of condition and what is required by it. There are 4 broad categories:

Compliance - The condition specifies matters to which you must comply. These conditions do not require the submission of additional details and do not need to be discharged.

Pre-commencement - The condition requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before any work begins on the approved development. The condition will list any specific works which are exempted from this restriction, e.g. ground investigations, remediation works, etc.

Pre-occupation - The condition requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before occupation of all or part of the approved development.

Bespoke Trigger - The condition contains a bespoke trigger which requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before a specific action occurs.

Please note all conditions should be read fully as these headings are intended as a guide only.

Where approval of further information is required you will need to submit a conditions application and pay the relevant fee, details of the fee can be found on the "what happens after permission" pages of the Council's Website. You can submit your conditions application via the Planning Portal at www.planningportal.co.uk or send it direct to planning_registration@bathnes.gov.uk. Alternatively this can be sent by post to The Planning Registration Team, Planning Services, Lewis House, Manvers Street, Bath, BA1 1JG.

Decision Making Statement

In determining this application the Local Planning Authority considers it has complied with the aims of paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Framework.

Item No:	09		
Application No:	16/05508/FUL		
Site Location:	18 Upper Camden Place, Walcot, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset		
Ward: Lansdown	Parish: N/A	LB Grade: II	
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Installation of proposed mansard roof and associated dormer windows to front and rear elevations		
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Article 4, Article 4, Article 4, Conservation Area, Forest of Avon, Hotspring Protection, Listed Building, MOD Safeguarded Areas, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, World Heritage Site,		
Applicant:	Mrs Tracey Dean-Chalkley		
Expiry Date:	9th February 2017		
Case Officer:	Laura Batham		

Defer for site visit - to allow Members to understand the context of the site

Item No:	10		
Application No:	16/05509/LBA		
Site Location:	18 Upper Camden Place, Walcot, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset		
Ward: Lansdown	Parish: N/A	LB Grade: II	
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent (Alts/exts)		
Proposal:	Internal and external alterations to install mansard roof and associated dormer windows to front and rear elevations		
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Article 4, Article 4, Article 4, Conservation Area, Forest of Avon, Hotspring Protection, Listed Building, MOD Safeguarded Areas, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, World Heritage Site,		
Applicant:	Mrs Tracey Dean-Chalkley		
Expiry Date:	9th February 2017		
Case Officer:	Laura Batham		

Defer for site visit - to allow Members to understand the context of the site

Item No:	11	
Application No:	16/05059/FUL	
Site Location:	5 Crown Hill, Upper Weston, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset	
Ward: Weston	Parish: N/A	LB Grade: II
Application Type:	Full Application	
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension	
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Article 4, Conservation Area, Forest of Avon, Hotspring Protection, Listed Building, MOD Safeguarded Areas, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, World Heritage Site,	
Applicant:	Mr A Pearce	
Expiry Date:	15th February 2017	
Case Officer:	Anna Jotcham	

DECISION PERMIT

1 Standard Time Limit (Compliance)

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) and to avoid the accumulation of unimplemented planning permission

2 Sedum roof (Compliance)

If, within a period of five years from the date of the development being completed, the sedum roof indicated on approved plan 497.17.A received 4 January 2017 dies, is removed or becomes seriously damaged or diseased it shall be replaced.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development and the surrounding area in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

3 Plans List (Compliance)

The development/works hereby permitted shall only be implemented in accordance with the plans as set out in the plans list below.

Reason: To define the terms and extent of the permission.

PLANS LIST:

19 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.21 BLOCK PLAN

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.1 EXISTING GROUND FLOOR PLAN

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.2 EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.3 EXISTING SECOND FLOOR PLAN

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.4 EXSITING SECTION

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.5.A EXISTING ELEVATIONS

4 Jan 2017 Drawing 497.16.A PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR
4 Jan 2017 Drawing 497.17.A PROPOSED SECTION
4 Jan 2017 Drawing 497.18.A PROPOSED ELEVATION

Condition Categories

The heading of each condition gives an indication of the type of condition and what is required by it. There are 4 broad categories:

Compliance - The condition specifies matters to which you must comply. These conditions do not require the submission of additional details and do not need to be discharged.

Pre-commencement - The condition requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before any work begins on the approved development. The condition will list any specific works which are exempted from this restriction, e.g. ground investigations, remediation works, etc.

Pre-occupation - The condition requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before occupation of all or part of the approved development.

Bespoke Trigger - The condition contains a bespoke trigger which requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before a specific action occurs.

Please note all conditions should be read fully as these headings are intended as a guide only.

Where approval of further information is required you will need to submit a conditions application and pay the relevant fee, details of the fee can be found on the "what happens after permission" pages of the Council's Website. You can submit your conditions application via the Planning Portal at www.planningportal.co.uk or send it direct to planning_registration@bathnes.gov.uk. Alternatively this can be sent by post to The Planning Registration Team, Planning Services, Lewis House, Manvers Street, Bath, BA1 1JG.

In determining this application the Local Planning Authority considers it has complied with the aims of paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Framework.

Item No:	12
Application No:	16/05060/LBA
Site Location:	5 Crown Hill, Upper Weston, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset
Ward: Weston	Parish: N/A LB Grade: II
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent (Alts/exts)
Proposal:	Demolition of rear extensions and construction of new single-storey extension, replacement of dormer (front and rear) and casement (rear) windows and stone cleaning to front facade
Constraints:	Affordable Housing, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Article 4, Conservation Area, Forest of Avon, Hotspring Protection, Listed Building, MOD Safeguarded Areas, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones, World Heritage Site,
Applicant:	Mr A Pearce
Expiry Date:	15th February 2017
Case Officer:	Anna Jotcham

DECISION CONSENT

1 Time Limit - Listed Building Consent (Compliance)

The works hereby approved shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To comply with Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

2 Materials - Submission of Schedule and Samples (Bespoke Trigger)

No construction of the external walls of the development shall commence until a schedule of materials and finishes, and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces, including roofs, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the development and the surrounding area in accordance with Policies D.2 and D.4 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan and Policy CP6 of the Bath and North East Somerset Core Strategy.

3 Stone cleaning (Compliance)

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Stone Cleaning Assessment and Specification included within the 'Design, Philosophy and Access Statement' dated October 2016.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the building in accordance with Policy BH.2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

4 Stone Cleaning Sample (Bespoke Trigger)

No work shall commence on the stone cleaning hereby approved until a sample panel has been provided in-situ to establish the final parameters of the stone cleaning and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved panel shall be kept on site for reference until the development is completed. Thereafter the work shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved sample panel.

Reason: To safeguard features of special architectural and historical interest and preserve the character and appearance of the building in accordance with Policy BH.2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

5 Mortar Mix (Bespoke Trigger)

No re-pointing / stone repair work shall be carried out until details of the specification for the mortar mix and a sample area of pointing / stone repair demonstrating colour, texture, jointing and finish have been provided in situ for the inspection and approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority and retained for reference until the work has been completed. Once approved the works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard features of special architectural and historical interest and preserve the character and appearance of the building in accordance with Policy BH.2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

6 Extension - external glazing (Bespoke Trigger)

No installation of external glazing, shown on approved plan 497.18.A received 4 January 2017, shall commence until full details comprising appropriately scaled drawings and product specification have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the work shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the building in accordance with Policy BH.2 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan.

7 Plans List (Compliance)

The development/works hereby permitted shall only be implemented in accordance with the plans as set out in the plans list below.

Reason: To define the terms and extent of the permission.

PLANS LIST:

19 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.21 BLOCK PLAN

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.1 EXISTING GROUND FLOOR PLAN

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.2 EXISTING FIRST FLOOR PLAN

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.3 EXISTING SECOND FLOOR PLAN

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.4 EXISTING SECTION

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.5.A EXISTING ELEVATIONS

4 Jan 2017 Drawing 497.16.A PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR

4 Jan 2017 Drawing 497.17.A PROPOSED SECTION

4 Jan 2017 Drawing 497.18.A PROPOSED ELEVATION

14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.19 WINDOW CASEMENT DETAILS
14 Oct 2016 Drawing 497.20 INTERNAL DOOR DETAILS

Condition Categories

The heading of each condition gives an indication of the type of condition and what is required by it. There are 4 broad categories:

Compliance - The condition specifies matters to which you must comply. These conditions do not require the submission of additional details and do not need to be discharged.

Pre-commencement - The condition requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before any work begins on the approved development. The condition will list any specific works which are exempted from this restriction, e.g. ground investigations, remediation works, etc.

Pre-occupation - The condition requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before occupation of all or part of the approved development.

Bespoke Trigger - The condition contains a bespoke trigger which requires the submission and approval of further information, drawings or details before a specific action occurs.

Please note all conditions should be read fully as these headings are intended as a guide only.

Where approval of further information is required you will need to submit a conditions application and pay the relevant fee, details of the fee can be found on the "what happens after permission" pages of the Council's Website. You can submit your conditions application via the Planning Portal at www.planningportal.co.uk or send it direct to planning_registration@bathnes.gov.uk. Alternatively this can be sent by post to The Planning Registration Team, Planning Services, Lewis House, Manvers Street, Bath, BA1 1JG.

In determining this application the Local Planning Authority considers it has complied with the aims of paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Framework.

This page is intentionally left blank