

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday, 22nd September, 2021, 11.00 am

Councillors: Sue Craig (Chair), Sally Davis (Vice-Chair), Vic Clarke, Paul Crossley, Lucy Hodge, Duncan Hounsell, Shaun Hughes, Dr Eleanor Jackson, Hal MacFie and Ruth Malloy (Reserve) (in place of Shelley Bromley)

48 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

49 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Shelley Bromley – substitute Cllr Ruth Malloy.

50 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair, Cllr Sue Craig, declared an interest in application no. 20/03166/FUL, Regency Laundry Service, Lower Bristol Road, Bath, as the site is located opposite her property. Cllr Craig stated that she would leave the meeting when this application was discussed and would take no part in the debate or vote.

51 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was no urgent business. The Chair thanked Cllr Sally Davis for chairing the last meeting and Cllr Appleyard for acting as substitute member.

52 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.

53 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 August 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

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

The Committee considered:

- A report by the Head of Planning on various planning applications.
- An update report by the Head of Planning 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.

Note: At this point Cllr Sue Craig left the meeting having declared an interest in the following application. Cllr Sally Davis took the Chair.

Item No. 1

Application No. 20/03166/FUL

Site Location: Regency Laundry Service, Lower Bristol Road, Westmoreland, Bath – Erection of two buildings of up to 4 storeys comprising co-living accommodation with co-working space to the ground floor, alongside landscaping works, cycle parking and disabled car parking bays following demolition of existing buildings.

The Case Officer reported on the application and his recommendation to refuse. He explained that the arrangements for the payment of Council Tax by future residents of the accommodation are not a planning matter or a material consideration.

A local resident spoke against the application.

The agent spoke in favour of the application.

Cllr June Player spoke against the application. She expressed concern regarding the adverse effect of the large bulky buildings on residential amenity, in particular, for the residents of St Peter's Place. She also expressed concern about the adverse impact on the character of the area. She stated that the arrangements for parking and cycling is not acceptable and the height of the proposed buildings would lead to loss of light and overlooking. The quality and design of the buildings are not appropriate and there are parking and highway safety concerns.

Cllr Colin Blackburn spoke in favour of the application. He felt that the provision of accommodation for professionals wanting to house share is needed in Bath. He felt that the scheme is positive and of high quality. The site is no longer suitable for commercial use and he stated that the focus should be on residential accommodation in this location.

The Case Officer then responded to questions as follows:

- There would be a lift in the building.
- There would be some larger accessible studios which would be suitable for disabled people.
- There would be a drop-off area in front of the building.
- The employment space available in Bath is largely office space rather than industrial. There is only about a 1% vacancy rate for industrial premises. No evidence has been provided by the applicant that they have advertised the site for industrial use within the last 12 months.
- It was confirmed that the rental would be approximately £220 per week for the studio accommodation with shared facilities.
- There would be two parking bays, one for disabled parking and one for a car share vehicle. There would be no visitor parking. There is on street parking to the west of the site. The site is very close to the city centre and is aimed at young professionals.
- The level of parking provision is a planning consideration. The current parking policy has no specified parking standard for co-living accommodation.
- If the accommodation comprised self-contained flats, then about 75-80 parking spaces would be required.
- The affordable housing element of the scheme would be secured by a section 106 agreement which would be in perpetuity. The applicant could appeal this after five years but would have to provide strong reasons why this was no longer appropriate. The Council would be able to nominate tenants through its housing team.
- Lighting levels are considered to be reasonable in this high-density area.
- There would be six charging points for electric bicycles and cycle parking within the scheme.

Cllr Crossley stated that digital employment space is now required, and that the development is in line with future employment practice. He noted that property in Bath is very expensive and that this would provide 100% residential accommodation rather than student accommodation. He felt that the developer has listened to both residents and councillors. The accommodation would be suitable for young people and is in a sustainable location. It would encourage graduate retention and help local employers. Council tax will be payable and there is also 20% affordable housing. The green credentials of the building are good, and it will meet both housing and carbon reduction goals.

Cllr Crossley then moved that the Committee delegate to permit the application. This was seconded by Cllr Clarke.

Cllr Jackson stated that people need jobs and felt that this proposal does not meet the need for cheaper accommodation. She did not feel that the committee should go against the policy regarding employment zones. The premises have not been marketed for a year. She also felt that the design should complement the surroundings and that there would be a loss of amenity for local residents.

Cllr MacFie felt that the applicants have not proved that there is no requirement for industrial use in the area as required by the policy.

Cllr Hounsell felt that the application is premature because the necessary marketing

has not yet taken place.

Cllr Hughes felt that more diverse industry is required in the area and he had concerns regarding this type of development which could generate a high turnover of tenants.

Cllr Hodge noted that the site is ring-fenced for industrial use and should be used to provide jobs and employment for the future.

The motion was then put to the vote and there were 3 votes in favour of the motion and 7 votes against. The motion was therefore LOST.

Cllr Jackson then moved the officer recommendation to refuse. This was seconded by Cllr Hodge.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 5 votes in favour, 3 votes against and 1 abstention to REFUSE the application for the reasons set out in the report.

Note: At this point Cllr Sue Craig returned to the meeting and resumed the Chair.

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

The Committee considered:

- A report by the Head of Planning on various planning applications.
- An update report by the Head of Planning on items 1 and 2 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 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. 20/04760/EFUL

Site Location: Former Bath Press Premises, Lower Bristol Road, Westmoreland, Bath – Development of the site to provide a residential-led mixed-use development comprising 286 residential units (Use Class C3) and provision of commercial floor space at ground floor level (Use Class E), demolition of existing chimney, provision of 3 substations, together with associated infrastructure, landscaping, plant equipment, car and cycle parking, and access.

The Case Officer reported on the application and his recommendation to refuse. He informed members that further information regarding the affordable housing element has been received. The developer will now offer 4 of the town houses as affordable housing, which makes a total of 1.4% affordable housing across the whole site. This

offer would be contingent on permission being granted and would be rescinded if the applicant went to appeal.

A representative from the Bath Preservation Trust spoke against the application.

The agent spoke in favour of the application.

Cllr Colin Blackburn, local ward member, spoke against the application. He felt that the developer was ignoring key policies including those relating to affordable housing.

Cllr June Player, local ward member, spoke against the application. She stated that the application is not policy compliant in relation to affordable housing requirements (this should be 30%) and parking. She also expressed concern regarding the loss of the historic chimney, highway safety, noise, pollution, loss of office floor space, bedrooms facing onto the main road, overdevelopment of the site, poor design, and the creation of a tunnelling effect along the Lower Bristol Road.

The Case Officer then responded to questions as follows:

- The location has some characteristics of a gateway site.
- As there is no allotment or vegetable growing area on site there would be a requirement for an offsite contribution.
- The chimney has local historical significance.
- The rental costs would be £1,050pcm for a one-bedroom property, £1,550 for a two-bedroom property and £2,000 for a 3-bedroom property.
- The weight given to the viability report is for the decision-maker to decide. There are no objections to the lack of affordable housing within the scheme.
- The applicant has confirmed that they would accept a condition requiring the retention of office space.
- The 5-storey block has a mansard roof and is set back from the road.
- The height strategy does not form part of the development plan and is a guidance document rather than a supplementary planning document. However, it is a material consideration and officers feel that the development is compliant with the strategy.
- There is a proposal to open up the East and Western routes on the site but there would be no connection between the North and South routes.

Cllr Jackson moved the officer recommendation to refuse the application. She noted that this is a key site within Bath, and she was concerned at the loss of employment space, lack of parking and loss of the historic chimney.

Cllr Hodge seconded the motion stating that she has concerns regarding the housing mix, loss of office space and lack of a North/South route.

Cllr Hounsell expressed concerns regarding inadequate parking provision and lack of affordable housing.

The Case Officer explained that the viability report has been accepted and so advised against refusing on the grounds of lack of affordable housing.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 9 votes in favour and 1 vote against to REFUSE the application for the reasons set out in the report.

Item No. 2

Application No. 21/01588/FUL

Site Location: Field between City Farm and Cotswold View, The Hollow, Southdown, Bath – Erection of 9 dwellings with associated access, parking, drainage, landscaping, and ecological mitigation.

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

A representative from Bath Preservation Trust and a local resident spoke against the application.

Cllr Sarah Moore, local ward member, spoke against the application. She expressed concern regarding the design of the properties as there are no other terraced properties in this area. The site is on the edge of the AONB and can be viewed from a number of viewpoints around the city which would have an adverse effect on the World Heritage site. Trees would also be removed, the proposal would detract from the City Farm area, and a green field site would be lost which would be harmful to local wildlife including bats.

Cllr Dine Romero, local ward member, spoke against the application. She was concerned at the loss of a green setting in an area which needs pockets of green space. She also had concerns regarding road safety and poor visibility.

Officers then responded to questions as follows:

- No trees will be removed from the site.
- The nearest area of terraced housing would be Cotswold View. The Hollow itself contains semi-detached dwellings. The Planning Inspector who considered the appeal found the houses to be acceptable and not out of keeping with the context.
- The materials include timber cladding and were considered to be acceptable by the Planning Inspector who found that they would soften the built form.
- The comments of the Planning Inspector are highly significant and should be taken into account by the Committee.
- The Highways Officer felt that the changes to the traffic calming measures on The Hollow would be a more effective way of enforcing the 20mph speed limit.
- It would be highly unlikely that nine additional dwellings would generate a significant amount of extra traffic. Not much data is currently available regarding the effect of the Clean Air Zone on traffic using The Hollow as the last 18 months are not considered to be representative because of the Covid-19 pandemic.
- The Police have not raised any objections to the traffic calming proposals. However, they have raised concerns regarding the potential for anti-social behaviour in the rear parking area. Subject to conditions, officers are satisfied that the impact of anti-social behaviour can be mitigated.
- The Council Ecologist has not raised any objections to the proposal and any issues raised regarding ecological matters will be covered by condition.

- The lighting would be low-level bollard lighting controlled by condition.
- This scheme provides ecological improvements which addresses the concerns expressed by the Planning Inspector. The Police and the Highways Team have also confirmed that the proposed traffic calming measures would be an improvement.

Cllr Crossley, local ward member on the committee, stated that this application would have a major impact on the Southdown Ward. There has been no traffic count since the introduction of the Clean Air Zone which has caused people to re-route through the area. This application would introduce an additional junction to The Hollow. It would have an adverse visual impact on the important hillside and on Bath City Farm. He then moved refusal of the application for the following reasons:

- The adverse impact on biodiversity in the area.
- Lack of a traffic survey update since the introduction of the Clean Air Zone.
- Adverse impact on the narrow road leading to increased traffic obstruction.

Cllr Hodge noted the value of the green field site for local residents and felt that the design would be incongruous to the area.

Cllr Davis stated that if the committee refused the application this could result in another appeal which the Council was likely to lose because the issues raised by the Inspector have now been addressed.

Cllr Hounsell felt that this is an improved application as there would be no significant impact on the highway and there would be a biodiversity gain.

The Deputy Head of Planning pointed out that there had been no objection from the Ecologist or Highways Officer. It would therefore be difficult to defend a refusal on these grounds at appeal.

The motion was put to the vote and there were 4 votes in favour and 6 votes against. The motion was therefore LOST.

Cllr Davis then moved the officer recommendation to permit. This was seconded by Cllr Clarke. The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 6 votes in favour and 4 votes against to PERMIT the application subject to the conditions set out in the report and a s106 agreement.

Item No. 3

Application No. 21/03281/FUL

Site Location: Land South of Unit 18, Midsomer Enterprise Park, Midsomer Norton, Bath – Erection of storage containers, support infrastructure and security fence for Battery Energy Storage facility.

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

The Case Officer then responded to questions as follows:

- The Council's noise team have raised no objections or concerns regarding this application.

- Midsomer Norton Town Council responded to the application stating that they had no comments.

Cllr Hughes, local ward member on the committee, congratulated the Cabinet members, officers and the applicant for reaching an acceptable solution through negotiation. He then moved the officer recommendation to permit. This was seconded by Cllr MacFie.

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.

Item Nos. 4 and 5

Application Nos. 21/02980/LBA and 21/02981/AR

Site Location: Friends Meeting House, York Street, Bath – External alterations for the installation of 4 hand painted timber signs fixed onto side and front elevations (Resubmission).

The Case Officer reported on the applications and her recommendation to refuse.

The applicant and a member of the public spoke in favour of the applications.

The Case Officer responded to questions as follows:

- There are other possible solutions to the signage such as combining it with the railing, the use of A-Boards or free-standing signposts which could be removed when the business is closed.
- The proposed signs would be positioned at either side of the steps and the portico and would be permanently affixed to the building.
- The main differences between this and the previous application are that the signs are smaller, and the Friends Meeting House sign would not be painted over.
- The Case Officer felt that there is scope for a more bespoke package of signage and that the size and positioning of the signs harms the character of the listed building.

Cllr Craig, local ward member on the committee, stated that she supported the applications and felt that the location of the Toppings bookshop in this area will be of great benefit. She noted that the change of use of the building to retail has been agreed and felt that this application meets the commercial needs of the applicant and enables the building to be conserved.

Cllr Hounsell felt that the proposed signs are modest and attractive and will enable the business to thrive as potential customers need to know where the shop is located. He then moved that the committee delegate to permit the applications for the following reasons:

- No damage would be caused to the fabric of the listed building.
- The proposal will enhance the long-term success of the business and enable the use of the building.
- The benefits of the proposal outweigh any potential harm.

This was seconded by Cllr Crossley who felt that the signage would cause no harm to the building.

Cllr Hodge stated that the colours are acceptable, and the signage offers a discrete and elegant solution. She felt the proposal would also avoid cluttering the street with movable signage.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 9 votes in favour and 1 vote against to DELEGATE TO PERMIT the applications subject to conditions.

Item No. 6

Application No. 21/02883/FUL

Site Location: Hunters Quest, Iford Close, Salford – Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2 semi-detached houses/garages and 1 flat with associated parking, landscaping, and widened access.

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

The applicant spoke in favour of the application.

The Case Officer then responded to questions as follows:

- She explained the layout of the plot and parking areas.
- Unit 3 would be an individual unit.
- The proposal would be about 1m taller than the existing building.
- The proposal would result in the loss of one cedar tree which is considered acceptable by the Arboricultural Officer. If required, a condition could be included to request mitigation measures for the loss of the tree.

Cllr Hounsell, local ward member on the committee, stated that the application was supported by Salford Parish Council and by Cllr Singleton the other ward councillor. Salford has a very eclectic mix of properties. He outlined the road layout in the area and stated that the proposal would not be detrimental to the local street scene. It would add to the housing stock in Salford and would provide more modest accommodation which was needed in the area. He then moved that the committee delegate to permit the application. This was seconded by Cllr MacFie.

The motion was put to the vote and it was RESOLVED by 5 votes in favour, 4 votes against and 1 abstention to DELEGATE TO PERMIT the application subject to conditions.

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

The Committee considered the appeals report. The Committee noted that the appeal for the Homebase site had been successful and the Deputy Head of Planning outlined the reasons cited by the Planning Inspector for this decision.

RESOLVED to NOTE the report.

The meeting ended at 4.10 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

Planning Committee

Date 22th September 2021

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED SINCE THE PREPARATION OF THE MAIN AGENDA

ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Item No.	Application No.	Address
Site visit 01	20/03166/FUL	Regency Laundry Lower Bristol Road Westmoreland

Representations

One additional letter of support has been received from the Managing Director of Regency Laundry Ltd.

The letter advises that the business has now taken occupation of their new purpose-built industrial unit in Corsham, Wiltshire. They advise that they have been operating there for over 4 months, with the vast majority of staff retained. They intend to run both sites in parallel until later this year, to ensure a smooth transfer of operations.

They highlight the differences between the two operating environments which they consider confirms their view that the current site no longer meets the requirements of a modern industrial business and is not longer viable for on-going industrial use.

They list the benefits of the purpose built unit over the current premises as increased productivity, unrestricted working hours, lack of sensitives with regards to neighbours and ample space for staff parking and HGV movements. They contrast this with the myriad of site-related issues experienced at St Peter's Terrace.

They remain fully supportive of the proposed development.

Item No.	Application No.	Address
Main agenda 01	20/04760/EFUL	Former Bath Press Premises Lower Bristol Road Westmoreland

Consultations

The following updated consultation responses have been received:

ECOLOGY: No objection, subject to conditions

The updated information addresses previous comments. Conditions for a CEMP (Ecology), including indirect impacts on Linear Park SNCI, a LEMP and to secure a sensitive external lighting scheme will need to be attached to any consent granted.

AIR QUALITY: No objection.

The Air Quality Technical Note submitted with the revised scheme has supplemented the original Environmental Statement section on Air Quality. The Technical Note considers changes to the baseline monitoring, changes in baseline traffic flows and flows from the revised plans. There are no significant changes to the conclusions in the original assessment. The Technical Note states that the development will use Mechanical Ventilation and Heat Recovery which will mitigate the higher levels of pollution which the properties with facades on Lower Bristol Road will be subject to. The note also indicates there are a number of mitigation measures within the development which will minimise the impact of the development on air quality including electric vehicle charging points, travel planning and cycle parking.

Officer assessment

For the sake of clarity, some additional commentary upon the heritage impacts of the proposals is provided below.

Listed buildings

There is a duty placed on the Council under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting' to 'have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

There are no listed buildings in the immediate vicinity of the application site. The nearest listed buildings are located to the east along Lower Bristol Road, such as Victoria Buildings (Grade II) and Park View (Grade II). Further to the south is 17-29 Denmark Road (Grade II) and to the west is Charlton House (Grade II).

There is only a limited degree of intervisibility with the application site, but some dynamic views of the development and these heritage assets may be experienced.

However, given the acceptable building heights and designs, it is considered that the proposals will preserve the setting of these listed buildings.

Conservation area

The committee report refers to the duty under s72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation area. However, the application site is not within the Bath Conservation Area and so the duty does not apply.

However, to be clear, the impact upon the setting of the Bath Conservation Area is a material consideration. In this instance, it is considered that, due to the distance from its boundary and the acceptable height and design of the proposed buildings, the proposals will preserve the setting of Bath Conservation Area.

World Heritage Site

Bath, in common with many historic towns and cities, is predominantly low rise in character, punctuated with a limited amount of tall historic buildings, most notably the Abbey. Bath is also characterised by the surrounding, elevated topography and this crucial landscape setting is part of the OUV of the World Heritage Site. Furthermore, the surrounding hills afford important and significant, sweeping views across the city in all directions that have been valued historically, and this remains the case today and are significant in how the city is interpreted, enjoyed and experienced

The proposed development is considered to comply with the Bath Building Heights Strategy and has been submitted with an LVIA which assesses the impact of the proposals upon the surrounding landscape. Whilst there will be some intrusion into views, this is within the context of the site being allocated for development and the acceptable heights and design of the buildings will ensure that the proposals preserve the OUV of the World Heritage Site.

Item No.	Application No.	Address
Main agenda 02	21/01588/FUL	Field Between City Farm And Cotswold View The Hollow Southdown

Recommendation

The recommendation includes reference to a s106 agreement to secure, inter alia, the following:

a) the long term safeguarding and wildlife conservation management of the area of land to the north of the development site (as shown on the soft landscape plan 1380-02-P9) and the long term management of any other ecological measures approved / required by condition (off site or within the development site)

...

The above wording refers to measures 'off site or within the development site'. For clarity, the proposed ecological compensation and enhancement measures are proposed on land within the red line of the application site and therefore there is no requirement or proposals for off-site ecological measures.

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND REPRESENTATIVES SPEAKING AT THE
MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE ON WEDNESDAY 22 SEPTEMBER
2021**

Morning Session

SITE VISIT LIST			
ITEM NO.	SITE NAME	NAME	FOR/AGAINST
1	Regency Laundry Service, Lower Bristol Road, Westmoreland, Bath	Alistair Welch	Against
		Kenny Oke (on behalf of applicant)	For
		Cllr Colin Blackburn (Local Ward Member)	For
		Cllr June Player (Local Ward Member)	Against

MAIN PLANS LIST			
ITEM NO.	SITE NAME	NAME	FOR/AGAINST
1	Former Bath Press Premises, Lower Bristol Road, Bath	Alexandra Best (Bath Preservation Trust)	Against
		Jo Davis (Agent)	For
		Cllr Colin Blackburn (Local Ward Member)	Against
		Cllr June Player (Local Ward Member)	Against

Afternoon Session

2	Field between City Farm and Cotswold View, The Hollow, Bath	Alexandra Best (Bath Preservation Trust) Graham Sandall	Against (To share 3 minutes)
		Cllr Sarah Moore (Local Ward Member)	Against
		Cllr Dine Romero (Local Ward Member)	Against
Separator			
3	Land South of Unit 18, Midsomer Enterprise Park, Midsomer Norton	NO SPEAKERS	
Separator			
4 & 5	Friends Meeting House, York Street, Bath	Robert Topping (On behalf of Applicant) Kirsten Elliott	For (To share 6 minutes)
Separator			
6	Hunters Quest, Iford Close, Saltford	Paul Payne (Applicant)	For
Separator			

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

22nd September 2021

DECISIONS

Item No:	001	
Application No:	20/03166/FUL	
Site Location:	Regency Laundry Service, Lower Bristol Road, Westmoreland, Bath	
Ward: Westmoreland	Parish: N/A	LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application	
Proposal:	Erection of two buildings of up to four storeys comprising co-living accommodation with co-working space to the ground floor, alongside landscaping works, cycle parking and disabled car parking bays following demolition of existing buildings.	
Constraints:	Article 4 HMO, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Air Quality Management Area, Policy B4 WHS - Indicative Extent, Policy B4 WHS - Boundary, Policy CP9 Affordable Housing Zones, District Heating Priority Area, Flood Zone 2, HMO Stage 1 Test Area (Stage 2 Test Req), LLFA - Flood Risk Management, MOD Safeguarded Areas, Policy NE5 Ecological Networks, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,	
Applicant:	Lower Bristol Road Bath Limited	
Expiry Date:	23rd September 2021	
Case Officer:	Chris Griggs-Trevarthen	

DECISION Refuse as per officer recommendation

Item No:	01
Application No:	20/04760/EFUL
Site Location:	Former Bath Press Premises, Lower Bristol Road, Westmoreland, Bath
Ward: Westmoreland	Parish: N/A LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application with an EIA attached
Proposal:	Development of the site to provide a residential-led mixed-use development, comprising 286 residential units (Use Class C3) and provision of commercial floor space at ground floor level (Use Class E), demolition of existing chimney, provision of three substations, together with associated infrastructure, landscaping, plant equipment, car and cycle parking, and access.
Constraints:	Article 4 HMO, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Air Quality Management Area, Policy B1 Bath Enterprise Zone, Policy B3 Twerton and Newbridge Riversid, Policy B4 WHS - Indicative Extent, Policy B4 WHS - Boundary, Policy CP9 Affordable Housing Zones, District Heating Priority Area, Flood Zone 2, Flood Zone 3, HMO Stage 1 Test Area (Stage 2 Test Req), LLFA - Flood Risk Management, MOD Safeguarded Areas, Policy NE1 Green Infrastructure Network, Policy NE5 Ecological Networks, Placemaking Plan Allocated Sites, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,
Applicant:	Aberdeen Standard Investments
Expiry Date:	24th September 2021
Case Officer:	Chris Griggs-Trevarthen

DECISION Refuse as per officer recommendation

Item No:	02
Application No:	21/01588/FUL
Site Location:	Field Between City Farm And Cotswold View, The Hollow, Southdown, Bath
Ward: Twerton	Parish: N/A LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application
Proposal:	Erection of 9 dwellings with associated access, parking, drainage, landscaping and ecological mitigation.
Constraints:	Article 4 HMO, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Policy B4 WHS - Indicative Extent, Policy B4 WHS - Boundary, Policy CP9 Affordable Housing Zones, Policy LCR5 Safeguarded existg sport & R, MOD Safeguarded Areas, Policy NE2A Landscapes and the green set, Policy NE3 SNCI, Policy NE5 Ecological Networks, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,
Applicant:	Freemantle Capital Partners (Hollow) Ltd
Expiry Date:	24th September 2021
Case Officer:	Chris Griggs-Trevarthen

DECISION Permit as per officer recommendation

Item No:	03
Application No:	21/03281/FUL
Site Location:	Land South Of Unit 18, Midsomer Enterprise Park, Midsomer Norton, Bath And North East Somerset
Ward:	Midsomer Norton North
Parish:	Midsomer Norton
LB Grade:	N/A
Application Type:	Full Application
Proposal:	Erection of storage containers, support infrastructure and security fence for Battery Energy Storage facility.
Constraints:	Agricultural Land Classification, Coal - Standing Advice Area, Policy CP9 Affordable Housing Zones, Policy ED2A Strategic & Other Primary In, LLFA - Flood Risk Management, Policy NE1 Green Infrastructure Network, Neighbourhood Plan, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,
Applicant:	Conrad Energy (Developments) II Limited
Expiry Date:	24th September 2021
Case Officer:	Hayden Foster

DECISION Permit as per officer recommendation

Item No:	04
Application No:	21/02980/LBA
Site Location:	Friends Meeting House, York Street, City Centre, Bath
Ward: Kingsmead	Parish: N/A LB Grade: II
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent (Alts/exts)
Proposal:	External alterations for the installation of 4no. hand painted timber signs fixed onto side and front elevations (Resubmission).
Constraints:	Article 4 Bath Demolition Wall, Article 4 Bath Office Conversion, Article 4 Reg 7: Estate Agent, Article 4 HMO, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Policy B2 Central Area Strategic Policy, Policy B4 WHS - Indicative Extent, Policy B4 WHS - Boundary, Conservation Area, Policy CP12 Bath City Centre Boundary, Policy CP9 Affordable Housing Zones, Policy CR3 Primary Shopping Areas, Listed Building, MOD Safeguarded Areas, Policy NE1 Green Infrastructure Network, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,
Applicant:	Topping & Company Booksellers Limited
Expiry Date:	23rd September 2021
Case Officer:	Caroline Waldron

DECISION Delegate to permit subject to conditions

Item No:	05
Application No:	21/02981/AR
Site Location:	Friends Meeting House, York Street, City Centre, Bath
Ward: Kingsmead	Parish: N/A LB Grade: II
Application Type:	Advertisement Consent
Proposal:	External alterations for the installation of 4no. hand painted timber signs fixed onto side and front elevations (Resubmission).
Constraints:	Article 4 Bath Demolition Wall, Article 4 Bath Office Conversion, Article 4 Reg 7: Estate Agent, Article 4 HMO, Agric Land Class 3b,4,5, Policy B2 Central Area Strategic Policy, Policy B4 WHS - Indicative Extent, Policy B4 WHS - Boundary, Conservation Area, Policy CP12 Bath City Centre Boundary, Policy CP9 Affordable Housing Zones, Policy CR3 Primary Shopping Areas, Listed Building, MOD Safeguarded Areas, Policy NE1 Green Infrastructure Network, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,
Applicant:	Topping & Company Booksellers Limited
Expiry Date:	23rd September 2021
Case Officer:	Caroline Waldron

DECISION Delegate to permit subject to conditions

Item No:	06
Application No:	21/02883/FUL
Site Location:	Hunters Quest, Iford Close, Saltford, Bristol
Ward: Saltford	Parish: Saltford LB Grade: N/A
Application Type:	Full Application
Proposal:	Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 2no semi detached houses/garages and 1no flat with associated parking, landscaping and widened access.
Constraints:	Agricultural Land Classification, Policy CP9 Affordable Housing Zones, Housing Development Boundary, LLFA - Flood Risk Management, MOD Safeguarded Areas, SSSI - Impact Risk Zones,
Applicant:	The Urban Reno Company
Expiry Date:	19th August 2021
Case Officer:	Samantha Mason

DECISION Delegate to permit subject to conditions

This page is intentionally left blank