

Bath & North East Somerset Council

MEETING: **Development Control Committee**

MEETING DATE: **15th February 2012**

AGENDA
ITEM
NUMBER

RESPONSIBLE OFFICER: Lisa Bartlett, Development Control Manager,
Planning and Transport Development (Telephone:
01225 477281)

TITLE: **NEW PLANNING APPEALS, DECISIONS RECEIVED AND DATES OF
FORTHCOMING HEARINGS/INQUIRIES**

WARD: ALL

BACKGROUND PAPERS: None

AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM

APPEALS LODGED

App. Ref: 11/03251/FUL
Location: Indaba Entry Hill Combe Down Bath
Proposal: Provision of rear dormer and loft conversion including external wall
modifications
Decision: REFUSE
Decision Date: 4 October 2011
Decision Level: Delegated
Appeal Lodged: 29 December 2011

App. Ref: 11/03666/FUL
Location: The Lodge Kelston Knoll Kelston Road Kelston Bath
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension to provide a new kitchen space
Decision: REFUSE
Decision Date: 19 October 2011
Decision Level: Delegated
Appeal Lodged: 19 January 2012

App. Ref: 11/01674/OUT
Location: Churchlands Greensbrook Clutton Bristol
Proposal: Erection of a two bedroom cottage
Decision: REFUSE
Decision Date: 5 July 2011
Decision Level: Delegated
Appeal Lodged: 23 January 2012

App. Ref: 11/03393/FUL
Location: 153 Newbridge Hill Newbridge Bath BA1 3PX
Proposal: Erection of new single family dwelling on land at the rear of 153/155 Newbridge Hill
Decision: REFUSE
Decision Date: 24 November 2011
Decision Level: Planning Committee
Appeal Lodged: 23 January 2012

App. Ref: 11/02602/FUL
Location: South Breach Cottage Ashton Hill Corston Bath
Proposal: Erection of a car shelter and equipment trailer (Retrospective).
Decision: REFUSE
Decision Date: 21 October 2011
Decision Level: Delegated
Appeal Lodged: 25 January 2012

App. Ref: 11/01644/FUL
Location: Site Of Colliery Tramway Radford Hill Timsbury Bath
Proposal: Erection of stables.
Decision: REFUSE
Decision Date: 6 July 2011
Decision Level: Delegated
Appeal Lodged: 27 January 2012

APPEAL DECISIONS

App. Ref: 11/01925/FUL
Location: Stonecroft, Keels Hill, Peasedown St John, BA2 8EW
Proposal: Erection of a granny annexe following demolition of existing cattery
Decision: **PERMIT**
Decision Date: **16TH June 2011**
Decision Level: **Delegated**
Appeal Decision: **DISMISS**

Summary:

The appellant applied for the erection of a granny annexe following the demolition of the existing cattery buildings (11/01925/FUL). This was granted, subject to conditions and one of these was for the proposed annexe to remain ancillary to Stonecroft and not to be occupied separately as it was not capable of independent occupation with adverse impact on the residential amenity of occupiers.

The Inspector noted that if the condition was lifted, the proposed area of private amenity space would be divided between the annexe and Stonecroft. He noted that this would offer neither dwelling an acceptable provision of amenity space and the resulting development would represent overdevelopment of the site. There would also be concerns about overlooking

between the properties. He concluded that the condition is necessary and reasonable by reference of the tests set out in Circular 11/95.

App. Ref: 11/00491/FUL
Location: The Pelican Inn, 10 South Parade, Chew Magna, BS40 8SL
Proposal: Erection of a new dwelling and associated amendments to the adjoining car park layout
Decision: **REFUSE**
Decision Date: **21st April 2011**
Decision Level: **Delegated**
Appeal Decision: **ALLOW**

Summary:

The appellant applied for the erection of a dwelling on land to the rear of the Pelican Inn and amendments to the car park layout (11/00491/FUL). The application was refused as the site was not an infill site and therefore represented infill development, which by definition is harmful to Green Belt, the design and siting were harmful to the Chew Magna Conservation Area and inadequate information was submitted to assess the potential impact on any archaeological remains.

The Inspector considered that the site did constitute an infill site as there was development on three sides of the plot. This led him to conclude that the development did not constitute inappropriate development and as it was sited close to the centre of the village, would not be harmful to openness. He considered that the siting and design would enhance the conservation area. He considered that in the absence of firm evidence that the site was archaeologically significant, a condition would be sufficient to mitigate against potential harm to archaeology.