

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

**Development Control Committee**

**24<sup>th</sup> October 2012**

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

**ITEM 10**

**ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
01	12/00972/REG04	Keynsham Town Hall

Consultation response from Keynsham Town Council

At a special Town Council meeting, it was resolved that the recommendation from the Community Focus Group regarding changes to the design of the proposals for the re-development of the Town Hall site be approved.

Consultation response from English Heritage

Do not consider that the amendments materially address areas of concern previously identified and that therefore comments made in earlier correspondence remain extant. But additionally, and in specific terms, the roof forms now promoted are contextually incongruous and serve to accentuate the harmful impact which the development will cause. Further, in the nature of their design and the discrete and somewhat subjective manner in which it has been formulated, they run the risk of compromising whatever holistic integrity the original concept may have possessed.

Consultation Response from Council's Historic Environment Team:

Considers that nothing in the amended scheme overcomes the difficulties and original objections remain. Considers that the amended roof design will appear unwieldy and dominant features within the Conservation Area. Considers there to be a complete dislocation between the analysis of the site's context and the revised designs, that the scheme lacks any local distinctiveness, will be out of keeping with its strategic position within a market town, and will damage the character of the Conservation Area. Would recommend a radical re-think of the design approach.

Additional Letters of Representation

5 letters received objecting to the revised application, making the following main points:-

- Difficult to see any meaningful changes
- No improvement on the existing 1960s buildings on site
- Does not fit in with a historic market town
- Buildings are still too massive for the proposed site
- Gold cladding, although reduced, is still too much
- Design is a throwback to 1960s/70s architecture
- Landscaped gardens will be replaced by dominant retaining wall
- Wishes to see the design sent back to the drawing board
- Changes are only a marginal improvement
- Feels the alterations constrained by the wording of Committee's last resolution
- Agrees with the Historic Environment Team's response (see above)
- Revised design is little better and still looks like communist block apartments

---

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Address:</b>
02	12/02848/FUL	12 High Street

One further objection has been received objecting to the application for the following reasons;

The expansion of the retail use would result in a reduction of the number of parking spaces.

The expansion of the store will lead to an increase in on street parking.

It is a matter of concern that small businesses have to give way to large supermarkets.

### **OFFICERS REPORT**

The above comments do not alter the officer's recommendation and the application is still recommended for permission.

---

<b>Item No</b>	<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Address:</b>
03	12/03082/AR	Roman Candles, 5 Terrace Walk

In terms of the legal approach, members are advised that the duty under Section 16 of the Listed Building Act (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) applies only to the application for listed building consent (12/03095/LBA), not to the advertisement application. However, the duty under Section 72 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area is a general duty which applies to both applications.

Members are also reminded of regulation 3 of the Advertisement Regulations which states that a local planning authority shall exercise its powers under the Regulations in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking into account the provisions of the development plan, so far as they are material; and any other relevant factors. Factors relevant to amenity include the general characteristics of the locality, including the presence of any feature of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest. In taking account of factors relevant to amenity, the local planning authority may, if it thinks fit, disregard any advertisement that is being displayed. Unless it appears to the local planning authority to be required in the interests of amenity or public safety, an express consent for the display of advertisements shall not contain any limitation or restriction relating to the subject matter, content or design of what is to be displayed.

### **Updated Reason for Refusal**

The signage by reason of its poor design and use of inappropriate materials is detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the appearance of the building and fails to preserve or enhance this part of the Conservation Area. The works are contrary to Section 12 of the NPPF, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990, Regulation 3 of the Control of Advertisements Regulations 2007 and contrary to Policies D.4, BH.2, BH.6 and BH.17 of the Bath and North East Somerset Local Plan, including minerals and waste policies, October 2007.