

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

Development Management Committee

Date 16th November 2016

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

ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

ITEM

Item No.	Application No.	Address
001	16/00792/FUL	8 Warminster Road, Bathampton, Bath

Bathampton Parish Council is now aware that its comments on the initial application for 8 Warminster Road require clarification.

They should read (changes are in *italics*):

1. The extension is too overbearing for the location. *In the past few years, two applications for just decking developments in the rear of the same row have been unsuccessful for this reason.*
2. The extension will be intrusive and overlook neighbouring gardens, and will particularly adversely affect Number 7.
3. The extension will not fit within the existing building line of the rear extensions of the other houses.”

Comments are noted. There is no change to the officer recommendation.

Email from applicant received 11.11.16 (including plans and photographs, some of which are annotated).

1. All gardens are angled to the West. Our boundary with number 7 is a steeper angle than that with number 9, meaning our garden widens the further away you get from the houses (A balcony 2 meters within our boundary with number 7 therefore gets much further within our boundary as you travel down the garden)
2. Bathampton Parish Council made 3 objections. They have had to amend their first objection about other applications for 2 storey extensions previously being refused following evidence of the 2 storey extensions at

number 9 and number 10, neither of which Bathampton Parish Council objected to (planning reference numbers 00/01836/FUL and 10/05012/FUL)

3. Bathampton Parish Council's 2nd objection relates to being intrusive and overlooking. Bathampton Parish Council have not actually visited our property, despite being invited to.
4. Bathampton Parish Council's 3rd and final objection is that the extension will not fit within the building line. Bathampton Parish Council did not object to the previous planning application by 7 Warminster Road where the extension exceeded the building line, to which our extension falls in line (see diagram below submitted with planning application for 7 Warminster Road, reference 14/02060/FUL)
5. Number 9 Warminster Road have built a 2nd floor rear conservatory, but also extended to the side of their property right up to our boundary. This prevents us from also being able to extend to the side as we would in effect create a terrace (see diagram above for evidence of No 9 (house to right of no 8) being built to the boundary)
6. Number 7 have previously written requesting that the planning committee view number 7's drawings to show the impact of the extension. We would like to draw attention to the fact that the drawings show our proposed extension much larger than it will be. For instance, the photo below shows our extension actually on the balcony of number 7 (approx 80cm/2.5ft over the boundary line), far increasing the perceived impact. It should also be mentioned that these same incorrect photos have been provided to other neighbouring properties during the initial consultation period.

Finally, a couple of points that I feel should be highlighted following the site visit:-

- a)** The balcony at number 7, following extension works, is built right to the boundary and currently has a direct line of sight over the entire top half of our garden (gardens angle West, giving them a greater view of our garden), across our entire balcony, and direct sight into our dining room. To a lesser extent we have line of site across the entire balcony of number 7
- b)** There is currently direct line of site from our balcony across the full balcony of number 9, and into their 2nd storey conservatory extension
- c)** Note the positioning of the balcony at number 6, in line with the forward edge of the lower ground floor extensions
- d)** Please note the minimal impact on view from our house if number 7 built the same extension instead of us (using the flag pole number 7 erected on their balcony which may have given the illusion of our extension being more intrusive when viewed from number 7)
- e)** Finally, I have also included a photo of the 2nd storey conservatory extension at number 9 with lower ground floor below as evidence of other 2 storey extensions in case this was not noticed at the site visit

Comments are noted. There is no change to the officer recommendation.

Item No.	Application No.	Address
01	16/03114/ERES	Roseberry Road, Bath

Updated plans list due to typographical errors in the list as cited in the committee report

Plans list

25 Oct 2016	L421_E	BUILDING B ELEVATIONS SOUTH AND EAST
25 Oct 2016	L300 REV G	PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN FLOOR 00
25 Oct 2016	L307 REV E	PROPOSED SITE ROOF PLAN
25 Oct 2016	L400 REV E	BUILDING A NORTH - SOUTH ELEVATION
25 Oct 2016	L401 REV E	NORTH EAST ELEVATION
25 Oct 2016	L402 REV E	NORTH NORTH ELEVATION
25 Oct 2016	L403 REV E	NORTH WEST ELEVATION
25 Oct 2016	L410 REV E	A SOUTH_ELEVATIONS SE AND SW
25 Oct 2016	L411 REV E	A SOUTH_NORTH WEST ELEVATION
25 Oct 2016	L420 REV E	BUILDING B ELEVATIONS NORTH AND WEST
25 Oct 2016	L430 REV E	BUILDING C ELEVATIONS SOUTH AND WEST
25 Oct 2016	L431 REV E	BUILDING C ELEVATIONS NORTH AND EAST
25 Oct 2016	L500 REV C	PROPOSED SECTIONS_BUILDING A AA BB
07 Oct 2016	L378 E	PHASING PLAN - PHASE 2 WORKS CAR PARKING.
06 Oct 2016	PLAN 9	ARTICULATED HGV ACCESSING FOOD STORE
20 Sep 2016	031-001 D	LANDSCAPE PLAN
20 Sep 2016	037-002 K	RIVERSIDE PLANTING PROPOSALS
20 Sep 2016	037-201 F	PLANTING PLAN GROUND LEVEL
20 Sep 2016	037-202 E	PLANTING PLAN LANDSCAPE DECK
20 Sep 2016	037-210 D	SOIL PROFILE PLAN GROUND LEVEL
20 Sep 2016	037-302 C	HARD LANDSCAPE PLAN GROUND LEVEL
20 Sep 2016	037-304 C	SURFACE FINISHES LANDSCAPE DECK
19 Sep 2016	037-405_B	WILLOW REVETMENTS
19 Sep 2016	037-412_A	TIMBER BENCH - STANDARD
19 Sep 2016	037-413_A	TIMBER BENCH - SMALL CUBE
19 Sep 2016	037-415_A	CYCLE STAND
19 Sep 2016	037-430_B	LOW STONE WALL & STEPS
19 Sep 2016	037-441_D	FENCING TO SERVICE YARD
20 Jun 2016	15123_L501_B	PROPOSED SECTIONS BUILDING A CC DD
20 Jun 2016	15123_L502_B	PROPOSED SECTIONS BUILDING B EE FF
20 Jun 2016	15123_L503_B	PROPOSED SECTIONS BUILDING C GG HH
20 Jun 2016	E-0001 REV 02	LIGHTING LAYOUT
20 Jun 2016	15123_L001_B	SITE LOCATION PLAN
20 Jun 2016	15123_L002_B	EXISTING SITE LAYOUT
20 Jun 2016	037-421_A	PAVING-COBBLE STRIP
20 Jun 2016	037-414	TIMBER BENCH WITH BACK
20 Jun 2016	037-ID-104_D	PROPOSED MATERIALS HARD LANDSCAPE
20 Jun 2016	037-ID-105_A	PROPOSED MATERIALS STREET FURNITURE
20 Jun 2016	037-R001_O	ILLUSTRATIVE LANDSCAPE PROPOSALS
20 Jun 2016	15123_L301_E	PROPOSED SITE PLAN FLOOR 01
20 Jun 2016	15123_L302_E	PROPOSED SITE PLAN FLOOR 02
20 Jun 2016	15123_L303_E	PROPOSED SITE PLAN FLOOR 03
20 Jun 2016	15123_L304_E	PROPOSED SITE PLAN FLOOR 04
20 Jun 2016	15123_L305_E	PROPOSED SITE PLAN FLOOR 05
20 Jun 2016	15123_L306_E	PROPOSED SITE PLAN FLOOR 06

20 Jun 2016	037-111_D	SECTIONS GREEN LINK
20 Jun 2016	037-401_A	SEMI MATURE TREE PIT SOFT LANDSCAPE
20 Jun 2016	037-403_A	SEMI MATURE TREE PIT HARD LANDSCAPE
20 Jun 2016	037-410_B	PLANTER LANDSCAPE DECK
20 Jun 2016	037-411_A	BOLLARDS
20 Jun 2016	15123_L350_C	GYM FLOOR PLAN
20 Jun 2016	15123_L351_C	GYM ELEVATIONS AND SECTIONS
20 Jun 2016	037-440	FENCING TO TEMPORARY CAR PARK

Item No.	Application No.	Address
07	16/03652/FUL	Applegate Stables Shockerwick Lane Bathford Bath BA1 7LQ

Since publication of the committee report the applicant has submitted additional letters of support making the total number of support letters received in respect of this application 7. The applicant has also submitted a petition of 27 signatures, 21 of which serve to underpin prior letters of support submitted in respect of 2014 application 14/02558/FUL.

The agent has also submitted comments from a third party in regards to the Highways objection. The third party is a director of MBC Traffic who provide consultation on traffic and transportation matters.

In summary, the third party comment states that (in their opinion) the proposal will have a de minimis impact and would not in the context of NPPF be severe. By residing on site, the third party is of the opinion that the owner will be able to reduce some trips associated with travelling to and from work and that this will be of benefit. The opinion is also given that adequate provision for parking adequate can be provided and maintained.

In response to these comments, the officer wishes to state the following:

- Whilst the ability for the owner to reduce travel to and from work may be a benefit, it would not counterbalance the increase in traffic caused by the expansion of the site if planning permission were to be granted.
- Additional stables will result in additional movements to and from the site by clients, which is likely to include both car vehicles and horse boxes. Furthermore, a greater amount of traffic would be expected to be generated from deliveries to the dwelling and visits by friends and family
- The third party states that the officer needs to take a balanced view. The Council considers that it has taken a balance view of this matter and has reached the decision that notwithstanding the observations of

the third party the quantum of development if approved will result in more movements to the site and not less - as suggested.