

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

**Development Management Committee**

**Date 18 October 2017**

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

**ITEMS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

**Item**

001	17/02591/FUL	143 Calton Road Lyncombe, Bath
-----	--------------	-----------------------------------

The following additional condition is suggested:

Notwithstanding the approved plans, the lower half of the first floor and second floor windows on the rear elevation hereby approved shall be non-opening and obscurely glazed and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To safeguard the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers.

**ITEM**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
002 & 003	17/01708/FUL & 17/01709/LBA	2 Manor Farm Cottages, Anchor Lane, Combe Hay, BA2 7EH

Since the Committee Report was written, one further letter of support has been received from the owner/occupier of Week Cottage, Combe Hay, the content of which is summarised below:

- Harm to the Conservation Area from on-street parking;
- The proposed development will result in four vehicles;
- Potential highway safety and access issues from additional on-street parking.

The existing dwelling has three bedrooms. Following the proposed development, the property would have four bedrooms. It is not considered that the creation of one additional bedroom will significantly increase the parking

demand associated with the property compared to the existing three bedroom dwelling.

The parking standards set in the schedule to Placemaking Plan Policy ST7 apply to new residential development and not extensions. Nevertheless, these parking standards do not require four parking spaces for a four bedroom dwelling.

As set out in the Committee Report, the parking of cars on the adjacent lanes is not considered to result in an unacceptable road safety or congestion issue, not does it cause substantial harm to the setting of surrounding listed buildings or the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

There is no change to the officer recommendation.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
04	17/03041/FUL	28 Meadlands, Corston, Bath

Since the Committee Report was written, further comments have been received from Corston Parish Council. The Clerk has visited the neighbouring property at number 27 and has reiterated previous objections raised, which are summarized below:

- Due to the property's orientation, the existing sitting room of number 27 has limited sunlight currently.
- Number 27 is set 3-4 feet below the application site.
- Light is restricted into the rear window of number 27 by a fence.
- The proposed development would significantly darken the front room of number 27
- The proposed extension is not visually attractive.
- The proposed extension is too close to the boundary of number 27.
- Any future planning application should be moved from the boundary, redesigned to better complement the local character and include window panels along the edge of the boundary to enable as much light as possible to enter the front room of number 27.

There is no change to the officer recommendation.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
05	17/03012/FUL	Clock House Bathford

Since the committee report was written further written comments have been received from the applicant supporting the application and disputing the

accuracy of the report and assessment. The entire email is reproduced below in italics;

*Unfortunately I will be abroad when my application is considered by the Committee otherwise I would have attended and defended it. However I must register my strongest possible objection to Ms Waldron's continuing campaign of misinformation regarding our property included in the REPORT in spite of the unqualified support of the Parish Council.*

*1. Her assertion that the former coach house and stables to Titan Barrow were converted into two cottages in the 1930's is pure speculation. The original doors would not have matched or had equal function - the Left being a door to the stables the Right being a door to the coachman's residential accommodation.*

*2. Her assertion that the original building is 'relatively simple and unpretentious' defies belief. She rightly describes the style as Tudor Gothic though hardly 'simple' but ignores the three original Georgian stone pineapple embellishments to the parapet.*

*3. Her assertion that any photograph shows two top lights is wrong. The opening height of the doorways is 6'6" IE No adequate height for any top lights.*

*4. Her assertion that the door that replaced the door described in the Listing details as 'modern' is again hardly 'elaborate' though a description 'traditional' might be appropriate. The replacement door is identical in design and every detail to the glazed screen to the Dining room immediately adjoining permitted by Ms Waldron in 2009.*

*5. Her assertion of any erosion of the special character is again wrong. Given the present use of the building as a single family home the original duality of doors is irrelevant and disturbing architecturally. A single visually important entrance door is a more logical expression of the current function of the undivided building. It can be argued that the creation of an important aesthetic axis provides a more harmonious balance of the elevational elements particularly taking the large glazed screen she permitted into consideration.*

*6. Her fifth paragraph is entirely inappropriate at best and untrue at worst. NOTHING WAS NEGOTIATED OUT. Nash Partnership were simply instructed to omit that element of the applications.*

*6. Her penultimate assertion regarding the duty of special regard for 'the desirability of preserving the building or it's setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest' is not empirical to the Committees' decision since the preservation of the building is irrelevant - THE BUILDING IS NOT AT RISK and the setting and any special features are UNCHANGED. She equally ignores Historic England General principles BH8: 'Architectural details that match or are in keeping with those found in the building/cumulative change reflecting the history of use and ownership have contributed to the historic interest of...buildings'. The committee will note from the Listing LBS 32180 dated 19 October 1963 the reference to '2 Modern doors' NOT '2 HISTORIC DOORS'.*

*In the event of refusal an Appeal will be made to the Planning Inspectorate not least because of Ms Waldron's continuing personal bias but equally since*

*there is no measurable harm caused to the character or significance of the Listed former coach house by these proposals.  
I trust you will bring these comments to the attention of the Committee given that by force of circumstances I cannot attend.*

Information about the history of the building has been taken from the Design and Access Statement submitted by the applicant in connection with a previous application on site. The report notes that the coach house was converted to cottages in the 1930s and includes a photograph showing the building in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Listed buildings will often retain features and characteristics relating to a former use. This is part of their significance and altering them to reflect the current use will often harm the listed building.

The penultimate paragraph in the report is a statement of the councils statutory duty which is included in all reports relating to listed building consent applications.

There is no change to the officer recommendation.