

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL**

**Planning Committee**

**23 September 2020**

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

**ITEM**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
03.	20/01893/LBA	Cleveland Bridge, Bathwick.

The following further comments, in summary, have been received Pulteney Residents Association maintaining their objection to the proposals:

- Repositioning of the kerbs is not like for like repair. The reason given in the application for repositioning of the kerbs is a design fault leading to water ingress which is causing decay. The Departure from Standards document sets out a different reason relating to weight limits and to enable an Assessment Live Loading of 40 Tonnes to be achieved. The application therefore relates to traffic considerations.
- It is questioned whether Historic England were properly consulted.
- The true impact of the extension of the kerbs in front of the tollhouses is not shown.
- Neither the application nor the Departure from Standards mentions the question of whether repositioning of the kerbs would impact on their function of preventing vehicles striking the historically valuable but structurally weak parapets. If the repositioning of the kerbs exposes the original parapets to greater risk of destruction this should be addressed in the application.
- None of the technical assessment documents include anything beyond a superficial examination of the structural condition of the original abutments (which are subject to the same loading as the road slab).

## ITEM

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
04.	19/05204/FUL	Parish's House, Timsbury, BA2 0ND.

Application withdrawn.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Address</b>
06	20/01688/FUL	Inglescombe Cottage Church Lane Englishcombe

Further comments have been received from the applicant. These are available to view on the public website under "Background Papers – Applicant Statement and Photos" dated 16<sup>th</sup> September.

The emails contain photographs of the site and surrounding properties within the village. The comments detail properties within the village which have roof lights and the viewpoints of these sites from the church.

In addition, the Committee Report states that following: "*There has been some confusion within the highways comments that the proposal will be a separate holiday let and therefore is not parking policy compliant.*" Highways DC were originally consulted on the planning application, when the Design & Access Statement wrongly suggested the proposal was going to be a holiday let. This has formed the basis of their comments. The Design & Access Statement was subsequently amended. Highways DC were not re-consulted on the amendments as the parking arrangement was considered policy compliant by the Case Officer.

**Bath and North East Somerset Council ( Land To North Of The Orchard,  
High Street, Pensford No.3 ) Tree Preservation Order 2020**

20/02420/FUL has since been refused planning permission on 8<sup>th</sup> September.

Two of the three reasons for refusal relate to the loss of trees and green infrastructure and are reproduced below.

1 The proposed development would result in an unavoidable permanent net loss of vegetation and the associated permanent net loss of biodiversity, and is not capable of avoiding, minimising, or compensating for these impacts. It also reduces the existing contribution made by the site to local Green Infrastructure. The proposal therefore does not demonstrate compliance with Policies NE3 or NE1 of the Placemaking Plan and Environment & Leisure Community Action Policy 2 of the Publow and Pensford Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2035.

2 The proposed development will result in the loss of protected trees for which adequate compensatory provision has not been demonstrated. The proposal therefore does not demonstrate compliance with Policies NE6 or NE1 of the Placemaking Plan and Environment & Leisure Community Action Policy 2 of the Publow and Pensford Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2035.