

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday 19th November 2025, 10.00 am

Councillors: Tim Ball (Chair), Paul Crossley (Vice-Chair), Fiona Gourley, Ian Halsall, Duncan Hounsell, Shaun Hughes, Dr Eleanor Jackson, John Leach and Tim Warren CBE

64 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

65 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies of absence were received from Cllrs Hal MacFie and Toby Simon. Cllr Duncan Hounsell was in attendance as a substitute for Cllr Simon.

66 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Eleanor Jackson declared an interest in item (3) of the mains application list: 25/01546/FUL – 1 Wells Road, Westfield, Bath as a Director of Radstock Co-operative Society which was located on an adjacent site. She confirmed she would read a statement on behalf of herself and ward member Cllr Mansell and then withdraw from the meeting and not take part in the debate or vote on that application.

67 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was no urgent business.

68 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Democratic Services Officer informed the meeting of the process for public speakers to address the Committee.

69 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of 22 October 2025 be confirmed as a correct record for signing by the Chair.

70 MAIN PLANS LIST - APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION ETC FOR DETERMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE

The Committee considered:

1. A report and update report by the Head of Planning on the applications under the main applications list.

2. Oral statements by members of the public and representatives. A copy of the speakers' list is attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes.

RESOLVED that in accordance with the delegated powers, the applications be determined as set out in the main applications decisions list attached as Appendix 2 to these minutes.

1. 25/00142/RES - Bath Quays North Development Site, Avon Street, City Centre, Bath

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered a reserved matters application for layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for plots 6 and 7.

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that officers be delegated to permit the application subject to:

A) A Legal Agreement to secure:

1. A financial contribution of £243,840.48 towards greenspace enhancement and maintenance in the local area associated with additional need generated by the development.
2. A financial contribution of £330,430.58 towards the Council's carbon offsetting fund to mitigate residual emissions in compliance with Policy SCR6.
3. A travel plan delivery and monitoring bond £75,175 +/- £4,775 monitoring fee as required by the Transport & Development SPD.
4. A financial contribution of £5,114.60 towards Traffic Regulation Order to accommodate disabled car parking and/or car club bay on public highway (as necessary).
5. A planning obligation securing at least 2 years membership to the nearest car club bay for each dwelling on occupation.
6. A planning obligation securing creation and delivery of 1 new car club bay on the public highway surrounding the development, or at an alternative location on the wider development site forming part of the outline planning permission (Bath Quays North).
7. Planning obligation to provide 14 work placements, 2 apprenticeships and 2 new jobs in construction as well as a £7,040.00 contribution towards Targeted Recruitment and Training in Bath and North East Somerset.

B) The conditions set out in the report (or such conditions as may be appropriate).

The following public representations were received:

1. Klass Koopmans, local resident, objecting to the application
2. Chris Beaver, agent, supporting the application

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The difference between accessible and wheelchair accessible dwellings referred to different design standards for building regulations, accessible dwellings could be adapted in the future whereas wheelchair accessible dwellings could be occupied immediately by wheelchair users.
2. The development did not include affordable housing. This was policy compliant as the target of 40% affordable housing was subject to a viability study and there was evidence that the provision of affordable housing was unviable in relation to

this development. This was because the development as a whole had to be taken into account and it was the building costs associated with the whole site including commercial development that made the provision of affordable housing unviable.

3. There was a viability review mechanism secured by a S106 Agreement prior to works commencing on site.
4. The issue of affordable housing could not be revisited as part of the reserved matters application.
5. In terms of ensuring the development was car-free, the site was within a parking permit area and so residents would need to travel a distance to find unrestricted parking, and this would act as a deterrent. The development would not be eligible for a parking permit.
6. The number of potential children requiring school places was calculated by the Education Services Team using a formula based on the number of bedrooms.
7. Although some homes had less amenity than others, the application was policy compliant as the assessment related to the development as a whole rather than individual flats.
8. There would be a loss in amenity for adjacent residents, but these homes experienced no current obstruction from the development site as a vacant car park which was an unusual scenario for homes located in a dense city centre environment.
9. There was a difference in height between the development and properties on Milk Street, but the heights of the proposed development complied within the parameters of the indicative heights in the outline planning permission.
10. There was no vehicular access to the courtyard area.

Cllr Halsall opened the debate and noted that as a reserved matters application, the principle of development had been established, and the committee had to consider the details. He stated that the scheme was well designed although he had some reservations about some of the flats being substandard. He acknowledged that there would be some loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, but not enough to cause harm and he moved the officers' recommendation to delegate authority to permit the application. This was seconded by Cllr Crossley who stated that this was a good scheme for the city centre and although there would be a change of aspect for some residents, there was a need for high density developments in the city centre.

Cllr Leach expressed concern that it had not been possible to provide any affordable housing as part of the development.

Cllr Gourley concurred with this view and also raised concerns that there was no outdoor amenity space or car club parking space but overall recognised the need for this type of housing and confirmed she would be supporting the motion.

Cllr Warren spoke in support of the motion and noted that there would be provision for affordable housing if it was found viable at a later stage.

Cllr Hughes shared concerns about the lack of affordable housing but acknowledged that this was not a consideration for the reserved matters application. He also raised concerns in relation to the design and the height in relation to Milk Street and the loss of amenity for existing residents and stated that he would not be supporting the application.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (7 in favour and 2 against).

RESOLVED that officers be delegated to permit the application subject to:

A) A Legal Agreement to secure:

1. A financial contribution of £243,840.48 towards greenspace enhancement and maintenance in the local area associated with additional need generated by the development.
2. A financial contribution of £330,430.58 towards the Council's carbon offsetting fund to mitigate residual emissions in compliance with Policy SCR6.
3. A travel plan delivery and monitoring bond £75,175 +/- £4,775 monitoring fee as required by the Transport & Development SPD.
4. A financial contribution of £5,114.60 towards Traffic Regulation Order to accommodate disabled car parking and/or car club bay on public highway (as necessary).
5. A planning obligation securing at least 2 years membership to the nearest car club bay for each dwelling on occupation.
6. A planning obligation securing creation and delivery of 1 new car club bay on the public highway surrounding the development, or at an alternative location on the wider development site forming part of the outline planning permission (Bath Quays North).
7. Planning obligation to provide 14 work placements, 2 apprenticeships and 2 new jobs in construction as well as a £7,040.00 contribution towards Targeted Recruitment and Training in Bath and North East Somerset.

B) The conditions set out in the report (or such conditions as may be appropriate).

2. 25/02735/FUL - Bath Fire Station, Bathwick Street, Bathwick, Bath, BA2 6PU

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the erection of a fire station, offices and drill tower with revised access, car parking, landscaping and associated ancillary works following demolition of the existing fire station, offices and drill tower.

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that officers be delegated to permit the application subject to:

1. Authorise the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to complete a Legal Agreement to secure a financial contribution of £60,191 towards the Council's Carbon Offsetting Fund.
2. No material change in circumstances relating to addition of buildings at the site to the National Heritage List for England).
3. The conditions set out in the report (or other such conditions as may be appropriate).

The following public representations were received:

1. Luke Gazzard, Assistant Chief Fire Officer, Avon Fire and Rescue Service supporting the application.

Cllr Toby Simon was unable to attend the meeting, and a statement was read on his behalf as ward Councillor summarised as follows:

1. He had asked for the application to be considered by committee in view of the salience of the application.
2. Although it was sad to lose the existing station, it was in poor structural condition and did not meet modern requirements for a fire station.
3. The new design, which had benefited from a design review panel, would prove over time to be a good example of 21st century architecture as this generation's contribution to the Bath streetscape.
4. He agreed with the officer that there was no unacceptable impact on the neighbourhood.
5. He endorsed the officer recommendation to give delegated authority to permit the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. There would be a public record of the important history of the building, and this would be secured by condition.
2. Some aspects of the old building would be retained and used on the new building, including the crest which would be relocated. A heritage walk would be installed with the history of station. The design reflected the civic status of the building and signage would be reinstated.

Cllr Warren opened the debate and commented that although it was disappointing to see an old building demolished, in this case the 90-year old building was not fit for purpose, and the new building was essential to give firefighters the facilities they deserved. He moved the officers' recommendation to delegate to permit the application.

Cllr Hounsell concurred with this view and drew attention to the current state of disrepair and poor-quality accommodation for firefighters. He seconded the motion.

Cllr Crossley spoke in support of the motion and praised the design of the new building and acknowledged the need for modern facilities to ensure a rapid response time.

Cllr Jackson agreed with comments and also expressed concern at the current restrictions in the site in terms of attending river rescue emergencies.

In supporting the motion, Cllr Halsall stated that if the existing building was to be listed, it would not be able to continue as a fire station as it was not fit for purpose.

Cllr Gourley paid tribute to Molly Taylor, the female architect who designed the existing fire station, but agreed that the building was no longer fit for purpose for the modern fire service.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (9 in favour and 0 against - unanimous).

RESOLVED that officers be delegated to permit the application subject to:

1. Authorise the Head of Legal and Democratic Services to complete a Legal Agreement to secure a financial contribution of £60,191 towards the Council's Carbon Offsetting Fund.

2. No material change in circumstances relating to addition of buildings at the site to the National Heritage List for England).
3. The conditions set out in the report (or other such conditions as may be appropriate).

3. 25/01546/FUL – 1 Wells Road, Westfield, Bath And North East Somerset

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the change of use from office and storage (E) to a large House of Multiple Occupancy (HMO) (sui generis).

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Matthew Bissex, agent, supporting the application.

Cllr Jackson read a statement on behalf of herself as adjacent ward councillor and Cllr Mansell as a ward councillor summarised as follows:

Cllr Mansell:

1. Agree with the objections raised by Radstock Town Council.
2. The development would breach the terms of the trust which stated that the site should be used for health purposes.
3. There was already a pressure on parking spaces in Radstock, and this development would add to that.
4. The building was not accessible.
5. A business use would be better as there was a need for more jobs in Radstock that people could access, rather than travelling into Bath.

Cllr Jackson:

1. The site was a former GP home and practice from 1891-1961 and from 1961 – 1995 it housed clinics and the district nurse centre. The Leigh House Trust was formed in 2000 offering offices to charities with a medical dimension.
2. Agree with the concerns of Radstock Town Council about the loss of employment space.
3. However, there were exceptional circumstances in relation to this site. The building needed a new roof and a new boiler. Disabled access would also need improving for the site to be used as offices.

Cllr Jackson withdrew from the meeting at this point and took no part in the debate and decision.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. There were 2 parking spaces as part of the development. It may be possible to park additional vehicles outside the entrance as there was an area of land that was not public footpath/highway.
2. There were no free parking spaces close to the site.

3. It was not possible to park in the rear garden as the area was raised up from the road and would involve considerable works to be used for parking.

Cllr Hounsell opened the debate and acknowledged that there had been a lot of effort to create a good quality building with spacious rooms and that the site was in a central location opposite bus stops. He noted the comments raised in relation to the history of the site and covenants but stated that these were not material considerations and he moved the officers' recommendation to permit the application. This was seconded by Cllr Halsall who commented that the large building was suitable for a high-quality conversion to a HMO.

Cllr Hughes stated that although the site was relatively sustainable in terms of access, 60% of residents commuted to work and Radstock was an area with a high level of car dependency, however, he considered the design of the development to be a good example of a HMO and on balance, he supported the motion to permit the application.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (8 in favour and 0 against - unanimous).

RESOLVED that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

4. 25/01499/FUL - 56 Stonehouse Lane, Combe Down, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset, BA2 5DW

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the erection of 6 2-3 storey dwellings and associated access, drainage and hard/soft landscape works following demolition of 2 existing houses.

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Chantal Hopper and Mrs Carpenter, local residents, objecting to the application.
2. Spencer Back, architect, supporting the application.

Cllr Onkar Saini was in attendance as ward councillor and read a statement summarised as follows:

1. He asked the Committee to refuse to grant planning permission for the application.
2. He considered the application constituted over-development of a sensitive urban site and the replacing of 2 dwellings with 6 dwellings was out of scale and out of place with the surrounding area.
3. He was concerned about the impact on residential amenity and effectiveness of a 3m hedge as a screen.
4. The visibility splay fell short of standard.
5. He raised further concerns about the loss of trees and bat roost and questioned the mitigations.

6. He was also concerned about contamination in view of the site's previous history as a quarry.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. In relation to the extant permissions, there would be a net increase of 2 dwellings.
2. Tilted balance was engaged in view of the lack of a 5-year land supply for housing in the current development plan and unless there was a strong reason for refusal, the balance was in favour of granting permission.
3. The proposed dwellings would be 2, 4-bedroom homes and 4, 5-bedroom homes.
4. The private outside amenity space was considered reasonable for the size of the dwelling. There was no requirement for a certain ratio of building to outdoor amenity space and officers considered the size of gardens to be appropriate to the context.
5. The sun path and shadows modelling during the Spring equinox was generally accepted as the most reasonable time as a median point between the summer and winter solstice.
6. Officers did not consider that the application constituted over-development of the site and if the Committee was minded to disagree then it would need to identify harm.
7. The proposed development was too small to trigger a requirement for affordable housing as this was only required for developments of more than 10 houses.

Cllr Crossley expressed the view that the application, due to height, size and massing would constitute over development of the site and would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. He moved that the application be refused. This was seconded by Cllr Jackson who raised concerns about the development being overbearing which would result in overshadowing and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.

Cllr Halsall spoke in support of the motion, stating that the scale and design of the 6 houses was inappropriate on the site.

Cllr Hounsell spoke in support of the officers' recommendation to permit the application as he considered that the application was policy compliant and did not consider reasons to refuse to outweigh the tilted balance in favour of permitting the development.

Cllr Gourley expressed concern about the loss of bungalow in favour of 4-and 5-bed properties in view of the need for smaller properties for older people downsizing and younger people starting homes.

Cllr Warren stated that while there was a need for bigger homes, he considered that this application did constitute over-development of the site.

Cllr Hughes spoke in support of the motion to refuse the application and for the reasons already stated and an additional reason about the lack of amenity for residents of the new development. This was accepted by mover and seconder of the motion.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (8 in favour and 1 against).

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The height, size and massing would constitute over-development of the site and would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
2. The development would be overbearing and result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties in terms of shadowing and loss of privacy and lack of amenity for residents of the proposed dwellings due to the limited outdoor space.

Cllr Jackson left the meeting at this point.

5. 23/04552/FUL - Central Garage, 93 Bristol Road, Whitchurch, Bristol, Bath And North East Somerset

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the demolition of an existing garage building and erection of a commercial unit (Use Class E) with two flats above (Use Class C3).

He gave a verbal update to report that the chair referral comments in the report referred to the wrong scheme and should be as recorded on the Chair/Vice Chair Delegation Decision Form on file, but this did not affect the officer recommendation.

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Chris Goodsall and Michael Henry supporting the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The significance of the nearby Grade II listed building was due to the age of the cottage which is understood to date from the 17th century and was of value as an example of the rural housing which characterised the
2. settlement prior to its urbanisation.
3. Highways officers were satisfied that there was sufficient space for vehicles to turn within the site to ensure that access and egress onto the main road could be achieved in a forward gear.

Cllr Hughes welcomed the mixed development and acknowledged that concerns about the height had been addressed, and he moved the officers' recommendation to permit the application. This was seconded by Cllr Warren.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (8 in favour and 0 against).

RESOLVED that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

71 NEW PLANNING APPEALS LODGED, DECISIONS RECEIVED AND DATES OF FORTHCOMING HEARINGS/INQUIRIES

The Committee considered the appeals report.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 2.00 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services