

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday 18th February 2026, 10.00 am

Councillors: Tim Ball (Chair), Paul Crossley (Vice-Chair), Fiona Gourley, Ian Halsall, Hal MacFie, Toby Simon, Shaun Hughes, Dr Eleanor Jackson and John Leach

88 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

89 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Tim Warren.

90 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to item 3. 25/04242/FUL - The Coach House, Midford Road, Midford, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset, Cllr Crossley stated that he was the Council's representative on the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Beauty Board but as the Board had not been consulted on the application he did not consider he had an interest and would be participating in the debate and vote.

91 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was no urgent business.

92 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

93 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of 21 January 2026 be confirmed as a correct record for signing by the Chair.

94 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. 25/04124/FUL - 26 Wedgwood Road, Whiteway, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset, BA2 1NX

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the change of use from a single dwelling (C3) to 7-bedroom house in multiple occupation (HMO) (Sui Generis).

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

Cllr Sarah Moore was in attendance as ward councillor and raised the following points:

1. She questioned whether figures were accurate in relation to the calculation of the number of residential properties and number of HMOs.
2. She was concerned that there were non-registered HMOs which had not been taking into consideration and would put the percentage over the threshold of 10% in the 100m radius.
3. The plans were of concern; the smallest bedroom and bathrooms were too small and there were no detailed plans for the kitchen.
4. The cycle store at the back was only accessible through the communal area of the house and this was not ideal for tenants.
5. Although the property was served by bus services, these were subsidised and could not be guaranteed to continue in the long term.
6. There was a lack of on-street parking in the area and this would be exacerbated if the tenants had cars.
7. She asked the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. This application would not result in sandwiching of a residential property.
2. There were no residents parking zones in operation in the area.
3. In terms of whether the heating system needed to be upgraded, the property was Grade C rated which was the requirement for HMOs and so there was no planning requirement to upgrade.
4. The figures for residential properties/HMOs were calculated using the Council's mapping service and officers had no reason to believe these were inaccurate. If anyone was aware of HMOs operating without planning permission, this should be referred to the enforcement team for investigation. If the Committee required a further investigation of the figures, then a deferral was recommended.
5. In terms of the party wall and impact on the neighbouring property, building regulations would control construction.
6. The tenants would need to bring their bicycles through the communal area in the house to access the cycle store as the house was terraced and there was no separate access to the garden. It was considered that the rear garden was the safest location for the cycle store.

Cllr MacFie moved that the application be deferred to enable further clarification on

the figures of residential properties and HMOs within a 100m radius of the application site. This was seconded by Cllr Simon who requested a list of all properties and their status in order to make an informed assessment.

Cllr Halsall spoke in support of the motion to defer as the concentration of HMOs in the area was close to the threshold of 10%.

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

RESOLVED that the application be deferred to enable further clarification on the figures of residential properties and HMOs within a 100m of the application site.

2. 25/04650/FUL - 16 Alderley Road, Southdown, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset, BA2 1LB

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the change of use from a dwellinghouse (C3) to a house in multiple occupation (C4) including partial conversion of an existing garage.

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 Jones, agent, supporting the application.

Cllr Dine Romero was in attendance as ward councillor and read a statement summarised as below:

1. She expressed concern about the loss of an affordable family home and the impact on the community, such as the viability of local schools.
2. The increase in the number of adults living in the property could result in up to 6 cars and would have an impact on air quality in the area.
3. She was concerned about elements of the design such as the bathroom located next to the kitchen and that bins and bicycles would need to be transported through the communal area.
4. She asked the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The bin store was located at the back of the house and bins would need to be brought through the communal living area to the front of the building for collection. This was not an unusual situation for terraced housing.
2. The location of the toilet would need to meet building regulations.
3. Officers did not consider that there was an unacceptable level of harm caused by overlooking.
4. The 3 parking spaces included in the plans did exceed the minimum requirement of 1 parking space.
5. It was not a planning consideration whether the dropped curves would prevent people parking on the road.
6. The development would be allowed under permitted development if it was not located within an area subject to an Article 4 Direction restricting
7. the conversion of residential properties into HMOs.
8. Officers did not consider there would be an impact on sewage/drainage as the

increase was from a 5-bedroom dwelling to a 6-bedroom dwelling.

Cllr Crossley opened the debate as ward councillor. He agreed that the application complied with HMO requirements but expressed concern about the loss of amenity to neighbouring properties and the loss of on street parking. This was seconded by Cllr Hughes who expressed reservations about the feasibility of the design. The Deputy Head of Planning - Development Management advised against the loss of on-street parking as being a reason for refusal as there was no right to park on a public highway and it was agreed that this reason be withdrawn

Cllr Halsall spoke in support of the motion due to the impact on residential amenity. He agreed with the need to retain affordable family homes.

Cllr Leach spoke against the motion as he did not consider there was a defensible reason to refuse the application.

Cllr Gourley spoke in support of the motion as she considered the design would impact on amenity of future residents.

On voting for the motion, it was NOT CARRIED (4 in favour and 5 against).

Cllr Jackson moved the officers' recommendation with an additional condition to ensure that the loft space could not be used for additional accommodation. This was seconded by Cllr Leach.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (5 in favour and 4 against).

RESOLVED that the application be permitted subject to the conditions in the report and an additional condition to ensure that the loft space would not be used for additional accommodation.

3. 25/04242/FUL - The Coach House, Midford Road, Midford, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the demolition of an existing two-storey dwelling, and replacement with a contemporary two-storey self-build dwelling in the green belt.

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

1. the submission of a Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking to secure the property as a self-build dwelling.
2. the conditions set out in the report.

There were no public representations on the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The existing building was not of historic interest or significance.
2. There was no requirement for a separate application for the demolition of the existing dwelling as the site was not in a conservation area.

Cllr Gourley opened debate as local councillor and stated that the proposed

development would be more fit for purpose than the existing dwelling and would not be visible in the wider landscape. She moved the officers' recommendation that the application be permitted. This was seconded by Cllr Halsall who stated that he was satisfied the existing dwelling was not a heritage asset and that the benefits of replacing the current dwelling with a sustainable building outweighed the loss of the building.

Cllr Hughes raised concerns about the proposed materials, particularly in relation to the roof.

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

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

1. the submission of a Section 106 Unilateral Undertaking to secure the property as a self-build dwelling.
2. the conditions set out in the report.

95 **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2025 - AMENITY LAND AT IVY AVENUE, SOUTHDOWN, BATH NO.334**

The Tree Officer introduced the report which considered a Tree Preservation Order which had been the subject of two objections. She drew attention to the update report which confirmed that one objection had since been withdrawn.

She advised that the officers' recommendation was that the Tree Preservation Order be confirmed without modification.

The following public representations were received:

1. Craig Harding, landowner, objecting to the Tree Preservation Order.
2. Neil Wood, local resident, supporting the Tree Preservation Order.

Cllr Dine Romero was in attendance as ward councillor and read a statement summarised as below:

1. She had received representations from local residents who had expressed concern about the loss of the trees which had been felled on the site and were concerned about the loss of further trees.
2. The woodland formed part of an amenity that residents had a right to.
3. The site was an area of woodland and had an important role in supporting the stability of the hill as well as providing a habitat for wildlife.
4. She asked the Committee to approve the TPO to protect the remaining trees.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The landowner could not be instructed to replant trees, but woodland designation would cover the regeneration and regrowth of tree stumps.
2. The TPO would control any future felling and if more than 5 cubic metres were to be felled in one calendar month then a felling license would be required. The Council would be consulted in this situation.

Cllr Crossley opened the debate as ward councillor and stated that there were few trees in the area and therefore the impact of losing trees was great. He moved the

officers' recommendation to approve the TPO. This was seconded by Cllr Jackson.

Cllr Hughes spoke in support of the motion and referred to the Council's declaration of an ecological emergency.

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

RESOLVED that the Tree Preservation Order be approved.

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

The Committee considered the appeals report.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

97 **QUARTERLY PERFORMANCE REPORT - 1 OCT - 31 DEC 2025**

The Committee considered the appeals report.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 12.25 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services