

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday 21st January 2026, 10.00 am

Councillors: Tim Ball (Chair), Paul Crossley (Vice-Chair), Fiona Gourley, Hal MacFie, Duncan Hounsell, Shaun Hughes, Dr Eleanor Jackson, Ruth Malloy and Tim Warren CBE

80 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

81 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Ian Halsall, Cllr John Leach and Cllr Toby Simon.

There were the following substitutions:

Cllr Ruth Malloy for Cllr Toby Simon

Cllr Duncan Hounsell for Cllr John Leach

82 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Hounsell declared an interest in that he may be considered predetermined in relation to item 1 - 25/03496/FUL – 22 Tynning Road, Saltford and stood down from the Committee to speak as ward councillor and then withdrew from the meeting and took no further part in the debate or vote.

Cllr Jackson declared a disclosable personal interest in item 3 - 25/04547/TCA - 4 Meadow View, Radstock and withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the application.

In relation to item 2 - 25/02637/FUL - Barn, Bailbrook Lane, Lower Swainswick, Bath, Cllr Crossley stated that he was the Council's representative on the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Beauty Board and as the Board had not made a determination on the application plus considering the councillor code of conduct test for this interest, he held an open mind to the planning arguments and would be participating in the debate and vote.

83 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was no urgent business.

84 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Democratic Services Officer informed the meeting of the process for public

speakers to address the Committee.

85 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings of 17 December 2025 be confirmed as a correct record for signing by the Chair.

86 **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. 25/03496/FUL - 22 Tynning Road, Saltford, Bath and North East Somerset

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the demolition of an existing bungalow and the construction of 5 new bungalows including a new access road off Tynning Road.

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

1. A Section 106 Agreement to cover a financial contribution for:
 - a. replacement tree planting for 12 replacement trees
 - b. a monitoring fees contribution of £468 per obligation
2. The conditions set out in the report with an amendment to condition 15 to include "(Hillside Trees January 2026)" after "Tree Protection Plan".

The following public representations were received:

1. A local resident, objecting to the application.
2. John Blake, architect, supporting the application.

Cllr Duncan Hounsell stood down from the Committee to speak as ward councillor and raised the following points:

1. Although he welcomed the late change to reduce 2 of the proposed bungalows from 4-bed to 2-bed, he objected to the application as he considered it to constitute over-development of the site due to loss of amenity to neighbouring residents and lack of amenity to future residents of the site.
2. The density of the development was also out of keeping with the character of the area.
3. The size of bathroom/toilet was too small for older people with accessibility requirements.
4. Garden space was negligible.
5. The proposed access road was on the wrong side of the plot.

6. Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) was only achievable off-site, and it could have been achieved on-site with a lower density development.
7. Similar backland developments in Saltford had been successful due to lower density.
8. He was aware of tilted balance arguments but considered the application to be contrary to policies.

At this point, Cllr Hounsell withdrew from the meeting and took no further part in the debate and vote in relation to the application.

Cllr Chris Warren was in attendance as ward councillor and read a statement summarised as below:

1. He objected to the application.
2. He recognised the contribution of backland developments but did not consider this application to be appropriate.
3. The proposed 5 properties constituted over-development of the site.
4. He was concerned the development would add to on-street parking.
5. He was also concerned about the loss of wildlife habitat.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. In determining whether an application constituted over-development, there needed to be consideration of any harms e.g. if there was an adverse impact on residential amenity or on the character of the area.
2. There was no specific policy requirement for a minimum outdoor space/garden. Policy D6 referred to sufficient amenity space and officers were of the view that this application was policy compliant.
3. The development was denser than others in the surrounding area, but a balance needed to be made between Policy D2 "Local Character and Distinctiveness" and the National Planning Policy Framework requirements for the efficient use of land in meeting the needs for homes.
4. In relation to BNG, offsite delivery was permissible. Less dwellings on site would have enabled more onsite provision but this needed to be balanced with other considerations such as the lack of a 5-year land supply.
5. The access road would not be adopted as the Highways Authority did not adopt roads of this scale. Comments had been raised that moving the access road would have less impact on residents, but the current location was a design choice that was considered acceptable by officers.
6. There was no Neighbourhood Plan for Saltford.
7. In terms of sewer drainage, the drainage team was satisfied with the arrangements and there would be a drainage condition attached to the planning permission.

Cllr Hughes opened the debate and stated that although the site was in a sustainable location and there was a need for bungalows, he was concerned about over-development and the impact on the character of the area and the loss of amenity for existing residents and lack of amenity for future residents. He also expressed concern that BNG could not be met on-site and that there would be a loss of green space as a result of the development. He moved that the application be refused and this was seconded by Cllr MacFie.

The Team Manager – Development Management clarified that the application was policy compliant in relation to BNG and therefore this was not a valid reason for

refusal, but the loss of green space could be included in the reason relating to harm to amenity.

Cllr Gourley agreed that there was a need for more bungalows but shared concerns about the lack of amenity space.

Cllr Crossley spoke in support of the motion as he considered the application to constitute over-development which caused harm to the character to the village and a lack of amenity to residents.

Cllrs Warren and Jackson also spoke in support of the motion.

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

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons

1. Impact to character - the development constituted over-development with a lack of green and amenity space and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
2. Harm to residential amenity - the development would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties resulting in a lack of privacy and there was a lack of amenity and green space for future occupiers.

Cllr Hounsell returned to the meeting.

2. 25/02637/FUL - Barn, Bailbrook Lane, Lower Swainswick, Bath, Bath and North East Somerset

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the change of use and conversion of a barn into a single dwelling house

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. Cllr Peter Lewis, Batheaston Parish Council objecting to the application.
2. Angela Toms, on behalf of local residents objecting to the application.
3. Chris Dance, agent, supporting the application.

Cllr Joanna Wright was in attendance as an adjacent ward councillor and read a statement summarised as below:

1. The application site was located in an important position within the Green Belt, the Cotswold National Landscape and World Heritage Site setting.
2. Although the site was in an adjacent ward, the proposed development would impact on residents in Lambridge ward.
3. There was a history on the site including enforcement issues and damage to mature trees.
4. The development would result in a detrimental impact on residential amenity and if the application was permitted, there should be a condition to remove the first-floor window to prevent overlooking.
5. Neighbouring residents were concerned about the dwelling being used for short term lets.
6. There were also concerns about the impact on the public right of way.

7. Lighting would impact on dark skies.
8. This was an inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and the Committee was urged to refuse the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The history of the site was relevant in terms of what permissions had been granted, but any enforcement issues were not relevant to this application, and a decision should be made on the application on its merits.
2. The barn was built in 2016 under permitted development rights, the agricultural use had since changed as there was a new owner.
3. The site was outside the housing development boundary.
4. The access was considered to be suitable for the proposed use. If the Committee considered that the track should be upgraded, this could be confirmed by a condition.
5. In terms of development in the Green Belt, there was an exception in NPPF which stated that a change of use was acceptable providing the development did not cause substantial harm.
6. It was accepted that the access to the site was likely to be by private car, but the site was close to the edge of an urban area and not considered to be in a remote isolated location. The nearest bus stop was on London Road West.
7. The dwelling could be converted to an HMO or holiday let without planning permission (as long as class C3 or C4), as it was outside the area of Bath covered by the Article 4 direction.
8. The nearest property was 55m from the development and officers did not think there was significant harm in terms of overlooking or residential amenity.
9. There would be 3 parking spaces which was consistent with parking standards.
10. Any further applications for barns on the site would need to prove agricultural use.

Cllr Warren opened the debate and stated that as this was a conversion of a redundant agricultural building rather than a new building, it would be difficult to find a reason to refuse the application. He moved the officers' recommendation to permit the development. This was seconded by Cllr Hounsell who stressed the need to apply current policies.

Cllr Jackson spoke against the motion, as she did not consider the current use to be redundant and was concerned that the development was not accessible without a car.

Cllr Hughes expressed concerns about the application in the context of its setting.

As mover of the motion, Cllr Warren confirmed that he did not think any additional conditions should be included.

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

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

Cllr Tim Warren left the meeting at this point.

Cllr Jackson declared an interest in the following item and withdrew from the

meeting.

3. 25/04547/TCA - 4 Meadow View, Radstock, Bath and North East Somerset

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered a notification for tree works in a conservation area.

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that no objection be raised.

There were no public speakers.

Cllr Crossley moved the officers' recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Gourley.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (7 in favour and 0 against).

RESOLVED that no objection be raised to the notification for tree works.

Cllr Jackson returned to the meeting.

4. 25/04609/TCA - Audley House, Park Gardens, Lower Weston, Bath, Bath and North East Somerset

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered a notification for tree works in a conservation area

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that no objection be raised.

There were no public speakers.

Cllr Jackson moved the officer recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Gourley

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

RESOLVED that no objection be raised to the notification for tree works.

87 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 12.12 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services