

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday 18th March 2026, 10.00 am

**Councillors:** Tim Ball (Chair), Fiona Gourley, Ian Halsall, Hal MacFie, Toby Simon, Shaun Hughes, Dr Eleanor Jackson, John Leach and Tim Warren CBE

#### 98 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

#### 99 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Paul Crossley.

#### 100 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 101 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was no urgent business.

#### 102 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

#### 103 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings of 18 February 2026 be confirmed as a correct record for signing by the Chair.

#### 104 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) which had been deferred from the previous meeting to enable further clarification on the density of HMOs within a 100m of the application site. He confirmed that HMO density has been re-calculated to 9.2% (down from 9.9%) and the officers' recommendation was that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

There were no question from Members.

Cllr Halsall acknowledged that the recalculation confirmed that there was less than 10% density of HMOs but commented that 10% was the maximum rather than a target. He stated that he favoured purpose-built student accommodation rather than family homes being converted to HMOs but that the application was policy compliant and he would support the officers' recommendation.

Cllr Hughes stated that he had concerns outside of the density issues in terms of the harms caused by overdevelopment of the site and the design of the development and he would not support the officers' recommendation.

Cllr Jackson stated that although she supported students living in the community and affordable alternatives to purpose built accommodation, she was concerned about the number of people who would be living in this development and the logistics of getting cycles and bins through the living accommodation.

Cllr Gourley agreed that the amenity for the residents was not ideal but due to the HMO density being below 10% she did not consider there were any grounds to refuse the application.

Cllr Halsall moved the officers' recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Simon.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (6 in favour and 3 against).

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

**2. 25/04417/FUL - Rainbow Wood House, Widcombe Hill, Widcombe, Bath**

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the installation of ground mounted solar array and ground source heat pump closed loop underground borehole array, with associated landscaping.

He gave a verbal update to confirm amendments to the conditions as follows:

1. An additional condition - Wildlife Mitigation and Enhancement Scheme (Compliance): - to secure compliance with the details already supplied.
2. Updated condition in relation to the removal of solar panels to also include the removal of the frames, the gravel and permeable membrane with the addition of top soil to return to the site.

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. Sasha Berezina, on behalf of local residents, objecting to the application.
2. Dr Alyson Warhurst, applicant, supporting the application.

Cllr Stuart Bridge read a statement on behalf of himself, and Cllr Alison Born (ward councillors) as summarised below:

1. They had visited the site and noted the amendments made by the applicant following objections raised by local residents.
2. In principle they welcomed the ambition of the project but had concerns about the size and visibility of the solar panel array and the impact on the protected landscape.
3. They also had concerns about whether the drilling may impact on properties below Rainbow House in terms of flooding.
4. They noted the officers conclusion that there was less that substantial harm and that sufficient safeguards were in place to mitigate flooding and drainage concerns.
5. In view of the level of public interest they had referred the application to the Committee for determination.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. Officers had concluded that there was no harm to the Grade II\* Listed Gothic Temple as it did not directly overlook the site and there was no intervisibility between the site and the temple.
2. The solar panels were predicted to generate 156,000kw of electricity and the dwelling had a recorded usage of 63,000kw hours. The ground source heat pump array was predicted to require 65,000kw hours of electricity which provided the heating requirements for the dwelling as a whole. At peak generation the panels would over-supply at about 20%. This did not mean this would be a commercial solar farm, the over-supply would take into account different weather conditions and the additional supply would be fed back to the grid.
3. The numbers were based on the details supplied by solar panel providers and had been taken at face value.
4. The site was bigger than some other solar panel sites because the panels were situated lower to minimise the visual impact which meant that they were less efficient.
5. There would be batteries located on the north west side of the dwelling. Given the distance from dwellings, a noise report had not been requested.
6. The site was in the green belt, world heritage site and conservation area.
7. There would not be any solar panels on the roof of the building.
8. The fence was not part of the application and was subject to a separate enforcement process.
9. The site of the solar arrays had been agreed in consultation with conservation team as the preferable location.

Cllr Warren opened the debate and expressed reservations about the suitability of the site due to its location in the green belt, World Heritage Site, conservation area and the National Landscape.

Cllr Gourley acknowledged the concerns of neighbours but also noted that there was no legal entitlement to a view. She recognised that the applicant had tried to minimise the impact by locating the panels on the ground and using panels with a non-shiny finish. She stated the need to reduce dependence of fossil fuel and concluded that, on balance, she supported the application.

Cllr MacFie spoke in support of the application as he considered the visual impact to be minimal.

Cllr Halsall acknowledged that the development was in a sensitive setting and sympathised with concerns of neighbours but commended the applicants on minimising the impact. He also gave consideration to the fact that B&NES Council had declared a climate emergency. He moved the officers' recommendation to grant permission. Cllr Simon confirmed that he would be willing to second the motion but asked if this could be worded as "delegate to permit" to allow a review of the additional/amended conditions and asked that the planting schedule maximise opportunities to screen the site.

Following advice from the Team Manager – Development Management, it was agreed that the amended conditions, as set out in the Officer's presentation, would be published on the planning portal for 7 days before the decision notice was issued. Cllr Halsall agreed the revised wording and the motion was formally seconded by Cllr Simon.

Cllr Jackson questioned whether there was an argument that the application constituted over-development of the site.

Cllr Leach agreed with the conclusions of officers that the harm was less than substantial and outweighed by the significant benefits and confirmed he would support the motion.

Cllr Hughes referred to the objection of the Bath World Heritage Officer, although he recognised the benefits to the residents.

Cllr Halsall noted that there had been no objection from the Conservation Officer, National Trust or Cotswold Conservation Board.

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

**RESOLVED** that officers be granted delegated authority to grant permission subject to conditions, the details of which would be published on the planning portal for 7 days prior to the issuing of the decision notice.

- 3. 25/03507/FUL - 15 - 17 Trim Street, City Centre, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset, BA1 1HA**
- 4. 25/03508/LBA - 15 - 17 Trim Street, City Centre, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset, BA1 1HA**

The Planning Case Officer introduced two reports on applications on the same site which considered:

1. an application for the construction of 15 new market housing apartments within the existing building envelope. Change of use from Office (Class E) to Dwellings (Class C3).
2. a listed building application for internal and external alterations for the construction of 15 new market housing apartments within the existing building envelope. Change of use from Office (Class E) to Dwellings (Class C3)

She confirmed the officers' recommendation that:

In relation to application 25/03507/FUL:

Officers be granted delegated authority to permit the application subject to:

1. A Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:
  - a. A financial contribution of £152,860 in lieu of affordable housing provision.
  - b. A financial contribution of £1,530.73 towards Special Educational Needs and Disabilities provision.
2. The conditions set out in the report.

In relation to application 25/03508/LBA:

Listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

There were no public representations on these applications.

In response to Members' questions on both applications, it was confirmed:

1. A condition was included to ensure that waste management details were submitted and approved.
2. The air conditioning units would be removed as part of the planning permission, and this was considered to be a benefit of the application.
3. The building had been vacant for 2 years. Alternative office space was available elsewhere in Bath which was of better quality.
4. The external stair lift would be removed as part of the application. The flats would not be accessible for wheelchair users and so the lift was likely to be redundant if retained.

In considering application 25/03507/FUL:

Cllr Hughes opened the debate and stated that although he had reservations about the small level of contribution, on balance he supported the application as a good use of the building. He moved the officers' recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Warren.

Cllr Halsall spoke in support of the application as the site was in a sustainable location and in view of the authority's lack of a 5-year land supply for housing.

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

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

1. A Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:
  - c. A financial contribution of £152,860 in lieu of affordable housing provision.

- d. A financial contribution of £1,530.73 towards Special Educational Needs and Disabilities provision.
2. The conditions set out in the report.

In considering application 25/03508/LBA:

Cllr Hughes moved the officers' recommendation, and this was seconded by Cllr Warren. On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (9 in favour and 0 against - unanimous).

**RESOLVED** that listed building consent be granted.

**5. 25/04688/FUL - 54 Stonehouse Lane, Combe Down, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset, BA2 5DW**

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the demolition of an existing house and the erection of two new 2-storey dwellings and associated access, drainage and hard/soft landscape works.

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. Gillian Carpenter, local resident, objecting to the application.
2. Matthew Parfitt, applicant, supporting the application (read in absence).

Cllr Onkar Saini was in attendance as ward councillor and raised the following points:

1. He had reached a different conclusion to officers and considered the site to be a constrained infill plot with limited separation distances.
2. The application was out of keeping with the surrounding area where there was more generous spacing between properties.
3. The application eroded the openness of the street scene.
4. There was only 1 parking space for a 4-bed house and unsafe access and egress.
5. The application contravened placemaking policies and was an over extensive form of development.
6. He asked the committee to refuse the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. There was no proposed condition to remove future permitted development rights.
2. There was a condition to ensure windows were obscurely glazed at first floor level in between the two houses. At ground floor level the two properties were separated by a fence.
3. There was a distance of between 2m and 3m between the two properties.
4. The application was compliant with parking standards.

Cllr Simon opened the debate and stated that although he appreciated the concerns of neighbours, he did think it was important to maximise the housing available to the people of Bath. He moved the officers' recommendation. Cllr Halsall indicated that he would be willing to second the motion subject to an additional condition to ensure

the removal of permitted development rights. Cllr Simon agreed to this addition as mover of the motion and the motion was seconded by Cllr Halsall.

Cllr Jackson questioned the need to demolish the existing bungalow but considered that there was no justification to refuse the application.

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

**RESOLVED** that the application be permitted subject to the conditions set out in the report and an additional condition to remove permitted development rights.

**6. 25/04673/FUL – Lansdown Close, College Road, Lansdown, Bath, Bath And North East Somerset, BA1 5RR**

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the erection of a new detached dwelling within the curtilage of an existing dwelling.

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. Kerry McClelland/John Morgan, local residents objecting to the application.
2. Chris Dance, agent, and Andrew Girdher, applicant, supporting the application.

Cllr Lucy Hodge was in attendance as ward councillor and read a statement summarised as below:

1. The application site was located in a quiet tree-lined road consisting of distinctive early Victorian villas.
2. If the application was approved this would be the first backland development in the area and set a precedent in the conservation area.
3. The application constituted over-development, backland developments should be subservient to frontage buildings.
4. There would be an impact on outlook.
5. She asked the Committee to consider overturning the officers' recommendation due to the harm caused by the over-development of site by the size, scale and massing of the development.

Cllr Mark Elliot was unable to attend as ward councillor and a statement was read on his behalf:

1. He had requested that the application be determined by the committee after being contacted by residents in the neighbouring properties.
2. The neighbours had significant concerns about loss of amenity and privacy due to the size of the proposed build, and its proximity to their boundaries.
3. He asked the Committee to give due consideration to the concerns of neighbours.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. The Tree Officer was satisfied that the trees would not be damaged by the construction of the new access.
2. There would be two separate drives as the result of the development. The existing drive would serve the new property and there would be a new drive for

- the existing property.
3. Officers did not consider that the balcony would impact on residential amenity as there was a sufficient distance between properties.
  4. The existing hedge would provide screening and combined with the fact that the development was for a single-storey development, and the facing area would be non-living areas with small windows, there was not considered to be harm to residential amenity.
  5. Waste collection would be from the road side.
  6. Policy D7 required backland developments to be “well related and not inappropriate in height, scale, mass and form to the frontage buildings” but did not refer to backland developments not being subservient to the frontage. Officers view was that the application was policy compliant.
  7. Officers considered the contemporary design to be appropriate.
  8. The development was not considered to be overbearing or have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

Cllr Jackson opened the debate and moved that the application be refused as the design of the application would cause harm to the conservation area; the size, scale and massing would result in an overbearing development which would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties including the Victorian villa and the proposed access was inadequate. This was seconded by Cllr Hughes. The Team Manager - Development Management advised that as Highways Officers had not objected to the application, it would be difficult to defend a reason relating to the proposed access. The mover and seconder of the motion agreed to remove the reason relating to the access.

Cllr Simon spoke against the motion as he considered the development to be well designed and proportionate.

Cllr Gourley also spoke against the motion as she did not consider the development to be overbearing and in relation to design, there were other contemporary houses in the area.

On voting for the motion, it was NOT CARRIED (3 in favour and 6 against).

Cllr Simon moved the officers recommendation to permit the application subject to the conditions set out in the report. This was seconded by Cllr MacFie.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (6 in favour and 3 against).

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

Cllr Simon left the meeting at this point.

## **7. 25/02450/FUL - 1 Audley Close, Lower Weston, Bath**

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the demolition of an existing single storey side extension; the erection of a two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension and internal amendments and retrofit to the existing property.

She 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. Simon Malthouse, local resident, objecting to the application.
2. Jason Glassick, on behalf of applicant, supporting the application.

Cllr Ruth Malloy was in attendance as ward councillor and read a statement summarised as below:

1. The site was located in a the Bath Conservation Area, the World Heritage Site and the Great Spa Towns of Europe.
2. The proposed scale and massing of the development would dominate the cul-de-sac.
3. The development was not in keeping with other properties in the area.
4. She acknowledged that the applicant had made some revisions in view of objections to lessen the impact on residents' amenity.
5. She asked the Committee to overturn the officers' recommendation and refuse the application due to the harm to the conservation area/heritage site and detrimental impact on residential amenity.

There were no questions from Members.

Cllr Gourley opened the debate and stated that the increase in size of the new development was not a concern and that there was already a level of overlooking in the existing configuration.

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

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.

## 105 **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 1.11 pm

Chair .....

Date Confirmed and Signed .....

Prepared by Democratic Services