

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held

Wednesday 15th April 2026, 10.00 am

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

106 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

107 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Hal MacFie.

108 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to items 2 and 3 23/00429/FUL & 23/00430/LBA Charmydown Barn, Charmydown Lane, Swainswick, Bath, Cllr Halsall declared that one of the public speakers was known to him, but this did not influence his view and he would participate in the debate and vote on these applications.

Cllr Crossley stated that, as he was the Council's representative on the Cotswolds National Landscape Board, he would be withdrawing from the meeting during consideration of the following applications:

1. 25/03757/EFUL - Eastern Sports Field, Sports Training Village, University Of Bath Campus, Claverton Down, Bath
2. 23/00429/FUL - Charmydown Barn, Charmydown Lane, Swainswick, Bath
3. 23/00430/LBA Charmydown Barn, Charmydown Lane, Swainswick, Bath

109 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was no urgent business.

110 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

111 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

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

112 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.

[Cllr Crossley withdrew from the meeting at this point.]

1. 25/03757/EFUL - Eastern Sports Field, Sports Training Village, University Of Bath Campus, Claverton Down, Bath

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the delivery of student accommodation with associated vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access, internal highways, car parking (including reconfiguration of an existing parking area), cycle parking, green and blue infrastructure (including drainage features and soft landscape planting), hard landscaping, boundary treatment, new and replacement external lighting, ancillary infrastructure (including storage, substations, pumping stations, photovoltaic panels, and internal and external plant), ground remodelling, and two padel courts.

She gave a verbal update to report that additional comments had been raised following publication of the update report and responded as follows

1. "Travel plan bond is inadequate". The details of the Travel Plan bond were set out within the Highways Section of the report
2. "The use of the site by Bath Rugby and the recreation ground as a Park and Ride" - This would only be for premier league matches on Saturday and Sunday. On other occasions there would be capacity elsewhere. The use would not clash with university open days or events.
3. "B&NES traffic management team confirmed in writing that they have formally added physical traffic calming for the Claverton Down Road gateway to the official Council list, so the comment in the report that it has not been deemed necessary to seek a contribution to traffic calming is outdated." – in order for a contribution to be considered reasonable, it must meet the CIL regulation 122 test. The development would not generate a significant amount of traffic to meet the test for a contribution towards traffic calming.
4. "Active travel contribution is designated for Norwood Avenue and will not address traffic calming." – The S106 would secure the delivery of an enhanced Active Travel Link between Norwood Avenue and The Avenue and a financial contribution of £850,000 towards an Active Travel link between the campus and city centre.
5. Bath Spa University has asked for it to be noted that it was not consulted by the University of Bath prior to the letter referred to in the update report which set out the University's position with regard to how the proposals would operate alongside their existing accommodation portfolio.

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

1. A Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:
 - a. Delivery of an enhanced Active Travel Link between Norwood Avenue and The Avenue
 - b. A financial contribution of £850,000 towards an Active Travel link between the campus and city centre
 - c. A refundable Travel Plan bond of £150,000
 - d. A contribution of £426,411 towards primary healthcare
 - e. A contribution of £223,792 towards the Council's Carbon Offset fund
 - f. A contribution of £26,345 towards Targeted Training and Recruitment
 - g. An enhancement to the Community Garden/Orchard
2. The conditions set out in the report.
3. Referral to the Secretary of State.

The following public representations were received:

1. Mark Rose, agent, supporting the application.

Cllr Stuart Bridge was in attendance as adjacent ward councillor and read a statement as summarised below:

1. His concern about the application was in relation to the safety on Claverton Down Road.
2. A lack of a safe pedestrian crossing would be a risk to students trying to cross the road, especially during the evening hours.
3. Claverton Down junction had been identified as suitable for traffic calming measures.
4. He asked the Committee to defer making a decision pending further negotiations to secure a S106 contribution to fully fund traffic calming on Claverton Down Road.

Cllr Manda Rigby was in attendance as ward councillor and read a statement as summarised below:

1. She agreed with the concerns about Claverton Down Road safety and the need for traffic calming measures.
2. She would like to see details of active travel proposals for the area.
3. She was also concerned about the impact on the community living near the campus in terms of healthcare. The increase in student numbers could result in the nearby GP surgery not having enough capacity for local residents.
4. She noted the contribution to primary care but questioned what this would fund.
5. She was concerned that the application for purpose-built student accommodation would not take the pressure off the increasing number of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) in the rest of the city and asked if a condition could be

included to ensure that the purpose-built accommodation was not restricted to first year students.

6. She asked the Committee to defer taking a decision to take these points into consideration.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. In terms of highway safety, the application would result in a reduction in car parking which would reduce traffic accessing the site.
2. There were parking controls in the area which would prevent parking in the surrounding area.
3. The Scholars Way scheme would be delivered this year and would include a crossing which would help mitigate concerns. There would also be a developer contribution towards active travel between the site and the city centre. It wasn't possible to give details of how this funding would be spent as a specific scheme had not yet been drawn up.
4. In terms of bus services to and from the campus, discussions were ongoing and this would be included in the travel plan.
5. There would be cycle storage on site.
6. In relation to whether there could be a condition relating to accommodation being used for students other than first years, the university only had limited control over where students lived, and students may choose to live off campus.
7. There would be some displacement of those living in the city centre when additional accommodation was available on campus. Accommodation run by the university was generally cheaper than privately owned accommodation.
8. Officers had given weight to the redistribution of students as a result of the application, but no weight had been given to the question of whether the number of HMOs would reduce.
9. The student accommodation could not be used for holiday rental.
10. In relation to the impact on GP surgery/local people, the ICB had requested a financial contribution to refurbish and extend the existing facility. There was no contribution towards dental provision, and this was not requested for planning applications.
11. There was a balance between the lighting of the car park for safety reasons and protecting the bat corridor. There were mitigations in place such as a centrally controlled dimming regime and fencing and this was considered acceptable by the Council's Ecologist and Natural England. No concerns had been raised by the Ecologist in relation to car headlights. There was already a lit car park on the site and so the proposal would not make the current situation worse and there would also be controls by a condition.

Cllr Simon opened the debate as ward councillor. He disagreed with colleagues who had asked for a deferral for further information as he felt that there was sufficient information within the report to determine the application. He expressed the view that the benefits of the application and mitigations outweighed harms; the application was policy compliant; it would allow the university to have on site accommodation reducing pressure on city centre accommodation and consideration needed to be given to the lack of a 5-year land supply for housing. He moved the officers recommendation to delegate to permit. This was seconded by Cllr Gourley.

Cllr Warren spoke in support of the application acknowledging that the university needed to grow to be sustainable and that it could stop the growth of HMOs in Bath.

Cllr Hughes spoke against the motion, expressing concerns that the growth of the university could result in an increase in the number of HMOs; that some objections were still outstanding; there would be the harm to the Cotswold National Landscape; there would be increased pressure on health care and active travel plans were inadequate.

Cllr Halsall stated that this would be a phased development which would allow the Council to adapt its policies regarding HMOs through the Local Plan process. He considered the design to be acceptable and was mindful of the lack of a 5-year land supply for housing and in view of this, he would be supporting the motion.

Cllr Leach spoke against the motion due to the location of the car park next to a bat corridor.

Cllr Jackson acknowledged the concerns about the bat corridor but also noted that any reduction in lighting would have an impact on the safety of users of the car park. She raised concern about the lack of a plan for how the contribution towards Active Travel would be spent, but on balance she confirmed she would support the motion.

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (5 in favour, 2 against and 1 abstention).

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

1. A Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:
 - a. Delivery of an enhanced Active Travel Link between Norwood Avenue and The Avenue
 - b. A financial contribution of £850,000 towards an Active Travel link between the campus and city centre
 - c. A refundable Travel Plan bond of £150,000
 - d. A contribution of £426,411 towards primary healthcare
 - e. A contribution of £223,792 towards the Council's Carbon Offset fund
 - f. A contribution of £26,345 towards Targeted Training and Recruitment
 - g. An enhancement to the Community Garden/Orchard
2. The conditions set out in the report.
3. Referral to the Secretary of State.

2. 23/00429/FUL - Charmydown Barn, Charmydown Lane, Swainswick, Bath

3. 23/00430/LBA Charmydown Barn, Charmydown Lane, Swainswick, Bath

The Planning Case Officer introduced two reports on applications on the same site as follows:

23/00429/FUL - Internal and external alterations and extension to existing barn in connection with conversion to a residential dwellinghouse (use class C3). To also include reprofiling of east field, hard and soft landscaping, installation of drainage and effluent pipes, and creation of pond with decks.

23/00430/LBA – listed building consent.

He gave a verbal update as follows:

1. To confirm that the reference to duty to further the statutory purposes of the Cotswold National Landscape referred to Section 85 of Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 which required any authority to seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.
2. The receipt of a group objection, further to earlier objections, from Batheaston, Swainswick and St Catherine Parish Councils.
3. The receipt of a further objection from neighbours circulated to member of the Planning Committee.
4. A further objection from another neighbour forwarded by Wera Hobhouse MP. The objections raised were addressed as part of the officers' report.

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that:

In relation to application 23/00429/FUL – permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

In relation to application 23/00430/LBA – listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Tom Jackson, clerk of St Catherine Parish meeting on behalf of Batheaston, Swainswick Parish Councils and St Catherine Parish meeting objecting to the applications.
2. Alan Pearce, on behalf of local residents, objecting to the applications.
3. Hannah Spence, agent/Mark Watson, architect supporting the applications.

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

1. Local residents objected strongly to the application and were frustrated and angry about works being carried out without planning permission/listed building consent.
2. She had a number of concerns and these were shared by her fellow ward councillor, Cllr Kevin Guy.
3. The application was retrospective and the work that had already been carried out to a listed building was a criminal offence as well as a breach of planning law.
4. The ongoing works had blighted the lives of residents of neighbouring properties for 18 years.
5. She had received complaints about works on site dating back to 2020.
6. The current application involved extensive works with an enlarged basement with an increase of 140m², a kitchen and space for 15 bedrooms. There were concerns that this would be used as an events venue.

7. The unauthorised works had included spoil being dumped on the ground south of the barn; and the removal of coppice and stone walls.
8. There were legal questions about whether the 2013 permission was valid.
9. The harm was significant with no public benefit.
10. In relation to ecology, the application did not comply with policy NE3.
11. Neighbours had concerns for the future use of the site.
12. She asked the Committee to refuse the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. A retrospective application could not be treated differently and this application needed to be judged on its merits. As part of the enforcement process officers had put a stop to the works on site. The submission of the application was a way to regularise the unauthorised works.
2. As to whether the works would have been approved if the application had been submitted in advance, the officers had not assessed this scenario.
3. In terms of the increase, the extension was moderately larger than was usually acceptable in the green belt, but much of the extension was underground which lessened the visual impact.
4. If the application was refused and any subsequent appeal was dismissed, the Council would have to consider what enforcement action could be taken and what harm might arise. The removal of the extension would be challenging and could cause further harm to the barn.
5. The barn formed part of the historic curtilage of a listed farmhouse and was therefore a 'curtilage listed building' rather than listed in its own right.
6. The design had been amended in relation to the 3 arched openings and the current design was 2 windows and a Crittall frame door. This would respond to the requirement to retain uninterrupted, glazed openings.
7. There had not been a change in owner since the 2013 scheme.
8. In relation to fears that the building would be used for commercial purposes, any change of use would require a separate planning permission, and it would be an enforcement issue if the building was used for commercial purposes without consent.
9. Permitted development rights were very limited due to being a curtilage listed building.

Cllr Simon opened the debate and referred to the need to consider this application and balance the harms and mitigations and advantages. He noted there was no presumption against retrospective applications. He recognised that there had been planning breaches but this had not been without consequences as it had led to a four-year delay. He suggested that granting permission was best way forward and moved the officers' recommendations on both applications.

Cllr Eleanor Jackson seconded the motion. She expressed the view that the building had improved considerably since 2013 and the development would sit better in the landscape.

Cllr Warren expressed concern about the planning breaches and stated that he was not minded to support permitting the development.

Cllr Leach confirmed he would not support the motion on the basis of the heritage

harm that would result.

Cllr Hughes expressed concern about the increase in floor space, ecological damage and considered the development was inappropriate in the green belt.

Cllr Halsall sympathised with neighbours but hoped permitting the application would regularise the works on the site and acknowledged it wasn't appropriate to refuse the application on the basis of it being retrospective. He stated that although it was larger than usual in a green belt setting, a lot of the extension was underground and not visible and noted that any change in use would need a further planning application. He confirmed that, on balance, he would support the motion.

Cllr Gourley also spoke in support as the best option for the future of the barn.

In considering application 23/00429/FUL:

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (5 in favour and 4 against – Chair using casting vote).

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

In considering application 23/00430/LBA:

On voting for the motion, it was CARRIED (5 in favour and 3 against).

RESOLVED that listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

[Cllr Crossley returned to the meeting at this point]

4. 25/04283/FUL - 12 Cameley Green, Twerton, Bath

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the change of use of a 3-bedroom dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a 7-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Sui Generis) with single storey rear extension, associated external and internal alterations, bin store and bike store.

He gave a verbal update to confirm that:

1. The figures relating to HMOs had been re-checked and there was an increase to 6 out of 86 properties which was 7% (this was below the maximum threshold of 10%).
2. In terms of parking standards, 1 parking space for 7 people in an accessible location was considered suitable.

He confirmed the officers' recommendation that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report with an amendment to condition 2 requiring photographic evidence of soundproofing measures.

The following public representations were received:

1. Tobias Deacon, agent, supporting the application.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. Loft insulation was included as part of the development. The management of asbestos was not a material consideration.
 2. The main points of the 42 public objections related to noise disturbance; parking and traffic; impact on local schools and the loss of a family house.
 3. The cycle storage and service access was located at the rear of the property.
 4. The nearest bus stop was 30m distance from the property.
 5. There was evidence following on from 2 studies, the latest being 2019, that HMOs did not result in an increase in parking when compared to family homes.
- Cllr Warren noted that the application would result in a density of 7% which was below the threshold and moved the officers' recommendation to permit the development. Cllr Halsall seconded the motion but expressed concern at the loss of a family house.

Cllr Gourley shared concerns about the loss of a family house but considered the rooms to be of reasonable size and did not think there was a reason to refuse the application.

Cllr Hughes acknowledged that the density of HMOs had not been exceeded but he considered the application to be over-development and would not be supporting the motion.

Cllr Leach concurred with this view and expressed concern about a communal room for 7 adults being located against a party wall and the impact on residential amenity for the neighbouring property.

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

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report with an amendment to condition 2 requiring photographic evidence of soundproofing measures.

5. 25/04761/FUL - 17 Foxcombe Road, Newbridge, Bath

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered an application for the change of use from two flats to a single dwelling (C3) to revert to the original use.

She gave a verbal update to confirm that on page 177 of report, the description should read "change of use for 2no. 2-bed flats."

She confirmed the officers' recommendation that the application be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

The following public representations were received:

1. Anna Brown, applicant, supporting the application.

Cllr Michelle O'Doherty was unable to attend as ward councillor and a statement was read on her behalf as summarised below:

1. She supported the application.

2. It was a finely balanced case, and she believed the benefits outweighed the harm.
3. The existing accommodation was arranged over interlocking levels and separated by lightweight partitions.
4. Reverting to a single dwelling would restore a coherent, high-quality home, far better suited to the building.
5. In terms of housing capacity, a 4-bed family home was likely to accommodate as many or more people than the current arrangement.
6. On housing need, there was a shortage of family homes in Bath.
7. On amenity, removing the subdivision would address the issue of noise between the two separate units.
8. She asked the Committee to permit the application.

In response to a Member's question, it was confirmed that the conversion of two adjoining dwellings into one would also require planning permission.

Cllr Jackson spoke in support of the application and cited the social and economic benefits of the change of use to a single dwelling. She moved that the officers' recommendation be overturned and the application be permitted. This was seconded by Cllr Gourley who noted that the current sub-division was awkward and she supported the addition of a family home.

Cllr Leach spoke in support of the motion due to the need for higher quality family accommodation.

Cllr Simon asked if the motion could be amended to "delegate to permit" to allow officers to consider any appropriate conditions. This was agreed by mover and seconder.

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 appropriate conditions.

6. 25/02196/OUT - Parcel 5378, Hallatrow Road, Paulton, Bristol

The Planning Case Officer introduced the report which considered an application for outline permission for the erection of a care home (Use Class C2), access, car parking, servicing and other associated works, with consideration of layout, scale, and access.

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

1. A Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:
 - a. 1x Fire Hydrant (£1,500 financial contribution)
 - b. Targeted recruitment and training contribution (£7,040 contribution, 14 work placements, 2 apprenticeship starts 2 new jobs)
 - c. Contribution to local care network £38,684.

2. The conditions set out in the report.
3. An additional condition relating to Dementia Care Marketing Strategy (pre-occupation).
4. The receipt of confirmation of the acceptance of the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) from Natural England.

The following public representations were received:

1. Alex Veitch, agent, supporting the application.

Cllr Liz Harding was unable to attend the meeting, and a statement was read on her behalf as summarised as below:

1. She objected to the application for two main reasons.
2. Firstly, there was already sufficient capacity within the care home system, and an additional care home was not required.
3. Secondly, the extensive layout of a care home would have a significant impact on the green infrastructure of the area.
4. There would be damage to trees and Paulton had the lowest percentage of tree cover in B&NES.
5. A further point was that the medical support required by the care home would not be adequate and all three local GP surgeries were under substantial strain.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. It was not possible to give an exact number on the number of staff that would be employed as this would depend on the operator, but it was estimated to be between 70-80.
2. As there was no identified provider it was not possible to say if there would be a partnership with Bath College in relation to recruitment and training.
3. In terms of local need, there was a demand for specialist care e.g., dementia care.
4. There was no requirement for a viability assessment or consideration of alternative sites.
5. The location of the access was near the new roundabout, and this would slow traffic. There was a 30mph speed limit and a proposal for a dropped kerb crossing.
6. The nearest bus stop was just under 400m from the access point.
7. The site was outside the housing development boundary but had previously been put forward for housing and had not been ruled out for any particular reason. Tilted balance applied due to the lack of a 5-year land supply for housing.
8. The 84-bed space development equated to 44 dwellings.
9. There would be an impact on local GP surgeries and therefore the NHS had requested a contribution of £38,684 towards capital works.
10. The external appearance and landscaping would be the subject of a reserved matters application.

Cllr Gourley spoke in support of the application and the principle of having dementia care provision. She moved the officers' recommendation, and this was seconded by Cllr Simon.

Cllr Crossley supported the motion and highlighted the benefits for the community, the need for dementia care and the creation of additional jobs.

Cllr Hughes expressed disappointment that there wasn't a strategic approach to the provision of care homes but confirmed that he supported the application.

Cllr Jackson expressed concern about the site being outside of the housing development boundary.

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

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

1. A Section 106 Agreement to cover the following:
 - a. 1x Fire Hydrant (£1,500 financial contribution)
 - b. Targeted recruitment and training contribution (£7,040 contribution, 14 work placements, 2 apprenticeship starts 2 new jobs)
 - c. Contribution to local care network £38,684.
2. The conditions set out in the report.
3. An additional condition relating to Dementia Care Marketing Strategy (pre-occupation).
4. The receipt of confirmation of the acceptance of the Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) from Natural England.

7. 25/03500/FUL - 15 Milsom Street, City Centre, Bath

8. 25/03501/LBA - 15 Milsom Street, City Centre, Bath

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered 2 applications on the same site:

25/03500/FUL – a full application for repairs to roof and installation of PV panels and AOV rooflights

25/03501/LBA – a listed building consent application.

She confirmed the officers' recommendation that:

In relation to application 25/03500/FUL – permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

In relation to application 25/03501/LBA – listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

There were no public speakers in relation to the application.

In response to a Member's question, it was confirmed that it was highly unlikely that the building would not be able to take the weight of the solar panels as the majority of roofs were able to do so.

In considering application 25/03500/FUL:

Cllr Crossley moved the officers' recommendation, and this was seconded by Cllr

Simon.

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

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

In considering application 25/03501/LBA:

Cllr Crossley moved the officers' recommendation, and this was seconded by Cllr Simon.

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

RESOLVED that listed building consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

9. 25/02727/VAR – 17-18 Milsom Street, City Centre, Bath

10. 25/02725/VAR – 17-18 Milsom Street, City Centre, Bath

The Planning Officer introduced the report which considered 2 applications on the same site:

25/02727/VAR – variation of condition 4 (Plans List (Compliance)) of application 23/03107/FUL (Conversion of the upper floors to 4no. residential units.)

25/02725/VAR – Variation of conditions 2 (Shop front adaptation (Bespoke Trigger)) 3 (Replacement internal doors (Bespoke Trigger)) 4 (Fireplaces (Bespoke Trigger)) 5 (New Window Details (Bespoke Trigger)) 6 (Insulation (Bespoke Trigger)) 7 (Secondary Glazing Details (Bespoke Trigger)) 8 (Service Details (Bespoke Trigger)) and 9 (Plans List (Compliance)) of application 23/03108/LBA (Internal alterations to convert the upper floors into 4no. residential units.)

She confirmed the officers' recommendation that:

In relation to application 25/02727/VAR – permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

In relation to application 25/02725/VAR – consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

There were no public speakers on the applications.

In response to a Member's question, it was confirmed that the original use of the lantern would have been as top lighting for a room with no additional windows.

In considering application 25/02727/VAR:

Cllr Crossley moved the officers' recommendation, and this was seconded by Cllr Simon.

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

RESOLVED that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

In considering application 25/02725/VAR:

Cllr Crossley moved the officers' recommendation, and this was seconded by Cllr Simon.

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

RESOLVED that consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in the report.

11.26/00993/TPO - Holy Trinity Church, Church Street, Paulton

The Arboricultural Officer introduced the report which considered an application for tree works subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

She confirmed the officers' recommendation that consent be granted for the tree to be felled.

The following public representations were received:

1. Dr Kathryn Ford, Paulton Parish Council emphasising the importance of the tree for the local community and questioning whether there were alternatives to felling.

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed:

1. From an ecological point of view, it was not a viable option to sanitise the area surrounding the tree.
2. The danger of retaining the tree was that there could be further limb loss or the whole tree could fall over. The tree was located close to a vicarage and overhung a car park.
3. The importance of the tree was recognised and the recommendation to fell was not taken lightly.
4. As to whether there were options to save the tree, any works were likely to destroy the amenity of the tree. Copper Beech trees did not respond well to pruning.
5. Micro drilling was not recommended as it only captured one moment in time.
6. The proposed works were likely to take place after the summer.
7. Any works would be deferred if there were birds nesting in the tree.
8. It could be an option to propagate trees from beech mast.

Cllr Jackson moved the officers recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Hugues.

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

RESOLVED that consent be granted for the tree to be felled.

12.26/00605/TCA - Flat 2, Meriden, Weston Road, Lower Weston, Bath

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

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

There were no public speakers in relation to the application.

Cllr Warren moved the officers' recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Jackson.

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

RESOLVED that no objection be raised to the proposed tree works.

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

Cllr Jackson referred to the high success rate for the Council in relation to appeals and thanked officers for their work.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

The meeting ended at 3.20 pm

Chair

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services