

DRAFT MINUTES

Planning Committee

24th May 2018

Present:

Members (15)

Councillors Barnes, Chair (GB); Baker, Vice-Chair (PB); Atherstone (VA); Barrell (DB); Collins (MC); Cooke (SC); Flynn (WF); Hegenbarth (AH); Hobley (KH); McCloskey (PM); Oliver (TO); Seacome (DS); Wheeler (SW).

Substitutes: Councillor Rowena Hay (RH)
Councillor Malcolm Stennett (MS)

Officers

Tracey Crews, Director of Planning (TC)
Emma Pickernell, Senior Planning Officer (EP)
Nick Jonathan, Legal Officer (NJ)

1. Apologies

Fisher (BF); Payne (JP)

2. Declarations of interest

There were none.

3. Declarations of independent site visits

16/01515/FUL 252 Bath Road

Councillor Stennett and Councillor Hay.

4. Public Questions

There were none.

5. Minutes of last meeting

Resolved, that the minutes of the meeting held on 19th April 2018 be approved and signed as a correct record *without* corrections.

DRAFT MINUTES

6. Planning applications

Application Number:	18/00350/FUL
Location:	118 Canterbury Walk
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of new outbuilding to operate as holistic beauty treatment business (sui generis use)
View:	Yes
Officer Recommendation:	Permit
Committee Decision:	Permit with additional condition
Letters of Rep: 2	Update Report: Report update – amended condition

EP introduced the application for planning permission as above, to allow the applicant to run her business from home. Opening hours requested are 9.30am-5.30pm Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, and 2.00-8.00pm Thursday. The applicant anticipates seeing four clients a day, making this a relatively low key use. Officers feel that the dimensions and design will have an acceptable impact on the area, and County Highways do not have any issues. The recommendation is to permit, with conditions.

Public speaking

Neighbour (neutral)

Does not object to the planning application per se, but would like to raise the following concerns and request that certain conditions be applied. Firstly, it has been suggested that four vehicles could be parked at the premises at any one time, but this is not possible – there isn't enough room at the side of the properties where the front doors are situated. Canterbury Walk is quite narrow and it is frequently difficult to accommodate delivery, maintenance and refuse vehicles together with resident parking. With clients manoeuvring in and out regularly and extra parking on the road, this may cause obstruction and further nuisance to through traffic and to neighbours' access.

The second point concerns her privacy and security. There is no restriction on the number of clients attending the business between 9.30am and 5.30pm, with a late evening of 8.30pm. If Members look at the photograph attached to her letter of representation, they will note that her front door, kitchen window and rear gate face No 118 within 6-8feet. There is a 3-foot fence dividing the properties, which belongs to No. 118. There will be a loss of privacy and security with clientele continuously passing her door and window. Her security light will be going on and off late into the evening, particularly in the winter months, which may be a cause of concern for neighbours.

If the Committee is mindful to grant permission, would be grateful of a requirement for No. 118 to provide fencing to the maximum height allowed along from the garage to the end of the bungalows, which would afford some privacy and security.

Member debate

SW: is sorry not to have been on Planning View, but on the point about the security fence, will be interested to hear comments from officers as to whether this can be included as a condition to smooth the waters.

MC: was on site visit, and agrees with the officer. This proposal will not be intrusive, but his concerns are two-fold: there will always be a certain amount of traffic and parking issues generated by a business run from home. This is a narrow and busy road, near the junction with Salisbury Avenue, which is also a busy road. Has sympathy with people living adjacent to this proposed development. The main problem with attaching conditions to planning permissions is this: if the number of vehicles at any one time was to be restricted, how would this be enforced and by whom? Time and time again, the Committee puts conditions on planning permissions which

DRAFT MINUTES

aren't enforceable. Is confident that we have it in our power to require a fence to be put up and the number of vehicles limited – but if we can't enforce it, there isn't much point.

TO: would support the inclusion of a condition for a fence to the maximum height allowed.

SC: on site visit, noted that this a residential road, and introducing a business here will change the nature of the locality. The business will provide personal services, and this will mean people coming and going throughout the day. The suggestion that there will be just three or four people a day suggests long appointment time, but if these were to be shorter, there could be a lot more clients. Having visited the site, it is obvious that the front doors of the two properties look at each other across a narrow driveway in an intimate relationship. If the application is permitted, at the very least a condition for a fence should be included to restore the privacy of the neighbour. Her personal space will be infringed by the number of people visiting during the day.

PB: it is pertinent that the neighbour didn't object in principle to there being a business next door, but has real concerns about its effect on her. Businesses in homes are more and more a feature of modern society, and should be encouraged and supported; we should support local people. This isn't going to be a big business but a small-scale one and the neighbour is OK with the nature of it, so if anything can be done to improve her privacy, then we should do that.

EP, in response:

- The siting of an extended fence can be facilitated, and in anticipation of this issue coming up at Committee, the officer has had some preliminary conversations with the applicant. She is happy to raise the height of the fence;
- Regarding conditions, the opening hours and also ensuring that the premises will just be used by the applicant for the hours set out on the application form and in the supporting information – these are all enforceable. The proposed opening hours are common; it will be relatively straightforward to identify a breach, and also for enforcement officers to take action if required. These conditions will be enforceable;
- Regarding the nature of the use, the applicant has an existing business, currently situated on the Promenade; information about that business has been provided – the sort of treatments, how long each client will stay etc. It can be assumed that the relocated business will operate in a similar manner. Appointments tend to be quite long, so there will not be a big through-put of clients.

RH: the officer has said a fence can be conditioned. The neighbour has asked for 'the highest fence possible'. What height will that be?

EP, in response:

- There is an existing fence further back in the site, and it would be sensible to carry this on – it is 1.7m minimum, and high enough to stop anyone from peering over.

Vote on officer recommendation to permit, with condition for suitable fence

13 in support

1 in objection

1 abstention

PERMIT

DRAFT MINUTES

Application Number:	16/01515/FUL
Location:	252 Bath Road
Proposal:	Regeneration of site to provide replacement retail at ground floor (flexible A1/A3 use), 7no. apartments over, 1no. end terrace house and a detached dwelling to the rear (Revised scheme)
View:	Yes
Officer Recommendation:	Permit
Committee Decision:	Refuse
Letters of Rep:	151
Update Report:	i. Report update ii. Additional representations, including photo montage from speaker

EP introduced the application for planning permission to demolish all the structures on the site – the dwelling and buildings currently used for Bath Road Market, and to replace it with a ground floor retail unit, seven duplex apartments and a town house, with a separate detached dwelling at the rear. Bin and bike storage is provided at the back, and an archway to Langdon Road serves as the main access to the site. Highways Officers are happy with the proposal.

It is a prominent site, with a significant tree on the corner. The applicant has made several significant revisions to address concerns regarding design, and also the impact on the tree. The conservation officer and trees officer support the current proposal. There are concerns from the Architects Panel, regarding the size, materials and design, but officers have considered these matters and feel that the planning balance comes down in favour of the proposal. There will be a purpose-built commercial unit on the ground floor, which will provide jobs, and the site is situated in a sustainable location. The recommendation is to approve subject to conditions, including the extra conditions circulated on the blue update.

Public Speaking

Neighbour, in objection

This proposal is an overdevelopment of the site, a monolithic mass at variance with its surroundings; it does not respect Langdon Road where it is mainly sited, and is not of sufficient quality to warrant approval. The Civic Society has stated that two storeys would fit better than three, and the Architects Panel suggested that losing the town house altogether would give the development more space. The Residents Association consider it an overdevelopment of the site, which should be scaled back. None of this has happened, with hardly any size change since they were made.

The conservation officer suggests that the massing and scale would not be out of keeping with other three-storey buildings in Bath Road, but the majority of the development is in Langdon Road, where there are no three-storey buildings. Langdon Road is described in the Leckhampton Character Appraisal as attractive late Victorian and Edwardian red brick semi-detached houses with unifying characteristics, therefore dominant and distinctive within the street scene. This is not consistent with CBC's policy CP7: this design is not consistent with its surroundings, does not fit in with the existing buildings, is overly dense, out of place, and has little amenity for its residents. It led to believe that it is the best compromise that can be reached, but CBC planning didn't compromise when a coach house was refused 50 metres away behind the police station, describing it as anachronistic and incongruous, failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. Nor did CBC compromise at the other end of Langdon Road when No. 34 was built in 2010, insisting on approving all details, including sash windows, rooflights, vents, flues etc.

We shouldn't be compromising. The emerging Local Plan suggests that development will only be permitted where it complements and respects neighbouring development and the character of the locality. JCS Policy SD4 also dictates the new development should respect the character of the site and its surroundings, the enhance local distinctiveness and grain re lay-out, mass, form and all other matters.

DRAFT MINUTES

Conservation areas are not intended to prevent change but to ensure that future development is appropriate to the area. This proposal is not, and the NPPF suggests that permission should be refused for development of poor design which fails to take opportunities available to improve the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Agent, in support

This mixed-use proposal has been over three years in the making – pre-application discussions started in October 2014, with the principle of redeveloping this brownfield site, all the way through to the detailed proposal presented today. A public consultation was held in June 2016, and the applicants have responded to feedback from officers, consultees, surrounding businesses and members of the public. The design has changed radically at least three times, the footprint has been amended many times, and tree protection measures have been carried out precisely as recommended by the trees officer. Overall there has been a 20% reduction in residential floor space compared with the original submission, a clear reduction in scale and massing, and the height in Langdon Road has also been reduced at a point much earlier in the road, to complement the height of No. 2.

This has all been achieved in the context of the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning applications should optimise the potential of a site to accommodate development. Currently the site is made up of a dilapidated house in multiple occupation, hardstanding, and low-rise greenhouses which are not fit for purpose and nearing the end of their life. The proposal will result in a large investment at this end of Bath Road, both in a financial sense and in enhancing the conservation area – the quality of the materials can be controlled through the recommended conditions. The applicants are very much aware that many residents have concerns in relation to car parking, but as the committee report states, it is not the role of an individual planning application to solve a problem that already exists.

The existing site has unrestricted retail use and the current house – with six tenants – has no on-site parking at all, whereas the application will provide on-site parking at a level supported by transport experts at Gloucestershire Highways. There are no highways objections to the proposal, given the sustainable nature of the location. Regarding the height of the coach house to the rear of the site, it will be much lower than the existing building at 252A Bath Road, and the levels conditions will ensure that it is set at an appropriate height.

It has taken a long time to get to this point, but there have been good reasons for this, and the significant improvements in the proposed scheme are clear to see. Trusts that the quality of the submission, together with the work carried out by officers to achieve an application worthy of support, will allow Members to endorse the recommendation to permit.

Councillor Sudbury, in objection

Has no in-principle objection to the redevelopment of the Bath Road Market site; the loss of it and the pop-up shops will be a huge concern to the small businesses which operate there and their customers, but the current buildings could and should be improved upon. As a prominent site in the conservation area, it requires very special consideration, and it is therefore disappointing that there have been so little improvements to the original plan over the last two years. An active local residents association was established 18 months ago, doing marvellous work to improve and enhance the area, but the developers have not engaged with them at all to address the concerns of the local community.

Her key concern is that trying to fit nine dwellings into this small site will always be an over-development of the site. The consequences of this are very significant – the proposed design will harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and cause unacceptable loss of amenity to neighbours in Langdon Road and Francis Street. The design will not complement or respect the character of the area, particularly the south-facing elevation to Langdon Road; could not disagree more with the planning officer's comments on this aspect of the plans. Langdon Road architecture is uniform and distinctive: domestic in style; pretty, two-storey semi-detached houses with front gardens, sash windows and pitched roofs. This is seen in all the roads in the Naunton

DRAFT MINUTES

Park area – it is the character of the area, and while Bath Road itself may be more diverse, the residential side roads have a very distinctive character and this development faces onto Langdon Road – its character must be responded to in a more harmonious way than is proposed.

The design, scale, mass, fenestration of what is proposed is a bleak, utilitarian caricature of the pretty dwellings that make this area so attractive. The fenestration isn't in keeping with the proportions of the Edwardian sash windows in the area. There is not enough 'space' in the southern elevation. The site entrance with building over the top is too dominating. The redevelopment of the garage site to the Natural Grocery Store at the other end of Bath Road incorporated windows in keeping with Clare Street and a south-facing elevation dropping to a single storey, creating a clear space and not dominating the street scene.

Has serious concerns about the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the existing residents, as well as occupiers of the new building, from potential noise and odours if the flexible space is used for restaurant purposes. Can permitted development rights be withdrawn so that any proposed usage can come back to Committee for detailed determination? This point is also important in terms of deliveries to the end user – parking is an absolute nightmare in the area, and people park in the loading bay at the front. A1 use could potentially be a small supermarket with numerous deliveries each day. This location could not sustain these types of the delivery without creating a danger to other road users.

With respect to highways officers who raised no objection, they do not seem to understand how difficult parking is for residents of the streets off the east side of Bath Road and Leckhampton Road. There is no permit parking on this side of the road, unlike the west side. Commuters, shoppers and Bath Road workers compete with residents for scarce parking spaces; conducted a parking survey in the area in 2016, in which 60% of residents felt there was a problem.

The coach house is built up to the boundary of 1-5 Francis Street; officers say there will be no unacceptable loss of light but acknowledge that the building will have an overbearing impact on those properties – a term used to describe the dominating effect of the development on neighbouring property in terms of scale and massing. So the officer is saying that the coach house *will* harm the amenity enjoyed by the residents of 1-5 Francis Street because of its scale, massing, and generally dominating effect.

Local Plan policy CP4 and JCS SD14 seek to ensure that new developments don't have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity, so how can permitting a development that includes an aspect overbearing on five properties be considered in any way acceptable?

Urges Members to refuse the application on the grounds of CP4, and also CP7, for the harm it will do to the conservation area.

Member Debate

MS: agrees with Councillor Sudbury. This is over-development of the site and a missed opportunity at the gateway to Bath Road, and for town, for people approaching from that direction – it will be the first thing they see, and needs to be a quality building with green space around it. Agrees that policies CP4 and CP7 are grounds for refusal, which demand compatible use with each other and with adjacent land users, and in keeping with the conservation area. Also considers JCS Policy SD8 to be appropriate – this proposal doesn't meet its requirements, which demand a positive contribution to the local character of the area. If it was a free-standing building in a different location it might be OK, but in this location, in a conservation area, it is not right. It also contravenes the emerging Local Plan policy D(6), which requires proposals to complement and respect neighbouring developments. CBC could be said to be at fault here for not having a development brief for this area – it would have been great to have some scheme set out so we could support it straight away. Would like to know how much consultation there was with local residents. Suspects it was very little. Will have difficulty in supporting this scheme.

DRAFT MINUTES

GB: is MS proposing refusal?

MS: is happy to do to so.

PB: if an architect spent three years designing this scheme, they wouldn't be his architect for much longer. Is staggered that this scheme has been presented to Members. This is a hugely prominent site, completely at odds with the nature of the area. Langdon Road is very special, and has planning protection because it is so precious – why are we even considering this lump on the end of it, on design grounds if nothing else? It is a monolithic over-development, a carbuncle which will stick out like a sore thumb. Supports MS in his move to refuse. The applicants could do far better; both the Architects Panel and the Civic Society have said as much, and consider it to be over development. The concept of a mixed residential and retail scheme is good, but hates the arches – it would be much better to have open access and three or four houses with gardens. This proposal is boring and ugly, and could be so much better.

SW: is going to echo some of the comments already made. Why is this a conservation area? What makes it special? You only have to look at the drawings or look at the area to see what is special about it. Is not suggesting that any proposal should be a rubber stamp of all the other streets, but unfortunately this is a rubber stamp of the abysmal buildings that went up in the 1970s, and everyone seems to agree that those were horrible buildings. This opinion has nothing to do with the other buildings on the street. Even if it wasn't in a conservation area, would struggle to support it; it just doesn't belong there. Is with MS here; can't support the development of the site until something that fits in is put forward.

DS: his immediate reaction looking at the Langdon Road elevation was that the fenestration of the proposal is vertical whereas Langdon Road windows are horizontal – so the proposal is against the spirit of Langdon Road from the start. Parking is problematic already in this area. Realises that the development is constrained by the tree on the corner, and it looks like no windows have been included on that aspect of the building for that reason; in Imperial Square there were trees in front of the Broad Walk, which in no time residents were suggesting should be trimmed back or cut down – it be the same here.

GB: considers the applicant has missed an opportunity on a major point coming into town. The building looks like a 1960s cinema, and doesn't fit into the street scene. Is concerned that this proposal is an over-development.

SC: considers this a very interesting and potentially exciting development, with additional housing and commercial space imaginatively combined. As other Members have said, this corner is very prominent and noticeable, and anything here will become a local landmark and could have a big impact. It will be a very busy site. Notes that there is a lot packed into the edges of the site, and the 3D pictures look as if the Bath Road side is flush with the second floor of the adjoining building – in fact it would protrude further. Is mainly worried about the Langdon Road side; the dominant façade of the proposal is on that pretty, well-preserved street, and we are now presented with a new development, the detailing of which is completely different – scaled up, untidy and haphazard. Whatever goes on this site will be a dominant landmark for many years, and it should improve the street scheme. Cannot comment on car parking, bike and bin stores are good, but would like to see something much better overall. This is over- development ; likes the concept on this important site but the detailing lets it down.

DB: is very much a newbie, but has a few things to add. The coach house backs on to Francis Street – officers say the daylight test is acceptable, but the proposed building will be very near to back gardens, and its height will be overbearing. The brick frontage of the Langdon Road aspect – doesn't accord with pretty brick houses, and agrees with DS's comments that the vertical windows are not good. Can see, however, that this proposal has a lot in its favour – the residential/commercial mix, bike storage etc.

DRAFT MINUTES

MC: this is difficult, and has to add an element of reason to the debate. This is an ugly, dilapidated, brownfield site, which will be developed at some point. Preferred Robert Young but obviously that is now gone. The proposed solution combines retail and commercial; we need more houses, and there is a shortage of affordable housing in Cheltenham – thought this has to be the right housing, in the right place, and of the right design. Parking here is already a problem, and the developer can't sort this out or be blamed in that respect – we have no minimum parking requirement standard. The proposal includes one parking space per dwelling, and Gloucestershire Highways consider this to be acceptable. Has sympathy with local residents, but something is going to happen on this site. KS mentioned odours if the ground floor is used for A3, but there are several restaurants along Bath Road, and the aroma can be quite nice. Other Members have spoken, and it's clear a lot will oppose the application, but will keep open mind for now. We have to be realistic about this ugly brownfield site; there will be something there sometime, and hopes this will sooner rather than later.

AH: a lot of his points have already been raised. Regarding the design and parking issues, we have to bear in mind that we are not only considering houses but also homes – where people are going to live.

PM: A number of assertions have been made, and is still undecided about which way to vote. If the proposal is refused, the applicant will get pegs in ground on the off-chance. At the start of this operation, there was an open session at the Norwood Arms, where the developer engaged with the local community; it was well attended. We are now several versions on from the original proposal. On site visit, stood in a delightful garden in Francis Street, at the back of where the coach house will be. 16ft poles had been erected to the height of the proposed building; the shadow cast at 2.00pm was no more than 5ft and didn't reach the house, so cannot see that the coach house will make much difference to the garden. This is a sustainable site, on a bus route, and 10 cycle spaces are provided for the flats – it is ideal for a greener way of living, and not necessarily the case that each flat will have two vehicles as well. Car parking provision is not unreasonable, based on local data. Has looked at 34 Langdon Road, at the other end of the road – a delightful extension which mirrors the Edwardian houses – but developers don't have to match their proposals, clone-like, to Bath Road – we need some gradation. Can see that parking is a problem here, but that is not for a planning application to solve. Regarding the potential A1 or A3 use for the ground floor, Bath Road doesn't need more restaurants, and would like to see this restricted to A1, for which business activity would be finished by 6.00, leaving car parking on the surrounding streets for residents; there are many uses which would be appropriate to this area. The NPPF promotes a presumption in favour of development, and although this could be better, it is a good application in face of all the different considerations.

KH: there are some positives in this proposal: it is good to have more housing in Cheltenham, especially in this area, which is a desirable place to live. It is to be welcomed, as is the redevelopment of a brownfield site. It can sometimes be tedious as a councillor to be barracked by people objecting to building anything anywhere. Last year there were many objections to proposals to build on fields; if people are objecting here too, where can new building go? Feels this is a general point worth making.

Regarding the level of parking provision for the site, is pleased that the developer has made some provision, but doesn't believe it will be adequate. The size and design of the units are not for families with one car; more likely for one or two sharers, which will mean multiple vehicles, thus increasing parking issues in the area. Agrees with residents here. AH reminded Members that these will be homes, not just houses, and questions therefore whether what is proposed will be the nicest of places to live.

Looking at the positives, there is concern that the third storey is incongruous with the surrounding streets – takes the point, but the street scene of retail units along Bath Road is different. This is a prominent site; the buildings here vary in height. GB compared the proposal to a 1960s cinema – civic societies across the kingdom hold these in great affection; it's a shame that it isn't an actual 1960s cinema. **Agrees that the style of the arch isn't fitting, but we cannot live in the past;** there

DRAFT MINUTES

are some excellent examples of modern architecture, and although it isn't the best in this case, neither would pastiche be – it is rarely successful on sites such as this. Agrees that this is a prominent site, and as proposed, people would be asking 'how did planners let that pass?'

To conclude, is challenged to say how this proposal could be improved, bearing in mind the considerations needed to make the site viable.

EP, in response:

- A lot of members have talked about the design; there has been a lot of to-ing and fro-ing to come to something appropriate - materials, design, massing – and officers feel a good balance has now been struck between providing a good level of accommodation and protecting the area around the site;
- Officers feel the height is appropriate to Bath Road and to Langdon Road; the massing is different to Langdon Road, but the prevailing ridge height is the same; and the materials combine the render of Bath Road and the brick of Langdon Road;
- Coming down to the detailing, and subjective considerations of what or may not be acceptable, the NPPF steers local authorities away from this – it has to be based in objective analysis;
- Taking into account the SPD criteria of assessing infill scenes, the eaves height, ridge height, pattern of openings – these are different, but the scheme ticks all the right boxes;
- Amenity is only a real issue for the coach house and the properties in Francis Street, and an additional cross-section has been provided to show the relationship between them. The conclusion is that there will not be unacceptable impact on the light, and privacy will be secured by obscure glazing to the rear. As to whether the coach house will be overbearing – it will have a impact, and the outlook from the gardens on Francis Street will change, but officers do not feel that it will be an unacceptable level of harm;
- Regarding parking, as members have said, this isn't an issue for the planning applicant to solve – it is an existing issue. Bath Road Market and the HMO provide no parking; the proposal will provide nine spaces, is situated on sustainable bus routes, within walking distance of town – all of which Highways officers consider make it acceptable. The number of car parking spaces provided is based on average car ownership in the area, and ticks the right boxes;
- Regarding the safety of the archway, this is set in from the edge of the pavement, to ensure pedestrians will be visible to drivers going in and out;
- To PM's comments about usage of the ground floor unit, it would not be appropriate to limit this to A1 use. The application is for A1/A3 use, and we cannot unilaterally take this out of the proposal; we must consider what has been asked for;
- These are the main issues but if it is looking like Members want to refuse the scheme, can give advice on what is likely to swing it at Appeal – will wait for more debate before doing this.

GB: Members have had a good debate, and raised a lot of issues; there is no need to extend the debate too much if all the issues have been covered, and Members can vote on the officer recommendation.

MS: the applicant was asked for a quality statement building as the entrance to the Bath Road area. If it was free-standing, it would look better, but here it is over-development and doesn't complement the existing grain of the area. Isn't saying it's bad design, just that it isn't right in this location.

Vote on officer recommendation to permit

1 in support

12 in objection

2 abstentions

NOT CARRIED

GB: Members now need to talk about refusal reasons and consider how these might stand up at appeal.

DRAFT MINUTES

EP, in response:

- In terms of design, it boils down to scale, mass, detailing of th building, and how it responds to the character of the conservation area. Appropriate policies to consider here are Local Plan CP7and CP4; JCS SD4 and SD8; the SPD on garden infill, and the NPPF;
- If Members want to pursue loss of amenity to Francis Street as a refusal reason, it boils down to the overbearing impact only – no other reason – and the policies here would be CP4 of the Local Plan, JCS SD14, and the NPPF.

MS: what about the emerging local plan policy?

EP, in response:

- The emerging local plan is at a very early stage.

MS: it's still worth including it as a refusal reason. The Inspector can just ignore it if he/she doesn't agree.

EP, in response:

- SD8 is definitely the appropriate policy in the emerging Local Plan. Is doubtful about how much weight it carries at this stage, but it can be included as a refusal reason if Members want.

TO: can concern about the A1/A3 usage be added? That Members would prefer it to be A1?

EP, in response:

- Would need to hear more about the issue here – is it the noise or smells that Members are concerned about? There is no supporting information from consultees.

TO: it is more about the right mix of businesses in Bath Road.

EP, in response:

- The report addresses this. The applicant will seek a use that doesn't harm the vitality of Bath Road as a centre. This would be a weak ground for refusal.

PM: the key point is that A3 use would more likely mean evening opening. If it is retail, it will shut at 6.00pm, and not exacerbate the parking issue in the surrounding streets.

GB: can EP sum up the refusal reasons put forward, based on loss of amenity and design.

EP, in response:

- For the scale, mass, and detail of the design, appropriate refusal reasons are Local Plan Policies CP3 and CP7; JCS policies SD4 and SD8; the SPD on garden infill; and the NPPF. Also the emerging local plan policy;
- For the overbearing effect on Francis Street, the appropriate refusal reasons are: Local Plan Policy CP4; JCS Policy SD14; and the NPPF.

Vote on MS's move to refuse on the above grounds

13 in support

1 in objection

1 abstention

REFUSE