'Hold Date'

Bristol City Council Development Management

Delegated Report and Decision

Application No: 23/00867/F Registered: 13 March 2023

Type of Application: Full Planning

Case Officer: Expiry Date: 8 May 2023

Site Address: Description of Development:

87 Queenshill Road Pr

Bristol BS4 2XQ Proposal of 2 new dwellings to land adjacent to and rear of 87 Queenshill Road to include 1 2 Bed, 3 Persons, end of terrace dwelling and 1 4 Bed, 6 Persons dwelling to the rear

with associated amenity and parking space.

Ward: Knowle

Site Visit Date: Date Photos Taken:

Consultation Expiry Dates:

Advert and/or Site Notice:

Neighbour: 26 Apr 2023

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is located on Queenshill Road, adjacent to the junction with Crossways Road, to the south of Knowle Park Primary School. The surrounding area is a primarily residential area, apart from the primary school and Knowle Community Centre. The site is currently occupied by one semidetached dwelling that benefits from a front and rear garden, and a garage and driveway access in the rear garden, off Crossways Road. The site backs onto Paignton Square, a development of approximately 35 residential dwellings approved in 2015.

The site is not located within a conservation area.

RELEVANT HISTORY

There is no relevant site history.

APPLICATION

Planning permission is sought for the construction of 2 new dwellings to land adjacent to and rear of 87 Queenshill Road to include 1No. 2-Bed, 3-Person, end of terrace dwelling and 1No. 4-Bed, 6-Person dwelling to the rear with associated amenity and parking space.

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

20 neighbours were consulted via individual letters regarding the proposed development. 4 objections were received, summarised below:

- o Concerns regarding access into the park, and potential disturbance of wildlife
- o Impact on neighbouring amenity with regards to overbearing, loss of light, overlooking and loss of privacy.
- o Obstruction of access to park as a result of increased cars.
- o Increase of noise

OTHER COMMENTS

The Council's Transport Development Management Team commented the following:

Principle:

This application seeks approval for the erection of two dwellings on the land adjacent to and rear of 87 Queenshill Road, in addition to associated cycle storage, waste storage and 5 vehicle parking spaces.

Highway Network:

The site is located on Queenshill Road, which is an adopted carriageway subject to a speed limit of 20 mph. The nearest bus stops are within a distance of 270m from the site, hosting the 73 citylines bus service, which arrives within 35-minute intervals and travels to several areas within the city, including the city centre.

Access:

Contrary to the Highways Act (1980), the door belonging to No. 87b opens outwards onto the adopted footway on Crossways Road. Amended plans are required showing the door to open onto the applicant's private land only.

TDM note the access to the cycle stores to be inadequate, as the access does not comply with the requirement for access (including doorways) to cycle stores to maintain a minimum width of 1.2m at all times. As such, the applicant is required to submit amended plans showing access to each dwelling's cycle store to maintain a minimum width of 1.2m.

Car Parking:

Contrary to the Local Plan standards, there is an overprovision of parking for No. 87b (plot 2). The path beside the parking spaces is also inadequate as it measures less than the required width of 1.2m, as needed for cyclists and their bicycle to access the cycle store with no damage or difficulty when manoeuvring the bicycle. As such, the applicant is required to remove one of No. 87b's parking spaces from the plans, to ensure adequate access to the cycle store can be obtained.

The two parking spaces proposed for No. 87 (the existing dwelling) are both non-compliant with the Local Plan, which requires parking spaces to measure no less than 2.4m by 4.8m. A 500mm buffer space between the parking space and wall has also not been provided, as required to prevent the overhanging of a vehicle onto the footway. The applicant is required to remove both parking spaces from the amended plans, as TDM are not confident that the retention of these parking spaces would not result in the obstruction of the highway and an acceptable impact on highway safety.

As for No. 87a (plot 1) the applicant has proposed one parking space. For the motorist to enter/exit the proposed parking space an excessive amount of manoeuvring over the footway would be required, and TDM are not confident that this would not result in the motorist failing to see any pedestrians or cyclists on the footway. The footway is also used by children travelling to a nearby primary school, meaning there is a risk that the motorist would fail to see a child when reversing into the parking space. The excessive manoeuvring over the footway would also likely result in damage to the footway, contrary to Policy DM23. The applicant is required to remove both parking spaces from the plans.

As 4 of the parking spaces are inadequate, the development would mainly depend on on-street parking spaces. Based on 2011 census car ownership statistics, TDM estimates that the total parking requirement of all three dwellings would be 5 additional cars parked on the highway network. Due to the potential impact the development could have on the highway network, the applicant is required to submit a parking survey which should demonstrate on-street parking capacity for 4 vehicles. The applicant should refer to the Council's Parking Survey guidance when conducting the parking survey.

Visibility:

In regard to the proposed parking space for No. 87b (plot 2), any objects within the pedestrian visibility splay (including walls and fences) must be no higher than 600mm. This would apply to the wall separating No. 87b's parking space from No. 87's access path, thus the applicant is required to label the plans to reflect compliance with this requirement.

Cycle Parking:

The applicant has proposed a cycle store within the garden of all three dwellings, noting that up to 4 bicycles can be stored within each cycle store and the cycle store will be similar to those from 'code store'. The number of proposed cycle spaces is adequate, although sufficient detail has not been provided on the design and layout of the proposed cycle stores. The applicant must therefore provide revised floor plans and elevations showing the layout, design and capacity of weatherproofed, enclosed and secure cycle parking for each dwelling, in addition to detail on the proposed cycle stand (preferably the Sheffield stand).

Waste:

Bin stores and waste containers have been provided in the rear gardens of all three dwellings, although the floor plans and elevations do not demonstrate the amount and size of each type of waste container, as required by the Council's Waste Guidance. As such, the applicant is required to provide amended floor plans and elevations showing ventilated, screened and secure bin stores with capacity to store the following containers for each dwelling: 180L refuse bin, 55L green recycling box, 44L black recycling box, 23L brown food waste bin and 90L blue cardboard sack.

Recommendation:

TDM is unable to make a recommendation without the requested information on cycle storage, waste storage, access, visibility and parking. The applicant must therefore provide the following:

Amended plans showing 1.2m-wide access (including doors) to each dwelling's cycle store. Amended plans showing the removal of No. 87 and 87a's parking spaces, in addition to one of 87b's parking spaces.

Submission of a parking survey, to demonstrate on-street parking capacity for 4 vehicles. Amended plans with annotation to confirm the wall separating No. 87b's parking space from No.

87's access path will be no higher than 600mm.

Revised floor plans and elevations showing the layout, design and capacity of weatherproofed, enclosed and secure cycle parking for each dwelling, including detail on the proposed cycle stand type.

Amended floor plans and elevations showing ventilated, screened and secure bin stores with capacity to store the required amount and size of each type of waste container.

TDM will only be able to make a recommendation once the applicant has provided the requested information.

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework – December 2023

Bristol Local Plan comprising Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011), Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014) and (as appropriate) the Bristol Central Area Plan (Adopted March 2015) and (as appropriate) the Old Market Quarter Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015 and the Hengrove and Whitchurch Park Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019.

In determining this application, the Local Planning Authority has had regard to all relevant policies of the Bristol Local Plan and relevant guidance.

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework - December 2023

Bristol Local Plan comprising Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011), Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014) and (as appropriate) the Bristol Central Area Plan (Adopted March 2015) and (as appropriate) the Old Market Quarter Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015 and the Hengrove and Whitchurch Park Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019.

In determining this application, the Local Planning Authority has had regard to all relevant policies of the Bristol Local Plan and relevant guidance.

ASSESSMENT

A) WOULD THE PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT BE ACCEPTABLE?

The site is currently occupied by one semidetached dwelling set within a spacious plot. Planning permission is sought for the construction of two dwellings, 1No. 2-bed, 3 person dwelling attached to the existing dwelling, and 1No. 4-bed, 6-person dwelling in the rear garden. The site is note allocated for any specific future use, but give the local context, and subject to other assessments, the principle of residential (albeit more intensive) use of the site is considered acceptable.

The development of private gardens is however assessed against Policy DM21 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies 2014, which states that development will not be permitted unless:

- (i) the proposal would represent a more efficient use of land where higher densities are more appropriate; or
- (ii) the development will result is a significant improvement to the urban design of the area; or (iii) the proposal is an extension to an existing dwelling.

The policy also states that in all cases any development of garden land should not result in harm to

the character and appearance of the area.

Policy states that higher densities of development are appropriate in and around the city centre, in or close to other centres and along or close to main public transport routes. The proposed site in this instance is located within approximately 450m of the Wells Road/Broadwalk Town Centre and is within walking distance to good public transport links to the city centre. In this case, it is subsequently considered that the proposal would result in the more efficient use of land in an area where higher densities are appropriate.

The loss of garden space and creation of new dwelling is therefore considered acceptable in regard to criterion i) of Policy DM21 in principle in this instance. However the policy also requires that in all cases any development of garden land should not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As set out in Key Issue C below the proposal would not meet the requirement of this policy and as such fails to meet the requirements of DM21.

B) MIX AND BALANCE

The NPPF (2023) reflects the need to significantly boost the supply of housing and to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Policy BSC18 of the adopted Core Strategy reflects this guidance and states that "all new residential development should maintain, provide or contribute to a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes to help support the creation of mixed, balanced and inclusive communities", with reference to the evidence provided by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, also notes that `developments should contribute to a mix of housing types and avoid excessive concentrations of one particular type'. The policy wording states that development `should aim to' contribute to the diversity of housing in the local area and help to redress any housing imbalance that exists.

Bristol comprises a diverse range of residential neighbourhoods with significant variations in housing type, tenure, size, character and quality. A wide range of factors influence the housing needs and demands of neighbourhoods. Such factors include demographic trends, housing supply, economic conditions and market operation. The inter-relationship between these and other factors is often complex and dynamic. In the circumstances, housing requirements will differ greatly across the city and will be subject to change over time. With this in mind an overly prescriptive approach to housing mix would not be appropriate. However, it has been possible to identify broad housing issues that are applicable to many neighbourhoods.

Analysis of the city's general housing needs and demands has identified a number of indicative requirements for each of 6 city zones. The zones reflect sub-market areas used in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The intention is to provide a strategic steer for all sizes of residential scheme within each zone. A local area-based assessment is required to assess the development's contribution to housing mix as a smaller scale will not provide a proper understanding of the mix of that area; a larger scale may conceal localised housing imbalances. As a guide the neighbourhood is defined as an area equivalent to the size of a Census Lower Level Super Output Area (average of 1,500 residents).

The application site is located within the Knowle Park LSOA within the Knowle Ward. An up-to-date picture of the proportion of different residential accommodation types in the LSOA can be obtained by assessing the 2021 Census data. The Westbury Village (LSOA) has a proportion of houses to flats at 86.7% houses and 13.3% flats. Of these dwellings 6.8% are one-bedroom, 9.8% are two-bedroom and 71% are three-bedroom. Across Bristol, 64.7% of units are houses and 35.2% are flats. Across Bristol 16.2% of units are one-bedroom, 28.4% are two-bedroom and 38.8% are three-bedroom.

It can subsequently be concluded that the area around the application site is dominated by 3-bed houses. Whilst this proposal would not address this imbalance, the introduction of new houses in this instance is considered acceptable as there is a city-wide need for all types of accommodation in general including a specific need for family accommodation.

C) WOULD THE PROPOSAL BE ACCEPTABLE IN DESIGN TERMS AND WOULD IT HARM THE CHARACTER OR APPERANCE OF THE SURROUNDING AREA

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF (2023) states that planning decision should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Policy BCS21 of the Bristol Core Strategy (2011) requires new development in Bristol to deliver high quality urban design and set our criteria to measure development against including the need for development to contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing ocal distinctiveness.

Policy DM26 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies expands upon BCS21 by outlining the criteria against which a development's response to local character and distinctiveness will be assessed. This policy states that the design of development proposals will be expected to contribute towards local character and distinctiveness by responding appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings, building lines and setbacks from the street, skylines and roofscapes. Development should also reflect locally characteristic architectural styles, rhythms, patterns, features and themes taking account of their scale and proportion. Development will not be permitted where it would be harmful to local character and distinctiveness or where it would fail to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. Infill development will be expected to have regard to the prevailing character and quality of the surrounding townscape. The higher the quality of the building group and the more unified the character of the townscape, the greater the need to reproduce the existing pattern, form and design of existing development. Infill developments on return frontages should be compatible with the open character of corner sites and be subservient in height, scale and massing to the primary frontage building. Policy DM26 also states that development should retain existing buildings and structures that contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness.

Policy DM27 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies expresses that the layout, form, pattern and arrangement of streets, buildings and landscapes should contribute towards to creation of quality urban space and that the height, scale and massing of development should be appropriate to the immediate context, site constraints, character of adjoining streets and spaces and setting. DM27 further states that the layout and form of development, including the size, shape, form and configuration of blocks and plots, will be expected to establish a coherent and consistent building line and setback that relate to the street alignment.

Policy DM29 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies states that new buildings should be designed to a high standard of quality, responding appropriately to their importance and reflecting their function and role in relation to the public realm. This policy further states that proposals for new buildings will be expected to be clearly organised in terms of their form and internal layout and circulation to reflect the hierarchy of function they will accommodate, the uses they will serve and the context they will address.

In addition to the above, Policy DM21 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies states that in all cases, development of garden land should not result in harm to the character and appearance of an area. Development involving gardens should ensure that the

character of the street is not harmed and that appropriate boundary treatments and planting are retained.

The site is currently occupied by 1No. semidetached, two-storey dwelling, set within a garden. Planning permission is sought for the construction of two new dwellings to land adjacent to and rear of the host property, to include 1no. 2-Bed, 3-Person, end of terrace dwelling and 1no. 4-Bed, 6-Person dwelling to the rear with associated amenity and parking space.

The character of this section of Queenshill Road is defined by relatively low density, uniform, two storey semi-detached dwellings, set back from the road edge. Each junction is characterised by spacious open corner plots. To the rear of the site lies the Paignton Square development, approved in 2015, characterised by uniform semi-detached style dwellings.

The open and spacious corner plots are considered positive features within the streetscene which contribute positively to local character and distinctiveness, and are evident throughout the wider area as well. As noted above, Policy DM21 requires that development of garden land should not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed dwelling 87A, which would be attached to the host property, would occupy the current side garden of 87 Queenshill Road, and would be built close to the boundary with the two roads at this junction. By filling this plot, the development would introduce a prominent addition and visual clutter to the streetscene, detracting from the open character of the corner plot. This would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area, and is not considered acceptable.

Another defining characteristic of the immediate street is the uniformity of semidetached pairs, a feature that contributes to the cohesive streetscape. It is considered that the proposed 87A (attached to the host dwelling) would unbalance the existing semidetached pair, and encroach upon the established building line along Crossways Road, visually disrupting the layout and form of the streetscene. By not respecting the established form, pattern and arrangement of the street and surrounding buildings, the development would not demonstrate a positive addition to the steetscene and area and this would be contrary to Policy DM27.

Queenshill Road exhibits semidetached pairs of houses, set within in relatively generous garden plots - some dwellings along the street benefit from subservient, single storey outbuildings within their gardens and a sense of openness is retained within each individual plot, and therefore the overall backland character of the area does not appear cluttered. It is considered that two additional dwellings on this site would be inappropriate and would result in overdevelopment of the site. The combined scale, bulk and mass of the two proposed dwellings would appear at odds with the prevailing patterns of development in the area and would result in a cramped and unsympathetic form of development. The proposed dwelling 87B, set in the in the rear garden of the host dwelling, would not appear inkeeping by virtue of its bulk and built form, and would not be visually subservient which is important in the context of backland development. It is noted that Policy DM21 states that development of private gardens would be acceptable where the proposals would represent a more efficient use of land in area that higher densities are more appropriate, however, the proposed level of built form proposed by this application is not considered acceptable in this case, given the resulting overdevelopment of the site and the detrimental impact on the character of the area and host dwelling.

For the reasons set out above, the application is considered unacceptable and is recommended for refusal.

D) DOES THE PROPOSAL PROVIDE A SATISFACTORY LEVEL OF RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION?

The NPPF (2023) states that planning decision should ensure developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. It also states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development.

The adopted Bristol Core Strategy Policy BCS18 (2011) makes specific reference to residential developments providing sufficient space for everyday activities and space which should be flexible and adaptable, by meeting appropriate space standards. The Core Strategy states that building to suitable space standards will ensure new homes provide sufficient space for everyday activities.

Under the 2015 Housing Standards Review a new nationally described space standard was introduced and in March 2015 a written ministerial statement to parliament confirmed that from 1 October 2015 existing Local Plan policies relating to internal space should be interpreted by reference to the nearest equivalent new national technical standard.

Policy DM29 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) also states that new development should be dual aspect where possible, particularly where one of the aspects is north-facing. This policy, as well as DM27, further states that new buildings will be expected to ensure that existing and proposed development achieves appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight. Policy DM14 in the same document requires developments to deliver a healthy living environment.

In accordance with Core Strategy Policy BCS18 and national space standards, a 2-bed, 3-person, 2-storey dwelling should have an internal floor space of at least 70sqm and; a 4-bed, 6-person, 2-storey dwelling should have an internal floorspace of at least 106sqm. Both dwellings meet the minimum space standards and consequently the application will provide sufficient space to meet everyday activities and to enable an adaptable and flexible environment. The application is considered acceptable on these grounds.

In relation to outlook and light levels, the properties contain an acceptable amount and size of windows to both front, rear and side elevations, at all floors. Each property will also have an adequate amount of external amenity space.

There are no objections to the application on the grounds of noise and disturbance for future occupants. Full detail of the proposed air source heat pumps (including exact location, noise levels, and mitigation measures if necessary) would be secured via condition if an approval was forthcoming.

E) WOULD THE PROPOSAL UNACCEPTABLY AFFECT THE RESIDENTIAL AMENITY OF NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES?

The NPPF (2023) states that planning decision should ensure developments create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. It also states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the

development. Development should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and the quality of life and limit the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation.

Policy BCS21 in the Bristol Core Strategy (2011) advocates that new development should deliver high quality urban design that safeguards the amenity of existing development. Policy DM30 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) states that extensions and alterations to buildings will be expected to safeguard the amenity of the host premises and neighbouring occupiers and care should also be taken to ensure that any extension or alteration does not result in a harmful loss of sunlight or daylight through overshadowing of its neighbours.

Furthermore, new developments should not be overbearing or result in unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy. Policy DM27 in the same document further states that new buildings will be expected to ensure that existing and proposed development achieves appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight.

There is substantial concern in relation to the siting, scale and overall design of the development on surrounding residents. In particular, there is concern that the siting and scale of the proposed dwelling in the rear garden of the host dwelling (proposed 87B) would detrimentally impact on the quality of outlook and create a sense of overbearing, for the neighbouring No. 85 Queenshill Road, as well as for the host property at No.87 Queenshill Road. There is concern that the first-floor windows of the two-storey development in the rear garden would introduce a sense of perceived overlooking in to the garden of 85 Queenshill Road. The substantial increase in massing along much of the boundary with the private garden of one of the flats at Paignton Square, from the two-storey scale of proposed 87B would have a significant enclosing effect and reduce overall sunlight into the space, thus proving detrimental to the quality of the amenity space.

Overall, it is concluded that the proposal as a result of its siting, scale and inadequate separation distances from surrounding development would harmfully overbear neighbouring residents including their external amenity areas, as well as detrimentally impact on their quality of outlook. Furthermore as a result of the proposed development in the rear garden, the amenity of neighbours would be impacted by way of a loss of privacy.

F) HIGHWAY SAFETY, TRANSPORT AND MOVEMENT ISSUES

Policy BCS10 in the Bristol Core Strategy (2011) states that developments should be designed and located to ensure the provision of safe streets and reduce as far as possible the negative impacts of vehicles such as excessive volumes, fumes and noise. Proposals should create places and streets where traffic and other activities are integrated and where buildings, spaces and the needs of people shape the area.

Policy DM23 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) in addition states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions. Examples of unacceptable traffic conditions referred to in the policy include the introduction of traffic of excessive volume, size or weight on to unsuitable highways/or in to residential or other environmentally sensitive areas. This could result in high levels of transport noise and disturbance, a decrease in air quality and unsafe conditions both on the highway and for pedestrians. This policy further states that development proposals will be expected to provide an appropriate level of safe, secure, accessible and usable parking provision (including cycle parking) and that proposals for parking should make effective and efficient use of land and be integral to the design of the development. The approach to the provision of parking aims to promote sustainable transport methods, such as walking, cycling and public transport, as encouraged by Core Strategy Policy BCS10.

Policy BCS15 in the Bristol Core Strategy states that all new development will be required to provide satisfactory arrangements for the storage of refuse and recyclable materials as an integral part of its design. Policy DM32 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies states all new developments will be expected to provided recycling facilities and refuse bins of sufficient capacity to serve the proposed development. This policy further states that the location and design of recycling and refuse provision should be integral to the design of the proposed development. In assessing recycling and refuse provision, regard will be had to the level and type of provision, having regard to the above requirements and relevant space standards; and the location of the provision, having regard to the need to provide and maintain safe and convenient access for occupants, while also providing satisfactory access for collection vehicles and operatives. Policy DM23 also states that the provision in new development of safe, secure, well located cycle parking can be very important in encouraging people to cycle regularly. It is important that development proposals incorporate these facilities and parking at the outset of the design process. Applicants should refer to the council's 'Guide to Cycle Parking Provision' for guidance on this matter.

This application seeks approval for the erection of two dwellings on the land adjacent to and rear of 87 Queenshill Road, in addition to associated cycle storage, waste storage and 5 vehicle parking spaces. The site is located on Queenshill Road, which is an adopted carriageway subject to a speed limit of 20 mph.

The application has been considered by the Council's Transport Development Management Team (TDM).

Car Parking:

The development proposes 5 car parking spaces, 3 for the new dwellings, and 2 for the existing. The proposed car parking would not be in line with local plan standards, given that there would be an overprovision of parking for 87B and inadequate measures in place for cyclists to access the cycle store. Furthermore, the two car parking spaces proposed for the existing dwelling are both non-compliant and do not meet the local plan standards in terms of size. A 50cm buffer space between the parking space and wall has also not been provided, to prevent the overhanging of a vehicle on the footway. The car parking space proposed for 87A would not be acceptable, given that in order to for the motorist to enter/exit the proposed parking space an excessive amount of manoeuvring over the footway would be required, which may result in the motorist failing to see pedestrians and cyclists of the footway.

As 4 of the parking spaces are inadequate, the development would mainly depend on on-street parking spaces. Based on 2011 census car ownership statistics, TDM estimates that the total parking requirement of all three dwellings would be 5 additional cars parked on the highway network. Due to the potential impact the development could have on the highway network, the applicant would be required to submit a parking survey which should demonstrate on-street parking capacity of 4 vehicle, should an approval be forthcoming.

Cycle Parking:

The applicant proposes to provide a cycle store within the garden of all three dwellings, and up to 4 bicycles can be stored within each cycle store. The proposed number of cycle spaces is adequate, although sufficient detail has not been provided on the design and layout of the proposed cycle storeys. Further details would be secured via condition if an approval was forthcoming.

Waste:

The applicant proposes to provide bin stores and waste containers in the rear gardens of all three dwellings, although floor plans and elevations do not demonstrate the amount and size of each type of waste container, as required. Further details would be secured via condition if an approval was forthcoming.

Access:

Contrary to the Highways Act (1980), the door belonging to 87B open outwards onto the adopted footway on Crossways Road. Furthermore it is noted that access to the cycle stores are inadequate, as the access does not comply with the requirement for access (including doorways) to cycle stores to maintain a minimum width of 1.2m at all times.

Overall the proposed development is therefore not considered acceptable in transport terms.

G) SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Current planning policy within the adopted Bristol Development Framework, Core Strategy (2011) requires new development to be designed to mitigate and adapt to climate change and meet targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. This should be achieved, amongst other measures, through efficient building design, the provision of on-site renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20% based on the projected residual energy demand of new buildings. The approach proposed should also be supported by the provision of a sustainability statement and an energy strategy.

Policy BCS14 states that new development will be expected to demonstrate that the heating and cooling systems have been selected according to the following heat hierarchy:

- 1. Connection to existing CHP/CCHP distribution networks
- 2. Site-wide renewable CHP/CCHP
- 3. Site-wide gas-fired CHP/CCHP
- 4. Site-wide renewable community heating/cooling
- 5. Site-wide gas-fired community heating/cooling
- 6. Individual building renewable heating

Policy BCS15 (Sustainable Design and Construction) of the adopted Core Strategy sets out that sustainable design and construction should be integral to new development in Bristol. Consideration of energy efficiency, recycling, flood adaption, material consumption and biodiversity should be included as part of a sustainability or energy statement. Policy BCS15 also aims to ensure that development proposals are designed and constructed to minimise their environmental impact.

The applicant has provided this level of information and the proposal meets the 20% reduction in carbon emissions through the use of air source heat pumps. The heating and hot water will also be provided by the heat pumps, which will be in line with the Council's heat hierarchy. Renewable energy is also proposed in the form of solar PV panels to the roof. The application is therefore considered acceptable on these grounds; conditions would be attached to any permission if forthcoming requiring the submission of further detail regarding the exact location and specification of the heat pumps and PV panels to ensure they are installed and operational prior to the occupation of the residential accommodation permitted.

H) FLOODING

Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the NPPF recognises that the planning system should conserve and enhance the environment by minimizing impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. The NPPF also states development should be safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) of the NPPF states that if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Policy BCS13 (Climate Change) sets out that development should contribute to mitigating and adapting to climate change such as minimising flood risk.

Policy BCS15 (Sustainable Design and Construction) aims to ensure that development proposals are design and constructed to minimise their environmental impact. Development is expected to minimise vulnerability to flooding.

Policy BCS16 (Flood Risk and Water Management) states that development in areas at risk of flooding will be expected to: be resilient to flooding through design and layout, and/or incorporate sensitively designed mitigation measures, which may take the form of on-site flood defence wors and/or a contribution towards or a commitment to undertake such off-site measures as may be necessary, in order to ensure that the development remains safe from flooding over its lifetime.

The site is located within a Flood Zone 1 and as such risk of flooding is low and only surface water drainage issues need to be mitigated. The proposal is for two new dwellings. The proposal would include additional hardstanding and the application has been supported by a drainage plan. The application is considered acceptable on this basis, however any permission if forthcoming would be subject to a condition requiring Sustainable Urban Drainage Strategy.

CONCLUSION

The application is recommended for refusal.

EQUALITIES ASSESSMENT

During the determination of this application due regard has been given to the impact of this scheme in relation to the Equalities Act 2010 in terms of its impact upon key equalities protected characteristics. These characteristics are age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation with relevant groups) that different groups have or would have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation this particular proposed development. Overall, it is considered that this application would not have any significant adverse impact upon different groups or implications for the Equality Act 2010.

RECOMMENDED REFUSED

The following reason(s) for refusal are associated with this decision:

Reason(s)

- 1. The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, bulk, massing, form, positioning and overall design in relation to the attached and surrounding properties, would represent an inappropriate over intensive form of development that would fail to respond to the local development patterns and special qualities of the area, and would fail to appear subservient in the context of backland development. The proposal would represent an over intensive form of development, resulting in a cramped and overdeveloped appearance to the plot, which would be detrimental to the character of the area. Furthermore, by occupying the side garden of the host property, the proposed development would impact the characteristic open corner plots that are a defining feature of the area, which would be detrimental to the appearance and character of the streetscene. As such the proposed development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2023); Policy BCS21 of The Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM26, DM27 and DM29 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014).
- 2. The scale, form, mass and proximity of the proposed dwelling in the rear garden of the host dwelling (87B) would result in detrimental harm to the quality of outlook to neighbouring properties, including 85 Queenshill Road, and the host property. The proposal would also have a detrimental impact on the quality of outdoor amenity space for the flats at Paignton Square by way of overbearing impact and additional shadowing. The position of the first-floor windows of 87B would furthermore lead to a sense of perceived overlooking and loss of privacy for the amenity space of 85 Queenshill Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to guidance contained within National Planning Policy Framework (2023); Core Strategy (2011) Policy BCS21 and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) DM27 and DM30.
- 3. The proposed development fails to provide adequate or appropriate car parking arrangements, and fails to provide appropriate access arrangements to the cycle store. The development would give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions and would not provide safe access to the highway network. The proposal is therefore contrary to guidance contained within National Planning Policy Framework (2023); Core Strategy (2011) Policy BCS10 and Site Allocations and Development Management Policy (2014) DM23.

Advice(s)

1. Refused Applications Deposited Plans/Documents

The plans that were formally considered as part of the above application are as follows:-

22102-PL01 Existing floor plans and elevations, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL02 Plot 1 - Proposed floor plans and elevations, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL03 Plot 2 - Proposed floor plans and elevations, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL04 Existing and proposed streetscene, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL05 Existing site plan, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL06 Proposed site plan, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL07 Indicative drainage plan, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL08 Site location plan, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL09 Existing block plan, received 13 March 2023

22102-PL10 Proposed block plan, received 13 March 2023

Sustainability statement, received 13 March 2023

Coal mining risk assessment, received 13 March 2023 Design and access statement, received 13 March 2023

Case Officer:			
Authorisation:			
commrepref V1.0211			