

'Hold Date'	
-------------	--

## Bristol City Council Development Management

---

### Delegated Report and Decision

<b>Application No:</b>	21/05586/X	<b>Registered:</b>	18 October 2021
<b>Type of Application:</b>	Variation/Deletion of a Condition		
<b>Case Officer:</b>	██████████	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	13 December 2021

**Site Address:**

Murco Filling Station  
Hampton Road  
Bristol  
BS6 6JA

**Description of Development:**

Application for the variation of condition No. 9 (List of approved plans and drawings) following grant of planning permission of 20/04182/F for the installation of vehicle charging points and associated enclosures and electrical infrastructure. Variation sought for Relocation of substation due to UKPN requirement.

**Ward:** Clifton Down

**Site Visit Date:**
**Date Photos Taken:**
**Consultation Expiry Dates:**

**Advert** 24 Nov 2021  
**and/or Site** 24 Nov 2021  
**Notice:**

**Neighbour:** 15 Nov 2021

#### SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is located on Hampton Road in the Clifton Down Ward of Bristol. The site comprises of a four-pump vehicle filling station which benefits from a single storey sales and retail unit and hot food takeaway, car parking area and associated infrastructure such as canopy and vent stack pipe. The site is accessed from Hampton Road.

The application site is located within The Whiteladies Road Conservation Area and is adjacent to the Cotham and Redland Road Conservation Area. Kingdom Hall is to the south east of the site and is a locally listed building. There are no other Listed Buildings in the surrounding area. There are no TPO protected trees on or around the site. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.

#### PLANNING HISTORY

The site has the following planning history:

- o 88/00584/F | Provision for new canopy | GRANTED (9 May 1988)
- o 88/02724/F | Extend shop to provide new pump house and new car wash | REFUSED (19

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

September 1988)

- o 95/00085/F | Refurbishment of existing petrol filling station with new car jet wash facility | REFUSED (11 April 1997)
- o 96/00877/F | Proposed car sales (5 No) from forecourt | REFUSED (11 April 1997)
- o 01/00690/F | Demolition of existing sales building, remove 4 No pump islands (retaining half canopy and 2 no. pump islands). Erection of new sales building, retain underground storage tanks, forecourt resurfacing and refurbishment works | GRANTED (13 July 2001)
- o 02/01991/F | Removal of section of front boundary wall to widen the access way to the site | GRANTED (26 July 2002)
- o 05/03620/F | Installation of jet wash facility within a steel framed glass canopy, relocation of trash area and landscaping | REFUSED (22 May 2006)
- o 06/00703/F | Installation of a replacement ATM cashpoint machine | GRANTED (5 April 2006)
- o 09/04786/A | 2 No internally illuminated free standing single sided display units | GRANTED (25 January 2010)
- o 16/00989/F | External refurbishment of forecourt shop | WITHDRAWN (12 May 2016)
- o 17/06608/F | New shop front and ATM relocated | GRANTED (2 February 2018)
- o 20/04182/F | Installation of vehicle charging points and associated enclosures and electrical infrastructure | GRANTED (14 January 2021)
- o 21/05029/NMA | Application for a non-material amendment following grant of planning permission of 20/04182/F for the installation of vehicle charging points and associated enclosures and electrical infrastructure - now proposed relocation of existing sub-station | NOT AGREED (7 October 2021)
- o 21/05025/A | Installation of 5 metre internally illuminated EV pole sign and relocation of existing totem sign | REFUSED (15 November 2021)

The site at the time of determination is also subject to a planning enforcement case (ref. 21/30496/NAP) for the development not being carried out in accordance with planning permission 20/04182/F.

## APPLICATION

The application seeks to permission to vary condition 9 (List of Approved Plans and Drawings) of application 20/04182/F which approved the installation of vehicle charging points and associated enclosures and electrical infrastructure.

The amendment would involve the relocation of the GRP Substation, LV GRP Enclosure and EV charging points, removal of Raption Power Packs and installation of an additional charging station.

Please see the application form and submitted documents for further information.

## RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

### A) NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION

Neighbouring properties have been notified in relation to the proposed development of the site.

Five responses were received objecting to the application. These are summarised below:

- o The changes do not solely involve the relocation of the substation
- o LV Enclosure has been installed
- o Charging points also relocated to the rear

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

- o Drawings do not show all elements
- o Substation is not mitigated and will have adverse impact on Conservation Area
- o 1.5m high planting is insufficient
- o Inconsistency between plans and design
- o Impact on site lines for drivers and risk of collision
- o TDM should review these plans
- o Location of lighting and pollution
- o Misleading plans
- o Unable to review plans due to inconsistencies
- o Installation of large box cabinet without permission
- o Revised plans omit further information
- o Installation of lamp posts not included
- o Raption Power Packs missing
- o Further consultation required
- o Amendments to advertising pole
- o Reduced sight lines from charging bays
- o Low wall not shown adjacent to Hampton Road

One responses was received which commented on the application. This is summarised below:

- o Copy of TDM comments as email chain would not open for resident

Planning matters in relation to the design and neighbour amenity will be dealt with later in this report and other matters are deemed as not relevant or civil issues and are therefore not a planning consideration.

**B) WARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

No comments from Ward Members were received.

**C) BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL'S CITY DESIGN TEAM**

Bristol City Council's City Design Team were consulted on the proposed plans. They had the following comments:

- o The plant equipment would be located at the front of the site. This would blight the street frontage and be incongruous to the conservation area.
- o The LPA approved this equipment at the rear of the site to reduce its impact. This would harm the appearance of the site and surrounding area. This equipment should be at the rear of the site and not adjacent to the street.
- o The equipment in this location would reduce legibility within the site and would screen the EV charging points

**D) BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL'S TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM**

Bristol City Council's Transport Development Management Team were consulted on the proposed plans. They had the following comments on 4 November 2021:

- o It is difficult to make a full assessment on the application if the proposed plan does not provide the information about the final proposed layout. Therefore we cannot recommend approval, due to insufficient information.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

o TDM has concerns about the location of the proposed sub-station. This will severely intervisibility between vehicles entering the site, and vehicles leaving the parking spaces

In response, updated plans were submitted to the LPA. Bristol City Council's Transport Development Management Team were consulted on these proposed plans and they made the following comments on 5 November 2021:

O The principle of EV charging is also welcomed, as outlined in TDM's comments on the approved scheme.

O We disagree with the applicant's position that there will be no visibility obstruction or safety issues. The height of the cabinet and the planting will obstruct visibility which is currently not obstructed.

O The cabinet is 2.5m tall, and the proposed planting is 1.5m - these will clearly obstruct visibility in the drivers plane.

O Anyone driving out from the spaces will not see a car approaching from the south until it is directly behind them, giving neither driver ability to stop in time.

O This is unsafe and will impact on safety in the site, and on Hampton Road, to the detriment of safety of all road users.

E) BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL'S POLLUTION CONTROL TEAM

Bristol City Council's Pollution Control Team were consulted on the proposed plans. They had the following comments:

O No objection from me on this one subject to the two noise conditions remaining on the consent.

F) NETWORK RAIL

Network Rail were consulted on the proposed plans. They made the following comment:

o Network Rail have no objection to the variation of condition 9.

RELEVANT POLICIES

PAN 2 Conservation Area Enhancement Statements (November 1993)  
Cotham and Redland Conservation Area Character Appraisal

Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990

National Planning Policy Framework – July 2021

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.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

ASSESSMENT

A) WOULD THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS IN TERMS OF DESIGN, LAYOUT AND SCALE BE ACCEPTABLE AND WOULD IT PRESERVE OR ENHANCE THE CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE OF THE WHITELADIES ROAD CONSERVATION AREA, ADJACENT COTHAM AND REDLAND CONSERVATION AREA AND NEARBY LOCALLY LISTED BUILDING?

The Authority is required under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

Section 16 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Policy BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) states that development should be of a high quality design and respect the local area.

Policy BCS22 (Conservation and the Historic Environment) states that development proposals should safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including: Scheduled ancient monuments; Historic buildings both nationally and locally listed; Historic parks and gardens both nationally and locally listed; Conservation areas; and Archaeological remains.

Policy DM26 (Local Character and Distinctiveness) states that development should respond appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings, building lines and set-backs from the street, skylines and roofscapes. Development should also respect, build upon or restore the local pattern and grain of development.

Policy DM27 (Layout and Form) aims to ensure development contributes to the successful arrangement and form of buildings, structures and spaces and contribute to the creation of quality urban design and healthy, safe and sustainable places.

Policy DM29 (Design of New Buildings) sets out 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.

Policy DM30 (Alterations to Existing Buildings) sets out that new development will be expected to respect the siting, scale, form, proportions, materials, details and the overall design and character of the host building, its curtilage and the broader street scene.

Policy DM31 (Heritage Assets) sets out that development will be expected to conserve and where appropriate enhance heritage assets and/or its setting. These include schedule monuments, archaeological sites, listed buildings, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens and locally important assets.

The proposed development would involve the construction of four EV charging spaces and installation of associated infrastructure. The principle of these works in an established fuel station is considered to be acceptable and works were previously approved under 20/04182/F. This

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

application seeks to vary the approved plans and relocate the substation and associated infrastructure and would include an additional charging point. The LPA fully supports the installation of EV charging spaces however these must be installed sensitively to the site and surrounding area.

The proposed amendment is not considered to be respectful of the site and surrounding conservation areas. The proposal would involve the relocation of the substation and LV enclosure close to the boundary with Hampton Road which would significantly harm the street scape and would result in a very large and incongruous addition to Hampton Road. The proposed equipment would be up to 2.4m in height and would fail to be sufficiently screened by landscaping. Furthermore, the proposed materials, form and bulk of the equipment would be insensitive to the conservation area and would result in an unattractive street frontage. The officers' report for application 20/04182/F made it clear that the substations were not respectful of the conservation area however they were proposed to be screened entirely and located at the rear of the site. The proposed location and insufficient screening would result in a harmful addition to the conservation area which would fail to enhance the conservation area. The proposal would result in additional urban clutter which would detract from the street and be visually dominant and intrusive. The equipment in this location is also considered to reduce legibility within the site and would screen the EV charging points from the street. As part of the application, insufficient evidence has been provided in order to justify the harm to the conservation area and it is not clear why the substations are proposed to be relocated. Concerns with the design and location of equipment were raised by neighbouring properties and the City Council's City Design Team objected to the application and harm caused to the conservation area. The proposal has failed to preserve or enhance the conservation area and would result in an insensitive and unattractive addition to the site and Hampton Road. The proposal is therefore not acceptable in design terms.

It is noted that there are concerns with the accuracy of the submitted plans and elements such as light column's and a cabinet adjacent to the substation are not included within the plans. Neighbours and the LPA have raised these concerns to the agent however revised plans were not submitted prior to the determination. The LPA has made a decision based on the submitted plans.

It is also noted that a Non-Material Amendment for these works was not agreed by the LPA (ref. 21/05029/NMA) and the LPA recommended against submitting an application for design reasons.

In summary, the proposal fails to comply with the adopted Core Strategy and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies. The proposal would fail to be respectful of the surrounding conservation area and would not harm the character or appearance of the site and Hampton Road.

**B) WOULD THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS CAUSE ANY UNACCEPTABLE HARM TO THE RESIDENTIAL AMENITY OF ADJACENT OCCUPIERS?**

Section 12 (Achieving Well-Designed Places) of the NPPF outlines that planning policies and decisions should ensure that development create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Policy BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) of the adopted Core Strategy states that new development should safeguard the amenity of existing development.

Policy BCS23 (Pollution) of the Core Strategy outlines that development should be sited and designed in a way as to avoid adversely impacting upon environmental amenity or biodiversity of the surrounding area by reason of fumes, dust, noise, vibration, smell, light or other forms of air, land, water pollution, or creating exposure to contaminated land. Further to this, in locating and designing development, account should also be taken of the impact of existing sources of noise or

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

other pollution on the new development and the impact of the new development on the viability of existing uses by reason of its sensitivity to noise or other pollution.

Policy DM27 (Layout and Form) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014) states the layout and form of development should enable existing and proposed development to achieve appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight.

Policy DM29 (Design of New Buildings) states that new buildings should ensure that existing and proposed development achieves appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight.

Policy DM35 (Noise Mitigation) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014) outlines that development which would have an unacceptable impact on environmental amenity or biodiversity by reason of noise will be expected to provide an appropriate scheme of mitigation.

The proposed amendments are not considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring properties with regard to overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking impacts. The proposed development would be screened by the boundary treatments to the side and rear. The proposed LV GRP Enclosure would be taller than the existing boundary treatments however this structure would be positioned further away from residential dwellings and the overall structure is considered to be acceptable and would not cause harm to neighbouring properties with regard to overbearing or overshadowing impacts. The proposal is also considered to be sited sufficient distance from neighbouring properties as to not be overbearing or overshadowing. The proposed vent stack would be a like-for-like replacement and would not therefore lead to any further harm to neighbouring properties. The proposal is not considered to impact overlooking or loss of privacy at neighbouring properties.

The proposed amendments would retain the Electrical Substation, LV GRP Enclosure and EV charging points within close proximity to neighbouring properties especially those at Melville Court, Hampton Road. The proximity of neighbouring properties raised concerns regarding noise and light pollution and comments for application 20/04182/F raised concerns with electromagnetic radiation which also must be considered here. Whilst electric charging points and substation would not cause any significant noise, they can give rise to low-level frequency noise. As part of the application and application 20/04182/F, limited information was provided to overcome these concerns however it was considered that the proposal would be acceptable in principle in this location but further information was required by the Pollution Control Team to make an informed comment. No further information was provided to overcome these concerns however the Pollution Control team raised no objection to the principle of development subject to conditions relating to noise from plant and equipment being attached to the decision. It is therefore considered necessary to attach these conditions to address these concerns if an approval was forthcoming.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in its context and is not considered to have a significantly harmful impact upon neighbour amenity subject to conditions. The application complies with Policies BCS21, BCS23 and DM35.

**C) WOULD THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS CAUSE ANY HARM TO PEDESTRAIN OR HIGHWAY SAFETY AND WOULD THE WASTE AND RECYCLING FACILITIES BE ACCEPTABLE?**

Policy BCS10 (Transport and Access Improvements) of the Core Strategy states that development should be designed to ensure streets where traffic and other activities are, are integrated and should be designed to ensure the provision of safe streets.

Policy BCS15 (Sustainable Design and Construction) of the Core Strategy states that all new development will be required to provide satisfactory arrangements for the storage of refuse and

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

recyclable materials as an integral part of its design. Major developments should include communal facilities for waste collection and recycling where appropriate.

Policy DM23 (Transport Development Management) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014) outlines that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions and would be expected to provide safe and adequate access onto the highway. It also states that parking must be safe, secure, accessible and usable.

Policy DM32 (Recycling and Refuse in New Development) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted July 2014) states that all new residential properties will be expected to provide, sufficient space for the storage of individual recycling and refuse containers to reflect the current collection regime; or communal recycling facilities and refuse.

The proposed amendment would involve the loss of 7 car parking spaces and installation of 4 EV Charging Spaces. The LPA fully supports in the inclusion of EV charging spaces in this location however the proposed development must harm pedestrian and highway safety.

The proposed substation and LV GRP enclosure would be located closer to the vehicle entrance on Hampton Road. The proposed substation would also project further into the site's forecourt at a total height of 2.4m with landscaping at 1.5m in height. Concerns were raised with regard to visibility and highway safety and the City Council's TDM Team objected to the proposed amendment and as the proposed substation and planting would obstruct visibility when entering the site and attempting to manoeuvre into EV charging spaces. Concerns were also raised regarding visibility from drivers manoeuvring out of the spaces as the substation would block visibility. The proposal would remove visibility at all times, which is not the same as an infrequent and temporary situation. Furthermore, the gap between structures is very small and will not allow sufficient opportunity for intervisibility. The City Council's Standing Advice is that all structures should be under 0.6m in height surrounding parking spaces and entrances in order to ensure visibility is acceptable. The LPA raised these concerns with the agent, however insufficient evidence was provided in order to address this. The proposed scale, height and location of the substation would harmfully impact upon on safety within the site and on Hampton Road, to the detriment of safety of all road users and therefore fails to comply with local plan policies regarding highway safety. The proposed would therefore not be acceptable in terms of transport.

The amendment would involve retaining the existing bin storage area to the west of the site. The LPA supports the overall size of this enclosure and recognises that it is an existing enclosure and is already screened and lockable. The LPA however has concerns with regarding to accessing this bin store as the EV charging spaces would be directly alongside the access doors. It is considered that if a car was parked alongside the entrance and within the EV space, it would not be possible to access this store. It would also not be possible to move bins from the storage point to the collection point if a car was parked within this space. This is clearly evident as the access doors and parking space overlap within the proposed layout plan (drawing no. 13664-P11-144 A). The proposal does not include a dedicated pathway to access this bin store. This concern was also raised by the LPA however revised plans were not submitted prior to determination. It is considered that the proposed amendment would fail to provide a safe and accessible route to the bin storage area and would therefore fail to comply with local plan policies regarding waste and recycling.

Overall, the proposed development would fail to safeguard highway safety and would fail to provide an accessible bin storage area. The proposal would fail to comply with local plan policies and would cause significant harm to safety and amenity and therefore would not be acceptable.

D) WOULD THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS IMPACT SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE



**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

CHANGE?

Policy BCS13 (Climate Change) of the adopted Core Strategy sets out that development should contribute to mitigating and adapting to climate change, and to meet targets to reduce CO<sup>2</sup> emissions.

Policy BCS14 (Sustainable Energy) of the adopted Core Strategy sets out that development in Bristol should include measures to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from energy use by minimising energy requirements, incorporating renewable energy sources and low-energy carbon sources. Development will be expected to provide sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from residual energy use in the buildings by at least 20%. Supports the delivery of a district heating network in Bristol.

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 Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note (July 2020) offers advice on the implementation of Bristol Local Plan policies as they relate to sustainability, climate change and resilience.

A sustainability statement was not required as part of this application as the proposal was exempt as per the Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note (July 2020).

As per the original application, the proposed development would introduce electric vehicle charging points within this site for the use of surrounding residents and/or visitors. This would be to enable those with electric vehicles to charge their vehicles. Electric vehicles are considered to be a much more sustainable mode of transport when compared to petrol and diesel vehicles and a barrier to the uptake and use of electric vehicles is the lack of easily available charging points. The proposal is considered to help address the lack of charging points within this area of the city and promote the use of electric vehicles. This would help to reduce carbon emissions within the city and promote cleaner air. The proposed development is considered to comply with sustainability and climate change policies and would promote more sustainable travel in Bristol. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and comply with policies BCS13, BCS14 and BCS15.

E) WOULD THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS IMPACT LAND CONTAMINATION?

Policy BCS23 (Pollution) states that development should be sited and designed in a way as to avoid adversely impacting upon environmental amenity or biodiversity of the surrounding area by reason of fumes, dust, noise, vibration, smell, light or other forms of air, land, water pollution, or creating exposure to contaminated land. Further to this, in locating and designing development, account should also be taken of the impact of existing sources of noise or other pollution on the new development and the impact of the new development on the viability of existing uses by reason of its sensitivity to noise or other pollution.

Policy DM34 (Contaminated Land) states that new development should demonstrate that: any existing contamination of the land will be addressed by appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that the site is suitable for the proposed use and that there is no unacceptable risk of pollution within the site or in the surrounding area; and the proposed development will not cause the land to become contaminated, to the detriment of future use.

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

As per application 20/04182/F the site is currently a filling station which raises land contamination concerns and the proposal also intends to decommission an existing tank. The Land Contamination Team raised no concerns with the proposed development subject to conditions. The development must ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised and it is deemed necessary to attach an unexpected contamination condition to ensure that in the event contamination is encountered during the works it will be dealt with at the time. The proposal is not considered to lead to the land becoming contaminated and there is no risk of contamination within the site or surrounding area. In light of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with policies BCS23 and DM34.

### CONCLUSION

In conclusion it is considered that the proposed amendments would result in an incongruous addition to the site and to Hampton Road and would fail to respect the character and appearance of the Conservation Areas. The proposed equipment would be highly visible and would not be sufficient screened. The proposal would also fail to comply with local plan policies with regard to highway safety and waste and recycling.

The LPA supports the inclusion of EV charging points and recognises that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of amenity, sustainability and land contamination policies. However, this would not minimise or outweigh the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area and impact on highway safety, waste and recycling. The proposed amendment is therefore considered not to be in accordance with the NPPF, Act and the Local Plan, when read as a whole.

The proposed amendment is therefore 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 in terms of siting, scale, bulk, layout and materials would fail to respect the character and appearance of the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area and adjacent Cotham and Redland Conservation Area. The proposed plant equipment would result in an incongruous addition to the street scape and would result in an insensitive and dominant addition to Hampton Road. The proposal would fail to conserve or enhance the conservation area and would result in additional urban clutter, would detract from the street and be visually intrusive. The proposal would be located within a highly visible location and

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED**  
**Murco Filling Station Hampton Road Bristol BS6 6JA**

the proposal would be out of character within the surrounding conservation area. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Local Plan Policies BCS21, BCS22 and DM31 as well as the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area Enhancement Statement (1993) and Cotham and Redland Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2011).

2. The proposed development would fail to safeguard highway safety and due to the location and scale of plant equipment would severely impact inter-visibility between vehicles entering the site and vehicles leaving the parking spaces. The plant equipment would obstruct visibility and would harm the safety of all road users. Furthermore, the proposed development would fail to include a safe and accessible route to the waste storage location. The application is therefore recommended for refusal due to conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019); Core Strategy (2011) BCS10 and BCS15 and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) DM23 and DM32.

**Advice(s)**

1. Refused Applications Deposited Plans/Documents

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

13664-LP1-144 Location Plan, received 18 October 2021

13664-BP1-144 Block Plan, received 18 October 2021

13664-P10-144 Existing Site Layout, received 18 October 2021

13664-P11-144 A Proposed Site Layout, received 5 November 2021

13664-P12-144 Substation Elevations, received 18 October 2021

13664-P13-144 Proposed Elevations, received 9 November 2021

---

Case Officer: [REDACTED]

Authorisation: [REDACTED]

commrepref  
V1.0211