

## **Bristol City Council- LPA S62A Statement Note**

**Planning inspectorate reference: S62A/2025/0110**

**LPA reference: 25/12705/PINS**

**Address: 7 Redcatch Road, Bristol, BS4 2EP**



### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application site is addressed 7 Redcatch Road located in Knowle ward. The site is located in the Wells Road / Broadwalk centre, within the secondary shopping frontage.

The site consists of a two-storey, mid terrace property split into a retail unit at ground floor level and a one-bedroom flat at first floor level. There is an outrigger to the rear with both single storey and two storey elements.

The site is not located in a conservation area, however, is located opposite Knowle Methodist Church, a grade II listed building.

### **APPLICATION**

Application for Planning permission for Change of ground floor from Class E to 1no. residential flat, including removal of shopfront, partial demolition of rear extension, and erection of a ground floor rear extension.

### **RELEVANT HISTORY**

90/01940/F Change of use on ground floor only from retail to estate agents office. First floor to remain residential. Date Closed 17 August 1990 Permission Granted.

91/02609/F Change of use from a shop to a take-away pizza and burger shop. Date Closed 27 January 1992 Refused.

25/10922/PINS Application for Planning permission for Change of ground floor from Class E to 1no. residential flat, including removal of shopfront, partial demolition of rear extension, and erection of a ground floor rear extension. Date Closed 22 May 2025 Refused.

Relevant history in the immediate area:

13 Redcatch Road: 21/06697/COU

Application to determine if prior approval is required for a proposed change of use from Commercial, Business and Service (Use Class E) to Dwellinghouses (Use Class C3).  
Prior Approval Given.

### **RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION**

23 neighbouring properties were consulted via individual notification letter with an expiry date of 31.07.25.

The site was advertised via site notice for a period of 21 days.

No responses were received.

## **OTHER COMMENTS**

### **Transport Development Management**

Bristol City Councils Transport Development Management team were consulted as part of the assessment process. They had no objections to the scheme, however recommended the inclusion of a number of conditions and advices. Their comments are as follows:

#### **Principle**

The applicant is seeking planning permission to convert an existing Class E ground floor commercial unit into a Class C3 one bedroom dwellinghouse. There is an existing one bedroom dwelling on the first floor which will be retained as existing.

TDM have previously recommended refusal (Application: 25/10922/PINS) on the grounds that accessway between Ryde Road and the rear of the site was not included within the red line boundary of the application, and it was therefore uncertain as to whether that land was available to be used for access by residents.

#### **Local Conditions**

The site is located on Redcatch Road, classified as a B road and subject to a 20mph speed limit. Redcatch Road is subject to waiting restrictions for vehicle parking, with a maximum stay time of 30 minutes between Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6pm, with no returns within 30 minutes.

The site is well connected with local bus services with a nearby bus stop on Wells Road, within 100m walking distance of the site, serving the 2 citylines, 2a citylines, 73 citylines, 172, 274, 375, 376 Mendip Explorer, and 376a routes. Another bus stop on Broad Walk, within 300m walking distance of the site, serves the 36 bus route.

The site is limited in terms of cycling opportunities, with no strategic cycle routes in the local vicinity.

#### **Access**

Primary access will be via Redcatch Road, with cycle access via the rear accessway connected with Ryde Road. The application now includes the rear accessway as part of the applications red line boundary, and the submitted cover letter states that the site has an existing access through to Ryde Road.

## Car Parking

No off-street car parking is proposed. As the site is not located within a Residents Parking Scheme (RPS) area, future residents of the development would be free to park on-street. As Redcatch Road is subject to waiting restrictions, any additional car parking will likely be on Ryde Road or along the north edge of Oakmeade Park, both of which are under heavy stress from on-street parking.

Due to the scale of the development and existing car ownership levels in the area, it is unlikely that the development will introduce more than one vehicle into the local network, TDM regard this as acceptable. However, in the event that the site becomes part of a future RPS, the development should be considered car-free/low car and therefore occupiers would be ineligible for resident parking permits.

## Cycle Parking

The applicant has proposed cycle storage to be located in the rear garden of the development, with space for two cycles. The cycle store would be accessed via a rear accessway from Ryde Road meaning cycles would not need to be taken through the dwelling. TDM regard this as acceptable.

## Waste

The waste store is also located in the rear garden, with space to hold one set of residential waste bins. On collection day bins would need to be moved from the rear garden to the adopted highway on Ryde Road to be collected, a distance of approximately 30 metres. TDM regard this as acceptable.

## Recommendation

TDM raises no objections to this application. Should the inspector see fit to approve the application, without prejudice, TDM would request the following standard conditions and advices:

### 1 – Implementation/Installation of Refuse Storage and Recycling Facilities – Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or use commenced until the refuse/area and where necessary, dropped kerb(s) to facilitate the manoeuvring of four wheeled bins onto the carriageway have been completed in accordance with the approved plans.

Thereafter, all refuse and recyclable materials associated with the development shall either be stored within this dedicated store/area, as shown on the approved plans, or internally within the building(s) that form part of the application site for the lifetime of the development.

The refuse store/area is not to be used for any other purpose other than the storage of refuse and recyclable materials. No refuse or recycling material shall be stored or placed for collection on the adopted highway (including the footway), except on the day of collection.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining premises; protect the general environment; prevent any obstruction to pedestrian movement and to ensure that there are adequate facilities for the storage and recycling of recoverable materials.

## 2 – Completion of Pedestrians/Cyclists Access – Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the means of access for pedestrians and/or cyclists have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for access purposes only for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

## 3 – Completion and Maintenance of Cycle Provision – Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until secure cycle parking and where shown, for commercial developments shower/changing facilities and lockers for cyclists to store cycling equipment, as shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of adequate and accessible cycle parking and associated showering/changing/storage facilities for commercial uses.

## Advice 1 - Restriction of parking permits future controlled parking zone/residents parking scheme

You are advised that the Local Planning Authority has recommended to the Highways Authority that on the creation of any Controlled Parking Zone/Residents Parking Scheme/Permit Parking Area area which includes the development, that the development shall be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers are ineligible for resident parking permits as well as visitors parking permits if in a Controlled Parking Zone/Residents Parking Scheme/Permit Parking Area.

Further information is available at [www.bristol.gov.uk/low-car-permit-restrictions](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/low-car-permit-restrictions) Holders of a disabled persons badge do not require resident parking permits. This also does not affect your right to obtain an Essential Visitors Permit (EVP) available at [www.bristol.gov.uk/parkingpermits](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/parkingpermits)

## Advice 2 - Street Name and Numbering

You are advised that to ensure that all new properties and streets are registered with the emergency services, Land Registry, National Street Gazetteer and National Land and Property Gazetteer to enable them to be serviced and allow the occupants access to amenities including but not limited to; listing on the Electoral Register, delivery services, and a registered address on utility companies databases, details of the name and numbering of any new house(s) and/or flats/flat conversion(s) on existing and/or newly constructed streets must be submitted to the Highway Authority.

Any new street(s) and property naming/numbering must be agreed in accordance with the Councils Street Naming and Property Numbering Policy and all address allocations can only be issued under the Town Improvement Clauses Act 1847 (Section 64 & 65) and the Public Health Act 1925 (Section 17, 18 & 19). Please see [www.bristol.gov.uk/registeraddress](http://www.bristol.gov.uk/registeraddress)

## **KEY ISSUES**

### **A) Principle of Development**

The proposal is not different in terms of principle from the previous application, 25/10922/PINS, as such the relevant section of the previous officer refusal recommendation is applicable:

Within Section 5 of the National Planning Policy Framework there is an identified need for housing with the intention of boosting the supply of homes, necessitating that sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. However, Section 7 outlines that planning policies should define a network and hierarchy of town centres and promote their long-term vitality and viability. As part of this policies are required to define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, and make clear the range of uses permitted in such locations.

Within Bristol's Core Strategy, 2011, policy BCS7 seeks to maintain a network of accessible centres. These centres provide focal points for development and principle locations for shopping and community facilities as well as local entertainment, art and cultural facilities. As such, BCS7 encourages uses which contribute to maintaining the vitality, viability and diversity of centres, specifically setting out that active ground floor uses will be maintained and enhanced throughout centres. Notably, BCS7 highlights that residential uses and offices would not normally be considered as active uses for ground floors in this context.

Within Bristol's Core Strategy Wells Road/Broadwalk is identified as a town centre in the hierarchy of centres. This classification is linked to policy DM8 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014. Policy DM8 establishes secondary shopping frontages as providing opportunities for a greater diversity of uses, however it is also outlined that both primary shopping areas and secondary shopping frontages will be expected to maintain or provide active ground floor uses.

Furthermore, DM8 of SADMP, 2014 sets out that the development of retail or other related uses across secondary shopping frontages will be acceptable where they would help to maintain or enhance the function of the centre, with the proviso that in all instances the proposed use will be expected:

- i. To complement the retail function of the centre and not harm its vitality, viability or diversity; and
- ii. Not to harmfully dominate or fragment frontages; and
- iii. To maintain an appropriate balance and diversity of uses in all parts of the Secondary Shopping Frontage; and
- iv. To generate a reasonable level of footfall and be of general public interest or service; and
- v. To be compatible with a shopping area in that it includes a shopfront with a display function and would be immediately accessible to the public from the street.

‘Other related uses’ is clarified to include gyms, arts and cultural premises and community facilities which would add to the vitality of the area and are considered to be active ground floor uses.

The application is located within a secondary shop frontage, with adjacent properties occupied by retail units. Whilst limited information has been provided as to whether the site is still in active use as a retail unit, street view images from 2024 suggest the unit was recently still in operation as a hairdresser. Additionally, no marketing has been submitted to demonstrate that the commercial unit is not viable.

The proposal seeks to change the use of the ground floor retail unit to a residential flat, including the removal of the existing shopfront. The proposed change of use is considered to negatively affect the vitality of the centre through the loss of a ground floor viable active use.

Furthermore, as previously outlined, DM8 sets out a list of criterion for retail and other related uses on secondary shopping frontages, the proposal’s conformity with these criteria is as follows:

- i. The loss of a ground floor active use and associated shopfront would harm the vitality of the secondary shopping frontage.
- ii. The proposed change of use from Class E to residential would fragment the shopping frontage, with properties on either side in use as retail units.
- iii. The proposed change of use would result in the loss of a hairdressers, reducing the diversity of uses across the shopping frontage.

- iv. The loss of an active ground floor use would fail to generate a reasonable level of footfall, additionally the loss of the associated shopfront would affect the activity of the frontage.
- v. The loss of the shopfront would be inconsistent with adjacent retail units and lack a display frontage.

As demonstrated above, the proposal is contrary to the criterion set out within policy DM8, additionally failing to adhere to the definition of 'other related uses'.

As such the proposal is contrary to Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2024; policy BCS7 of Bristol's Core Strategy; and policy DM8 of Site Allocations and Development Management policies, 2014.

Previous Section 62A inspector comments:

Within the previous Section 62A, 25/10922/PINS, Planning Inspectorate report the inspector concluded:

'the proposal would be contrary to SADMP Policy DM8 which requires development within secondary shopping frontages to provide active ground floor uses and frontages, support footfall and not harm the vitality, viability and diversity of the centre.'

However, when addressing planning balance the previous Section 62A inspector considered that:

'While the proposal conflicts with the retail policies of the development plan, I attach only very limited weight to this. The application site is a small unit within a much larger centre. It is towards the edge of the secondary frontage, with only a few retail units beyond. There would not be material fragmentation of the parade given the limited width of the application site and few units beyond, nor a strong adverse effect on footfall. The site is currently vacant, but the loss of the previous hairdressing use would not significantly harm the diversity of the centre.'

As such the previous inspector did not find the proposal's impact on the vitality and viability of the Wells Road/Broadwalk town centre to have sufficient detrimental impact to warrant the refusal of the scheme. Based on the previous inspector's decision, the proposals failure to conform to the above policies will not form part of the refusal reasons of this report.

## **B) Mix and Balance**

The proposal is not different in terms of the impact on mix and balance to that of the previous Section 62A application, as such the relevant section of the previous officer refusal recommendation is applicable:

Section 5 of the NPPF, 2024 identifies that to support the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes the overall aim should be to meet an area's

identified housing need, including with an appropriate mix of housing types for the local community.

BCS18 of Bristol's Core Strategy, 2011 states that 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. To achieve this development should contribute to the diversity of housing in the local area and help redress any housing imbalance.

Policy BCS18 states that the appropriate density for any individual site will be informed by the opportunity for a mix of uses across the site and the need to provide an appropriate mix of housing to meet the community's needs and demands.

It is standard practice for officers to determine the proportion and distribution of different dwelling sizes using census data separated into Lower Super Output Areas.

The 2021 Census data provides an up-to-date picture of the proportion of different residential accommodation sizes in the LSOA. The application site is located within the Upper Knowle LSOA.

Within the Upper Knowle LSOA 1-bedroom units make up a comparatively low percentage of total households at 16.2%. The percentages within the LSOA are as follows: 16.2% 1-bed, 12.6% 2-bed, 44.6% 3-bed, 26.6% 4-bed or more.

As such the proposal would contribute to providing an appropriate mix of housing, redressing the housing imbalance.

### **C) DOES THE PROPOSAL HAVE A HARMFUL IMPACT ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE AREA?**

The proposed exterior as visible from the public realm is not different from that of the previous application, as such the relevant section of the previous officer refusal recommendation is applicable:

Policy BCS21 of Bristol's Core Strategy 2011, states that new development in Bristol should deliver high quality urban design, which contributes positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness.

Policy DM26 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014 states development is expected to contribute towards local character and distinctiveness by respecting, building upon or restoring the local pattern and grain of development; and responding appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings.



Policy DM27 of SADMP, 2014 establishes the necessity of height, scale and massing of a development to be appropriate to the immediate context, site constraints, character of adjoining streets and spaces and the setting.

Policy DM30 of SADMP, 2014 sets out the expectation that development should 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; necessitating extensions to be physically and visually subservient to the host dwelling.

The proposal includes works to the rear of the property, the replacement of the existing rear outrigger and demolition of the existing store; to the front of the property the existing shopfront will be replaced by a smaller window and two new doors.

The site is located within a rank of retail units on a secondary shopping frontage, adjacent properties have glazed shopfronts with stallrisers enabling visibility into the shops as active frontages.

The proposal would replace the shopfront, including a stallriser and glazed front similar to adjacent units, introducing a smaller window and two new opaque doors. As such the proposal would disrupt the pattern of development, harming the character of the street scene and contrasting with the adjacent shopfronts allowing activity to commercial units. Furthermore, the proposed external changes would be less reversible, making the change of use feel more permanent.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2024; policy BCS21 of Bristol's Core Strategy, 2011; and policy DM26, DM27 and DM30 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014.

Previous Section 62A inspector comments:

Within the previous Section 62A, 25/10922/PINS, Planning Inspectorate report the inspector concluded:

'The proposed works would enhance the setting of the listed building through the re-introduction of more traditional materials and the removal of modern, unsympathetic alterations. Although a modest enhancement, this nonetheless weighs in support of the proposal.'

Based on the previous Section 62A inspectors report the proposals impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area will not form part of the refusal reasons of this report.

#### **D) WILL THE PROPOSAL PROVIDE A SATISFACTORY LIVING ENVIRONMENT FOR FUTURE OCCUPIERS?**

Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework outlines the importance of creating high quality, beautiful and sustainable places with specific requirement for

development to 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.

Policy BCS18 and BCS21 of Bristol's Core Strategy 2011 expand upon the concept of high-quality urban design. BCS18 sets out that appropriate space standards should be met in order to provide sufficient space for everyday activities as well as flexibility and adaptability. This includes facilitating the changing life circumstances of occupants, using the Lifetime Homes standard to assess the accessibility and adaptability of new housing.

Policy BCS21 reiterates the need for development to safeguard the amenity of existing development and create a high-quality environment for future occupiers. Additionally, development should deliver a safe, healthy, attractive, usable, durable and well-managed built environment. BCS21 lists matters of privacy, outlook, natural lighting, ventilation and indoor and outdoor space as considerations in creating a high quality built environment.

Policies DM27 and DM30 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014, repeats that development is expected to safeguard the amenity of existing and proposed development enabling appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight for both.

Revisions to the scheme since the previous Section 62A application, 25/10922/PINS (further information in the relevant history section of this report), include alterations to the internal layout repositioning the kitchen from the front of the property to the middle. The front of the property now contains a living room served by a window to the front of the property. The kitchen has no windows, however there is a skylight to the rear of the property, separated from the kitchen by a glazed partition and doors.

Whilst it is noted that an effort has been made to address the concerns related to previous application, 25/10922/PINS, officers do not consider the revised scheme to overcome the inspector's previous concerns.

The main living space to the front of the property is single aspect, served by one north facing window to the front elevation. The proposed living room is 6 metres in depth. Furthermore, the relevant window looks onto Redcatch Road, a secondary shopping frontage and public pedestrian footpath. As such future occupants would likely require some form of screening to prevent views into the property from passersby, this would further limit outlook from the rooms only window. By virtue of the main living areas depth, siting and orientation, north facing, officers consider the proposal to fail to provide adequate outlook and daylight.

Within previous appeal case APP/Z0116/W/24/3345351, the inspector gave consideration to the primary window's outlook onto a public pedestrian path, necessitating screening to provide appropriate privacy screening:

'I am mindful that the primary outlook from the living room area would be towards the public pedestrian path. It seems likely that future occupants may need to provide some form of screening, such as curtains or obscuring window film to prevent views into the property from people walking along the path. This would further limit outlook.'

The proposed kitchen has been relocated to the centre of the building, with no windows serving the room. The proposed kitchen is presumed to be used for cooking only with a separate living/dining space. Whilst policies lack clarification as to what constitutes a habitable room, previous appeal case, APP/Z0116/W/24/3345351, as part of an appeal dismissal reason stated 'The kitchen would have no outlook at all as no windows are proposed. The dwelling would therefore have a limited outlook'. The relevant proposal was for a kitchen separate from the main living/dining space. As such in line with the appeal case cited, given the kitchen has no windows it is considered to be a poor-quality living space with no daylight or outlook. The proposed skylight separated by a glazed partition and door is considered to have limited impact on daylight and no impact on outlook to the kitchen.

The proposed bedroom is served by one full window and adjacent door (presumed to be glazed based on elevation drawings), both are located on the side elevation of the bedroom looking onto the property's courtyard. Directly opposite the proposed bedrooms window/door is an existing boundary wall. Whilst there are some inconsistencies between the floorplans and elevation plans making it uncertain if this wall will be retained or replaced by a 1.8m fence, it is considered that there will be a boundary treatment of similar height directly opposite the bedrooms only window. As such it is considered that the proposed bedroom will achieve limited outlook and daylight, constituting a poor-quality living environment.

Furthermore, previous planning appeal, APP/Z0116/W/24/3349319, for a scheme involving bedrooms served by two windows looking onto a courtyard, was dismissed with the inspector citing the boundary treatment opposite 'would create dominant features that would have an overbearing effect on the outlook from the proposed development and restrict levels of light, harming the living conditions of future occupiers'. Whilst it is noted that in the appeal case the wall was higher than the proposed, the harmful impact is considered to be the same.

By virtue of the limited number of windows proposed, their siting and orientation, the proposal is considered to achieve insufficient levels of daylight, outlook and ventilation, failing to create a high-quality environment for future occupiers, contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2024; policy BCS21 of Bristol's Core

Strategy, 2011; and policies DM27 and DM30 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014.

The size of the proposed bedroom and gross internal area remains the same as the previous Section 62A application, as such the following is taken from the previous officer recommendation:

The gross internal area for the proposed ground floor flat measures approximately 65 square metres. The proposed bedroom within the ground floor flat measures approximately 10.3 sqm.

The proposed bedroom falls short of the nationally described space standards 11.5sqm for a dual occupancy room, as such it is considered a one-bedspace unit. The unit meets and exceeds the nationally described space standards with regards to gross internal area for a one-bedspace unit.

Whilst the proposal conforms to national space standards, Bristol City Council prefers a minimum of two-bedspace rooms as they provide more scope for facilitating changing life circumstances of occupants affording flexibility and adaptability.

The size of the units would not allow the flexibility and adaptability of use required by Policy BCS18 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) (Core Strategy). The Core Strategy policy seeks amongst other things seeks that dwellings provide sufficient space for everyday activities and the flexibility to adapt to changes in occupier's circumstances without them having to move home. However, in this instance the harm is not considered sufficient to warrant the refusal of the scheme.

Previous Section 62A inspector comments:

Within the previous Section 62A, 25/10922/PINS, Planning Inspectorate report the inspector concluded:

With regards to floorspace:

'I am satisfied that the overall space that would be available for future occupiers of the proposed flat would be acceptable'

With regards to light and outlook:

'I conclude that the proposal would not provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers of the proposed dwelling with respect to light, outlook, refuse and cycle storage'

It is considered that the proposal has not overcome previous officer and inspector concern for living conditions of future occupiers with regards to light and outlook. As such this forms the refusal reason for this report.

## **E) IMPACT ON AMENITY OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES**

Policy BCS21 sets the expectation for new development to safeguard the amenity of existing development and create a high-quality environment for future occupiers.

Policy DM27, of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policy 2014, states that development is expected to enable existing and proposed development to achieve appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight.

Policy DM30 states development is expected to safeguard the amenity of the host premises and neighbouring occupiers. Development should avoid harmful loss of sunlight or daylight through overshadowing; being overbearing; causing overlooking; or loss of privacy.

The proposal is generally the same externally as the previous Section 62A application, the only difference is the addition of a raised terrace with steps and a 1.8m boundary fence for the depth of the terrace.

The existing property has a rear extension along the boundary with No.9 Redcatch Road measuring 2.3 metres in depth and 2.5 metres at the eaves. The proposed boundary treatment measures 3.85 metres in depth by 2.68 metres in height. Therefore, the proposed boundary treatment would include an increased depth of 1.55 metres and increased height of 0.18 metres. Furthermore, the adjacent property is a commercial unit. As such the proposal is not considered to result in increased harm to neighbouring amenity sufficient to warrant the refusal of the scheme.

There are inconsistencies on the plans, with the ground floor plan detailing the existing boundary wall adjacent to No.9 Redcatch Road retained, whilst the proposed west elevation or rear elevation plans not including the retention of the boundary wall. Regardless of whether the boundary wall is retained or not the impact on neighbouring amenity is not considered to be significantly harmful beyond that of the existing to warrant the refusal of the scheme.

Given the proposal is largely the same as the previous Section 62A application the following officer comments are as set out within the previous report:

Within the sustainability statement it is detailed that an Air Source Heat Pump would be installed, however, the ASHP has not been illustrated on the plans. There are further details absent from the application including the specifications of the proposed ASHP and a noise assessment carried out from the neighbouring properties. As such officers cannot assess the potential impact of the ASHP in terms of noise pollution. Further detail of the ASHP should be secured via condition were permission forthcoming.

The proposed works will result in a footprint smaller than that of the existing and of the same depth along the site boundary with adjacent property No.5 Redcatch Road. The

existing rear outrigger measures approximately 2 metres in height at the eaves, the proposed rear outrigger measures approximately 3.6 metres in height.

However, given the adjacent property, No.5's closest window is set at a high level, the proposal would not breach the 45-degree line when measured from the centre point of the adjacent property's window. As such the proposal is not considered to harm neighbouring amenity in terms of light loss.

Impact on neighbouring amenity: acceptable

Overlooking/loss of privacy: acceptable

Visually overbearing: acceptable

Loss of sunlight/daylight: acceptable

Overshadowing: acceptable

## **F) SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE**

Policy BCS13 of Bristol's Core Strategy, 2011, states that development should contribute to both mitigating and adapting to climate change, and to meeting targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

Policy BCS14 sets out that Development in Bristol should include measures to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from energy use in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:

1. Minimising energy requirements;
2. Incorporating renewable energy sources;
3. Incorporating low-carbon energy sources

Consistent with stage 2 of the above, development will be expected to provide sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20%.

Policy BCS15 states that sustainable design and construction will be integral to new development in Bristol, with development required to submit a Sustainability Statement alongside the planning application, demonstrating key sustainability issues.

The appellant has stated within their cover letter that 'the applicant's preference would be to retain the existing heating system and to address sustainability measures through Building Regulations'.

However, officers expect a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20%, in line with the above policy. Whilst it is acknowledged that a new Core Strategy is emerging, it

has not yet been adopted and as such policies within Bristol's current Core Strategy, 2011, must be followed.

Whilst the appellant has requested that 'the energy statement therefore not form part of the approved plans and that heating and energy be addressed through Building Regulations', an energy statement has been submitted as part of the application. The energy statement states that the development would exceed the minimum required 20% reduction in carbon emissions through the installation of an Air Source Heat Pump, adhering to policies BCS13, BCS14 and BCS15 of Bristol's Core Strategy.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of sustainability and climate change; however, officers recommend the energy statement is included in the approved plans with its implementation conditioned.

#### **G) DOES THE PROPOSAL ADDRESS MOVEMENT, TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAY SAFETY ISSUES?**

Policy BCS10 of Bristol's Core Strategy, 2011, states that development proposals should minimise the need to travel, especially by private car, and maximise opportunities for the use of walking, cycling and public transport.

Policy BCS13 of Bristol's Core Strategy, 2011, states that development should contribute to both mitigating and adapting to climate change with measures including promoting patterns of development which encourage walking cycling and the use of public transport instead of journeys by car.

Policy DM23 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014, states that development should include the provision of secure, well-located cycle parking. To optimise access to sustainable transport modes, new development should provide links with existing public transport, pedestrian and cycle networks through its design and layout.

Policy DM32 of SADMP, 2014, sets out that residential development is expected to provide as a minimum, sufficient space for the storage of individual recycling and refuse containers to reflect the current collection regime. It is noted that the location and design of recycling and refuse provision should be integral to the design of the proposed development, with the location of the provision having regard to the need to provide and maintain safe and convenient access for occupants.

Bristol City Council's Transport Development Management team were consulted as part of the assessment process, they had no objections to the scheme, however recommended a number of conditions and advice. Full comments, conditions and advice detailed within the other comments section of this report.

#### **Conclusions**

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of impact on mix and balance; amenity of neighbouring occupiers; transport, movement and highway safety issues and sustainability and climate change. Officers have concerns regarding impact on the character and appearance of the area and the principle of development, unchanged from the previous Section 62A application. However, with respect to the previous planning inspectorate report, where these concerns were not supported or given limited weight, as such these concerns will not form part of the refusal reasons for this report.

Officers do not consider the proposal to have overcome previous officer and inspector concern for the provision of adequate light and outlook, as a result the proposal fails to provide a satisfactory living environment for future occupiers contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2024; policy BCS21 of Bristol's Core Strategy, 2011; and policies DM27 and DM30 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014.

Recommended for refusal.

**LIST OF PLANS CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE APPLICATION:**

Z-868 -D101 A Existing ground floor plan. Received 02.07.25.

Z- 868-D102 A Existing first floor plan. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D103 Existing elevations. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D104 Existing sections. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D105 B – Proposed ground floor plan. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D106 B Proposed first floor plan. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D107 Proposed elevations. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D108 A Proposed sections. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D109 B Proposed sections. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D110 A Site location plan. Received 02.07.25.

Z-868-D111 B Proposed block plan. Received 02.07.25.

Energy statement. Received 19.06.25.

Should the inspector reach a decision counter to the officer recommendation the following conditions should be applied:

**Time limit for commencement of development**

1. Full Planning Permission



The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

### **Pre commencement conditions**

#### **2. Details of air source heat pump**

There shall be no commencement of use of any air source heat pump until details including location, noise levels, and a calculation, in accordance with Microgeneration Certification Scheme planning standards (MCS 020) to show that the heat pump will be at or below the 42 dB limit at any neighbouring property have been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (Details of the Microgeneration Certification Scheme planning standards (MCS 020 including the calculation can be found at <https://www.planningportal.co.uk/permission/common-projects/heat-pumps/the-microgeneration-certification-scheme>)

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties.

#### **3. Implementation/Installation of Refuse Storage and Recycling Facilities – Shown on approved plans**

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or use commenced until the refuse/area and where necessary, dropped kerb(s) to facilitate the manoeuvring of four wheeled bins onto the carriageway have been completed in accordance with the approved plans.

Thereafter, all refuse and recyclable materials associated with the development shall either be stored within this dedicated store/area, as shown on the approved plans, or internally within the building(s) that form part of the application site for the lifetime of the development.

The refuse store/area is not to be used for any other purpose other than the storage of refuse and recyclable materials. No refuse or recycling material shall be stored or placed for collection on the adopted highway (including the footway), except on the day of collection.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the occupiers of adjoining premises; protect the general environment; prevent any obstruction to pedestrian movement and to ensure that there are adequate facilities for the storage and recycling of recoverable materials.

#### 4. Completion and Maintenance of Cycle Provision – Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until secure cycle parking and where shown, for commercial developments shower/changing facilities and lockers for cyclists to store cycling equipment, as shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of adequate and accessible cycle parking and associated showering/changing/storage facilities for commercial uses.

#### 5. Completion of Pedestrians/Cyclists Access – Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the means of access for pedestrians and/or cyclists have been constructed in accordance with the approved plans and shall thereafter be retained for access purposes only for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

### **Post occupation management**

#### 6. Energy and Sustainability in accordance

The development hereby approved shall incorporate the energy efficiency measures, on-site renewables, sustainable design principles and climate change adaptation measures into the design and construction of the development in full accordance with the Sustainability Statement inclusive of Energy Statement dated 13/02/2025, prior to occupation and thereafter retained in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the development incorporates measures to minimise the effects of, and can adapt to a changing climate.

### **List of Approved plans**

#### 7. List of approved plans and drawings

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision.

### **Reasons for refusal**

1. Given the limited number of proposed windows, their positioning in relation to surrounding structures/pathways and orientation, the proposal the proposal is considered to provide poor outlook and insufficient provision of daylight and ventilation contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2024; policy BCS21 of Bristol's Core Strategy, 2011; and policies DM27 and DM30 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, 2014.