



██████████,
21 Prince Street,
Bristol
BS1 4PH

officer: ██████████
phone: ██████████
email: ██████████
our ref: 24/03395/PREAPP
your ref:
date: December 2024

Dear ██████████,

PRE-APPLICATION ENQUIRY RESPONSE – FULL APPRAISAL

Application No: 24/03395/PREAPP

Proposal: Change of use of a vacant public house to commercial use and the demolition of the existing rear extensions to deliver an 18-bedroom HMO with communal living space.

Site Address: 110 - 112 East Street, Bedminster, Bristol BS3 4EY

I refer to your pre-application enquiry regarding the above proposal.

Executive Summary

- **Principally the application is acceptable, but the scheme is an overdevelopment in terms of the number of rooms proposed.**
- **The rear of the scheme should enhance the character of the Conservation Area, which it fails to do in its current format.**

Site Description

The site encompasses 110-112 East Street, which is currently occupied by the Assembly public house, with the rear of the site fronting Herbert Street. The 'front' of the site is a frontage fairly typical to East Street; three-storeys in height and finished in render. The parapet height of the building, owing to the additional storey, is higher than many surrounding buildings although it is noted that 118 and 120 East Street are of a similar vertical scale.

The rear of the site features an assortment of single-storey rear extensions, set far back from the street, with a lack of active frontage onto Herbert Street. Instead, the rear of the site is bounded by a brick wall. Further down Herbert Street there are buildings of differing scales and massing.

Proposed Development

The proposed development is for the construction of an 18-bed HMO (previously 16). No elevations have been provided looking from East Street, although it is understood that The Assembly pub would be replaced with a commercial unit, as well as with bin and bike stores which would serve the proposed HMO. The rear of the site is now proposed to be three-storeys in height.

For the purposes of this PREAPP response, the amended plans shall be assessed.

Relevant Planning History

94/00281/F Alterations to front and rear elevations. Date Closed: 20 April 1994, Granted, subject to conditions

04/00026/F Conversion of upper floors to provide 4 no. self-contained flats (Use Class C3).
Date Closed: 17 March 2004, Granted, subject to conditions

04/04874/F Alterations to front elevation. Date Closed: 20 January 2005, Refusal

05/00182/F Construction of a two-storey rear extension comprising 4 no. self-contained flats.
Withdrawn

05/02277/F Single storey rear extension to existing public house including external garden area.
Date Closed: 20 October 2005, Granted, subject to conditions

06/00045/F Demolition of buildings adjacent to the car park at the rear and construction of a single-storey extension.
Date Closed: 13 March 2006, Granted, subject to conditions

06/00107/F Construction of new shopfront to existing public house.
Date Closed: 9 March 2006, Refused

06/01730/F Construction of new shopfront to existing public house. Date Closed: 3 July 2006, Granted, subject to conditions

23/00686/F Creation of 2no. small houses in multiple occupation for 3-6 people (C4) at first and second floor level.
Date Closed: 14 June 2024 Granted, subject to conditions

24/03431/COND Application for approval of details reserved by condition 3 of permission 23/00686/F Creation of 2no. small houses in multiple occupation for 3-6 people (C4) at first and second floor level.
Date Closed: 23 October 2024

Emerging Local Policy

Officers draw your attention to the emerging local plan which is currently in its examination stage. Any formal application may be subject to policies contained within the emerging plan as it gets nearer to adoption. Emerging policies relevant to this development include, but are not limited to the following:

- Policy DS8 (Central Bedminster)
- Policy UL1 (Effective and efficient use of land)
- Policy H4 (Housing type and mix)
- Policy H6 (Houses in multiple occupation and other shared housing)
- Policy SSE1 (Supporting Bristol's Centres – network and hierarchy)
- Policy SSE8 (Public Houses)
- Policy T1 (Development and transport principles)
- Policy NZC1 (Climate change, sustainable design and construction)
- Policy FR1 (Flood risk and water management)
- Policy DC1 (Liveability in residential development including space standards, aspect and private outdoor space)
- Policy DC3 (Alterations to Existing Buildings)
- Policy DC4 (Recycling and refuse provision in new development)
- Policy CHE1 (Conservation and the historic environment)

Public Comments

One comment was received from the BS3 Planning Group. Their response is as follows:

The principle of change of use from a (Sui Generis) Public House to a (Class E) commercial unit. There is serious concern that we are losing not just a public house but a venue where communities can gather, and friendships can be formed. East St is surrounded to one side by over 1400 beds for student accommodation, and residents have been led to believe that these young people will help East St to regenerate and provide opportunities for the night time economy. So losing the Assembly at this point to commercial activities may not be the most creative use of one of the larger buildings on East St.

To continue that this development may not fit into the plans the community have for East St, which includes AGB working with ward Councillors and the BBC Regeneration Team to activate spaces when they become available. Other initiatives include Share Bristol which has recently moved into East St and will be piloting commercial activities particularly for Young People.

East St has recently been designated as a primary shopping area, and selected as one of five places in England to join a new £2.5 million National Lottery funded pilot. The funded pilot will secure and revive buildings for long-term local benefit to encourage more money to stay local and help build the local economy through the recently established Bedminster Property Partnership.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] /

We also note that the list of pubs given as justification for change from pub to commercial includes businesses which aren't pubs they are cafes and restaurants.

The principle of the delivery of one large HMO (Sui Generis) on the site.

A 16 bed HMO has been queried as overly large, and overly dense more similar to co-living without the usual amenities. Concern that the accommodation offered in Floors 1 & 2 could be compromised by the proximity of the 16 bed HMO.

Design Scale and Massing

General concern that too much is being shoe-horned onto the site - the heights of the buildings may be appropriate but the shape of the site means that though the bedrooms may have the minimum area required many end up being little more than corridors and the kitchenette next to Bed 3 is too small to operate safely.

All bedrooms are single aspect - poor for ventilation and preventing overheating The view from many of the bedrooms seems to be a blank wall 1 to 2m away.

Impact on the Historic Environment

110-112 East Street is a Victorian unlisted building of merit within Bedminster Conservation Area. We believe it is essential that all new building should be of the highest quality and reflect the identity of the area whilst looking to the best contemporary design and materials.

As we all know appearances do matter, and increasingly so with the new design codes under review. We are concerned that the eventual proposal should enhance the conservation area.

Whether the design offers a suitable environment for future residents and existing neighbours.

The outside space feels quite small, and north facing as well as hemmed in on 3 sides The roof top plant is not shown on the elevation, it should be and it may impact the courtyard The area for the raised walkway appears narrower on the first floor plan than it does on the ground floor plan. Which is correct?

Cross referencing the plans with the sections suggests that in the upper floor rooms the beds will be pushed into the area of reduced head-height. These may prove to be impractical rooms to use. Communal space seems to all be kitchen, no other facilities.

The use of the raised walkway alongside the bedrooms is not the best solution for privacy.

Whether the proposed development is ok for flood impact and whether a sequential test is required.

Suitability of the ecological benefits proposed. Good to see landscaping has been included, I recommend a wildlife pond and planting. Easy to maintain and attracts surprising amount of wildlife create habitat around the pond not water feature.

Recommendations regarding heating and renewables.

We are pleased to see that this application is considering sustainable materials, and we urge that there is a greater push for the use of good quality low energy design, and encourage the use of Passivhaus standards and Enerphit initiatives be used (for the existing building)

Acceptability of the highways measures proposed.

Bike park provision of four to the rear (Herbert st) , plus bins store for this group of 16 rooms, sounds like nothing given its car-free.

Note there are also bikes and bins in the pub for the HMO upstairs.

Principle of Development

Loss of Public House

Paragraph 93 of the NPPF (2023) specifies that to provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning decisions should:

- plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments; and
- guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs

Policy BCS12 (Community Facilities) of the Core Strategy states that existing community facilities should be retained, unless it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a need to retain the use or where alternative provision is made. In cases where community facilities are proposed for redevelopment the council will need to assess the loss in terms of the social, economic and physical impact on the local community and the harm caused to the level of community facilities provision in the area.

Policy DM5 (Protection of Community Facilities) of the SADMP outlines that the loss of community facilities will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that:

- i. The loss would not create, or add to, a shortfall in the provision or quality of such uses within the locality or, where the use has ceased, that there is

- no need or demand for any other suitable community facility that is willing or able to make use of the building(s) or
- ii. The building or land is no longer suitable to accommodate the current community use and cannot be retained or sensitively adapted to accommodate other community facilities; or
- iii. The community facility can be fully retained, enhanced or reinstated as part of any redevelopment of the building or land; or
- iv. Appropriate replacement community facilities are provided in a suitable alternative location.

Policy DM6 (Public Houses) states that Proposals involving the loss of established public houses will not be permitted unless it is demonstrated that:

- i. The public house is no longer economically viable; or
- ii. A diverse range of public house provision exists within the locality.

Where development is permitted any extensions or alterations should not harm the identity or architectural character of the public house.

Any forthcoming application would have to justify the loss of the public house through justification of either point i or ii, or both.

It is noted that this has been provided within the pre-application enquiry. A marketing report has been submitted, which shows that the site was advertised for 12 months with some interest but no offers. The Marketing Statement concludes that the unit is substantial, and that more demand would be received if the unit was a smaller retail unit. It should be noted that the Policy DM6 practice note makes it clear that applicants “will be expected to demonstrate that the public house has been marketed for a period of at least 18 months”. Any submission would have to accord with this.

The submission has also demonstrated that there is a diverse range of public house provision in the immediate vicinity, 14 in total. Policy DM6, in the supporting text, indicates that this should only be measured against other public houses within reasonable walking distance. The Policy DM6 practice note states that a reasonable walking distance is 800m.

For this reason, Flip Food, Old Book Shop, The Albatross Café have been discounted as they are registered to be ‘Café Bars’ within Pinpoint Data. The Barley Mow has also been discounted because the establishment is a wine bar.

There is a large range of provision of public houses in the immediate vicinity and that, based on the initial evidence, it is not considered principally that the loss of the public house here would be discordant with Policy DM5 or DM6. However, more evidence would be required within any submission. A Viability Assessment should be submitted to show that the pub is no longer economically viable and provide further evidence of a range of pubs within the locality. There should also be more information as to what the existing pub serves, and that measures to improve the viability of the existing pub have been pursued. Similarly, there should also be demonstration that there is a sufficiently diverse range of public houses which caters and meets the needs of the whole community. Applicants are referred to the Policy

DM6: Public Houses practice note for further information.

Use as an HMO

Policy DM2 (Residential subdivisions, shared and specialist housing) states that the construction of new buildings to be used as HMOs, specialist student housing and other forms of share housing will not be permitted where proposals would exacerbate existing harmful conditions. This policy does not permit new HMOs or the intensification of existing HMOs where development would create or contribute to a harmful concentration within a locality.

Managing the development of houses in multiple occupation, SPD (Adopted) November 2020 recognises that HMOs form part of the city's private rented housing stock and can contribute positively to people's housing choice. It is however recognised that HMOs are a more intensive form of accommodation than traditional flats or dwellings. Typically, this increases dependent on the level of occupancy. General issues associated with HMOs include: Noise and disturbance; Detriment to visual amenity (through external alterations and poor waste management); Reduced community facilities; Highway safety concerns (from increased parking); Reduced housing choice; Reduced community engagement; Reduced social cohesion.

The SPD expands on DM2 to provide a definition of what represents a 'harmful concentration' in the wording of the policy. This relates to two principles; local level and area level. At local level, a harmful concentration is found to exist where 'sandwiching' occurs. This is where a single-family dwelling (use class C3) becomes sandwiched with HMOs at sites adjacent, opposite or to the rear. This can happen within a flatted building with HMOs above and below also. With regards to the wider area, a harmful concentration is found to exist where a threshold proportion of 10% HMOs within a 100m radius of the site occurs. This is generally identified as a tipping point, beyond which negative impacts to residential amenity and character are likely to be experienced and housing choice and community cohesion start to weaken.

The LPA calculates that the percentage of HMOs within 100 metres of the site is 7.73% (the submitted pre-app statement quotes 9.09%). Similarly, data shows that no sandwiching would occur from the application scheme. Considering this, the provision of an HMO in this location is acceptable.

Introduction of Commercial Use (Class E) at ground floor level

East Street is a designated primary shopping area and is within the Bedminster centre. Therefore, there is no objection to incorporating part of the ground floor level under Class E use, as it would be within the relevant designations and character of the street.

Impact upon the Character and Appearance of the Area

Paragraph 41 of the National Design Guide states that well-designed new development responds positively to the features of the site itself and the surrounding context beyond the site boundary. It enhances positive qualities and improves negative ones. Paragraphs 52 and 53 outline that local identity is made up of typical

characteristics such as the pattern of housing, and special features that are distinct from their surroundings. Well-designed new development is influenced by an understanding of local character including built form and includes the composition of street scenes, individual buildings and their elements; the height, scale, massing and relationship between buildings; roofscapes; and façade design, such as the degree of symmetry, variety, the pattern and proportions of windows and doors and their details.

The development would require assessment against Policy BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) of the Core Strategy which advocates that new development should deliver high quality urban design that contributes positively to an area's character and identity, whilst safeguarding the amenity of existing development.

Similarly, the development will be assessed against Policies DM26 (Local Character & Distinctiveness) and DM27 (Layout & Form) of the Site Allocations & Development Management Policies (SADMP) Local Plan, which outline that all development is expected to contribute positively to an area's character and identity. This should be achieved by responding to the existing built environment. In particular, development should respect the local pattern and grain of existing buildings and respond to the local scale and character created by height, massing, shape and form, proportion, building lines, set-backs from the street, skylines and roofscapes.

East Street frontage

The frontage of this building would be assessed under Policies BCS22 (Conservation and the Historic Environment) of the Core Strategy DM31 (Heritage Assets) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan, which outline that all development proposals related to heritage and conservation are expected to safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance.

More information would be required to show the elevations of the 'front' of the building. It is understood that this would be unchanged, however this should still be shown on any full planning application so that the impact upon the Bedminster Conservation Area can still be adequately assessed.

The windows at the front of the building are particularly large, especially in their vertical aspect. There is some concern as to the location of the bin stores being at the front, given that they would be readily visible from one of the front-facing windows. The arrangement here is not particularly ideal in regard to conserving or enhancing the quality of the Conservation Area, and it is generally regarded that refuse should be out of sight along East Street. There is also concern that the halving of the ground floor in such a way shown would lead to the fragmentation of the commercial frontage within this part of the conservation area. Because the elevation treatment of this section is unclear currently, because nothing is shown, it is unclear at this stage how this can be successfully overcome/resolved because the windows would be required to change or be obscure glazed - both of which would cause some harm.

Other than the above, there is no further objection in regard to this aspect of the

scheme given that that it is understood there are no major changes to the design of this frontage.

Herbert Street Frontage

i. Design

The design of the rear should 'uplift' the street scene of Herbert Street. The rear of the site is still within the Conservation Area, so proposals should preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. Given that, currently, the rear of the building is a negative feature of the Conservation Area, the expectation in this instance is that any development should enhance the character and quality of the Conservation Area in order to be acceptable. Likewise to the façade facing East Street, this façade would also be assessed under Policies BCS22 (Conservation and the Historic Environment) of the Core Strategy DM31 (Heritage Assets) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan.

There have been many applications in the immediate vicinity, so there is an opportunity to improve the public realm and backlands character along this road. Many of the buildings at the rear are of a poor quality, and we expect proposals to enhance the architectural character rather than mimic it.

The proposal has been altered in its lifetime to incorporate three storeys at the rear instead of two. Because of the location of the site as being backland to East Street and buildings along Warden Road, one to two storeys on this frontage would be acceptable rather than three. Because of close proximity to the rear windows of houses along Warden Road, single storey would be the most appropriate (see more in the 'Amenity' section of the response).

Any planning application should also include 3D Views of the rear of the building as well as Herbert Street and the pavement. This is so that the LPA can understand how the proposals interface with the street.

The materiality of the rear of the building has been expressed as being render within the Design and Access Statement. The scheme would be improved if the building was finished in brickwork, much like other schemes and existing buildings along Herbert Street or some other high-quality material. Whilst the Bedminster Conservation Area Character Appraisal highlights stucco render as being within the material palette, this mainly refers to the material palette along East Street rather than Herbert Street. This is not solely refusable but, as stated, there building should be an improvement to the public realm along Herbert Street.

The details shown on the windows should be retained for any full planning application as it adds some visual interest to the rear façade. Further details of window detailing, along with the parapets and materials used should be provided so that it reduces the requirement for pre-commencement conditions should a full application be submitted.

The site plan has not been amended with the revised pre-application scheme. It is

shown on the revised rear elevation that the building would have a flat roof, which would be more in character with other buildings fronting Herbert Street. Similarly, the orientation of the rear building does not currently respect any discernible building line along the south of Herbert Street. The rear façade of the building should be in line with the south-west quoin of 90-96 East Street, and thus set back from Herbert Street. Currently, the building is not angled as such.

There are no other comments in regard to the design of the rear of the proposal.

Amenity

Neighbouring occupiers

Any full planning application would be assessed against Policies BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) of the Bristol Core Strategy which advocates that new development should give consideration to matters of neighbouring privacy, outlook and natural lighting. It also states that new development should safeguard the amenity of existing development.

The development would also be assessed against Policy DM29 (Design of New Buildings) of the SADMP which outlines proposals for new buildings will be expected to ensure that existing and proposed development achieves appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight.

As mentioned, the application site is in close proximity to dwellings along the eastern side of Warden Road. 1-6 Warden Court in particular, is extremely close to the application site. Currently, the buildings at the rear of the site are single-storey in height. Given that the proposal would incorporate additional stories there is concern that the development would lead to a loss of outlook and become overbearing onto these houses/residential units. Even though the design is single-storey on the western boundary and sloped downwards in the 'middle' section – which has presumably been designed in that way with those dwellings in mind – there is still some concern in regard to the height not being in compliance with DM29 and BCS21. Fewer storeys at the rearmost section would be encouraged by the LPA for any full planning application.

A South West Elevation should be provided on any full planning application for a full assessment on impact onto these windows. It would also be beneficial to understand if this overbearing/overshadowing impacts upon outdoor amenity areas.

Pollution Control were consulted on the scheme and offered no objection in regard to the development leading to excessive noise pollution as a result of increased occupancy.

Future occupiers

Policies relevant to the liveability of future occupiers include Policy DM2 which states that houses in multiple occupation will not be permitted where:

i. The development would harm the residential amenity or character of the locality as a result of any of the following:

- Levels of activity that cause excessive noise and disturbance to residents; or
- Levels of on-street parking that cannot be reasonably accommodated or regulated through parking control measures; or
- Cumulative detrimental impact of physical alterations to buildings and structures; or
- Inadequate storage for recycling/refuse and cycles.

ii. The development would create or contribute to a harmful concentration of such uses within a locality as a result of any of the following:

- Exacerbating existing harmful conditions including those listed at (i) above; or
- Reducing the choice of homes in the area by changing the housing mix.

Adopted Bristol Core Strategy Policy (2011) BCS18 makes specific reference to residential developments providing sufficient space for everyday activities and space which should be flexible and adaptable. In addition, Policy BCS21 sets out criteria for the assessment of design quality in new development and states that development will be expected to create a high-quality environment for future occupiers. 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.

Each proposed room within the HMO is single-aspect, except for Bedroom 18 which features 3 windows. Many of the windows in the proposed building are angled towards the east. There is a distance of approximately 3.5m between the flank of the proposed building and the side of 102-106 East Street.

There is concern that due to the limited separation distances between the neighbouring dwelling and the fenestration provided that it could impact light levels into the HMO, especially at the ground floor level. Currently, the separation distances are so limited that it would warrant refusal for impact upon future occupiers. A street elevation showing a 45-degree angle from side elevation, ground floor windows should be provided on any full planning application, showing overshadowing onto these rooms. The 45-degree test needs to be complied with so that the scheme is acceptable. There is also concern that there is limited outlook provided given the short separation distances. 25-degrees also needs to be shown so that the neighbouring building is not overbearing onto the proposed HMO. Currently, it is unclear how this issue can be overcome.

There is also concern that no outdoor amenity space has been provided except for a relatively small (7.5m² in area) raised courtyard garden.

Overall, there is a concern that the scheme is an overdevelopment of the amount of units proposed, and the development would be better, in liveability terms, if fewer

rooms were provided. This is because there would be more opportunity to afford better outlook and light into the rooms. There would also be more scope to provide a larger outdoor amenity area. Finally, it would reduce the scale of the building which, in turn, would help overcome concerns regarding neighbouring amenity.

Because no living room has been provided on the plans, the bedrooms have been measured against the minimum requirement for a combined bed and living room – which is 9m² within Bristol City Council's Room Size and Amenity Standards for Licensable Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) document. In this instance, all the proposed bedrooms meet this standard.

Sustainability

Given that the scheme proposes a new building at the rear, a sustainability and energy statement should be provided for any full planning application. This would be assessed against relevant policies BCS13 (Climate Change), BCS14 (Sustainable Energy) and Section 14 of the NPPF.

Transport and Highways considerations

Policy DM2 states that development will not be permitted if there is inadequate storage for refuse and cycles.

Drawing number 111b is unacceptable in regard to this because the proposed bike store can only be accessed via a flight of stairs. Stepped access is not suitable for most users, and the access provided here would mean that users would have to try to safely negotiate a flight of stairs with a bicycle, so this plan is deemed contrary to Policies BCS10 and DM23.

Drawing number 111a is more acceptable in terms of access because the cycle stores are located adjacent to Herbert Street. Therefore, purely in terms of access, proposed stores in this location accord with Policies BCS10 and DM23.

10 spaces have been provided for an 18-bedroom HMO. It is also unclear whether the 6-spaces at the front of the building are shared with the existing HMO on the upper floors of the East Street building. Similarly, it is unclear as to whether any cycle parking has been provided for the proposed commercial unit or if this has been encompassed within the 6 spots at the front.

Given there is no car parking, and that the scheme is in a residents' parking scheme, extra provision should be secured given the number of bedspaces and introduction of a commercial unit along East Street. It is noted that there is no specific minimum provision provided within Appendix 2 for 'sui generis' Houses in Multiple Occupation. Appendix 2 highlights that the minimum provision is that there is one space per 100m², which is met (given that the floor area of the commercial unit is only 52m²). Nonetheless, there is additional strain on this specific type of transport, so more spaces are preferable.

Flood Risk

The Flood Risk Team were consulted on the application and commented as follows:

To confirm how the LLFA will be commenting on the application (through direct consultation or consultation via the LPA and application of Standing Advice) see section 4.3 of the Bristol City Council Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (BCC L1 SFRA).

We would expect a Sustainable Drainage Strategy to be submitted with the main application that meets the requirements of the Level 1 SFRA. In particular (but not limited to), highlighting/addressing the following:

- Providing a Proof of Concept to identify the constraints and opportunities to sustainable drainage at as early a stage in the design process as possible.
- Surface water should be attenuated through a mix of multi-benefit SuDS where possible, including rain gardens, green roofs, privately maintained permeable paving, or features draining the highway such as highway bio-retention pods, swales. The site must limit the amount of single-benefit storage features like tanks or oversized pipes.
- Contamination on site should be analysed and deemed appropriate before infiltration is proposed. Consideration of ground water levels should be undertaken if soakaways are being proposed.
- If discharging into a watercourse/ditch, confirmation of ownership of the proposed receiving watercourses/ditches as well as an indication of the likely consents required (e.g. Flood Defence Consent/Land Drainage Consent) should be provided.
- If connecting to the public sewer, evidence that Wessex Water is satisfied with the discharge rate and that there is enough capacity in the sewer to accommodate this discharge, must be provided. Please contact planning.liaison@wessexwater.co.uk
- We recommend a two stage outflow, so that runoff generated during an event of up to 1 in 30 annual chance is discharged at the present day Qbar rates. Flows generated during an event of between 1 in 30 and up to 1 in 100 inclusive of climate change controlled to the Greenfield 1 in 100 annual chance event where possible, or 50% betterment on existing brownfield rates.
- Evidence that there will be no flooding on site for a 1 in 30 year event and that there will be no flooding of buildings, or leaving the site boundary for a 1 in 100 year event.
- Evidence as to how the site is limiting long term storage to existing rates.
- Confirmation of the proposed maintenance regime, including activities, frequency and responsibility.
- Discharge rates should be as close as is reasonably practicable to Greenfield equivalent rates, or at least 50% betterment on pre-

- development rates, but it can't exceed existing rates for the site.
- The requirements outlined in the BCC L1 SFRA will need to be adhered to. That is addressing three out of four of the benefits identified in the four pillars of SuDS design highlighted in the SuDS Manual. Including improving water quality, enhancing amenity value, increasing biodiversity and reducing water quantity.
 - We would recommend early engagement with the applicant to discuss their emerging sustainable drainage strategy.
 - The applicant should note that new Sewerage Sector Guidance (published 1st April 2020) enables Water Companies to adopt SuDS features as part of the surface water drainage network. Policies and Guidance on this can be found at <https://www.wessexwater.co.uk/services/building-and-developing/sector-guidance-on-sewerage-and-water-adoption-agreements>.
 - If the intention is to offer the drainage scheme up for adoption the applicant will need to consult with Wessex Water, 'prior to the submission of any' drainage scheme details 'to the local planning authority, to ensure compliance under the new adoption codes and to formally commence the adoption process. Applicants should contact Wessex Water through planning.liaison@wessexwater.co.uk for further information/discussion. The Local Planning Authority will support any applications brought forward through the Wessex Water adoption process.
 - The site has relatively poor infiltration potential with limited opportunities for bespoke infiltration based SuDS; this should be confirmed with infiltration testing carried out to BRE Digest 365 standard.
 - We have records of flooding within the vicinity of the site boundary.
 - The site is located within Flood Zone 2 and therefore a Flood Risk Assessment should be provided and consultation with the EA should be undertaken. A Flood Evacuation Plan should also be provided and consultation with EPRT and LLFA should be undertaken; this should address access and egress during a design flood event (1 in 100 fluvial and 1 in 200 tidal (inclusive of climate change commensurate with the lifetime of the development) whichever is larger) and a consideration of extreme flood events (1 in 1000 year).

In terms of planning requirements; the development would be subject to a sequential test in order to be acceptable. Even though the submitted Pre-application Flood Risk note states that the development "should be beyond the intended scope of the Sequential Test", the application is, nonetheless, within Flood Zone 2. Paragraph 175 states that "the sequential test should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding".

Applicants are referred to the Sequential Test Practice Note.

Contamination

The applicants are referred to the following.

Bristol Core Strategy - BCS23 (Pollution)

Local Plan - DM34 (Contaminated Land)

National Planning Policy Framework (2024) Paragraphs 124 (c), 180 (e & f) , 189 & 190

Applicants are reminded of paragraph 190 of the NPPF: Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner.

' Land Contamination Risk Management: Land contamination risk management (LCRM) - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)

' Planning Practice Guidance Note <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/land-affected-by-contamination>

' Planning Portal Guidance <https://www.planningportal.co.uk/permission/commercial-developments/land-contamination/why-do-you-need-to-know-about-land-contamination>

The proposed development is sensitive to contamination and is situated on or adjacent to land which has been subject to land uses which could be a potential source of contamination.

A minimum of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (also known as a desk study) looking into contamination shall be submitted with any future planning application, if the report identifies a requirement for a Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment submission of this information with the planning application is encouraged to reduce the burden of pre-commencement conditions and save time later in the development process.

More details regarding the team and services are available on the following website:

<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/planning-and-building-regulations-for-business/land-contamination-for-developers>

Biodiversity Net Gain

A BNG metric, or exemption statement, should be provided on any full planning application as the development does not involve a pure change of use.

Planning Obligations

The proposed development would be CIL liable as it would result in the creation of over 100m² of new built floorspace. As the proposal is located in the 'outer charging zone' of the Bristol City Council Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule,

the CIL liability will be the proposed Gross Internal Area (GIA) multiplied by £50 (£50/m²).

Completion of a CIL liability form is a validation requirement. Please refer to the following website for further details regarding CIL:

<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/planning-and-building-regulations/community-infrastructure-levy>

Bristol's CIL charging schedule can be found at the following address:

<https://www.bristol.gov.uk/documents/20182/33588/CIL+Charging+Schedule.pdf>

Conclusion

In summary, whilst the proposal is principally acceptable, the current format submitted in this pre-application would be refused. In particular, the design of the rear needs to enhance the character of the Conservation Area. Similarly, there are concerns as to the impact on future amenity in terms of outlook and lack of sunlight. Bike store provision also needs clarity on any future submission. Finally, it is the opinion of the LPA that a sequential test is provided on any full submission.

The views given are current at the time of giving the advice, but changes in the planning circumstances can change, and will need to be taken into account when any subsequent application is determined.

Please note that the above advice represents an informal opinion of an officer of the council who has no power to bind the council by the views expressed.

Yours sincerely,



Senior Development Management Officer