

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

Bristol City Council Development Management

Delegated Report and Decision

Application No: 18/01164/F **Registered:** 26 March 2018

Type of Application: Full Planning
Case Officer: [REDACTED] **Expiry Date:** 21 May 2018

Site Address: 36 Hampton Park
 Bristol
 BS6 6LH

Description of Development: Construction of a one bed house, sunken into existing rear garden.

Ward: Clifton Down

Site Visit Date: **Date Photos Taken:**

Consultation Expiry Dates:

Advert 9 May 2018 **Neighbour:** 11 May 2018
and/or Site 9 May 2018
Notice:

SITE DESCRIPTION

No. 36 Hampton Park is sited to the eastern side of the road and consists of a 3 storey 19th century style semi-detached townhouse with a large rear garden. The dwelling has been subdivided into flats, and the garden to the rear has been subdivided into separate amenity spaces for the respective flats, as well as a larger garden plot between the two properties (No. 36 and No. 34).

The two houses are situated around a corner in the road, with the wider plot, set down from road level, subsequently takes on a triangular shape - narrowing towards the road between the houses and expanding in width to the rear.

The development site is within the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area and it in close proximity to a railway cutting.

RELEVANT HISTORY

03/03400/F Conversion of property from 1no. maisonette and 2 no. flats to 1 no. maisonette and 3 no. flats (by the creation of one bedroom flat at ground floor level). 9 January 2004 PERMISSION GRANTED

07/04620/F Sub-division of lower ground maisonette to two flats, with alterations to the existing ground floor flat. 4 April 2008 PERMISSION GRANTED

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

14/00227/F Single storey extension to basement flat. 4 April 2014 REFUSED

APPLICATION

Approval is sought in relation to the erection of a two bedroom dwellinghouse to the vacant plot between No. 36 and No. 34 Hampton Park.

The two storey dwelling would be set back from the principal elevations to the neighbouring houses, and the majority of the space would be set down, out of view from the public realm at lower ground floor level. The lower ground floor would cover approximately 60% of the plot and would house all of the habitable living space, while a smaller ground floor level towards the entrance to the site would provide for covered staircase access and storage space, as well as additional light to the lower level. A small courtyard would be created to the northern side of the dwelling, and the house would be built up to the boundary with No. 36 to the south.

Elevations to the lower ground floor would be faced in natural stone, while the ground floor structure, including the roof, would be clad in standing seam zinc. Windows would be framed in aluminium and the flat roof to the lower ground floor would be a green roof.

OFFICER NOTE: Following concern regarding bedroom sizes, the applicant submitted revised drawings to demonstrate a single bedroom (2 bed space) dwelling. Refer to Key Issue C for further details.

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

41 neighbouring addresses were directly consulted regarding the application, and additional advertisement of the application by means of site and press notices was carried out. Consultation expired on 11th May 2018.

9 responses from 5 properties were received and are summarised below:

A letter of support was received from No. 28 Hampton Park:

- Good design and provision of renewable energies
- Addition of two beds in current housing climate positive
- Some concern regarding adequate parking

An objection was received from 16 Hampton Park:

- Loss of garden not acceptable and all are valuable as leisure, recreation and wildlife spaces

A neutral representation was received from the Bristol Civic Society:

- Interesting solution to accommodate a residential unit on site
- A suggestion to improve the cladding to the Hampton Park facing elevation to be more in-keeping with the material palette of the area

An objection and a neutral comment was received from No. 7 Warwick Road:

- No objection to building plan

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

- Objection to the material aesthetic of the top floor as it is not seen to be in keeping with the character of the area
- The arboricultural impact assessment has not been satisfactorily carried out and concern is raised regarding harmful impact to a wild cherry tree (neutral comment)

A representation in objection to the scheme was received from the **Hampton Park and Cotham Hill Community Group** (materially relevant comments summarise below):

- Area already over developed
- Loss of garden space would be detrimental and create a precedent for further loss of gardens in the area
- Possible damage to trees nearby
- No provision for parking

An objection was received 2 South Terrace:

- Proposed disrupts skyline and would potentially overlook neighbours
- Proposal out of keeping with existing pattern and grain of development
- Detrimental impact on parking

An objection was received from 9 Cotham Gardens:

- Loss of garden inappropriate
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Not a sensible or sustainable location

OFFICER RESPONSE: The material issues raised are noted and considered in the Key Issues below.

BCC CITY DESIGN GROUP (CDG)

An urban design officer at CDG was verbally consulted regarding the application and while noting that the scheme was an interesting approach to development of the site, the scheme was not supported based on concern relating to over-intensive development of the plot and harm to the setting of the Conservation Area.

NETWORK RAIL

Owing to the site's proximity to a railway line, Network Rail were consulted. No objection was raised.

RELEVANT POLICIES

PAN 2 Conservation Area Enhancement Statements (November 1993)
Planning Obligations SPD
Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990
National Planning Policy Framework – March 2012
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.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED

36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

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

KEY ISSUES

(A) WOULD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT BE ACCEPTABLE IN PRINCIPLE IN LAND USE TERMS?

Section 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines that housing applications should be considered within a context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The NPPF states local planning authorities should plan to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Policies BCS5 (Housing Provision) and BCS18 (Housing Type) of the Bristol Core Strategy as well as Policy DM1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (SADMP) reflect this guidance. Policy BCS5 (Housing Provision) of the Core Strategy outlines that delivery of housing to meet the Council's housing targets will primarily be focused on previously developed sites however some open space will be utilised for housing development.

Policy DM21 (Development of Private Gardens) of the SADMP outlines that private garden space makes an important contribution to the cities green infrastructure. In general, the Council will seek to retain private gardens however there are certain circumstances where development on private gardens will constitute sustainable development and contribute positively to the city's supply of new homes. Such circumstances occur where proposals make more efficient use of land where higher densities are appropriate, development results in significant improvements in urban design and where development involves an extension to an existing dwelling, retaining adequate functional garden. In all cases, any development of garden land should not result in harm to the character and appearance of an area. Development involving front gardens should ensure that the character of the street is not harmed and that appropriate boundary treatments and planting are retained.

It should be noted that the land, while once part of the garden area ancillary to No. 36, has since been divided off under previous consent to subdivide the host property into flats. Whilst it is no longer in direct use as a garden to any surrounding dwelling, it's original function remains as garden and it still retains the open quality of such an amenity. The site is situated in a residential area less than 50m from the Whiteladies Road Town Centre which has a wide range of services and public transport options.

In principle, the site therefore represents a sustainable location where the development of garden land to achieve higher residential densities could be appropriate. This is however subject to ensuring development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. In this case, the application has not successfully demonstrated that higher densities can be accommodated at this particular site without resulting in harm to the appearance and character of the area and is read as an incongruous form of development within the context of the street and wider conservation area. The proposal was also found to represent over intensive development of the site which by virtue of its siting and scale would provide substandard living conditions for future occupiers. A detailed assessment of the impact of development to local appearance and character and living environment created will follow within the next sections of this report however in light of this conclusion, the principle of the proposed development of garden land is not supported.

(B) MIXED AND BALANCED COMMUNITY ISSUE

Policy BCS18 of the Adopted Core Strategy 2011 seeks to ensure new development provides or

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

contributes to a mix of housing types to avoid excessive concentration of one particular type. An up to date picture of the proportion of residential accommodation types in the LSOA can be obtained by assessing the 2011 census data.

The application site is located within the Cotham Hill LSOA within the Clifton Down Ward. An up to date picture of the proportion of different residential accommodation types in the LSOA can be obtained by assessing the 2011 Census data. The Cotham Hill LSOA has a proportion of flats to houses at 87.1% flats to 12.9% houses. This suggests that there is an imbalance between flats and houses in this location. One and two bedroom properties are prevalent in the area, forming around 70% of all households.

Given this context the proposal (as originally proposed and amended) represents little change either to addressing the identified imbalance or exacerbating it. The classification of the unit as a dwellinghouse would be positive when considered against the dominance of flatted accommodation in the area, nevertheless the proposed two bedrooms would not offer a significant degree of diversity to the existing stock in terms of unit size.

Overall, given the scale and given that the proposal does not involve the loss of a large family dwelling, the proposal is found to have no impact on the mix and balance of the area and therefore would not warrant refusal on this basis.

(C) WOULD THE PROPOSAL BE ACCEPTABLE IN DESIGN TERMS AND WOULD IT PRESERVE OR ENHANCE THE CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE OF THIS PART OF THE WHITELADIES ROAD CONSERVATION AREA?

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The Authority is also required (under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The case of *R (Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks DC* [2014] EWHC 1895 (Admin) ("*Forge Field*") has made it clear where there is harm to a listed building or a conservation area the decision maker "must give that harm considerable importance and weight." [48]. This is applicable here because there is harm to the setting of the listed building and conservation area caused by the proposals as set out below.

Policy BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) of the Core Strategy 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.

Policy DM29 (Design of New Buildings) of the SADMP states that new buildings should present high quality design, responding appropriately to their importance and reflecting their function and role within the public realm. In particular, clear organisation and hierarchy in relation to function is encouraged, as are active street frontages with main entrances fronting the public realm and good levels of natural surveillance. Consideration should also be given for orientation in relation to climatic conditions. Exteriors should generate visual interest, be well proportioned and appear well ordered. Materials should be high quality, durable and sustainable, utilising colours and patterns which contribute positively to the character of the area. DM29 also notes that new residential development should provide dual aspect where possible, particularly where one of the aspects is north facing.

An urban design officer in the BCC City Design Group was verbally consulted regarding the

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

application and raised concern over the design and legibility of the access to the proposed dwelling, as well as concern regarding the physical constraints of the site and its ability to support a new dwelling that delivers suitably high quality living standards.

It is acknowledged that the house would be significantly set down from the level of Hampton Park road, and back from the principal elevations to existing houses, reducing the visible presence of the structure on the street scene to a small section of the ground floor structure as alluded to on street scene drawings.

Nevertheless, policies DM26 and DM27 of the SADMP state that new development should contribute positively to an area's character and identity through responding to the existing built environment and respecting the local pattern and grain of existing buildings. New development should also 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.

In this regard the structure would fail to complement surrounding development in terms of the local pattern and grain of existing buildings, as well as in terms of its siting, scale, form and proportions. While its visibility and presence on the street scene are restricted, and despite its low profile, in design terms the dwelling as proposed is nevertheless regarded to be an over intensive scale of development that would fail to respond appropriately to the back land, garden context of the site and the established layout of adjacent buildings. It is also concluded that the proposed scale and siting of the flat-roofed block is contrary to the established layout and pattern of adjacent buildings, resulting in a cramped and incongruous form which would be harmful to the established character of the area, and would fail to offer any enhancement gain to the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area.

(D) DOES THE PROPOSAL PROVIDE SATISFACTORY LIVING STANDARDS FOR FUTURE OCCUPIERS AND PRESERVE THE AMENITY OF NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTS?

Section 17 of the NPPF outlines 12 'core planning principles' which should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. One of these principles is that decision making should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Policy BCS18 (Housing Type) of the Core Strategy outlines that residential developments should provide sufficient space for everyday activities and to enable flexibility and adaptability by meeting appropriate space standards.

The relevant space standards are the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Nationally Described Space Standards for new housing published in March 2015. These outline technical standards for application to all tenures of housing across England. The standards set minimum internal areas which accommodation should provide relative to the number of future occupants. The standards also set minimum levels for built in storage within new house, bedroom sizes and minimum floor to ceiling heights. Double bedrooms should have a floor area of 11.5m² and a minimum width of 2.75m. Single bedrooms should have a minimum floor area of 7.5m² and minimum width of 2.15m. The dwelling should ensure 2.3m floor to ceiling height for at least 75% of the internal area. Any area with headroom of less than 1.5m is not counted within the Gross Internal Area unless used solely for storage.

In addition to meeting space standards, new dwellings are encouraged to achieve good standards of natural light, ventilation, outlook and privacy for future occupants. Where possible, dwellings should be dual aspect. Furthermore, some form of private outdoor amenity space is also encouraged for invaluable contribution to future occupants living conditions. Where space is at a

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

premium, balconies or roof terraces may be acceptable however must avoid overlooking neighbouring properties.

The original proposal and amended proposal adequately meets national space standards in terms of gross internal area, floor to ceiling height and internal storage area.

Some concern over the proposed two bedrooms was raised due to the narrow width of each room, and in response the applicant submitted amended drawings to show a single bedroom (2 bed-space), which is found to adequately overcome this concern.

Concern was also raised regarding intensive development of the sunken site resulting in poor levels of outlook for future occupiers. In this regard the applicant noted that through submitting amended plans the ratio of developed area in relation to external amenity space had been altered from 60%-40% respectively to 50/50, increasing the amount of space around the dwelling and between elevations and site boundaries.

While this alteration to the scheme is noted and is considered to be an improvement, it is not found to successfully overcome concern relating to poor outlook. Due in large part to the identified plot constraints - particularly restricted space and a sunken relative back land setting - the dwelling is essentially seen to be single aspect and it is not considered that the design of the house to incorporate a courtyard as a means of providing adequate, dual aspect outlook successfully overcomes this issue. Furthermore, all windows to habitable rooms would be between 3m and 5.5m of high boundary treatments, exacerbating poor quality outlook and fostering an oppressive sense of enclosure.

Impact to the amenity of neighbouring residents

Policy BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) of the Bristol Core Strategy advocates that new development should deliver high quality urban design. With regards to amenity, it is outlined that new development is expected to safeguard the amenity of existing development. In particular, development should give consideration to matters of neighbouring privacy, outlook and natural lighting.

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

Following a site visit, it was noted that the site is significantly sunken down from the street level, and surrounded by relatively high boundary fencing. It is not considered that any of the lower ground floor windows would overlook neighbouring properties allowing for a detrimental loss of privacy. Furthermore it is noted that the large windows to the eastern facing elevation of the ground floor structure would be obscure glazed and do not provide outlook to a habitable room. In this regard it is not expected that these windows would detrimentally impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

The ground floor level to the house would not extend beyond the rear elevations to neighbouring buildings on either side. There are two obscure glazed windows at ground floor levels to the flats on either side, but these serve bathrooms and the proposed ground floor to the new dwelling would not create a significant detrimental impact to those flats on this basis. Owing to this there is no concern that the proposal would be overbearing to neighbouring flats. Given the siting and scale of the ground floor element, it is also not considered that the proposal would cause any significant additional loss of daylight to habitable rooms or external amenity areas to neighbouring properties.

The lower ground floor level would be prominent of the boundary fencing with the flats to No. 36 by

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED

36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

approximately 34cm, along a depth of 12m. While considerable and not ideal, impact would be limited owing to the modest increase in height along the boundary, and it is not considered overall that overbearing would be significant in this instance.

Overall and on balance the proposal is found to be acceptable in terms of its impact to the amenity of neighbouring properties, however it is also concluded that the over intensive development of the site would lead to sub-standard levels of outlook and an oppressive living environment for future occupiers. The proposal is not supported on this basis.

(E) HIGHWAY SAFETY, TRANSPORT AND MOVEMENT ISSUES

Section 4 of the NPPF outlines that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Smarter use of technologies can reduce the need to travel. The transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel. However, the Government recognises that different policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas.

Policy DM23 (Transport Development Management) of the SADMP outlines that new development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions and will be expected to provide safe access to the highway network. The policy also outlines that new development should be accessible by sustainable transport methods such as walking, cycling and public transport. Furthermore, the policy sets standards for parking provision.

Policy DM32 (Recycling & Refuse Provision in New Development) of the SADMP outlines that all new development should provide bin and recycling storage facilities fit for the nature of development, with adequate capacity for the proposed development, in a location which is safe and accessible for all users and does not harm the visual amenity of the area or neighbouring amenity.

Parking Provision

Concern has been raised that no off-street parking has been proposed. In this regard it is considered that the dwelling is in a highly sustainable location which is within easy access of a wide range of amenities and public transport options along Whiteladies Road. As such, the location would be acceptable for a car free development subject to provisions for cycle parking and bin storage. It should be noted that the area is located within a residential parking zone and therefore a parking permit would not be provided for this car free development.

It is not considered that there would be a significant impact to on-street parking, and there are no further concerns in this regard.

Refuse and Recycling Storage and Collection

The Waste and Recycling guidance for developers, owners and occupiers (2010) states that all new development must provide accommodation for a minimum footprint size of 0.6m x 1.5m or a volume of 1.5m³ to enable a 25 litre capacity storage for organic waste and 2 kerbside boxes to be stored. Bins should be housed within a storage solution which avoids harm to the visual amenity of the area as well as a location which avoids prejudice to neighbouring amenity. The storage location should have easy access to the highway for collection.

The siting and scale of the refuse and recycling storage is seen to be adequate, and is separated from the proposed cycle storage. The location of the storage is sufficiently set away from accesses

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

to existing flats and access to the proposed dwelling. There are no further concerns in this regard.

Cycle Parking

Policy DM23 sets standards for the level of cycle parking within new houses. Cycle parking should be secure, weather tight and have easy and direct access to the public highway. Generally Sheffield stands are preferred as bikes can be individually secured and easily accessed.

The proposed cycle storage would be located to the front of the property within the secure storage area to the ground floor level. It would not obstruct existing or proposed accesses. Following the receipt of amended plans to show a single bedroom dwelling, the provision of storage for 1 cycle is seen to be sufficient. There are no further concerns regarding secure storage of bicycles.

Overall it is concluded that the site could sustain a car free development and has been assessed as such, and proposes an appropriate and secure area for cycle storage. Furthermore, adequate and policy compliant refuse storage is proposed. There are no further concerns that would warrant refusal of the scheme on highways grounds. If permission were forthcoming an advice would be added setting out that the dwelling would not be eligible for parking permits given its car free status.

(F) SUSTAINABILITY, CLIMATE CHANGE AND FLOOD RISK

Since the adoption of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy (2011) and with it Policies BCS13-16 applications are required to demonstrate how the proposed development would secure a saving in CO2 emissions from energy use through efficiency measures and incorporate of renewable forms of energy as well as protecting and ensuring against flooding.

A sustainability statement accompanies the proposal and suggests the use of approximately 4no. solar PV panels would achieve a Co2 reduction of 21%. This is found to be acceptable, and should approval be forthcoming further details regarding the arrangement and installation of solar PV would be secured by condition.

Surface water drainage

Bristol Core Strategy (2011) Policy BCS16 states that all development will also be expected to incorporate water management measures to reduce surface water run-off and ensure that it does not increase flood risks elsewhere. This should include the use of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS).

The applicant states that the proposed green roof would help towards the overall SUDs strategy in terms of reduced run-off. There is not additional information regarding the permeability of hardstanding however and in this regard further detail of the proposed paving could be secured via condition, to ensure it constitutes a sustainable drainage system.

(G) ARBORICULTURE

Section 11 of the NPPF (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible.

Policy DM17 (Development Involving Existing Green Infrastructure) of the SADMP outlines that development should integrate important existing trees. It is suggested that where tree loss or damage is essential to allow for appropriate development, replacement trees of an appropriate species should be provided in accordance with the standard set out within Policy DM17.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

Development which would result in the loss of Ancient Woodland, Aged trees or Veteran trees will not be permitted.

The application is supported by an arboricultural impact assessment which identifies two trees; a Wild Cherry within the curtilage of neighbouring No. 7 Warwick Road, and a Pear Tree in the curtilage of neighbouring No. 34 Hampton Park.

An arboricultural officer was verbally consulted regarding the scheme, and requested further information regarding the methods used to conduct the initial assessment. Following receipt of additional information concern was upheld, and it was concluded that an amended assessment should be provided prior to any positive determination of the scheme:

"In summary we require a revised arboricultural impact assessment and method statement report that contains a tree protection plan clearly illustrating the position and specification for protective barriers and for ground protection for all exposed areas of RPA."

On this basis the proposal cannot be supported on grounds of insufficient information relating to possible harm to a mature wild cherry tree and the pear as a result of development.

CONCLUSION

Overall it is maintained that owing to the context and constraints of the site, the proposed dwelling represents an over-intensive form of development which due to its overall design and siting would deliver sub-standard living conditions for future occupiers. Also the proposal would be harmful to the setting of the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area, as the structure would fail to complement surrounding development in terms of the local pattern and grain of existing buildings, as well as in terms of its siting, scale, form and proportions and would be contrary to the established layout and pattern of adjacent buildings, resulting in a cramped and incongruous form which would be harmful to the established character of the area, and would fail to offer any enhancement gain to the Whiteladies Road Conservation Area. In addition, the application has failed to demonstrate that the development proposed would not be have a harmful impact on existing trees in the immediate vicinity of the site

On this basis refusal is recommended.

RECOMMENDED REFUSED

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

Reason(s)

1. By virtue of the proposed form and siting as well as over intensive scale of infill development and overall design, the proposal would fail to respond appropriately to the back-land, garden context of the site and the established layout of adjacent buildings and general urban grain. Specifically, the proposed scale, siting and design of the flat-roofed block is contrary to the established layout and pattern of adjacent buildings, resulting in a cramped and incongruous form which would be harmful to the established character of the Conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings and appear visually alien to the existing garden context. These factors are individually and cumulatively contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), Bristol Core Strategy (2011) Policies BCS21 and BCS22 and Site Allocations & Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014) Policies DM21, DM26, DM27, DM29, DM30 and DM31 as well as the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH

Areas) Act 1990 and guidance within PAN2 (Conservation area enhancement statements)

2. The proposed scheme represents an unacceptable and over intensive form of development which is demonstrated by virtue of the sunken, poor quality back-land location and mainly single aspect design and overall siting in close proximity to significant boundary treatments which would create inadequate outlook serving the new dwelling. The development would thus result in an enclosed, oppressive, poor quality and un-adaptable living environment for future occupiers. The proposal as submitted contravenes guidance within the NPPF, Policies BCS15, BCS18 and BCS21 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM27, DM29 and DM30. of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Adopted 2014).
3. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development would not materially harm the health, or result in the loss, of the wild cherry and pear trees to the rear of the site that have a positive impact on the character of the wider street scene or that adequate mitigation measures are secured. The development is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policies BCS9, BCS11 and BCS22 Bristol Development Plan: Core Strategy (Adopted) June 2011 and Policies DM17, DM26 and DM31 of the Bristol Development Plan: Site Allocation and Development Management Policies (Adopted) July 2014; and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, guidance within PAN2 (Conservation area enhancement statements) and the Planning Obligations SPD.

Advice(s)

1. Refused Applications Deposited Plans/Documents

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

1645(L)18 Proposed street elevation, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)20 Proposed section AA, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)00B Location plan, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)02 Existing site plan, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)03 Existing site plan, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)04A Existing north elevation, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)05A Existing east elevation, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)06A Existing south elevation, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)07A Existing west elevation, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)10 Proposed site plan, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)11A Proposed lower ground floor plan, received 17 May 2018
 1645(L)12 Proposed ground floor plan, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)15 Proposed north elevation, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)17 Proposed south elevation, received 26 March 2018
 1645(L)16 Proposed east elevation, received 26 March 2018
 Design and access statement, received 26 March 2018
 Arboricultural impact assessment, received 26 March 2018
 Sunlight study, received 26 March 2018

Case Officer: [REDACTED]

Authorisation: [REDACTED]

commref
 V1.0211

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL () DELEGATED
36 Hampton Park Bristol BS6 6LH