

8 Walsingham Road  
Montpelier  
Bristol  
BS6 5BT

Planning Application Supporting  
Statement

Mr & Mrs Joynson-Bickerstaffe  
PV.1405  
March 2024

## CONTENTS

<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	The application proposal	2
1.2	Application contents	2
1.3	Stakeholder consultation	3
<b>2.</b>	<b>SITE CONTEXT</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Site location, description and context	3
<b>3.</b>	<b>PLANNING HISTORY</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Planning history	3
<b>4.</b>	<b>PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT</b>	<b>5</b>
4.1	Policy background	5
4.2	The statutory Local Plan	5
<b>5.</b>	<b>KEY PLANNING ISSUES</b>	<b>6</b>
5.1	Policy background	6
5.2	The Proposal	6
5.3	Key planning issues	7
5.4	Community Infrastructure Levy	12
<b>6.</b>	<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>12</b>

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This planning statement has been produced on behalf of Mr & Mrs Joynson-Bickerstaffe to support a householder planning application for a series of works comprising demolition of existing extensions, replacements with single and double storey extensions to the front and side of the house, replacement windows and doors, and a series of small landscape and boundary works at 8 Walsingham Road, Montpelier, Bristol (“the site”). The purpose of this application is to enable the creation of a multi generational family home for the applicant’s, which accommodates children, parents and grandparents along with other elderly relatives.

### 1.1 THE APPLICATION PROPOSAL

The description of development comprises:

***Demolition of existing single-storey side and front extensions, construction of a new two-storey side extension and single-storey front extension, replacement of windows and doors, and landscaping works including vehicular access gates and front boundary railings.***

The application proposal forms part of what is effectively a revised proposal at the site, following the refusal of the planning application ref. 22/04072/H, to refurbish and extend the existing dwelling in February 2023. The previous proposal consisted of single storey ground floor extensions to front, side/rear, together with a roof extension. The proposal was refused for a single reason relating to harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and a negative impact on the setting and appearance of the nearby Non-Designated Heritage asset. However, the delegated Officer’s report indicated the perceived harm was principally caused by the scale and design of the proposed roof extension and flat roof front extension. This application omits the roof extension and proposes a revised design for the front element, with a pitched roof and materials that match the existing dwelling.

A recent application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Development (“CLOPUD”) (ref. 23/04949/CP), submitted in December 2023, covered other low-key additions to the property, including a single storey south western side extension to replace the existing garage, replacement windows, and minor landscaping works. The applicants sought to confirm that these elements could be undertaken without the need for planning permission under the parameters of the General Permitted Development Order (2015) as amended (GDPO). However, Bristol City Council (“BCC”) determined that some of these elements (only the replacement windows and the terrace) required planning permission and did not issue the CLOPUD.

### 1.2 APPLICATION CONTENTS

This statement provides detailed consideration of the planning merits of the proposal, its impact on the character and appearance of the area and neighbour amenity and an analysis of relevant Local Plan and National Planning Policy guidance. The application is supported by the following information:

- Documents and plans schedule;
- Completed application forms and ownership certificates;
- Supporting planning application statement, produced by Planning Ventures;
- CIL Questionnaire, completed by Planning Ventures on behalf of Mr & Mrs Joynson-Bickerstaffe;
- CIL Form 9: Self Build Residential Extension Exemption Form, completed by Planning Ventures on behalf of Mr & Mrs Joynson-Bickerstaffe;
- Design and Access Statement, produced by Harvey Langston-Jones;
- Red line site location plan (Planning Portal); and

- Existing and proposed site layout, elevations and floorplans, produced by Harvey Langston-Jones.

## 1.3 STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

Due to the small-scale nature of the proposal the Council's formal neighbour notification and statutory consultation process is considered appropriate in this instance. However, the applicants have undertaken discussions with their neighbours and secured agreement to the application proposal.

## 2. SITE CONTEXT

### 2.1 SITE LOCATION, DESCRIPTION AND CONTEXT

The application site is located within Ashley Ward, a sustainable location within the residential area of St. Andrews to the north-east of Bristol's city centre.

The wider area is characterised by high density, urban, domestic-scale development. The immediate context predominantly comprises Victorian dwellings finished in brick and stone in semi-detached pairs or terraces, albeit the area immediately surrounding the application site, including Walsingham Road has a much more varied appearance, including some later terraced development to the south-east. The site's immediate context is formed by the Ecclesiastical buildings to the north-east and north-west. No. 8 was formerly known as St Bartholomew's Vicarage. St Bartholomew's Parish Hall is located to the north-east, at the corner of Walsingham Road and Sommerville Road, while the 1893 St Bartholomew's Church (a non-designated heritage asset) is located to the north-west fronting onto Sommerville Road, with its long flank elevation facing Maurice Road and St. Andrews Park opposite. The south-eastern portion of this rectangular block contains nine dwellings fronting on to either Maurice Road or Walsingham Road.

No. 8 is a large, early C20<sup>th</sup>, two storey detached dwelling finished in brick. While the other dwellings along Walsingham Road are positioned close to the street frontage with a 2-3m setback, No. 8 is set to the rear of the plot, well back from the road and the street's building frontage line. It has a substantial front garden area and no rear garden space. Due to the configuration of the application site, the main garden area to the property is currently visually open and lacks the privacy a rear garden would provide. The narrow gap to the rear of the property has resulted in limited space to provide any additional floorspace to the rear. The application property is broad and relatively shallow in plan form. It has simple flat elevations, with strong horizontal emphasis provided by rows of sash windows to the front and has a hipped roof with a pair of chimney features. There is also a front porch, together with small single storey side and rear extensions. An existing single detached garage is located with the western corner of the site very close to the site boundaries.

## 3. PLANNING HISTORY

### 3.1 PLANNING HISTORY

There is a relatively limited planning history associated with the site. The following applications are considered pertinent to this application and form the basis for the application proposal.

#### 3.1.1 8 Walsingham Road, St. Andrews, Bristol, BS6 5BT (The Application Site)

- **23/04949/CP** Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a Proposed Use or Development Demolition of detached garage, construction of single storey side extension, replacement windows, removal of side and rear windows and doors at ground floor. Replacement of windows with doors on the ground floor

front elevation, alterations to existing hard landscaping areas comprising creation of a terrace, steps and low walls at the front of the house and the relaying and extension of the driveway. Not Issued. 1st February 2024.

The single reason for refusal states that the proposed works do not fall within the definitions of permitted development within the 2015 GPDO (as amended). The decision notice specifies that the proposed replacement windows are not considered “of a similar appearance” to those existing. It also specified that there was insufficient detail on changes in levels at the site.

Despite this, BCC raised no further issues over the remaining elements, including the demolition of the existing detached garage and its replacement with a single storey side extension, the removal of side and rear windows and doors at ground floor, the replacement of windows with doors on the ground floor front elevation and the relaying and extension of the driveway. This was confirmed in an email from the case officer dated the 1st February 2024. However, the applicant intends to seek clarification on this matter through a further CLOPUD.

- **22/04072/H** Single storey ground floor extensions to front, side/rear and a roof extension. Refused. 01 Feb 2023.

The proposal was refused for a single reason relating to harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and a negative impact on the setting and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset.

In assessing the proposal, the Delegated Report raised objections to the design, height, bulk/massing and materials of the proposed roof extension, together with the design, scale, form, and materials of the front extension. It considered that these elements would have a negative impact on the street scene along Walsingham Road, with particular focus being drawn on the proposed roof extension and the glimpsed view between the Church and Parish Hall from Sommerville Road. It was also considered that these proposed elements would have a negative impact on the non-designated heritage asset, principally due to the historic subordinate nature of the former Vicarage in relation to these and the manner in which the additions would erode this relationship. The report did not raise any objections to the proposed side extensions, either in terms of design or amenity.

- **21/04694/H** Alterations to the house to include single storey ground floor extensions to front. Withdrawn. 22 November 2022. (No application documents available)
- **13/02900/F** Change of use from dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to non-residential institute (Use Class D1) and related alterations to improve accessibility and WC facilities. Granted. 27th August 2013. This permission was not implemented and the current lawful use of the building remains as a self-contained dwelling (Use Class C3).

### 3.1.2 11 Wathen Road Bristol BS6 5BY (semi-detached)

- **22/01090/H** - Single storey side and rear extension at ground floor level and additional dormer roof extension on rear elevation to create additional living space. Alteration to the front boundary to create an off-road parking space for 1no. vehicle. Granted 28th April 2022

### 3.1.3 6 Williamson Road Bristol BS7 9BH

- **22/03600/H** - Single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, and raised terrace area with pergola structure. Granted 14th September 2022
- **22/03601/H** - Alterations to front garden to form 1 x car parking space, new steps to front of house, bin store, and stepped planting beds. Granted 14th September 2022

## 4. PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

### 4.1 POLICY BACKGROUND

In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 planning applications must be determined in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (“NPPF”) has established a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It requires Local Planning Authorities to determine planning applications that accord with the Development Plan without delay. Where a Development Plan is absent or silent or relevant policies are out of date planning applications should be assessed against the policies of the NPPF and granted where adverse impacts don’t significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

### 4.2 THE STATUTORY LOCAL PLAN

The application site falls within the jurisdiction of BCC, and is governed by the policy context of the NPPF, National Planning Practice Guidance (“NPPG”) and the Bristol Local Plan, which in this part of the City comprises:

- The Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, adopted June 2011 (“BCS”); and
- The Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, adopted July 2014 (“SADMP”).

BCC is currently reviewing the adopted Local Plan, which, when adopted, will supersede the above documents. A draft was issued for public consultation in October 2023 with representations invited until late January 2024. This document carries very little weight in decision-making until it progresses much closer towards adoption.

A range of Supplementary Planning Documents and good practice guides adopted by the Council in accordance with the Local Plan are also of relevance. These comprise:

- SPD 2: A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions, October 2005;
- Climate change and Sustainability Practice Guide (2020) and Addendum (2023);and
- Community Infrastructure Levy, Charging Schedule, September 2012.

#### 4.2.1 Principal Policy Issues

The principal policy issues for this application relate to extensions to an existing house and design. The principal planning policies are considered to be: BCS20 (effective and efficient use of land), BCS21 (quality urban design), DM26 (local character and distinctiveness) and DM30 (alterations to existing buildings), BCS22 (Conservation and the Historic Environment) and DM31 (Heritage Assets), BCS13 (climate change), BCS14 (sustainable energy), BCS15 (sustainable design and construction), BCS16 (flood risk and water management) and DM1 (presumption in favour of sustainable development). As this is a small site, BNG compliance is not currently required.

#### 4.2.2 Designations

The Interactive Policies Map confirms the site is not allocated for any specific land use, purpose or aesthetic designations. It's in Flood Zone 1, Smoke Control Area 7, and in a surface water drainage discharge zone. There are no TPO trees on the site, the property is not listed nor locally listed and does not sit within a Conservation Area. Although the Ashley Down Conservation Area is 250m to the north and the Montpellier Conservation Area is 300m to the south. There is an Article 4 Direction covering the site and the wider area, which removes the ability to change the use of the property from a single dwelling to a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO).

## 5. KEY PLANNING ISSUES

### 5.1 POLICY BACKGROUND

As a general and overarching policy SADMP policy DM1 confirms the positive approach that the Council will take in dealing with applications that reflect a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It is noted that the Council will always work proactively with applicants to find solutions to approve proposals that secure development that improves the city's economic conditions, amongst other things. It is also noted that Local Plan policy compliant proposals will be approved without delay. This accords with the NPPFs objectives and requirements.

### 5.2 THE PROPOSAL

In order to create an intergenerational family home, the application proposal comprises the following constituent elements:

- Demolition of an existing single-storey (north-eastern) side extension and front extension;
- Construction of a new two-storey side extension;
- Construction of a new single-storey front extension;
- Replacement of existing windows and doors; and
- Landscaping works including front boundary treatments.

#### 5.2.1 Side Extension

The application property includes a small pantry to the north-eastern flank with a footprint of 7sq.m (2.5m x 2.8m). It is set back approximately 3.4m from the main front elevation of the house, and retains a 2.3m gap to the side boundary. It ranges in height between 2.75m to 2.9m above ground due to the site levels which gradually slope downwards from rear to front. Following demolition of the existing side extension, the proposed replacement two-storey north-eastern flank extension would be set back 1.3m from the main front elevation and stand at 3.1m wide and 6m along the flank at full two-storey height. The existing rear, single storey, flat roof ground floor extension will extend a further 1.5m to the rear to join at the rear of the proposed two-storey extension. This means that the ground floor footprint of the proposal would total 23.25sq.m. The proposed extension has a two-storey eaves level (measured from the front) of 5.9m, set below the 6.3m eaves of the existing house, with a proposed ridge height of 7.6m, again set below the 8.5m ridge of the existing house.

The proposed extension would total circa 37sq.m and be constructed from brickwork, with a hipped roof in concrete tiles, to match the application property, and painted, metal framed double glazed windows.

#### 5.2.2 Front Extension

The existing front storey extension extends 2m forward of the main front elevation, with a width of 5.3m, an eaves level of 3.2m, and a ridge height of 4.4m.

At circa 24.9sq.m the proposed front extension extends 3.7m forward of the main front elevation, is 10m wide, set in from the flanks by just under 4m on each side, with an eaves level of 2.8m and a ridge height of 4m. Similarly, the front extension's proposed materials are matching brick and concrete tiles, with painted metal framed double glazed doors and windows.

### 5.2.3 Replacement of Windows and Doors

Following the refusal to issue CLOPUD ref. 23/04949/CP the application proposal comprises the replacement of all existing painted, timber sash windows with painted metal, double glazed casement windows. A number of existing windows and doors will also be removed, but these fall under Permitted Development rights and are not covered by this application proposal.

### 5.2.4 Landscaping and Other Small Scale Additions

The application proposal also involves a range of small-scale hard landscaping works to the front and side of the house. These comprise the installation of new automated 2m high metal gates to the vehicle access, with 1m high railings running atop the length of the existing 1m high brick front boundary wall. Set immediately behind (north-west of) the front boundary will be a brick waste and recycling store facing the driveway, together with a seating area facing into the garden.

A series of landscaping works are also proposed immediately along the front elevation of the application property. These comprise a low wall positioned approximately 2.2m away from the main front elevation of the house, separating the lawn and garden area from a proposed hard landscaped area with a paved entrance courtyard and a seating area to the north-east, together with a set of steps connecting the terrace and seating area to the wider garden.

## 5.3 KEY PLANNING ISSUES

This application stands to be tested against the following issues and must be read in conjunction with the Design and Access Statement and the proposed plans:

1. Demolition and proposed floorspace, layout, scale, design and landscaping;
2. Impact on the non-designated heritage asset;
3. Impact on residential amenity; and
4. Sustainability.

### 5.3.1 Relevant Policies

Paragraph 131 of the NPPF advises that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Section 12 advocates that development should create high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places that maintain a strong sense of place, using building types and materials, amongst other things. It confirms that well designed development should not be refused.

The Local Plan endorses this guidance and advocates a high quality, imaginative approach to design that responds to its context. In support of objective 6 of the Core Strategy, which seeks to ensure a high quality built environment, policies BCS2 and BCS21 are of some relevance. Where pertinent BCS2 expects development to be of the highest design standard in terms of appearance, function and sustainability. BCS21 deals with the need for



development proposals to deliver high quality urban design that contributes positively to an area's character and identity. It requires new development to safeguard the amenity of existing and proposed development; create a high quality living environment for future occupiers; and, create buildings and spaces that are adaptable to changing social, technological, economic and environmental conditions.

In addition to this, aspects of policies DM26 and DM30 of the SADMP are considered to be of some relevance. Policy DM26 seeks to retain existing buildings of local character and outlines that the design of development proposals will be expected to contribute towards local character and distinctiveness. It further states that development will not be permitted where it would be harmful to local character and distinctiveness or where it would fail to take the opportunities available to improve the character and quality of the area. Policy DM30 requires alterations to buildings to respect the overall design and character of the host building, its curtilage and the wider street scene.

These policies are supported by Sections 5.1 and 5.5 of SPD2. Respectively these require alterations and extensions to generally respect but not mimic the style and appearance of the house and the character of the locality, particularly in relation to where relevant: built form, scale and proportions; window and door shape, style and details; and external materials. Extensions are required to be subservient to the original house and retain its existing character and appearance and minimise their visual impact on the street. It is noted that SPD 2 does allow for high quality design alternatives.

Paragraph 209 of the NPPF requires an application to take into account the significance of a Non-Designated Heritage asset. This is further supported by policies BSC22 and DM31 which require application proposals that affect locally important heritage assets to ensure they are conserved having regard to their significance and the degree of any harm or loss of significance.

### 5.3.2 Demolition and Proposed Floorspace, Layout, Scale, Design and Landscaping

As the site is not within a Conservation Area the demolition of the existing front and side extensions are acceptable.

It is clear from policy DM26 that BCC positively supports the adaptive reuse of buildings, particularly where they are of good design quality and contribute positively to the character and appearance of an area. Moreover, the principle of extensions to the application property is already established, with the presence of existing in-situ extensions. The application proposal seeks to upgrade the property to achieve a more modern living environment and ensure the longevity of the property as a family home. The proposal provides for the replacement of two existing extensions with a larger single-storey front extension and a two-storey side extension which connects to an extended rear single-storey extension, alongside external alterations. The application site is located within a street and area that contains a range of large detached, semi detached and terrace houses of varying designs and with various examples of house alterations/extensions. No. 8 Walsingham Road will essentially remain in its original form and can accommodate small-scale extensions without risk of overdevelopment or loss of identity. For these reasons, the principle of further residential accommodation here is considered acceptable as per the relevant requirements of policies DM26 and DM30.

Together the proposed extensions comprise circa 61.9sqm of floorspace, resulting in a total floorspace of 345sq.m. This is an increase in overall size of the application property by 18%. Within the context of the application property, the proposed extensions remain physically and visually subservient to the original structure and in no way dominate it - the proportions, form and footprint of the house remain clearly intact and expressed. The proposals are entirely consistent with patterns of development in the locality where extensions to large detached properties, of varying scales and heights, are prevalent.

This revised proposal responds to the concerns raised by BCC in the Officer's Delegated report to the previously refused application ref. 22/04072/H. This noted that whilst part of SPD2 required extensions to be located on the least prominent elevations and ideally at the rear to minimise visual impact on the street, it was acknowledged that the application site was unique in relation to the rest of the street, as it occupies a large plot and is set much further back from the street than other properties. The configuration of the site and position of the application property therefore leaves an extremely limited rear area which makes providing usable floorspace in that location impractical. Notwithstanding this, the revised proposal seeks to strike a balance between responding to BCC's previous concerns, while still enabling the applicants to refurbish and extend the property.

Consequently, the roof extension element, to which BCC previously objected, has been removed from the application proposal. Instead, the single-storey side extension, to which BCC raised no objection, has been replaced by a part single-storey and two-storey extension within a similar footprint. As previously noted this extension has been set-back (by 1.3m) and lowered (by 0.4m to the eaves level and 0.9m to the ridge height) and further accentuated by its narrower width (of 3.1m) from the application property to ensure that it remains subordinate, proportionate and maintains the balance of the building.

The refused application's front extension had a depth of 3.7m, a width of 10m (set in from the flanks by just under 4m on each side), and a flat roof terminating at 3.2m above ground. The materials included brick and elements of timber cladding. Together this was considered to have a negative impact on the application property, the neighbouring Non-Designated Heritage Asset and the streetscene.

Whilst the proposed front extension has a similar footprint as the refused, it has a lower eaves level of 2.8m and a ridge height of 4m. As with the proposed side extension the proposed materials and hipped roof form echoes the application property. Consequently, the proposed extension, which is centrally positioned on the front elevation and albeit larger than the existing front extension, ties in with the front elevation and would not detract from the character of the surrounding area nor negatively impact on the neighbouring Non-Designated Heritage Asset.

An important point of context for the application proposal is the significant scope for single storey extensions to the side of the building under Permitted Development ("PD") rights as set by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Class A (*Enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse*) of Schedule 2 of Part 1 of the GPDO permits the extension of dwellings within specific parameters. These PD rights allow a 2.4m wide 4m high extension to the side of the dwelling with a similar footprint to the proposed two-storey extension. In this context, the additional 1.8m high element with a 1.7m high hipped roof above as proposed by the current application is not considered to result in a new element of built form that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the streetscene.

Other minor alterations proposed to the application property include the removal of some windows and the replacement of all remaining ones. These proposed alterations would not fundamentally change the character of the application property, since for the most part, they retain existing openings and provide high quality contemporary replacements.

In summary the design approach responds to the application property's aesthetic as per policies DM26 and DM30. It proposes a sympathetic design that is visually subservient and works with its context. Moreover, the design and materials of the extensions comfortably reflect the architectural features and fabric of the application property.

Similarly, the landscaping works adjacent to the front elevation of the building are minor in scope and scale, including low walls, terracing and paving. Whilst these seek to provide a high quality and accessible amenity space for the applicants they would be imperceptible from beyond the application site.

The proposed front boundary alterations accord with the character of the area, as there are several examples of railings atop brick walls along Walsingham Road. Importantly, the addition of the railings and gates provide additional privacy and security to the garden and house without causing undue harm to the streetscene. The use of railings will not create a hard, solid boundary treatment as existing planted greenery behind the wall will continue to be visible. No trees are to be removed as a result of the proposed works and as such no Arboricultural Statement has been provided. Where considered necessary tree protection measures will be utilised to protect the garden's existing trees during building works.

The proposed extensions and external works together with the landscaping proposals represent a series of sensitively designed and relatively low-key changes to the application property and wider site that sympathetically respond to the application property and would not detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding area or that of the adjacent Non-Designated Heritage Asset. The design, scale and layout of the scheme positively responds to BCS2 and BCS21, DM26 and DM30, and the requirements of the NPPF for high quality design. Consequently there are no policy based reasons to refuse the extensions and external alterations to the application property and limited hard landscaping works that would prevent the positive determination of this element of the application proposal.

### 5.3.3 Impact on the Non-Designated Heritage Asset

It is acknowledged that St Bartholomew's Church is a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. The Officer's Delegated Report for refused application ref. 22/04072/H, states that the significance of the heritage interest of the Non-Designated Heritage asset is both its physical presence and setting. The significance of the Church derives from its historic and architectural character, and has a broader value to the area as a key building in the historic development of the suburb of St Andrews. The application site was formerly the Church Vicarage. This established a visual and functional relationship between the application site, the Church, and the Church Hall, which forms part of this significance.

In determining the refused application BCC considered the proposed roof extension would harm the relationship between the host dwelling and St Bartholomew's Church due to the size, scale and architectural treatment of the extension. The increase in the ridge height of the main dwelling, and the timber and zinc materials in particular, were considered to be dominant and visually competitive with the non-designated heritage asset, thus resulting in a loss of subservience and harm to the setting and appearance of the Church.

The application proposal has responded to this element of the reason for refusal. As previously noted the proposal for a two-storey side extension is considered to be a proportionate and subservient addition to the existing dwelling due to its limited width and reduced height. It will not be highly visible from the public domain, it will not limit nor visually detract from public views of the Ecclesiastical buildings from Walsingham Road. Furthermore the use of matching materials ensures the building reads as a whole and not disparate parts. On this basis and in accordance with the requirement of BCS22 and DM31 and paragraph 209 of Section 16 of the NPPF, the proposed extension would not harm the Non-Designated Heritage Asset nor its setting. Thus there are no policy based reasons for refusal nor any material considerations that would prevent the positive determination of this element of the application proposal.

### 5.3.4 Impact on the Residential Amenity of Neighbouring Properties

Although of only limited relevance, policies BCS18 and BCS21, DM27 and DM29 concern the need to safeguard the amenity of existing developments and to create a high-quality environment for future occupiers.

The site is located in a dense urban neighbourhood. However, the presence of the Church and Church Hall to the north-west and north-east of the application site means that its visual relationship with surrounding residential properties is limited to the following:

- No. 12 Walsingham Road, the adjacent residential property to the south-west of the site, set forward of the application site and forming a consistent building line with Nos. 16-20 further to the south-west;
- No. 18 Maurice Road, the left-hand dwelling of a pair of semi-detached 2-storey properties, to the west of the application site; and
- The row of dwellings to the south-east of Walsingham Road, including detached Nos. 1-7 (odd numbers) and the terraced dwellings further to the south-west.

Given that the proposal includes an extension to the north-east flank of the building, some 25-35m from the above properties, it would not result in any material changes in privacy, outlook or sunlight/daylight in relation to any of the surrounding properties.

In determining the refused 2022 householder application, which included single storey ground floor extensions to the front, both flanks and a roof extension (ref. 22/04072/H), the Delegated Officer's Report noted the proximity of the garage extension to the south-western flank to the boundary with neighbouring property, it was considered that this would not sufficiently infringe on amenity so as to warrant a refusal. No issues with the north-eastern flank extension were raised. Due to the position of the application property and neighbouring houses there will be no direct overlooking of adjacent gardens, nor intervisibility between the gardens and habitable room windows from the ground floor and first floor extensions.

Furthermore, the application proposal will have no impact on SPD2's 45° rule. As such it is considered that there will be no adverse impacts on the amenity or privacy of neighbouring properties as a result of the extension and small scale alterations to the rear of the house, and that this aspect of the proposal accords with the relevant policy context. Based on the broad similarities between the north-east flank element of the refused application, and the current application proposal, there is no reason for BCC to reach a different conclusion.

As noted above, the introduction of railings to the existing front boundary wall and the installation of automated access gates would significantly improve the applicants security, privacy and amenity.

Consequently, there have been no material changes in circumstances in the intervening period to warrant an alternative approach to this element of the application proposal. Nor are there any policy based reasons to refuse the application for harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties.

### 5.3.5 Sustainability

A sustainable approach has been taken to the application proposal in accordance with relevant Local Plan policies and Building Regulation requirements.

Core Strategy objectives 1 and 10 and policies BCS13, BCS14, BCS15 and BCS16 plus the accompanying Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note are of relevance, but only to the extent that they have informed the application proposal. As the application is for small scale extensions to an existing residential house, a Sustainability Statement and Energy Strategy is not required. Section 5.3 of SPD2 requires proposal for alterations and extensions to existing houses to consider sustainable design and construction through the use of,

amongst other things, double glazed windows, with low 'E' (emissivity) glass, highly efficient heating and lighting systems; the orientation of extensions and the potential for 'solar gain'; high levels of thermal insulation in floors walls and roofs; renewable energy sources of environmentally friendly, abundant building materials; and recycled materials. The application proposal accords with this, it will comprise a sustainable, high quality scheme, which focuses on compliance, where applicable and relevant, with adopted policies and sustainability requirements.

Demolition of the existing extensions is acceptable. These are old, of poor quality and thermally inefficient. The existing windows are degrading and require replacement. The ability to replace poorly constructed and thermally inefficient extensions with new highly efficient and sustainable structures alongside a more holistic approach to the rest of the house that accords with current Building Regs is the right way forward and a policy compliant approach. Although the application proposal is not required to meet the requirements of National Policy guidelines and the specific requirements of BCS13 – BCS16, the applicants are committed to limiting the existing building and the proposals' carbon footprint. The application proposal provides a thermally efficient building design, incorporates air source heat pumps within a new boiler room, energy efficient lighting, efficient water management measures and uses sustainable materials including double glazed windows. All of which will minimise energy requirements.

Taken together this small application takes a sustainable approach to development that is policy compliant. As such this element of the proposal is considered to be worthy of the grant of planning permission.

#### 5.4 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

The application proposal comprises new residential floorspace under 100m<sup>2</sup> GIA. As the application site falls within Bristol's Inner Ward charging zone, only new floorspace above the 100sq.m threshold is liable for CIL at a rate of £70.00 per sqm in accordance with BCCs Charging Schedule (2013). The area of new floorspace to be created is 61.9sq.m with the area to be demolished at 16.1sq.m. The total area applicable for CIL is therefore 45.8sqm. Not only is this below the 100sq.m trigger threshold, but as the application proposal is for residential extensions it's exempt from liability to pay CIL as per Regulation 7 of The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2014. Both the applicants and the application proposal comply with the requirements of parts 1, 3 and 4 of Para 42A (1), Section 7 of Part 6 of the CIL Regs, Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 25-003-20190315 of the NPPG, and BCCs Charging Schedule. No. 8 Walsingham Road is the applicants main residence and they will be constructing the residential extensions themselves; the works do not comprise a new dwelling; and, the application proposal is an exemption for residential extensions under 4b. Both the CIL Questionnaire and CIL Form 9 have, however, been completed and submitted with the application.

## 6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The application proposal accords with relevant policy tests and national government guidance in proposing a development which:

- Promotes a form and quantum of development that is entirely appropriate to its context;
- Proposes a more efficient and modern living home that caters for a multigenerational family and ensures the property's longevity through a range of sustainable measures;
- Responds appropriately in layout, scale and design to the existing house;
- Does not adversely harm on the character of the street scene and local area;
- Does not harm the adjacent non-designated heritage asset; and
- Does not harm the amenities of neighbouring properties.

As such a Section 38 (6) presumption exists in favour of the grant of planning permission.