

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

SUMMARY

The application relates to a property known as 22a Islington Road in Southville ward, south Bristol. It is a two storey building with single storey extensions located on the corner of Islington Road, opposite terraces on Allington Road. It is currently vacant, however the most recent use of the property is for employment uses (Use Class – B2 General Industrial).

The site is within Bedminster Conservation Area and is on the Bristol Local List in recognition of its heritage value.

The application was initially made in November 2017. Following the submission of amendments to the proposals in February 2018, it was considered by Development Control (DC) Committee B on 25 April 2018. The Committee resolved to defer the application to allow the case officer to seek further amendments to the roof of the scheme, due to concerns that the dwelling as proposed would result in unacceptable loss of light and amenity to neighbouring gardens. The Committee resolution in full was:

“that the item be deferred for officers to establish with the applicant if the roof can be re-designed to address amenity concerns about increased shading of the rear gardens and that, in the event that the applicant is unwilling to do this, officers be given delegated authority to refuse the application on these grounds.”

In response to this, the applicant has submitted revised plans in July 2018. The proposed amendments are:

- The roof has been redesigned to introduce a hipped roof form at the eastern side of the building.
- The boundary fence has been reduced to 1.8m in height at the rear, while the western boundary fence has been redesigned to a stepped design to increase privacy for occupants and neighbours.

The applicant has also submitted a revised sunlight assessment study assessing the impact on light of the revised proposals. The rest of the proposed development would remain as previously presented and considered by the DC B committee and as summarised below.

The application proposes to demolish all existing buildings on the site and construct a two storey 2no. bedroom dwelling. The dwelling would be of a contemporary, industrial style and would largely be contained within the established building lines of the street and the envelope of the existing building, including its height and footprint.

The application was referred to DC Committee B by Cllr Charlie Bolton on the basis of concerns that it would be overbearing, out of keeping with the area and would result in overlooking and overshadowing to neighbours.

There has been neighbour objection to the scheme, relating primarily to the design, impact on heritage assets and impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

Officers in the City Design Group, Transport Development Management and Land Contamination have been consulted during determination of the scheme, including upon submission of revised plans, and have ultimately raised no objection, subject to securing further detail via planning conditions.

On balance, officers have concluded that while the proposed development would result in harm to heritage assets, this is less than substantial and does not warrant refusal of the scheme. The benefits of the scheme are believed to outweigh this harm and include bringing a vacant site into use, securing an additional unit of housing and delivering a distinctive, high quality design. Impacts on neighbouring

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

amenity have been carefully considered and the scheme revised to minimise any unacceptable harm. It is concluded that the proposed development would be less than significantly harmful, particularly given the existing context and constraints of the site.

Officers recommend that planning permission is granted for the proposed development, subject to planning conditions.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to a property known as 22a Islington Road in Southville ward, south Bristol. It is situated on the south-east corner of Islington Road on the northern side of the street. Its south and east elevations form a direct frontage onto the pavement. The building is detached, however it shares a boundary with 22 Islington Road to the west and 37, 39 and 41 Allington Road to the north.

The site is comprised of a main two storey detached building with an asymmetrical hipped roof. It has a single storey flat-roofed extension to the west which runs along the boundary with No. 22 Islington Road and which forms a main entrance from the street. To the rear of the site is a large single storey lean-to extension which meets the side extension, such that almost the entire footprint of the site is built upon, with the exception of a small section of the north-west corner.

There is vehicular access to an integral garage/store to the east elevation of the site and a corresponding dropped kerb. The main building is finished in render with a red tiled roof, though exposed brick is visible on the northern elevation. The single storey extension roof is constructed of corrugated metal sheeting. The fenestration on the site is predominantly timber casement windows, although notable are the large black painted timber garage and warehouse doors on the east elevation. There is modern uPVC (or similar) glazing to the single storey side extension.

The building is located just within the boundary of the designated Bedminster Conservation Area and is identified as an 'unlisted building of merit' within the Conservation Area Character Appraisal (adopted December 2013). The building was subsequently included within the Bristol Local List (ID: 212), added in September 2015, which identifies local heritage assets outside of formal designation (e.g. Listed Buildings). It is believed to have been built in the 1880s.

The historic use of the site is for commercial/light industrial use. The last known use of the site was as a printing press under Use Class B2 – General Industrial. The site has been vacant since 2013.

The area surrounding the site is of predominantly residential land use and is characterised by rows of Victorian two storey terraces. The typical layout of the terraces is such that the rear gardens back onto each other and the rear elevation of dwellings are opposite one another with relatively small distances in between (typically less than 15m). Within this context, the detached siting of 22a Islington Road is atypical and it does not form part of the terrace further west, which begins from 30 Islington Road.

The immediate neighbour west of the site, 22 Islington Road, is also atypical being of three storey height and forming a semi-detached pair. The topography of the area is such that the Allington Road terrace is located at a lower level relative to the buildings on the north side of Islington Road. Due to raised foundations, the terraces on the south side and east corner of Islington Road are further elevated relative to the north of the road and the application site.

The architectural style of the area is fairly mixed, with various styles present in nearby terraces, however common features are pitched roofs, bay windows, exposed stonework and front boundary walls. There is little off street parking in the area.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

Beyond the immediate residential surroundings, the site is located close to local services, facilities and bus stops located on East Street and North Street, while the city centre is also within reasonable walking or cycle distance. Public open space at Greville Smyth Park and Victoria Park are also in the proximity of the area.

RELEVANT HISTORY

15/02956/PREAPP - Proposed redevelopment of the site (including demolition of existing building) to provide a new dwelling. Response received November, 2015.

14/04407/F - Demolition of existing two storey building and single storey extensions, erection of three storey dwelling and single storey garage for one vehicle. WITHDRAWN, October 2014.

03/04489/P - Outline application for demolition of existing workshops and residential development. WITHDRAWN, January 2004.

85/01197/E - Workshop for light industrial use and office accommodation ancillary to that use. REFUSED, September 1985.

APPLICATION

The application seeks permission to demolish all existing buildings on the site and construct 1no. two bedroom dwellinghouse.

The dwelling would be predominantly two storeys in height, however it would include single storey elements to the west and north east boundaries, with a flat and mono-pitched roof respectively. Following revisions to the scheme in July 2018, the main two storey element of the building would have an asymmetric roof; with a gable end to the west and hipped to the east.

The new dwelling would echo the existing layout with a south and east facing frontage onto Islington Road. The dwelling would represent an overall reduction in the footprint of buildings on the plot, with an increased area of private garden to the north-west corner of the site.

The maximum roof ridge height of the new dwelling would not exceed that of the existing building. The eaves height would be increased by 25cm and the overall massing of the roof would be increased due to the introduction of a gable end to the west, and a hipped roof form to the east with a steeper pitch than that of the existing building. The first floor would be extended 1m further west towards No.22 than the existing building.

The north elevation would feature an angled two storey protrusion of 2.2m depth with a full height window (curtain walling) facing west. The window would be set back from the northern elevation by 0.5m and would be partially obscure glazed at first floor, where it would serve a mezzanine living area. An existing low boundary wall at the rear of the dwelling would be replaced with 1.8m fencing.

The dwelling would be of a modern, industrial style featuring standing seam metal roofing, aluminium fenestration and red brick walls. It is proposed to install obscure glazing to the upper rear windows and louvred ventilation panels to windows on the east and south elevations.

The new dwelling would not have off-street parking. An enclosed cycle store for 2no. bikes and a courtyard refuse store would be provided in the north-east corner of the site, accessed via a roller shutter door on the east elevation.

Photovoltaic panels would be installed on the roof of the building.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION

July re-consultation

Following the resolution by DC B Committee on 25 April 2018, the applicant submitted revised plans in July 2018. Neighbours (and anyone who previously submitted comment on the application) were notified of the revised plans by letter issued 20 July 2018 requesting comments by a deadline of 3 August 2018. A site notice was posted near the site on 25 July 2018 with an expiry date of 8 August 2018.

In response to re-consultation, 7 responses were received. Of these all objected to the proposed development.

The concerns raised in relation to the revised proposals are:

- The revisions do not sufficiently address the concerns of the Development Control Committee or reflect the nature of their resolution on 25 April
- Impact on amenity of neighbours through loss of light (including indirect light)
- Development should fully retain the roof design of the existing building
- The retention of the west gable and reduction in the gap between 22a and 22 Islington Road would overshadow gardens of Allington Road
- North facing windows would result in a loss of privacy to Allington Road properties
- Lack of case for change to residential and loss of B2 use
- Overlooking from the two storey curtain walling onto gardens
- Would create increased pressure on parking
- Noise and disturbance from roof terrace [Case officer note: there is not a roof terrace proposed – please see Key Issue D for further discussion on this point]
- Lack of evidence such as light or topographical survey [case officer note: an updated light assessment was submitted with the revised plans and available on the planning portal website]

All consultation prior to DC Committee B on 25 April 2018

Upon submission of the application, 27 neighbouring properties were notified by letter issued 28 December 2017 requesting any comments to be submitted by a deadline of 18 January 2018. A site notice was posted near the site on 10 January 2018 with an expiry date of 31 January 2018. An advertisement was published on 10 January 2018 with an expiry date of 31 January 2018.

In response to consultation, 25 responses were received, all in objection to the scheme. It must be noted that some individuals submitted multiple objections; for clarity, there were responses from 18 individuals in total.

During the determination process, the applicant submitted revised plans in response to case officer comments. This included reducing the massing of the development to the west boundary, a set back to the curtain walling and the removal of off-street parking.

Neighbours were re-consulted for a 14-day period following the submission of the revised scheme, including any individual who previously responded to consultation.

In total, 36 neighbours were notified of the re-consultation via letter issued 19 February 2018 with a deadline of 05 March 2018 to respond.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

In response to re-consultation, 20 responses were received, all in objection to the scheme. It must again be noted that some individuals submitted multiple objections; for clarity, there were responses from 15 individuals in total.

The concerns raised are summarised below:

- Scale of proposals and subsequent impact with regards to light, overbearing and privacy for neighbouring occupants.
- Impact of the hip to gable roof form on light received by properties on Allington Road.
- Visual impact on Conservation Area and street scene
- Unjustified loss of an 'unlisted building of merit' within a Conservation Area.
- Unjustified change in land use and loss of existing employment site.
- Infilling of gap between 22a and 22 Islington Road and impact on light, views and privacy of neighbours.
- Impact on privacy of neighbouring residents and their gardens
- Design and materials out of keeping with surrounding Victorian terraces
- Noise from garden
- Increased pressure on parking in the area
- Potential to create precedent for modern design in the area
- Extent of obscure glazing reducing living environment for future occupants
- Insufficient neighbour consultation by applicant prior to submission
- Set back of curtain walling does not address loss of privacy to rear gardens west of the site.
- Lack of case for change to residential use
- Noise and disturbance from roof terrace [see case officer note above]
- Approval of the scheme would not be consistent with a recent refusal of planning permission on the street.
- Potential of site to be converted to flats at a later stage
- Construction impacts [Case officer note: impacts of construction cannot form part of the assessment of a proposed development for planning consent]
- Site notices not posted around site [Case officer note: this was checked upon receipt of the comment and it was confirmed by the BCC site notices team that the appropriate notices were placed near the site]
- Inaccurate or unclear plans [Case officer note: revised plans to correct an error in the west elevation were requested and provided by the applicant]
- Noise and disturbance from roof terrace [Case officer note: please see previous comment regarding roof terrace or Key Issue D]

AMENITY GROUPS

BS3 Planning Group – Objection:

“We continue to strongly OBJECT to the continuing proposals to demolish this building in the conservation area. The conservation area exists partly as a result of the idiosyncratic buildings scattered across it. The proposals neither enhance nor preserve the CA and attempt to replace an interesting historic building with a bland, massive box fronting the pavement and with large windows to the rear with views across neighbouring gardens. The building may be in disrepair, but local demand for studio and small office space is well known and there is no apparent attempt to refurbish this building and return it to employment use, but clearly a long-term attempt to attempt to demonstrate redundancy and therefore justify destruction. This must be resisted.”

COUNCILLORS

Councillor Charlie Bolton – Objection. Cllr Bolton referred the application to the planning committee, citing the following reasons for objection:

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

“Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of: Overlooking neighbouring properties; Loss of privacy; Overshadowing; Visual impact of the development; Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood; Design (including bulk and massing).

The proposed development is over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners. Inadequate neighbour consultation.”

INTERNAL CONSULTEES

City Design Group: No objection.

Both the Urban Design and Conservation sections of the City Design Group were consulted through the surgery process during the determination of this application, including upon receipt of amended plans in February and July 2018. CDG raised no objection subject to conditions. See Key Issues B and C for more detail.

Transport Development Management: No objection, following the receipt of revised plans in February 2018 which removed the off-street parking from the scheme.

Public Protection (Land Contamination): No objection:

“The planning application to demolish the existing property and create a new residential dwelling has been reviewed in relation to land contamination.

The applicants are referred to the following:

Bristol Core Strategy - BCS23 Pollution Local Plan DM34 Contaminated Land National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 109, 120 to 122

Planning Practice Guidance Note

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

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. The existing building dates from c1880 when it is believed to have been a coach house. During the twentieth century the property held a variety of uses including a liquid coffee manufacturers in the 1930's and 1940's, an electrical washing machine manufacturers in the 60's and a paint merchants in the 1970's. Whilst this is a minor application a risk assessment is required because of the potential risks identified.

A minimum of a phase 1 desk study looking into contamination must be submitted to the local planning authority and where deemed necessary a phase 2 intrusive investigation shall take place. If any information is already prepared submission prior to determination is encouraged to reduce the burden of pre-commencement conditions.

If not available it is recommended the standard conditions B11, B12, B13 and C1 are applied to any future planning consent.”

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework – July 2018

Bristol Local Plan comprising Core Strategy (Adopted June 2011), Site Allocations 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

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

Plan 2016 and Lawrence Weston Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017

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) IS THE PRINCIPLE ACCEPTABLE IN LAND USE TERMS?

The proposed development seeks to change the use of the site from Use Class B2 – General Industrial to Use Class C3 – Residential. The last known active use of the site for B2 use ended in 2013; it has been vacant since this time.

There are two key considerations in assessing the proposed development in land use terms. First, it must be determined whether the loss of the existing employment use is acceptable. Second, the suitability of the site for residential use must be assessed. These assessments will be made in turn.

Policy BCS8 of the Core Strategy (2011) requires that employment land outside of Principle Industrial Warehousing Areas is retained where it makes a valuable contribution to the economy and employment opportunities. The policy highlights the value of employment sites close to where people live and the difficulty in replacing employment sites when lost through redevelopment for alternative uses.

Policy DM12 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document (SADMP, 2014), provides detail to this approach, setting out the specific instances when loss of employment land will be permitted.

DM12 states that employment sites should be retained for employment uses unless it can be demonstrated that:

- (i) There is no demand for employment uses; or
- (ii) Continued employment use would have an unacceptable impact on the environmental quality of the surrounding area; or
- (iii) A net reduction in floorspace is necessary to improve the existing premises; or
- (iv) It is to be used for industrial or commercial training purposes.

With regards to the current application, only points (i) and (ii) of policy DM12 are relevant, as the application does not seek a reduction in floorspace to improve the existing premises nor proposes an industrial or commercial training use.

In order to satisfy the requirements of policy DM12, the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate that either there is no demand for employment uses or that continued employment use would have an unacceptable impact on the environmental quality of the surrounding area.

The applicant has not provided any evidence to support a claim that continued employment use would have an unacceptable impact on the environmental quality of the surrounding area as per criteria (ii) of policy DM12. Subsequently, the applicant is reliant on their assertion that the loss of the existing B2 use is supported through criteria (i) of policy DM12, namely that there is no demand for employment uses. It is a requirement of the policy that evidence is submitted to demonstrate that the site has been adequately marketed for employment uses.

The applicant disputes that the existing site constitutes 'valuable' employment space. They provide an assessment which cites the following reasons for the site failing to be an attractive prospect for potential occupiers in continued B2 use:

- Poor state of repair and a lack of modern features and facilities

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

- Isolation from other employment uses and close proximity to residential use
- Lack of off-street parking and servicing facilities
- Disjointed layout and floorspace

In accordance with the requirements of policy DM12, the applicant has submitted evidence that the site was unsuccessfully marketed for continued employment use. A statement from ETP Property Consultants demonstrates that the property was unsuccessfully marketed for continued employment use for over the minimum required period of 6 months, as set by Bristol City Council guidelines. ETP, in assessing the lack of interest in the site during this time, conclude that the poor condition and accessibility of the site, as well as availability within the market of more suitable properties, are factors in reducing demand for the site for employment use.

Following a second period of marketing from May 2017, it is stated that over 50 enquiries were received, largely relating to potential C3 use of the site, however two offers to purchase the property did not progress. Following case officer request, further detail of the offers made was provided by ETP, confirming that the majority of offers made were for proposed C3 use. It also further detailed that the two offers made to purchase the property were for B1 (business) use, however they did not progress following the failure to reach an overage agreement, which ETP conclude is an indication that the prospective buyers were intending to ultimately change the use of the building to C3 residential.

In assessing the proposed development against the requirements of policy DM12, it is considered that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that there is not demand for the continued employment use of the site. It is recognised that the site has been vacant for four years and is in a poor state of repair, as evidenced by the structural report submitted by the applicant. It is also recognised that the site is constrained for employment use given its location within a residential area with limits to accessibility and parking. It is considered that the evidence supplied by the applicant with regards to the marketing of the site is adequate in demonstrating that there is a lack of genuine demand for the site as an employment site. On balance, it is considered that the loss of the B2 use is acceptable.

An accepted loss of the B2 use does not preclude that residential use is acceptable and requires a further assessment.

Policy BCS5 states that the development of new homes will primarily be on previously developed sites across the city, with particular focus on delivering homes within south Bristol.

Policy BCS20 encourages the efficient use of land, and sets out that higher densities of development will be sought close to centres and along or near main public transport routes.

The application site is located in an area with a strong residential character. It is located 0.6 miles from Bedminster Parade to the east and 0.6 miles from North Street to the west, which are designated as a town centre and district centre respectively in the Core Strategy (2011). The city centre of Bristol is within reasonable walking or cycle distance and provides a wide range of employment, leisure and service facilities.

Bus routes from North Street and Bedminster Parade serve the city centre, while Bristol Temple Meads train station is 1.3 miles away.

It is considered that the proposed residential use would be appropriate in this location and would accord with policy objectives to locate new homes on previously developed land and close to centres and public transport routes. It is considered a sustainable location for a new dwelling which would contribute to overall targets for new homes both within south Bristol and the city as a whole.

In summary, the loss of the existing employment use is on balance considered to be acceptable and the proposed change of use to residential is concluded to be acceptable.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

(B) IS THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ACCEPTABLE IN DESIGN TERMS?

Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy is the overarching design policy which promotes high quality design across the city. The policy requires development to contribute positively to an area's character and safeguard the amenity of existing development and future occupiers.

The adopted development management policies reinforce this requirement, with reference to local character and distinctiveness (Policy DM26), layout and form (Policy DM27) and design of new buildings (Policy DM29). This section of the report considers how the proposed development responds to the requirements of these design policies.

Policy DM26 states that development will not be permitted where it would be harmful to local character and distinctiveness. The policy states that development should respond appropriately to the height, scale, massing, shape, form and proportion of existing buildings, including skylines and roofscapes. The policy sets out that while reproducing existing designs of development may be appropriate, there is also scope for innovative and contemporary design solutions where they would complement existing development.

Policy DM27 concerns the layout and form of development. The policy states that the height, scale and massing of development should be appropriate to the immediate context, character of adjoining streets and location within the townscape. Building lines should be consistent and coherent. Policy DM29 sets out the expectations of the design of new buildings, which will be expected to be of a high quality and a coherent rationale. It states that they should respond appropriately to their function and role in the public realm, employ high quality materials and contribute positively to the character of the area.

In considering the design aspect of the proposed development, it must be recognised that the existing building is of a scale, siting and architectural style that is in contrast to the surrounding built environment. Features of the building that are not found in the surrounding area include its detached siting, its asymmetric hipped roof and direct frontage onto the street.

It must also be recognised that while the building is of sufficient character and historic significance to be labelled as an 'unlisted building of merit' within the Bedminster Conservation Area, it is in a poor state of repair and currently the site does not make a significantly positive visual contribution to the street scene or character of the area, particularly given its prominent corner location.

The City Design Group (CDG) within Bristol City Council has been consulted with during the determination of this application, including the Conservation section. With regards specifically to the design, the CDG have raised no objection subject to securing further details by condition. Their comments are reflected in the remainder of this section, while the impact of the development in conservation and heritage terms is specifically addressed in Key Issue C.

i) Overall design approach

It is considered that the proposed rationale of the scheme, which seeks a contemporary, industrial approach to the design, is an appropriate response to the historic use of the site for employment use. The existing site has a limited architectural relationship to the surrounding Victorian terraces, such that there does exist an opportunity for an innovative and contemporary design approach to enhance the character and distinctiveness of the street, as set out in policy DM26.

Furthermore, the aspiration of the applicant to maintain unique character features of the existing site within the contemporary design is welcomed, including retaining its detached siting, direct street frontage, hipped roof to the east elevation and industrial character. The overall approach to the design of the new building is supported in accordance with policy DM29, subject to the details of the proposal being acceptable with regard to scale, massing, form, siting and materials as per the requirements of

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

policies DM26, DM27 and DM29.

ii) Layout

The proposed development would be of a detached siting and a layout which broadly accords with that of the existing site, retaining the direct street frontage to the south and east elevations and an area of private open space to the north-west corner.

The proposed development would represent a reduced footprint of built form on the site (approximately 166sqm) in comparison to existing (approximately 190sqm). The dwelling would not contravene established building lines on the street, including the angled two storey element of the design at the rear, which would align with and not exceed the rear building line of No.22.

With regards to layout and siting, it is considered that the proposed new dwelling would not represent a significant departure from the existing site. It would be appropriate within the immediate context and would be contained within established building lines. This accords with policy DM27.

iii) Scale, massing and form

The increased massing of the proposed development in comparison to the existing site has been a primary concern raised during neighbour consultation.

While the layout of the proposed site is similar to existing, it is recognised that the proposed extent of the two-storey element in particular represents an increase in its overall massing and scale, primarily due to its roof form and the curtain wall protrusion to the north.

With regards to the roof, the ridge height of the proposed development would not exceed that of the existing site, nor the surrounding dwellings on Islington Road. However, the eaves height would be increased by 25cm and there would be an overall increase in massing associated with the roof in comparison to the asymmetric hipped form of the existing building.

The application as originally submitted and considered by DC B in April 2018 comprised of a pitched roof with gable ends at both sides of the building. Following the resolution of the committee to defer a decision until revisions to the roof were made, the applicant has revised the scheme in July 2018 to remove the gable end to the east elevation and introduce a hipped roof form. This reduces the extent to which there is increased massing on the east side of the building, with a reduced roof mass than previously proposed. The revised roof design more closely resembles the form and character of the existing building and is considered appropriate in design terms.

The retention of a gable end to the west elevation would result in increased massing in comparison to the existing building, which is steeply hipped to this side. However, it would reflect the immediate neighbour at No.22, which has a gable end roof, as well as most of the surrounding dwellings; indeed, it is the dominant roof form of the Victorian terraces in the area. The asymmetric nature of the revised roof design would also reflect the existing building, which itself is characterised by a distinctive asymmetric hipped roof.

A partial gable/partial hipped roof form is apparent on other corner and end terrace buildings within the area, for example on 37 Allington Road and properties at the junction of Islington Road and Camden Road. Overall, it is considered that the revised roof design is acceptable.

The proposed development would extend the first floor to the west elevation by 1 metre beyond the existing building, reducing the gap between it and the adjacent dwelling at No.22. The gap between the proposed dwelling and No.22 would remain at just under 3 metres.

It is considered that this would be a sufficient visual gap to retain the detached character of the building and the existing relationship between No.22 and No.22a. It is considered that this extension would not result in substantial or significant harm to the character of the area or the street scene.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

Finally, the angled two storey protrusion to the rear represents an increased massing to the northern elevation in comparison to existing. However, this would not extend beyond the three-storey building line as established by the adjacent dwelling at No.22 and would appear subservient to the main building, with a reduced eaves height.

While it is recognised that some aspects of the proposed design represent an increase in the scale and massing of the new dwelling, it must also be noted that the majority of the proposals would be contained within the existing envelope and footprint of the site. Revisions to the scheme submitted in July 2018 further reduce the extent of increased massing due to the introduction of a hipped roof at the eastern elevation. Furthermore, the maximum height of the building would not be increased, and would remain substantially lower (2.5m) than that of the three-storey adjacent dwelling at No.22 and the elevated terrace on the south side of Islington Road.

It is considered that the proposed development would be of a scale and massing that does not represent a significant departure from the existing site and which would not result in substantial harm to the appearance and character of the area. This accords with policy DM26 and DM27.

iv) Materials and design details

Policies BCS21 and DM29 require that development is of a high quality. Given the location of the dwelling within a conservation area and the associated loss of an unlisted building of merit, the CDG places additional emphasis on the requirement to achieve a high-quality finish and secure the use of good quality materials and design details.

Following a request for further information, the applicant has specified the types of materials proposed for the building and has supplied precedent images. Details of the window reveals have been provided and comply with the request from CDG that this is at least 100mm to ensure an appropriately articulated elevation.

It is considered that sufficient information has been provided at this stage to provide confidence that the development would be of a satisfactory and high-quality finish to meet the objectives of policies BSC21 and DM29. However, it is proposed that conditions will be attached to any forthcoming consent to require the applicant to submit further details of the design and materials for approval prior to development.

In summary, the design of the proposed development is found to be acceptable. It is considered that the applicant has demonstrated a coherent design rationale and has taken an appropriate opportunity to introduce a contemporary and innovative design which would contribute to local distinctiveness. The overall siting, scale and massing of the development is appropriate and would not amount of significant harm to the character of the surrounding area. The proposed development is in accordance with the aims of policies BCS21, DM26, DM27 and DM29.

(C) WOULD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT RESULT IN UNACCEPTABLE HARM TO HERITAGE ASSETS?

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities to have special regard 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].

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018 states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing heritage assets, and the desirability of new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. It also states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, with any harm or loss requiring clear and convincing justification.

Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Further, Paragraph 200 states that local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets to enhance their significance and that proposals which preserve these elements should be treated favourably. Paragraph 197 states that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. There are two heritage assets of relevance to the proposed development. The first is the Bedminster Conservation Area, in which the site is located. This is a designated heritage asset.

Policy BCS22 states that development proposals will safeguard or enhance heritage assets and their character and setting. This includes conservation areas and historic buildings, including those locally listed.

Policy DM31 sets out that where a proposed development would impact the significance of a heritage asset (including those locally listed) the applicant will be required to justify the extent of proposed works and demonstrate how the features of the heritage asset and the local character of the area will be retained.

The site is identified as an 'unlisted building of merit' within the conservation area in the Bedminster Conservation Area Character Appraisal (adopted December 2013), however no description or reference is made to its significance within the document. It is situated on the boundary of the conservation area; much of the remainder of Islington Road is not within the conservation area, including the adjacent dwelling at No.22.

Within the conservation area, the site is located in the Stackpool Road character area, which is noted for its 'tightly packed Victorian terraces' and 'architectural uniformity'. Negative features are noted as loss of front boundaries, loss of traditional architectural details and the poor condition of some buildings.

The second heritage asset is the existing building of 22a Islington Road, which is included within the Bristol City Local List of heritage buildings. This does not constitute a designated heritage asset and subsequently, while this must be taken into account in determining the planning application (National Planning Policy Framework, paragraph 197), it carries less weight than a designated heritage asset such as the conservation area.

The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing buildings at 22a Islington Road and subsequently, the loss of a locally listed building within a conservation area. The applicant is therefore expected to meet the requirements of policy DM31.

The submitted Structural Inspection Report identifies that the existing vacant site suffers from significant structural problems and would require extensive works to enable the re-use of the building. The required works would result in the loss of historic fabric and would have significant costs, rendering the re-use of the site unviable financially while still having substantial harmful impact on the heritage asset. The applicant subsequently states that the full demolition of the building is required to secure a viable long term use of the site.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

The Heritage Report submitted by the applicant recognises that the demolition of the existing building would have a substantial negative impact on its individual heritage significance, however asserts that the primary issue for consideration is the impact of the development on the conservation area, the designated heritage asset. The report states that the design of the new dwelling is intended to reflect the scale and massing of the existing site, while also retaining its character as an unusual and distinctive building within the street scene. It concludes that while the proposed development may have a slight, negative impact on the Bedminster Conservation Area, this does not amount to substantial harm.

In considering the proposed harm to heritage assets, the Conservation section of the City Design Group has been consulted with. The CDG has reviewed the information submitted by the applicant and accepts that there does exist sufficient justification for the loss of the building.

It is recognised that the building is currently in a poor state of repair and does not contribute in a significantly positive manner to the character and historic significance of the conservation area. It is considered that the structural report does sufficiently evidence that to attempt to retain the existing building would impact viability of development and may not present substantial benefits with regard to heritage, given the amount of historic fabric that may be required to be lost through renovation works. Furthermore, given that the site (as a non-designated heritage asset) is ascribed less weight under national policy, it is considered that the public benefit of finding a viable use for a vacant site in a sustainable urban location outweighs the harm caused by the loss of the building.

With regards to the conservation area, it is considered that the loss of an existing 'unlisted building of merit' does in principle constitute harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset. However, a balanced assessment also identifies several mitigating factors which it is considered result in this harm being less than substantial.

First, it is noted that the existing building is in a poor state of repair and does not share the characteristics of the conservation area which contribute to its significance. The Stackpool Road character area is identified as significant on account of its uniform Victorian terraces and architectural details associated with these. 22a Islington Road is not of this character, and its significance is not otherwise noted in the conservation area appraisal. While the loss of the building will therefore have a significant local harmful impact in terms of the immediate street scene, its impact on the overall character of the Stackpool Road character area is considered less than substantial.

The site is located on the boundary of the Bedminster Conservation Area. Subsequently its visual impact on the heritage asset is limited to views from Allington Road and the eastern end of Islington Road; it is not a highly prominent historic feature or landmark within the conservation area. As such, it is considered that the loss of the unlisted building of merit would not amount to substantial harm to the overall significance or character of the designated heritage asset.

Finally, the proposed design of the new building has been found to accord with policy objectives regarding distinctive and high-quality design. The proposed design would retain several character features of the building particularly with regard to its siting, footprint, (partial) hipped and asymmetric roof form and industrial character. It is considered that the new dwelling would represent an enhancement to the existing street scene and subsequently the conservation area.

In summary, it is recognised that the proposed development requires the loss of an undesignated heritage asset (22a Islington Road) and would result in harm to a designated heritage asset (Bedminster Conservation Area). However, there is considered to be sufficient, evidenced justification for the proposed loss of the building and an associated public benefit of bringing a vacant site into use. On balance, it is concluded that the proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the Bedminster Conservation Area which would not warrant refusal of the development. It is considered that the development is acceptable with regard to its impact on heritage assets and is in overall compliance with national and local policy.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

(D) WOULD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT HAVE AN ACCEPTABLE IMPACT ON THE AMENITY OF NEIGHBOURING OCCUPIERS?

Policy BCS21 of the Core Strategy requires new development to safeguard the amenity of existing residents.

Policy DM29 sets out that new development should ensure that existing and proposed development achieves appropriate levels of privacy, outlook and daylight.

The Building Research Establishment (BRE)'s guidance document 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight' sets out tests that can be carried out to determine if a proposed development will result in substantial loss of light to neighbouring dwellings or gardens.

Objections have been received from neighbouring residents relating to the potential impact of the proposed development on their amenity through overshadowing, loss of privacy and overbearing. The issues will be addressed individually.

i) Overshadowing

The proposed development would represent an increased massing in comparison to the existing building, although the maximum height of the building would not be increased.

A sunlight assessment study has been submitted by the applicant and subsequently updated following revisions to the scheme, most recently within the July 2018 submission. The assessment has been produced with regard to the Building Research Establishment (BRE)'s guidance document Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight and has also been reviewed by officers with regard to this guidance.

Impact on adjoining dwellings

The light assessment shows that there would be limited impact on the internal living space of neighbouring dwellings, with increased shadow not extending to such an extent that habitable rooms would lose access to light. As demonstrated in the light assessment, the proposed dwelling meets the tests set out in BRE guidance which determine if a development would result in substantial effects on daylight received by adjoining dwellings. The development would not result in substantial harm with regard to light received within neighbouring dwellings.

An objection has been received relating to loss of light to the side elevation windows of No.22 Islington Road, and this forms one of the tests passed by the proposed development in the light assessment, and within BRE guidance. It must also be recognised that the existing outlook and light of these windows is poor, and at ground floor would remain the same as existing under the proposed development. It is considered that there may be minor impact to the first-floor window due to the 1 metre reduction in the gap between the two buildings at this level, however it is understood that this window serves a stairwell and not primary living space. The impact on the occupants of No.22 is not considered significantly harmful.

Impact on adjoining gardens

The BRE guidance states that if an existing garden or outdoor space is already heavily obstructed then any further loss of sunlight should be kept to a minimum. It sets a parameter that if an area of the garden which can receive two hours of direct sunlight on 21 March is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former size, then this further loss of sunlight is considered significant.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

The updated sunlight assessment demonstrates that there would be some loss of light as a result of the development which would primarily impact the rear gardens of properties on Allington Road. The loss of light is apparent when modelled for 21 March, a date which provides the average scenario according to BRE guidance. The extent of impact varies throughout the day, demonstrating minimal loss of light in the morning (8 am) and late afternoon (4pm), in which the rear gardens as existing are also in substantial shadow.

The greatest impact of the proposed development on Allington Road gardens is demonstrated to be between 10am and 2pm on 21 March, in which four surrounding properties would experience a loss of light considered noticeable under BRE guidance (less than 0.8 times the former area). However, it must be noted that none of these properties would be affected consistently throughout 10am and 2pm, rather they are each only affected for one period (e.g. in the 12 noon scenario only or the 2pm scenario only). Furthermore, the impact often relates to an already small parcel of light, in which – for example - the loss of 50% light within this parcel represents in reality a limited area of shadow.

Further assessment carried out by the applicant during the re-design of the roof has demonstrated that the most significant increase in shadow on 21 March is the result of the proposed rear boundary fence. This fence replaces an existing low boundary wall and is considered necessary to provide privacy between gardens. Furthermore, the fence, which would be 1.8m, could be erected at any point without planning permission under Permitted Development rights afforded by the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (GPDO), with the same resulting impact on the neighbouring garden.

The model for 21 June, which represents the best case scenario for light, shows that there would be minimal impact on neighbouring gardens during the summer months.

It is recognised that the rear gardens of Allington Road properties receive limited light at certain times of the year due to the topography of the area, and that subsequently it is preferable that any further loss of light is avoided. However, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in a loss of light to rear gardens that can be considered to result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity. The gardens that would lose light would not be affected all year-round or at all times of daylight, often losing small pockets of light that would be unlikely to provide substantial residential amenity if retained. The impact on occupants is considered in the context of their gardens already being substantially in shadow at the times of most impact, with summer months (when gardens would be most in use) largely unaffected.

The fall-back position regarding the rear fence must also be taken into consideration, in which the largest impact on light is the result of an aspect of the development which does not require planning permission and could be put in place at any time in the future irrespective of the current application.

Furthermore, it is considered appropriate to take into account that the adjacent dwelling at No.22 is approximately 2.5m taller than the proposed new dwelling and has a considerably larger impact on shadow and light of gardens opposite than that of the proposed development.

In summary, it is considered that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers through loss of light to their gardens or internal living space. While there may be some minor increase in overshadowing to gardens, it is determined that this would not result in significant or unacceptable harm to occupants and that the gardens would continue to receive appropriate levels of light, particularly within the existing context. The internal living environment of residents would be safeguarded. It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable with regard to overshadowing and any impacts are not unacceptable such to warrant refusal of the scheme.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

ii) Loss of privacy

Significant neighbour objection relates to the proximity of windows in the proposed dwelling and subsequent loss of privacy.

The proposed windows to the south and east elevations fronting Islington Road are intended to echo the fenestration of the existing building, with varying sizes and inconsistent placement. Whilst it is recognised that the windows would be large, their position is not materially different than that of the existing building and the majority of windows would serve hallways and bathrooms rather than living space. It is considered that the distance between the windows and dwellings opposite (approximately 12m) would be appropriate given the urban setting and is therefore acceptable with regard to impact on privacy.

The north elevation of the dwelling would have two first floor windows and a set of ground floor patio doors directly facing the rear of properties on Allington Road; this placement has received considerable objection from neighbours. These rear windows would be located approximately 6.8m from the rear boundary of No. 39 and 41 Allington Road, and approximately 14m from their nearest rear elevation.

The northern elevation would also have two windows facing westward toward No.22: a set of ground floor patio windows and a two-storey window (known as curtain walling) facing west in the angled rear two storey projection.

With regards to the rear windows directly facing north, it is appreciated that the elevated position of 22a Islington Road relative to the Allington Road properties increases a sense of being overlooked by these windows. It is also recognised that the building has been vacant for four years, with a resulting improvement in the sense of privacy. However, a balanced assessment must recognise that the proposed windows are not materially different in their outlook to that of the existing building. Such a separation difference is also typical of the area and the characteristic layout of its Victorian terraces. Finally, the applicant has proposed to obscure the first-floor north elevation windows and the future retention of this could be secured via condition. Subsequently, it is considered that there would not be a loss of privacy due to the directly rear facing windows.

The rear ground floor patio windows facing west would not have a significant impact on privacy due to the position of fencing to the north and west boundaries, preventing views into neighbouring gardens.

The two-storey curtain walling would be situated such that it would not extend beyond the building line of No.22. Subsequently, direct views to the west would be semi-obstructed. In order to further mitigate the impact of the window and limit outward views, the applicant has proposed that the first-floor level would be mezzanine, and set back by 1.5m from the window. While this would reduce the extent of overlooking possible, it is noted that permanent retention of this mitigating measure cannot be conditioned and therefore following case officer comments, the applicant has proposed further mitigation measures. The window has been set 0.5m behind an overhang of the northern elevation, such that views directly north toward Allington Road properties are not possible. A section of obscure glazing has also been introduced to the first-floor level at a position to prevent near views; in particular, views down into the rear patio of No.22 would be prevented. The installation and permanent retention of the obscure glazing would be secured via condition.

It is considered that neighbours have raised valid concern over the impact of a large two storey window on their privacy and this aspect of the design has been carefully assessed from an amenity perspective. Following the introduction of additional mitigation measures, it is concluded that the window would not result in unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbours. The resulting views from the upper floor of the window would be long and indirect views; direct overlooking into the living space of neighbouring properties would not be possible. It should be noted that the neighbouring three storey dwelling at No.22 has rear windows directly facing the opposite terrace at third floor level which would

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

allow for similar if not more extensive views over neighbouring properties. As such, the impact of the proposed development is considered not to result in a loss of privacy materially worse than the existing level of overlooking between properties.

In summary, it is concluded that the proposed dwelling would not result in a significant or unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

iii) Overbearing

Some concerns have been raised over the prospect of the new development being overbearing for neighbours, with an imposing or oppressive impact. It has been established earlier in this report that the scale and massing of the new dwelling is not significantly larger than that of the existing building, that it would not represent an increase in the maximum height of the existing site, that the existing footprint is reduced and that it does not contravene the established building line.

While 22a Islington Road is a prominent building due to the topography and its corner position, it must be noted that the adjacent dwelling at No.22 is three storeys and approximately 2.5m taller than the proposed dwelling. It is considered that this contributes to an existing sense of overbearing for properties on Allington Road.

It is considered that the properties most likely to be impacted by a sense of overbearing are No.37 and 39 Allington Road, which face upwards toward the north elevation. It is recognised that the new dwelling would be located in close proximity to their rear boundary and would create a sense of enclosure and overbearing. However, this must be considered within the context of the existing site. The existing site is built up to the boundary with No. 37 and 39 and covers a larger footprint against this boundary. It is considered that the proposed dwelling would not result in an increased sense of overbearing that is substantially more harmful than the existing outlook from the opposite properties.

Assessed within the above context, it is considered that the proposed development would not give rise to an unacceptable sense of overbearing that is materially different to that of the existing site or the neighbouring dwelling, and therefore does not warrant refusal of the scheme. However, in the interests of future safeguarding, it is recommended that a condition be applied to any forthcoming consent preventing the extension of the dwelling or installation of windows without further planning permission.

iv) Noise

Objections have been received relating to increased noise from the outdoor amenity space of the proposed dwelling and subsequent impact on neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed outdoor terrace is located in the same position as the existing rear courtyard, although it is of a larger size. Given the residential nature of the area, and that the existing layout of the Allington Road and Islington Road properties is such that their rear gardens back onto one another, it is not considered that the use of the rear garden at No.22a would result in unacceptable impact to amenity through noise.

Concern has also been raised over the potential use of the flat roof single storey sections of the development as an elevated roof terrace. A condition preventing this without further planning consent would be attached to any forthcoming consent.

(E) WOULD THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROVIDE AN ACCEPTABLE LIVING ENVIRONMENT FOR FUTURE OCCUPANTS?

BCS21 states that new development should provide a safe, attractive, usable and inclusive built environment which creates a high quality living environment for future occupants. This should include

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

consideration of outlook, privacy, natural lighting, ventilation and indoor and outdoor space.

Policy BCS18 states that residential developments should provide sufficient space for everyday activities and to enable flexibility and adaptability by meeting appropriate space standards.

The relevant minimum space standards for new housing is contained in the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Nationally Described Space Standards for new housing published in March 2015.

The minimum space standard for a two-storey 2 bedroom dwelling according to this guidance is 79sqm. The proposed dwelling would provide 225sqm of space for its occupants and therefore meets the required space standards.

The new dwelling would have a varied outlook, with fenestration to three elevations. It is recognised that the two bedrooms would have a less than ideal outlook; the ground floor bedroom would be served by a roof light and internal window only, while the first floor bedroom would have an obscured window and a roof light. However, given the generous size of the bedrooms (exceeding minimum space standards) and the dwelling as a whole, it is considered that this would not constitute a poor quality living environment such to give rise to refusal of the scheme.

There would be sufficient ventilation through the use of louvred ventilation panels.

The occupants of the dwelling would have access to private outdoor space of a reasonable size. In summary, it is considered that the proposed development would provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers.

(F) IS THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ACCEPTABLE WITH REGARD TO TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAY SAFETY?

Policy BCS10 of the Core Strategy states that development should promote sustainable transport choices.

Policy DM23 requires development to provide safe and adequate access to new developments.

Under the initial submission, the proposed development did include 1no. off-street parking space accessed via the east elevation. Bristol City Council's Transport Development Management (TDM) team objected to this proposal on the grounds of poor visibility, lack of manoeuvrability and safety concerns. The requirement to keep an integral garage unobstructed for access would also result in a reduction in available on street parking.

Following this response, the applicant has removed the off-street parking from the proposal and the development as revised would not provide any private vehicular parking. It is considered that this is appropriate given that the site is within a highly sustainable location close to main public transport routes.

Secure cycle storage for 2no. cycles would be provided in a cycle shed accessed from the east elevation. This provision meets the minimum requirements of policy DM23 and is acceptable.

Refuse storage would be provided adjacent to the cycle store with direct access to the street for collection via a garage door. This is considered acceptable by TDM.

The installation and maintenance thereafter of the cycle and refuse stores would be controlled via condition.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

In summary, the proposed development is acceptable with regards to transport and highway safety.

(G) DOES THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ADEQUATELY MEET OBJECTIVES OF SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE?

Policies BCS13 to BCS15 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy forms a suite of planning policies relating to climate change and sustainability. It requires development to both mitigate and adapt to climate change. This includes new development to minimise its energy requirements, address issues of sustainable design and construction and also water management issues to reduce surface-water run-off. Policy BCS14 requires that development provides sufficient renewable energy generation to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from residual energy use in the buildings by at least 20%.

The proposed development would result in the reduction of CO2 emissions by 20% through on site renewables (PV panels) and the design of the building would incorporate energy efficiency measures. Further details relating to the installation of the PV panels would be secured via condition.

In summary, the proposed development is acceptable with regards to sustainability and climate change.

(H) IS THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ACCEPTABLE WITH REGARD TO CONTAMINATED LAND?

Policy DM34 requires that new development should demonstrate that any existing contamination of land will be appropriately mitigated and that new development will not cause the land to become contaminated.

Given the industrial/commercial use of the existing site, Bristol City Council's Public Protection (Land Contamination) Officer was consulted on the proposed development.

The officer identified that the site is sensitive to contamination and subsequently, a risk assessment would be required prior to commencement of the scheme. This could be secured via condition if consent were forthcoming.

CONCLUSION

The application proposes to demolish a vacant industrial unit and construct a two bedroom dwelling in a sustainable location. In accordance with policy requirements, the applicant has provided sufficient evidence to justify the development in pure land use terms, in particular the loss of an employment site.

It is recognised that the site is of heritage value as a locally listed building within Bedminster Conservation Area. Subsequently, it is accepted that the proposed development does constitute a degree of harm to heritage assets. However, on balance, it is concluded that this harm would be less than substantial and does not warrant refusal of the scheme. Furthermore, the proposed development would be of a high quality, innovative design that it is considered would contribute to local distinctiveness and retain aspects of its character.

It is recognised that the proposed development would result in some impact to neighbouring residential amenity through overshadowing to gardens and a potentially increased sense of being overlooked. However, it is apparent that the greatest impact on light is the result of the boundary fence rather than the building itself, while there is sufficient mitigation proposed to safeguard privacy of neighbours. It is considered on balance that the proposed development would not result in unacceptable harm through overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing or which is substantially more harmful than the current building. Neighbouring properties would continue to receive appropriate levels

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

of light and outlook given the context of the surrounding area and the existing building.

The development would provide a high quality living environment for future occupiers that meets policy requirements regarding transport and sustainability measures.

It is concluded that the proposed development should be recommended for approval subject to conditions.

CIL

The Community Infrastructure Levy for this development is £15,167.41.

RECOMMENDED GRANT subject to condition(s)

Time limits for commencement of development

1. Full planning permission

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

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

Pre commencement condition(s)

2. To secure the recording of the fabric of buildings of historic or architectural importance

Prior to the commencement of development, including demolition, the developer shall record the building known as '22a Islington Road' and any ancillary structures and submit the record to the Local Planning Authority. The recording must be carried out by an archaeologist or archaeological organisation approved by the Local Planning Authority and submitted to the Historic Environment Record (HER), the record should then be submitted to Bristol City Museum and a hard copy to Bristol Record Office.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological or architectural importance within a building are recorded before their destruction or concealment.

3. Land affected by contamination - Site Characterisation

No development shall take place until an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, and has been completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site.

The contents of the scheme should be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. The report of the findings must include:

- (i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
- (ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - human health,
 - property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

- adjoining land,
 - groundwaters and surface waters,
 - ecological systems,
 - archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
- (iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).

This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's '*Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11*'.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination is understood prior to works on site both during the construction phase to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors

4. Land affected by contamination - Submission of Remediation Scheme

No development shall take place until a detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment has been prepared, submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination is understood prior to works on site both during the construction phase to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

5. Land affected by contamination - Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

In the event that contamination is found, no development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation shall take place until the approved remediation scheme has been carried out in accordance with its terms. The Local Planning Authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and be approved in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination both during the construction phase and to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

6. Further details – external

No development shall take place until a detailed part elevation and section at 1:20 scale showing all typical external treatments and building elements has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development will be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

Reason: in order to ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory, in accordance with quality expectations set out within the approved plans, and appropriate to the local context.

7. Further detail and submission of samples – materials

No development shall take place until all details of external materials have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. An agreed sample reference panel to include external facing materials and construction details shall be erected on site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved reference sample panel shall be retained on site until the completion of the development. The development will be carried out in accordance with the approved materials and panel.

Reason: in order to ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory, in accordance with quality expectations set out within the approved plans, and appropriate to the local context.

8. Further details – Photovoltaic Panels

Prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the works hereby approved details relating to the photovoltaic panels (including the exact location, dimensions, design/technical specification and method of fixing) shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved equipment shall be installed and operational prior to the first occupation of the use which they serve and retained as operational thereafter in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the development contributes to mitigating and adapting to climate change and to meeting targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and to ensure that the external appearance of the building is satisfactory.

9. Land affected by contamination - Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Condition 2 and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Condition 3 which is to be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with condition 4.

Reason: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

Pre occupation condition(s)

10. Implementation/Installation of Refuse Storage and Recycling Facilities – Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the refuse store, and area/facilities allocated for storing of recyclable materials, as shown on the approved plans have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter, all refuse and recyclable materials associated with the development shall either be stored within this dedicated store/area, as shown on the approved plans, or internally within the building(s) that form part of the application site.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

No refuse or recycling material shall be stored or placed for collection on the public highway or pavement, except on the day of collection.

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

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

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the cycle parking provision shown on the approved plans has been completed, and thereafter, be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of cycles only.

Reason: To ensure the provision and availability of adequate cycle parking.

12. Reinstatement of Redundant Accessways – Shown on approved plans

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the existing accesses to the development site has been permanently stopped up and the footway reinstated in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian safety.

13. No Further Extensions

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) no extension or enlargement (including additions to roofs) shall be made to the dwellinghouse hereby permitted, or any detached building erected, without the express permission in writing of the council.

Reason: The further extension of this (these) dwelling(s) or erection of detached building requires detailed consideration to safeguard the amenities of the surrounding area.

14. Obscured Glazed Windows

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) the following windows shall be glazed with obscure glass in accordance with the approved plans and shall be permanently maintained thereafter as obscure glazed:

- First floor windows in the north elevation
- Two storey curtain walling in the north-west elevation

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy.

15. No Further Windows

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and/or re-enacting that Order) no windows, other than those shown on the approved plans shall at any time be placed in the north elevation of the building hereby permitted without the grant of a separate planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises from overlooking and loss of privacy.

Development Control Committee B – 15 August 2018
Application No. 17/06582/F : 22A Islington Road Bristol BS3 1QB

16. Restriction of Use of Roof

The roof area of the development hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific planning permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises.

17. Demolition Linked to Redevelopment

The demolition works hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than as part of the completion of development for which planning permission was granted on XX and such demolition and development shall be carried out without interruption and in complete accordance with the plans referred to in this consent and any subsequent approval of details.

Reason: To ensure the demolition is followed by immediate rebuilding and to maintain the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

18. List of Approved Plans and Drawings

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

6254 3 0001 B Location Plan, received 27 November 2017
 6254 3 0101 I Proposed ground floor plan, received 14 February 2018
 6254 3 0102 I Proposed first floor plan, received 14 February 2018
 6254 3 0104 I Proposed roof plan, received 11 July 2018
 6254 3 0201 I Proposed section AA, received 11 July 2018
 6254 3 0202 F Proposed section BB, received 11 July 2018
 6254 3 0203 G Proposed section CC, received 11 July 2018
 6254 3 0301 I Proposed elevation east, received 11 July 2018
 6254 3 0302 G Proposed elevation North, received 11 July 2018
 6254 3 0303 F Proposed elevation south, received 11 July 2018
 6254 3 0304 G Proposed west elevation, received 11 July 2018
 6254 3 0501 F Proposed 3D Views external, received 11 July 2018
 Energy Statement, received 27 November 2017
 6254 REP03A Design Note (Parts 1-3), received 14 February 2018
 6254 3 0502A Proposed 3D Views External 2, received 20 February 2018
 6254 3 2501 External Walls - Openings - Windows, received 20 February 2018
 6254 3 0204 A Proposed Section D-D, received 11 July 2018

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Advices:


1. Alterations to vehicular access

There is a requirement to make alterations to vehicular access(s). Applicants should note the provisions of section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. The works should be to the specification and constructed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority (Telephone 0117 9222100). You will be required to pay fees to cover the Councils costs in undertaking the approval and inspection of the works.

Supporting Documents

2. 22A Islington Road

1. Previously proposed East elevation (as per 25th April Committee)
2. Previously proposed North elevation (as per 25th April Committee)
3. Previously proposed South elevation (as per 25th April Committee)
4. Revised 3D views (July 2018)
5. Revised proposed elevation East (July 2018)
6. Revised proposed elevation North (July 2018)
7. Revised proposed elevation South (July 2018)
8. Revised proposed elevation West (July 2018)
9. Revised section D-D (July 2018)
10. Updated sunlight assessment (July 2018)



Standing seam metal roofing / cladding




Red brick cladding to closely match existing



Metal panel finish to roller shutter door

Grey PPC aluminium window / door / rooflight frames / panels

Grey single ply roof to stores



No 37 Allington Road

+4.940 Ridge

+3.076 Eaves

Dotted line indicates house behind

+0.586 Brick wall

+0.000 DATUM LEVEL



East Elevation - Red brick walls with standing seam cladding / roof

Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
D	3/3/2017	Roof pop-ups omitted; roof height revised; material of stores revised to timber. Issued to client for approval.	JE	
E	21/3/2017	Minor revisions to windows; notes updated; issued for planning.	JE	
F	18/4/2017	Minor revisions to suit survey information.	JE	
G	17/11/2017	Material change to stores, doors and fence to garden.	JE	
H	9/2/2018	Entrance area reconfigured; first floor wall moved to the east and first floor rooms adjusted to suit; studio repositioned to rear of the site with access via kitchen / dining area.	JE	

Planning


22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol

Proposed Elevations
East Elevation

Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton
Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

Date	Drawn	Checked	Drawing No	Amendment
8/3/2016	JE	JE	6254 3 0301	H
Date	Amended	Checked	Status + Work Stage	
9/2/2018	JE	JE	Planning	
Scale	Sta	Scale @ A3	Developed Design	
1:100 @ A3	A3			

www.white-design.com
Hamilton House, 80 Stokes Croft, Bristol BS1 3QY
Copyright © 2017 White Design Associates. All rights reserved.



Standing seam metal roofing / cladding

Grey PPC aluminium window / door / rooflight frames / panels

Fence greyed out for clarity

+9.115 Ridge (varies)

EXISTING RIDGE LEVEL

EXISTING EAVES


EXISTING FIRST FLOOR

+0.000 DATUM LEVEL

+10.050 Ridge

+7.130 Eaves

No 22, Islington Road



North Elevation - Red brick walls with standing seam cladding / roof

Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
B	3/3/2017	Roof pop-ups omitted; roof lowered; render cladding replaced with standing seam. Issued to client for approval.	JE	
C	21/3/2017	Minor changes to windows; notes updated; issued for planning.	JE	
D	18/4/2017	Minor revisions to suit survey information.	JE	
E	17/11/2017	Notes updated.	JE	
F	9/2/2018	Entrance area reconfigured; first floor wall moved to the east and first floor rooms adjusted to suit; studio repositioned to rear of the site with access via kitchen / dining area.	JE	

Planning


22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol

Proposed Elevations
North Elevation

Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton
Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

Date	Drawn	Checked	Drawing No	Amendment
29/9/2015	JE	KH	6254 2 0302	F
Date	Amended	Checked	Status + Work Stage	
9/2/2018	JE		Planning Developed Design	
Scale	Sta	Scale @ A3		
1:100 @ A3	A3			






Standing seam metal roofing / cladding



Red brick cladding to closely match existing



Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
A	15/6/2016	Scale bar added. Notes updated.	JE	
B	3/3/2017	Roof pop-ups omitted; roof lowered; notes updated. Issued to client for approval.	JE	
C	21/3/2017	Minor amendments to windows; notes updated; issued for planning.	JE	
D	18/4/2017	Minor revisions to suit survey information.	JE	
E	9/2/2018	Entrance area reconfigured; first floor wall moved to the east and first floor rooms adjusted to suit; studio repositioned to rear of the site with access via kitchen / dining area.	JE	

South Elevation - Red brick walls with standing seam cladding / roof

Planning

22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol


Proposed Elevations
South Elevation

Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton


Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

Date	Drawn	Checked	Drawing No	Amendment
13/6/2016	YH	JE	6254 3 0303	E
Date	Amended	Checked	Status + Work Stage	
9/2/2018	JE		Planning	
Scale	Size	Scale @ A3	Developed Design	
1:100 @ A3	A3			

www.white-design.com
1 0117 964 7333
Hamilton House, 80 Stokes Croft, Bristol BS1 3QY
Copyright © 2017 White Design Associates. All rights reserved.



View 1 - Corner of Islington Road



View 2 - Building entrance from Islington Road

Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
B	13/6/2016	Views updated. Issued for planning.	JE	
C	3/3/2017	Roof pop-ups omitted; roof lowered. Issued to client for approval.	JE	
D	21/3/2017	Updated views; issued for planning.	JE	
E	9/2/2018	Entrance area reconfigured; first floor wall moved to the east and first floor rooms adjusted to suit; studio repositioned to rear of the site with access via kitchen / dining area.	JE	
F	11/7/2018	Roof form revised to include hipped gable to eastern end.	JE	

Planning


22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol

Proposed 3D Views
External - Sheet 1

Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton
Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

Date	Drawn	Checked	Drawing No	Amendment
17/12/2015	JE	KH	6254 3 0501	F
Date	Amended	Checked	Status + Work Stage	
11/7/2018	JE		Planning	
Scale	Sta	Scale @ A3	Developed Design	
NTS	A3			

whitedesign
1 0114 964 7333
www.white-design.com
Hamilton House, 80 Stokes Croft, Bristol BS1 3QY
Copyright © 2017 White Design Associates. All rights reserved.



Standing seam metal roofing / cladding



Red brick cladding to closely match existing



Metal panel finish to roller shutter door

Grey PPC aluminium window / door / rooflight frames / panels

Grey single ply roof to stores



East Elevation - Red brick walls with standing seam cladding / roof

Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
E	21/3/2017	Minor revisions to windows; notes updated; issued for planning.	JE	
F	18/4/2017	Minor revisions to suit survey information.	JE	
G	17/11/2017	Material change to stores, doors and fence to garden.	JE	
H	9/2/2018	Entrance area reconfigured; first floor wall moved to the east and first floor rooms adjusted to suit; studio repositioned to rear of the site with access via kitchen / dining area.	JE	
I	11/7/2018	Roof form revised to include hipped gable at eastern end.	JE	

Planning

22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol


Proposed Elevations
East Elevation

Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton
Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

Date 8/3/2016	Drawn JE	Checked	Drawing No 6254 3 0301	Amendment I
Date 11/7/2018	Amended JE	Checked	Status + Work Stage Planning Developed Design	
Scale 1:100 @ A3	Scale A3	Scale @ A3	www.white-design.com Hamilton House, 80 Stokes Croft Bristol BS1 3QY Copyright © 2017 White Design Associates. All rights reserved.	





Red brick cladding to closely match existing



Standing seam metal roofing / cladding

Grey PPC aluminium window / door / rooflight frames / panels

Fence greyed out for clarity



North Elevation - Red brick walls with standing seam cladding / roof

Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
C	21/3/2017	Minor changes to windows; notes updated; issued for planning.	JE	
D	18/4/2017	Minor revisions to suit survey information.	JE	
E	17/11/2017	Notes updated.	JE	
F	9/2/2018	Entrance area reconfigured; first floor wall moved to the east and first floor rooms adjusted to suit; studio repositioned to rear of the site with access via kitchen / dining area.	JE	
G	11/7/2018	Roof form revised to include hipped gable at eastern end; fence height indicated; drawing number corrected to Stage 3.	JE	

Planning


22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol

Proposed Elevations
North Elevation

Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton
Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

Date	Drawn	Checked	Drawing No	Amendment
29/9/2015	JE	KH	6254 3 0302	G
Date	Amended	Checked	Status + Work Stage	
11/7/2018	JE		Planning Developed Design	
Scale	Sta	Scale @ A3		
1:100 @ A3	A3			

www.white-design.com
Copyright © 2017 White Design Associates. All rights reserved.



Standing seam metal roofing / cladding



Red brick cladding to closely match existing



South Elevation - Red brick walls with standing seam cladding / roof

Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
B	3/3/2017	Roof pop-ups omitted; roof lowered; notes updated. Issued to client for approval.	JE	
C	21/3/2017	Minor amendments to windows; notes updated; issued for planning.	JE	
D	18/4/2017	Minor revisions to suit survey information.	JE	
E	9/2/2018	Entrance area reconfigured; first floor wall moved to the east and first floor rooms adjusted to suit; studio repositioned to rear of the site with access via kitchen / dining area.	JE	
F	11/7/2018	Roof form revised to include hipped gable at eastern end.	JE	

Planning


22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol

Proposed Elevations
South Elevation

Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton
Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

Date	Drawn	Checked	Drawing No	Amendment
13/6/2016	YH	JE	6254 3 0303	F
Date	Amended	Checked	Status + Work Stage	
11/7/2018	JE		Planning	
Scale	Sta	Scale @ A3	Developed Design	
1:100 @ A3	A3			

www.white-design.com
Hamilton House, 80 Stokes Croft, Bristol BS1 3QY
Copyright © 2017 White Design Associates. All rights reserved.




Standing seam metal roofing / cladding




Red brick cladding to closely match existing

Fence greyed out for clarity

Grey PPC aluminium window / door / rooflight frames / panels



Existing fence to no. 22 Islington Road shown in blue; grey fence shown is proposed to site boundary



Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
C	21/3/2017	Minor revision to window; notes added; issued for planning.	JE	
D	18/4/2017	Minor revisions to suit survey information.	JE	
E	9/2/2018	Entrance area reconfigured; first floor wall moved to the east and first floor rooms adjusted to suit; studio repositioned to rear of the site with access via kitchen / dining area.	JE	
F	20/2/2018	Depth of elevation extended to show area at rear of proposed dwelling.	JE	
G	11/7/2018	Annotations added to fencing.	JE	

West Elevation - Red brick walls with standing seam cladding / roof

Planning


22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol

Proposed Elevations
West Elevation


Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton
Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

Date	Drawn	Checked	Drawing No	Amendment
13/6/2016	YH	JE	6254 2 0304	G
Date	Amended	Checked	Status + Work Stage	
11/7/2018	JE		Planning	
Scale	Size	Scale @ A3	Developed Design	
1:100 @ A3	A3			

www.white-design.com
1 0117 954 7333
Copyright © 2017 White Design Associates. All rights reserved.



Type of obscured glazing proposed to curtain walling at rear



Rev.	Date	Notes	Revised by	Checked by
A	11/7/2018	Roof form revised to include hipped gable at eastern end.	JE	

Planning

22A Islington Road
Southville, Bristol

Date	Drawn	Checked	Drawing No	Amendment
14/3/2018	JE	KH	6254 3 0204	A
Date	Amended	Checked	Status + Work Stage	
11/7/2018	JE		Planning	
Scale	Size	Scale @ A3	Developed Design	
1:100 @ A3	A3			

Proposed Sections
Section D-D

Thomas Beldam & Georgina Bolton
Check all dimensions on site. If in doubt ask.

www.white-design.com
hamilton house 80, staples court bristol BS1 3DY
Copyright © 2017 White Design Associates. All rights reserved.

Section D-D - Curtain walling showing obscured glazing

Daylight / Sunlight Assessment

Issue: Planning

Revision : 5

Issue Date: July 2018

for

22A Islington Road, Southville, Bristol BS3 1QB



www.white-design.co.uk

tel +44 (0)117 954 7333

fax +44 (0)117 954 7338

White Design Associates Limited

Registration No 3499053

VAT Registration No 709 5853 06

Hamilton House, 80 Stokes Croft, Bristol, BS1 3QY

white design

Fifth Issue	July 2018	Updated to revised design and issued for Planning	JE	
Fourth Issue	March 2018	Updated to revised design and issued for Planning	JE	
Third Issue	November 2017	Revised and issued for Planning	JE	KH
Second Issue	June 2016	Issued for Planning	JE	KH
First Issue	June 2016	Issued in draft	JE	KH
Rev.	Date	Notes	Author	Checked by

Front page: OS Map extract, Application Site (red outline)

Ordnance Survey Map © Crown Copyright 2014

Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without the express permission of Ordnance Survey.

www.white-design.co.uk

tel +44 (0)117 954 7333

fax +44 (0)117 954 7338

White Design Associates Limited

Registration No 3499053

VAT Registration No 709 5853 06

Hamilton House, 80 Stokes Croft, Bristol, BS1 3QY

1 Introduction	4
2 Daylight.....	5
3 Sunlight.....	7
4 Diagrams - 21st March.....	8
5 Diagrams - 21st June.....	13
6 Conclusions.....	18

1 Introduction

This Daylight / Sunlight Assessment is for the proposed development of 22A Islington Road, Bristol as requested following the pre-application planning submission. The document is developed having regard to the BRE's (Building Research Establishment) guidance document *Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight*.

This document assesses the impact of the proposal on adjoining properties, including associated gardens or amenity space, in respect of potential loss of daylight and sunlight.

Since previous planning submissions, the design of the building has been revised to include a hipped roof to the eastern end; this is to limit overshadowing and to reduce the perceived height of the building where it turns the corner. There is also a stepped fence proposed to the boundary with no. 22 Islington Road to minimise perceived overlooking, whilst keeping any overshadowing to a minimum.

2 Daylight


In relation to daylight, the BRE guidelines are intended to be used for “rooms in adjoining dwellings where daylight is required, including living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms”. The guidance states that windows to the following areas need not be analysed: “bathrooms, toilets, storerooms, circulation areas and garages”.

Two windows have been used for the purpose of this assessment. The first is the downstairs rear window / patio door to the property on the corner of Allington / Islington Road (see plan and photograph). This opening has been chosen as it is the closest, and lowest, living room window on Allington Road. The first test referred to in the guidance is as follows:

“loss of light to existing windows need not be analysed if the distance of each part of the new development from the existing window is three or more times its height above the centre of the existing window. In these cases the loss of light will be small.”


Due to the change of level from the application site to the property on Allington Road, the above test is not met. The guidance continues:

“If the proposed development is taller or closer than this, a modified form of the procedure adopted for new buildings can be used to find out whether an existing building still receives enough skylight. First, draw a section in a plane perpendicular to each affected main window wall of the existing building (Figure 14 [see diagram below]). Measure the angle to the horizontal subtended by the new development at the level of the centre of the lowest window. If this angle is less than 25° for the whole of the development then it is unlikely to have a substantial effect on the diffuse skylight enjoyed by the existing building.”



Window location - plan

The proposed section (below) demonstrates that the 25° test can be met for this opening; the 1600mm height from which the line is drawn in the diagram is given in the guidance document for patio doors.



Window location - photo





Figure 14 from BRE guidance document



Proposed section showing daylight calculation


The second window is to the adjacent property on Islington Road (no. 22). This is believed to serve a kitchen on the lowest floor. The window does not meet the tests referred to above; however, the guidance document provides specific guidance for situations where “an existing building has windows that are unusually close to the site boundary”. It states:

“Figure F3 [see diagram below] shows an example, where side windows of an existing building are close to the boundary. To ensure that new development matches the height and proportions of existing buildings, the VSC and APSH targets for these windows could be set to those for a ‘mirror-image’ building of the same height and size, an equal distance away on the other side of the boundary.”

The section below shows the proposed outline (at proposed roof ridge level) in relation to the mirror-image (at roof verge level). The area of sky visible (defined by the yellow arrow) is less for the mirror-image as would be for the proposed building (green outline). In addition, it should be noted that as the depth of the proposed building is less than its neighbour, the impact on daylight compared to the mirror-image would also be less.



Window location - plan



Window location - photo





Figure F3 from BRE guidance document



Section showing mirror-image (red) and proposed outline (green)

3 Sunlight

The BRE guidance document identifies sunlight as a separate consideration. It states that:

“obstruction to sunlight may become an issue if: some part of a new development is situated within 90° of due south of a main window wall of an existing building; in the section drawn perpendicular to this existing window wall, the new development subtends an angle greater than 25° to the horizontal measured from the centre of the lowest window to a main living room (Figure 14 [see diagram on previous page])”.

As set out on page 5, the above test is met by the proposed development (see proposed section diagram).

In addition to consideration of the existing buildings, the BRE document recommends that sunlight in the spaces between buildings (in this case, the main back gardens to the existing houses) should also be assessed.

The guidance states:

“If an existing garden or outdoor space is already heavily obstructed then any further loss of sunlight should be kept to a minimum. In this poorly sunlit case, if as a result of new development the area which can receive two hours of direct sunlight on 21 March is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former size, this further loss of sunlight is significant. The garden or amenity area will tend to look more heavily overshadowed.”

It continues:

“Where there are existing buildings as well as the proposed one, ‘before’ and ‘after’ shadow plots showing the difference that the proposed building makes may be helpful. In interpreting the impact of such differences, it must be borne in mind that nearly all structures will create areas of new shadow, and some degree of transient overshadowing of a space is to be expected.

“If a space is used all year round, the equinox (21 March) is the best date for which to prepare shadow plots as it gives an average level of shadowing. Lengths of shadows at the autumn equinox (21 September) will be the same as those for 21 March, so a separate set of plots for September is not required (...).

“As an optional addition, plots for summertime (eg 21 June) may be helpful as they will show the reduced shadowing then, although it should be borne in mind that 21 June represents the best case of minimum shadow, and that shadows for the rest of the year will be longer.”

The diagrams on the following pages show shadow plots for a before and after view of the site for the 21st of March and 21st of June. Since previous planning submissions, it has been noted that the proposed rear fence to no. 22a is what is causing the majority of any changes to the shadow plots, not the buildings. The number of diagrams have therefore been expanded to show the proposed building with and without the proposed 1.8m high

boundary fence; the diagrams also show the existing building with a 2m high boundary fence (as would be within permitted development rights).

The diagrams on the following pages are set out as follows:

Top Left - Existing building - with existing fence to no. 22 boundary, but none to rear (current situation)

Bottom Left - Existing building - with 2m fence to rear boundary (within permitted development rights)


Top Right - Proposed building - with existing fence to no. 22 boundary, but none to rear (to demonstrate that the building itself has minimal impact)

Bottom Right - Proposed - with 1.8m fence to rear boundary and stepped fence to no. 22 boundary


The yellow outline  provides a comparison to the current situation (top left image).

Each of the following pages provides a commentary on the shadow impact. Section 6 of this document sets out conclusions in relation to daylight and sunlight impacts.


4 Diagrams - 21st March, 8am




Existing building with existing fence to boundary



Proposed building with existing fence to boundary



Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary


Commentary

- no gardens receive direct sunlight; no change from existing


21st March, 10am




Existing building with existing fence to boundary



Proposed building with existing fence to boundary



Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary


Commentary

- small impact (0.86 of former sunlit area) to 4th garden along Allington Road; bottom left image demonstrates that the impact is related to the proposed fence, not the building
- small impact (0.91 of former sunlit area) to main garden of no. 22 Islington Road; impact is related to the proposed building
- impact (0.50 of former sunlit area) to side garden of no. 22 Islington Road; impact is related to the proposed building


21st March, 12noon




Existing building with existing fence to boundary



Proposed building with existing fence to boundary



Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary


Commentary

- impact (0.43 of former sunlit area) on 3rd garden along Allington Road; bottom left image demonstrates that the impact is related to the proposed fence
- impact (0.61 of former sunlit area) on 2nd garden along Allington Road; this is related to the proposed building
- small impact (0.93 of former sunlit area) on side garden of no. 22 Islington Road; this is related to the proposed building


21st March, 2pm




Existing building with existing fence to boundary



Proposed building with existing fence to boundary



Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary


Commentary

- small impact (0.81 of former sunlit area) on 2nd garden along Allington Road; bottom left image demonstrates that the impact is related to the proposed fence
- impact (0.61 of former sunlit area) to 1st house on Allington Road; this is related to the proposed building


21st March, 4pm




Existing building with existing fence to boundary



Proposed building with existing fence to boundary



Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary

Commentary


- very little direct sunlight; no change from existing

5 Diagrams - 21st June, 8am


Commentary
- no change from existing




Existing building with existing fence to boundary



Proposed building with existing fence to boundary



Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary


white design

21st June, 10am


Commentary
- no change from existing




Existing building with existing fence to boundary



Proposed building with existing fence to boundary



Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary


white design

21st June, 12noon


Commentary
- no change from existing




Existing building with existing fence to boundary



Proposed building with existing fence to boundary




Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary

white design

21st June, 2pm




Existing building with existing fence to boundary




Proposed building with existing fence to boundary

Commentary
- minor change related to proposed fence




Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary




Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary

white design

21st June, 4pm




Existing building with existing fence to boundary




Proposed building with existing fence to boundary

Commentary
- minor change related to proposed fence



Existing building with 2m fence to rear boundary



Proposed building with proposed fence to rear boundary

white design

6 Conclusions

This Daylight / Sunlight Assessment has reviewed the impact on the existing properties on Allington Road and Islington Road.

In relation to daylight, the assessment concludes that impacts will be minimal, and are acceptable within the parameters set out in the BRE guidance document.

In relation to sunlight, the shadow plots in the previous sections demonstrate the following:

- generally, impacts are minimal (within parameters set out in the BRE guidance)
- where impacts are above the parameters set out in the BRE guidance, this can typically be attributed to the fence proposed at the rear of the property (which is within permitted development rights), rather than the proposed building; the following are those areas that are impacted by the building only
- there is an impact to the side garden of no. 22 Islington Road (shown in the March 21st, 10am plot); as can be seen from the diagram, there is a very small increase in the amount of shadow cast by the proposed building (over that cast by the existing); the area ratio impact is inflated by the small size of the area that currently receives sunlight; it is considered that the perception of overshadowing will be minimal
- there is an impact to the second garden on Allington Road (shown in the March 21st, 12noon plot); however, the 10am and 2pm plots demonstrate that there is no impact at other times of the day and therefore that any perceived overshadowing will be minimal
- there is an impact to the first garden on Allington Road (shown on the March 21st, 2pm plot); however, the

10am and 12noon plots demonstrate that there is no impact at other times of the day and therefore that any perceived overshadowing will be minimal

In conclusion, there are some minor impacts on the levels of sunlight within neighbouring gardens. These can predominantly be attributed to the fence proposed at the rear of the property (which is within permitted development rights), rather than the proposed building. Those areas where overshadowing is caused by the proposed building are minimal and limited to short periods of the day. It is therefore considered that the perception of any increase in overshadowing will be negligible.