

Development Control B Committee Agenda



Date: Wednesday, 9 June 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: The Council Chamber - City Hall, College Green, Bristol, BS1 5TR

Distribution:

Councillors: Ani Stafford-Townsend (Chair), Chris Windows (Vice-Chair), Donald Alexander, Lesley Alexander, Fabian Breckels, Andrew Brown, Tony Dyer, Zoe Goodman and Guy Poultney

Copies to: Zoe Willcox (Director: Development of Place), Gary Collins, Peter Westbury, Laurence Fallon, Matthew Cockburn, Jeremy Livitt and Alex Hawtin

Issued by: Jeremy Livitt, Democratic Services
City Hall, PO Box 3167, Bristol, BS3 9FS
E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk
Date: Tuesday, 8 June 2021



Agenda

12. Public Forum

All attendees for the meeting are requested to note that, due to Covid Safety requirements we have put the following measures in place: **(Pages 4 - 34)**

- All attendees to this meeting are asked to have a Covid lateral flow test 24 hrs prior to the day of the meeting and show the results of a negative test. It's important that you report the results of your test and that you get confirmation sent to your phone. Reception staff will ask to see this on the day of the meeting. If you have a positive test or if you develop any Covid 19 symptoms - high temperature, a new continuous cough, or a loss or change to your sense of smell or taste, you should book a test on GOV.UK and self-isolate while you wait for the results.
- You are required to wear a face mask at all times unless you are exempt. Social distancing rules remain in place.
- Members of the press and public who wish to attend City Hall are advised that you will be asked to watch the meeting on a screen in another room as due to the maximum occupancy of the venue.

Any member of the public or councillor may participate in public forum. The detailed arrangements for so doing are set out in the Public Information Sheet at the back of this agenda. Please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:

Questions:

Written questions must be received three clear working days prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your question(s) must be received at the latest **by 5pm on Thursday 3rd June 2021.**

Petitions and statements:

Petitions and statements must be received by noon on the working day prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your submission must be received at the latest **by 12 Noon on Tuesday 8th June 2021.**

The statement should be addressed to the Service Director, Legal Services, c/o The Democratic Services Team, City Hall, 3rd Floor Deanery Wing, College Green,
P O Box 3176, Bristol, BS3 9FS or email - democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Members of the public who wish to present their public forum statement, question or petition at the zoom meeting must register their interest by giving at least two clear working days' notice prior to the meeting by **2pm on Monday 7th June 2021.**



PLEASE NOTE THAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NEW STANDING ORDERS AGREED BY BRISTOL CITY COUNCIL, YOU MUST SUBMIT EITHER A STATEMENT, PETITION OR QUESTION TO ACCOMPANY YOUR REGISTER TO SPEAK.

In accordance with previous practice adopted for people wishing to speak at Development Control Committees, please note that you may only be allowed 1 minute subject to the number of requests received for the meeting.

Please also note that this meeting is being held as a physical meeting to ensure compliance with the relevant Government legislation concerning decisions made by Development Control Committee meetings.

Therefore, if you wish to speak to a Public Forum Statement, you will need to attend the meeting at City Hall, College Green, Bristol. However, all members of the public will be able to submit Public Forum Statements as normal and watch the meeting as it is being webcast by clicking on the appropriate link on the relevant webpage of the Bristol City Council website.

15. Amendment Sheet

(Pages 35 - 37)



Public Forum

D C Committee B

2pm on 9th June 2021



1. Members of the Development Control Committee B

Councillors: Ani Stafford-Townsend (Chair), Chris Windows (Vice-Chair), Fabian Breckels (Labour Group Spokesperson), Andrew Brown (Liberal Democrat Group Spokesperson), Donald Alexander, Lesley Alexander, Tony Dyer, Zoe Goodman, Guy Poultney

2. Officers:

Gary Collins - Development Management, Peter Westbury, Alex Hawtin, Zoe Willcox, Matthew Cockburn, Laurence Fallon, Jeremy Livitt

		Statements/Petitions	
Statement	Request To Speak Made Where Indicated S = Speaker	Name	Application
A1	S	James Galvin	20/06030/F – 7 Belvedere Road
A2	S	Councillor Martin Fodor	“
A3		David Andrew	“
A4	S	Marc Willis	“
A5	S	Carlton Romaine	“
A6	S	Julia Lietzau	“
A7		Dr Paul Rawlings	“
A8	S	Laura McEwen	“
A9		Eliza Rawlings	“
A10		Sam Taylor	“
A11	S	Maria O’Callaghan	“
A12		Marie Taylor	“
A13	S	Samantha Mant	“
A14		Oliver Bennett	“
A15	S	Kate Whitehead	“
A16		Kevin Chidgey	“
A17		Mary Carroll	“
A18		Dr Julie Gilg	“
A19		Harminder Singh Chana	“
			20/04678/F – St Johns Lane Health Centre
			NO STATEMENTS RECEIVED

**List of People Requesting to Speak – Public Participation – DC B Committee –
2pm on Wednesday 9th June 2021**

**DEADLINES: 5pm on Thursday 3rd June 2021(Questions), 2pm on Monday 7th
June 2021 (Public Participation), 12pm on Tuesday 8th June 2021 (Statements)**

A - Belvedere Road

A1 – James Galvin

A2 – Councillor Martin Fodor

A4 – Marc Willis

A5 – Carlton Romaine

A6 – Julia Lietzau

A8 – Laura McEwen

A11 – Maria O’Callaghan

A13 – Samantha Mant

A15 – Kate Whitehead

B - St Johns Lane Health Centre

No Speakers

STATEMENT A1

Dear Sir /Madame

The local care sector is facing new enormous challenges that need all the support for them to carry on delivering the services they provide in these challenging times.

The residents of any care home have basic human rights don't they and are as much entitled to be part of any immediate community where they reside in this instance Glenview care home.

After watching the whole of the last planning committee meeting on youtube I felt compelled to speak up on behalf of Mister Singh

I humbly ask you all to please consider the wider community and not just the immediate community in these extraordinary times of Covid 19 all sectors of the care community need help to survive and thrive to meet the new demands of Covid 19 and deliver even more necessary services for our elderly and the most vulnerable in our communities.

In the particular instance of Glenview care home many of the visitors are elderly themselves so having care homes as part of the whole community enables their visits to be more easily achievable

We should also recognise that we are talking about peoples livelihoods when many people no longer have jobs or secure futures due to the pandemic.

Care homes must not be viewed as a stigma to our communities but an absolutely integrated part of our community and with the ongoing rise and demands our care homes should be accessible to all and offer a new template that caters to our current needs as a caring city.

Care homes should not be pushed to the outskirts of Bristol as one of your planning committee members wrongly suggested at the last appeal ! Surely as Bristol prides itself on being a green capital all your doing is creating more unnecessary use of cars and traffic that will cause even greater pollution for our city .

The main issue with all homeowners in and around Glenview care home is the parking issue well thats a problem for everyone in Bristol and since the last planning committee meeting Mr Singh has had a thorough report commissioned and carried out by his architect to ascertain if there is indeed, as many homeowners claimed ,a parking issue it concluded that there is no issue with parking there at all including peak times of morning when people are leaving home for work or the evening when

they arrive home.

Many of the homeowners complaints at the last planning committee meeting were totally exaggerated with one person claiming that if the planning for the extension at Glenview was granted that over 50 % of all houses in the street would be care homes when in actual fact the planning officer for Bristol City Council states even with the planning granted it would still only be 30 %

We need to support our care homes even more now so I please ask you to support the latest submission from Glenview which has also taken the new number of proposed beds down to 14 and not 17

We have also received a letter of support from the Archbishop of Canterbury

Thank you

Mr James Galvin

STATEMENT NUMBER A2

Application no. 20/06030/F Site address: 7 Belvedere Road Bristol BS6 7JG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from 3 No. residential flats to provide 14 No. additional Bed spaces to Glenview Nursing Home at 8-9 Belvedere Road, Bristol.

Members of committee:

I rarely make a personal judgement on ward applications, preferring to allow residents to have their say when that's needed.

This meeting is different due to the background to the succession of applications, and the fact that for the first time in a year only in person statements can be made to committee. In fact last spring I got debate on a very similar application postponed as it was planned to exclude public statements from the agenda and only allow them at subsequent DC meetings. That application was for a very similar but 17 bed extension here and residents had waited about a year to have their say. While a separate application it was rejected and then taken all the way to appeal at the same time as this modified application was drawn up and submitted, plus yet another proposal - for an 8 bed flats conversion of the very same building. I think it's helpful to know about the succession of applications and care home developments in this one street.

If you've seen the pictures of ambulances, delivery lorries, hearses, waste trucks and bad visitor parking from the three existing care homes then you'll appreciate a bit of what has led to opposition to an extra block of care home development in the one street.

This application has raised a great many concerns locally due to impacts including traffic, parking (staff, servicing, visitors, and emergencies), noise, waste, and nuisance, and the cumulative impact of successive business developments in a residential street.

I encourage you to read the residents' concerns, listen to what they have to say, and consider the impacts this extra development would have.

Thank you

Cllr Martin Fodor

Redland Ward Green Party councillor

STATEMENT NUMBER A3

Written Statement - Objection to additional nursing home bed spaces in Belvedere Road

As a member of the British Army, I was allocated Service Family Accommodation (SFA) at 21 Belvedere Road, before deploying to Afghanistan and leaving my wife unaccompanied for approximately seven months in an unfamiliar location.

With only six SFA properties in the local area, the civilian residents of Belvedere Road were, and continue to be, very supportive of military families and I do not wish to see that diminish by the introduction of additional bed spaces for those who would be unable to make similar contributions.

Increasing nursing home patients will erode the social fabric of Belvedere Road and jeopardise community life, which is vitally important to the military families, and could be considered contrary to the spirit of the Armed Forces Covenant that is promoted by Her Majesty's Government.

When serving in areas of conflict, witnessing injury and death is to be expected, however it is disturbing to be back home and exposed to so many ambulances, stretchers and body bags associated with the nursing homes; increased bed capacity will only exacerbate these problems.

I respectfully request you accept the Committee Report and refuse this, or any other similar application or appeal for more nursing home facilities in Belvedere Road, in the strongest possible terms please.

Your Faithfully,

David Andrew

STATEMENT NUMBER A4

7 Belvedere, Bristol - Application 20/06030/F

Chairman,

I act for the applicants Meadowcare Homes. I draw members attention to public concern regarding highways issues and particular the issue of service and emergency vehicles blocking the road. The Councils highways officer recommended, and the applicants were happy to provide, two loading bays on Belvedere Road, as discussed on page 6 of the report. I am going to ask members to defer consideration of this application, for the reasons set out below.

The report refers to the recent appeal decision, but does not report that the Inspector was unable to accept this proposal because he was uncertain as to how the service bays would be delivered and managed. The officers report also fails to mention that after the appeal decision, on the 15th April 2021, we sent the Council a draft legal agreement and servicing management plan, setting out in detail how the service bays would be delivered and managed.

Despite these documents being with Council offices for over six weeks, these have been withheld from the Committee. This omission from the report is inexplicable, but it is clear that the Committee is being misled on a key issue which has been highlighted by many local residents and was one of the key reasons identified by Councillor Fodor for the 'call-in'.

The draft servicing management plan indicates that the bays would be available for deliveries during weekdays and would be available for use as parking spaces overnight and at weekends. This has the double benefit of resolving the existing issue of service vehicles blocking the road during the day, whilst retaining the parking spaces overnight and at weekends, when parking for local residents and visitors to the care homes is in most demand.

These details were not available to the Inspector in connection with the recent appeal, so were not taken into account. The single reason for refusal relates to congestion and conflict between road users. The legal agreement and the service management plan which have not been addressed by officers go to the very heart of this case. Members cannot be expected to make a fair and reasonable decision in this case if vital documents are deliberately withheld and not taken into account.

It is clear that this application cannot be determined without full consideration of the draft legal agreement and the service management plan submitted on the 15th April 2021. Members and local residents must not be denied the opportunity to consider these detailed proposals to address the issues of congestion and conflict between road users. The only reasonable course of action is to defer the application pending detailed consideration of the submitted legal agreement and servicing management plan.

Thank you.

STATEMENT NUMBER A5

Your ref 20/06030/F

4th June/2021

Dear Sir /Madam,

In this current time, we are facing challenge issues, including climate, Covid Brexit. Mental health and wellbeing and, of course, more long-term Dementia. Our care sector is facing enormous new challenges that need all the support it can get in helping them manage and deliver the essential services they provide in these challenging times. The residents of any care home have fundamental human rights and are entitled to be part of any immediate community they live in, which is Glenview Care Home. I feel communities have changed and evolved with the outbreak of Covid 19 and its new variants. We cannot sit in our bubbles and lock away those who need good, safe ongoing care, especially those with Dementia.

I reviewed the last planning committee meeting on Youtube. I felt that I had to speak out in defense of the nursing home and its residents and Glenview's plans to adapt to provide the services needed for people with Dementia. The planned proposal is vital to work that needs to start in thinking ahead in these traumatic times.

A residential community is about sharing a sense of place in a given geographical area and is not limited to a few common attitudes and interests. A caring community needs to look at how they can work together in supporting care services. Today's care homes need to survive and thrive in meeting the new demands of Covid 19 and enable them to provide vital services for our elderly and the most vulnerable in our communities.

Glenview should not be considered a stigma within its immediate community but as an essential part of its community. With the ongoing rise and demands, our care homes should be accessible to all and offer a new template that caters to our current needs a caring city. Please also consider those who work in the care industry when jobs no longer secure and may not get back to a reliable setting for years to come.

From viewing the last planning committee meeting on Youtube, all homeowners' main issue seems to be within parking. Most of the visiting family or friends to Glenview are themselves elderly. And view the care homes as part of their community and travel mostly by public transport and taxis. Parking in Bristol is an issue in general; please tell me a road or street without that problem. However, since the last planning meeting, Mr

Singh has had a thorough report commissioned and carried out by his architect to ascertain if there are indeed any parking issues as many homeowners claimed. The comprehensive report concluded that there was no parking issue, including at peak times of morning when people leave home for work or the evening when they arrive home. However, ironically, if the building were sold as flats or rented, this could increase the parking problem. Which makes me believe that objections are not to do with the parking issue, which is the objections are based on?

I ask that you consider Mr Singh's latest submission for work to be carried out. He has already made concessions by reducing the beds down to 14 from 17.

Again, this is a very stressful time, we are all in this together, and the benefits of the proposal for many must be equally recognised as the few objections.

Yours sincerely

Carlton Romaine

STATEMENT NUMBER A6

I am submitting this statement to ask the Committee to refuse planning permission for application 20/06030/F.

Belvedere Road is a short residential road close to Westbury Park Primary School, a number of good day nurseries, and Redland Green Academy. It is also within close walking distance of the local shops (on Coldharbour Road and North View) and green space/playgrounds (Redland Green and the Downs).

The residents have formed a supportive community, we have tried to help each other throughout lockdown, and we support the local businesses.

However, the increasing conversion of residential homes into nursing homes is threatening this, and removing residential homes from an area which is ideally suited to young families. This is not just due to the loss of affordable, reasonable-sized flats, but due to the increasingly harmful conditions on these roads, caused by the over-concentration of nursing homes.

These include:

- Dangerous road conditions due to obstructive parking and “road rage” as drivers circle the roads waiting for a parking place to become free
- Regular road blockages due to high volume of ambulances, deliveries and service vehicles
- Risk of accidents when cars/lorries reverse down the narrow roads, due to the blockages and parking on corners
- Stressful conditions for parents and children seeing body bags being removed from the care homes into waiting hearses
- Individual drives (and disabled spaces) being blocked by staff and visitors to the homes
- Frequently over-flowing rubbish (including medical waste).

The existing three nursing homes provide primarily end-of-life care, which is not best suited to this type of residential area. The patients, sadly, are unable to use the local facilities. Visitors are frequently distressed by the inability to park (for example, they will ask to block our drives in order to visit a loved one for potentially the last time, and of course we find it difficult to refuse this). Most staff tend to live a distance away, necessitating driving, as public transport is not an option for staff starting and ending shifts late at night.

My husband and I hope to have children and would love to stay here, use the local nurseries and primary school, which are within walking distance, as well as continue to use the local businesses. However, if the road continues to become commercialised with further nursing home development, this is unlikely to be possible for us.

I ask the Councillors to agree with the recommendation and refuse this application for planning permission. Please note that the previous application for a 17-bed extension was refused on the grounds that:

“The proposed development would result in a harmful concentration of shared housing / care homes on Belvedere Road, worsening the existing harmful conditions listed within point (i) of Policy DM2 (Residential Sub-divisions, Shared and Specialist Housing), including excessive noise and disturbance and inadequate storage of recycling/refuse”

and I believe this should also be given as a reason for refusing this application, which is substantially the same.

STATEMENT NUMBER A7

Dear Committee Members

My name is Dr Paul Rawlings and I live at 15 Belvedere Road which is situated directly opposite to Glenview Dementia Home. I am in full support of the planning officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission for this significant expansion to a care home in a residential road on the grounds of risks to highway safety from increased on-street car parking in an area which is already over-subscribed. In particular:

- The parking and resultant road safety issues on the street have been documented over a number of years, including being raised to Local Councillors at a meeting on 27th February 2019, long before this application (or the related one for a 17-bed extension) was submitted.
- Further evidence of ongoing issues was provided by residents objecting to this application (such as an FOI response showing the high number of PCNs issued in these roads, and 112 photos of cars parked dangerously, on corners and blocking dropped kerb pedestrian crossing points).
- As lockdown eases, and commuters return to using these roads as a free "park and ride" for the City Centre, the stress on parking will only increase.

I would also like to point out that refusing this application would be entirely consistent with the approach to local planning requests which Bristol City Council has previously demonstrated, and to do otherwise would indicate a lack of consistency, and unfairness, in how residential applications have been treated. As an example, I draw attention to a previous application, reference 19/01251/H, submitted 12th March 2019, for 3 The Glen (the adjacent road). Had this been granted it would have resulted in a net reduction of 1 on-road parking space. However, permission was refused on the grounds of highway safety; specifically, the "Delegated Report and Decision" by Case Officer Ben Royston, for this earlier case, includes the following comments from the Transport Development Manager:

"The application would create one off street parking space and the loss of up to two on-street parking spaces. This would be a net loss in an area where there is already over demand for parking spaces and would increase the risk of motorists parking in a dangerous manner. The application is thus recommended for refusal on the grounds of highway safety."

According to the applicant's own travel survey, the current proposed development will result in a net loss of 4 – 5 parking spaces and the actual net loss is likely to be even higher than this as outlined in detailed statements previously submitted to BCC. Therefore, this application will result in a significantly greater net loss of parking than that associated with the recent residential planning application (21/00415/) which was refused and similar to that of the 17 bed expansion (APP/Z0116/W/20/3263935) which was also refused. I trust that the Committee will apply a consistent approach to this application, and similarly reject this on the grounds of highway safety and increased risk of motorists parking in a dangerous manner in an area where BCC acknowledges there is already over demand for parking spaces.

Yours sincerely

Dr Paul Rawlings

STATEMENT NUMBER A8

Laura McEwen

I was one of the **62** residents who objected to the application for a 17 bed nursing home extension last march and I am now one of the more than **100** local residents objecting to the modified application of a 14 bedroom extension at 7 Belvedere Road. I ask councillors to uphold the decision of BCC that this commercial development should be rejected.

I am a mother to three young children and am one of the many families who live on Belvedere Road and The Glen. I have been working with our local Councillors Fi Hance and Martin Fodor for several years to raise the awareness of the dangerous state are roads are in and my concerns for the safety of children in the area. This has included chairing a community meeting with Fi Hance, to which 30 residents of Belvedere Rd and The Glen attended as well as a police community support officer, and members of the Westbury Park Association. I have also attended numerous meetings with other local groups concerned with road safety including Bishopston and St Andrews Traffic and parking Group. The intention of this has always been to try and help to solve what is essentially a boiling pot situation. I do constantly feel that pedestrians and cyclists are at risk here due to the chaos in terms of traffic management. As a working mother I would not be giving my time to this if I did not feel it was hugely important.

So why are we the roads so unsafe?

Bristol City Council is well aware of the problems faced by roads which neighbour an RPZ. Especially in areas that are hotspots for commuters travelling into the city. Belvedere Road is one of the first roads outside the Cotham North RPZ, and one of the first roads with unrestricted parking this side of Bristol. It is a hotbed for commuter traffic. Since the Cotham north RPZ extension was introduced parking has become totally impossible. This brings constant dangerous illegal parking, aggressive driving, road obstruction, blind corners and speeding.

In addition to the issues faced from the neighbouring RPZ the introduction of the care home **GlenView** in 2019 massively increased the parking problems even further due to the large volume of traffic a commercial business of this size brings.

Belvedere Road is constantly blocked by ambulances, servicing vehicles, a range of deliveries to the care homes, staff drop offs and pick ups, visitors unable to park, doctors, nurses, private ambulances, therapists, and daily waste collection. This all makes the road very dangerous. This has been heavily documented in photographs submitted by residents.

My final point is in regard to the integrity of the elderly in the homes. Due to the completely inadequate access and parking the elderly who need emergency care are often wheeled long distances up the road to get to an ambulance. This always looks really distressing for the patients. A purpose built home on a plot of accessible land would have an access point for emergency services close to the entrance of the home. Instead these converted nursing homes on Belvedere Road are three Victorian houses, with no dedicated parking, so it would never be possible to achieve this type of access without taking away all of the very limited residents parking. I simply don't believe these type of houses convert to appropriate accommodation for the elderly, especially those that need such a high level of medical care 24hrs a day.

Unfortunately the patients that pass away are sometimes wheeled up the road considerable distances in body bags, again due to ambulances being able to access the homes. This is something my children have been witness to on numerous occasions. They find it really scary and upsetting. There are currently already nearly 100 elderly patients in end of life care living on Belvedere Road, a short street of only 21 houses. Enough is enough. We cannot support any more commercial development of this kind on our road.

STATEMENT NUMBER A9

Statement submission to Development Control Committee on 9th June 2021 in support of Recommendation to Refuse Planning Permission for 20/06030/F: 7 Belvedere Road

I have been a Belvedere Road resident since 2001 and I live directly opposite Glenview. I fully support the BCC Planners' recommendation to REFUSE this application on the grounds of risks to highway safety. I have previously objected to the planning application to convert 7 Belvedere Road into a 17 bed extension for Glenview - that application was refused by BCC and the decision was rightly upheld by the Planning Inspectorate on the grounds of risks to highway safety. This application is not substantially different and the detrimental impact is the same so it is correct that BCC Planning is recommending refusal. I would also like to expand on my personal experience as a resident and reasons to refuse this planning application.

1. **Parking and highway safety issues:**

The current situation on nearby roads are already unacceptable with severe shortage of parking and highway issues due to the sheer amount of vehicles required to service the three care homes on Belvedere Road - any increase in care home beds would exacerbate the situation. The previous application that was refused by the Planning Inspectorate would have led to 111 care home beds in total on Belvedere Road; this application would have meant 108 care home beds which is a difference of 3 beds (2.7%) hence is not material. Our planning consultant's report has also clearly demonstrated the flaws in the applicant's highway report.

The highway issues on Belvedere Road and The Glen are well known. Living opposite Glenview means I personally suffer and also witness the daily struggles of others as a result of the already dangerous situation on our Road due to having three dementia care homes concentrated on one road with none of them have any parking provision. Residents, care home staff and visitors not having anywhere to park and end up having to block drives on a daily basis; also the ambulance paramedics and the delivery trucks having to load and unload in the middle of the road facing on-coming traffic which is highly dangerous. Hence this application must be refused because it would exacerbate an already dangerous situation. I frequently have to reverse the length of Belvedere Road towards a dangerous main road in order to find alternative routes to access my house. We are frequently blocked in or unable to access our drive. Local residents should not be put in such predicaments on an ongoing basis so I would urge the Councillors to refuse this application.

2. **Harm to the mix, balance and inclusivity of the community:**

Maintaining a balanced and cohesive community requires an appropriate housing mix. We acknowledge the need for elderly care homes, however, to have all dementia care homes in Westbury Park and Redland concentrated on Belvedere Road is not fostering a balanced mix. The proposal would result in a reduction of 3 large residential flats that could be occupied by persons or families who would benefit from the local amenities and schools. I have never seen any Glenview patients using local amenities or joining in our community events because regrettably they are unable to. I would therefore urge the Councillors to reject this application because of the harm it would impose on the mix, balance and inclusivity of the community.

3. **Excessive noise and disturbance with inadequate storage of recycling/refuse.**

The disturbance due to the volume of traffic and servicing vehicles for the dementia care homes on our road is already at a very high level. Doctors, ambulances, delivery vans and refuse lorries have to service Glenview 24/7 and since our lounge and main bedroom front onto Glenview, I suffer all the noises and flashing lights from the vehicles loading/unloading causing regularly disturbed sleep which is detrimental to my health - there is no escaping these disturbances due to the sheer volume involved. Furthermore, crying noises and screams from the care home patients are frequent and very disturbing - of course we fully sympathise with them but to subject all the neighbours including children and the elderly to those screams is very scary for them and such noises cannot be humanely stopped unlike, for example, loud music from a flat.

Furthermore, Belvedere Road lies within The Downs Conservation Area and the existing waste and recycling provision at Glenview is already overwhelming the neighbourhood environment with bins including clinical waste bins easily accessible by the public because all bins and refuse have to be stored on the forecourt areas next to the pavement - any additional beds would exacerbate this already intolerable environment.

To summarise, I urge the Development Control Committee to accept the BCC Planners' recommendation to refuse this planning application based on the reasons stated above.

STATEMENT NUMBER A10

Application no. 20/06030/F

Site address: 7 Belvedere Road Bristol BS6 7JG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from 3 No. residential flats to provide 14 No. additional Bed spaces to Glenview Nursing Home at 8-9 Belvedere Road, Bristol.

In May 2020, the planning committee members voted 8 to 1 to refuse planning permission for this development, when 17 bedrooms were envisaged.

Reducing that to 14 bedrooms does not change the argument in any way whatsoever.

The three reasons to refuse planning permission were:

1. The impact on the demand for parking and the concerns over highway safety.
2. The intensification of residential institutions on Belvedere Road, harming the mix, balance and inclusivity of the community.
3. The concentration of shared housing/care homes on Belvedere Road causing excessive noise and disturbance and inadequate storage of recycling/refuse

There are significant known issues in this area with regard to car parking, which negatively impacts on highway safety,

which would evidently be increased by the proposed extension. The shortage of parking spaces has led to dangerous parking

on dropped kerbs, a significant safety hazard as it blocks sight-lines at junctions, but also blocks access for mobility scooters,

wheelchairs and parents pushing children's buggies, forcing them to pass round the outside of cars in the middle of the road. My most serious concern is the risk of fire services being unable to manoeuvre at these junctions.

It has also led to visitors, medical professionals and tradesmen parking across driveways, blocking residents in and/or out of their premises. On occasion we have seen visitors' cars stopping in the street with their engines running, while another occupant is visiting inmates in the homes.

The concentration of care homes on this one street has already altered the dwelling mix significantly. These are dementia homes, not simply retirement homes. The occupants do not

leave the premises and consequently they are in no position to contribute anything to the local community, and nor do the staff who travel from further afield. By extending Glenview Care Home, the residents of 7 Belvedere Road will be lost, and this will further alter the balance, with care home inmates far outnumbering residents in the rest of the street.

It cannot be sufficiently emphasised how much disruption is caused already by the existence of these three care homes in Belvedere Road. Not only do the residents have to suffer from blocked roads, driveways etc, but the presence of vehicles parked with engines running for long periods has a very negative impact on the environment. These events often occur during unsocial hours, particularly the frequent emergency calls for ambulances. The applicant has specified the creation of loading bays at each home, but these are insufficient for the primary delivery company, Jones, as their lorry is too long to be able to park in these bays, so I have no doubt they will continue to block the street for long periods. With increasing demand from 14 extra inmates, these deliveries will take even longer.

Similarly ambulances would have insufficient space for the ramp and stretcher to manoeuvre if parked in these bays, so the likelihood of ambulances using them are slight in the extreme. Hence the problem of street blockages will continue, and in the meantime there will be fewer parking spaces for everyone else, exacerbating an already significant problem.

The planning department has already recommended rejecting this application for good reason. I urge the councillors to support that rejection.

Sam Taylor

STATEMENT NUMBER A11

Maria O'Callaghan Written Public Forum Statement - Development Control Committee B –
Wednesday 9th June 2021 - Re: Application No. 20/06030/F

I object in full to the proposed extension of the care home into 7 Belvedere Road for 14 extra dementia care beds. I strongly believe that this application should be rejected for the following reasons. Firstly, in May 2020, the planning committee members voted 8/1 in favour of refusal. This was not a close decision and to overrule this democratic process makes a mockery of the systems in place to protect citizens. The difference between 17 and 14 beds does not overcome the refusal reasons. The original planning application was refused for 3 reasons and I shall outline below why I believe these still stand:

1. The development impacts the demand for parking and highway safety. There are significant known issues in the area with regards to car parking. This has a huge impact on highway safety and the safety of children navigating the area. This will only get worse if the care home is expanded. There is no off-street parking provision for any of the care homes and nor can there ever be any. If designated space was provided for the care home on the street, this would just make the situation even worse for residents. More beds will mean more staff, ambulances, deliveries, waste collection and we cannot cope with the current levels. We are constantly dealing with road blockages caused by deliveries and emergency vehicles attending to the residents of the home. There are often illegal parking issues across road junctions and corners preventing refuse collections and reducing visibility. We often find our driveway blocked which has on multiple occasions forced us to miss appointments or be late for work or pre-arranged events.

2. The expansion of residential institutions specifically for Dementia patients on Belvedere Road is creating a disproportionate amount of commercial property and ruining the mix, balance and inclusivity of the community. It is not fair to expect one small residential street in the Redland Ward to host almost all the care homes in the area. The planning committee already outlined that an over concentration such as this would go against the councils own planning regulations so I do not understand how this can be approved.

3. The concentration of shared housing and care homes on the road is causing excessive disturbance, noise and there is inadequate recycling and refuse storage. I have every sympathy for the residents of the homes on Belvedere road. This is not about the residents but about the costs to the local area of running 4 large commercial care homes on one small street. My home is located next door to one of the 4 care homes. We deal with excessive noise, residents shouts and sometimes upsetting screams. The most notable noise is during shift changes at approx. 10pm when my 2-year-old daughter (who's bedroom is closest to the care home) is frequently woken by repeated slamming doors. The road is often blocked by deliveries to the care homes and this often causes backlogs or cars unable to enter/leave the road. The bins/recycling waste is not adequately stored, and this often spills onto the road. We do weekly litter picks and frequently pick up clinical waste, including gloves and facemasks from the street. I believe the applicant has not provided any additional compelling evidence to support this application. The parking survey is pointless, done during a pandemic without "normal" volumes of traffic. There are no visitors, a lack of commuter traffic and people are less likely to need to use their cars. It would be unfair to include this evidence in any decision making. I urge you to respect the decision previously made by the planning committee and again refuse to grant the planning permission for this extension.

STATEMENT NUMBER A12

Application no. 20/06030/F

Site address: 7 Belvedere Road Bristol BS6 7JG

Proposal: Proposed change of use from 3 No. residential flats to provide 14 No. additional Bed spaces to Glenview Nursing Home at 8-9 Belvedere Road, Bristol.

I am very concerned by the proposed extension, which can only exacerbate existing problems in our street. Belvedere Road is situated just outside a Resident's Parking Scheme area and consequently already suffers from significant parking issues. Residents find it difficult to park in the street, having to compete with commuters, teachers and parents from schools nearby. This lack of parking spaces too often leads to dangerous parking.

Last time the work lasted 2 years and caused regular road congestion and constant stressful noise. Belvedere and The Glen already suffer from the constant coming and going of staff, visitors, doctors and nurses, ambulances and delivery vans regularly blocking the road, this is in addition to regular recycling and waste collection, delivery vans that any road has to expect nowadays.

I am also concerned by the impact of the work on the health and well being of residents, nursing home residents included of course. This residential road is in danger of becoming a permanent working site.

I do accept that there is a need for care homes but there is already a significant over concentration of these commercial premises on our road. Belvedere already supports more than its fair share.

I urge the committee to support the officers' report and reject the application.

Marie Taylor

STATEMENT NUMBER A13

I am grateful that BCC Planning Dept. have recommended that this application is refused. I hope that the evidence provided by the Planning Report, and by other residents' statements to the Committee, is sufficient for the Committee to agree with the recommendation and refuse the application.

However, the Report (paragraph A) also states "It is considered that when compared to the overall housing stock within the Redland area, the loss of three residential units is not significant and that the need for dementia care outweighs this loss". I challenge this empty assertion as it is used to justify over-riding the NPPF "tilted balance" in favour of housing units, and entirely ignores advice from the Care Quality Commission regarding location and facilities (good garden space and visitor/staff parking) for dementia patients.

Belvedere Rd residents do recognise and support the need for good dementia care. We have been as supportive as possible to date, as an increasing number of houses have been turned from domestic homes (with 15 varied households) into nursing facilities – currently 5 large houses out of the 11 on one side of the road.

Furthermore, it was acknowledged at the Committee B meeting in May 2020 that residents do not raise formal complaints about the issues experienced on the road created by the existing 94 beds; as we recognise that these issues are inevitable with dementia homes and, to date, we have accepted the need to live with an amount of disruption from the current care homes (screaming/wailing, regular hearse visits, visitor/staff parking pressure, commercial and waste vehicle and ambulance congestion at all times of the day and night).

It's only with the application for a further expansion that we have felt the need to say that 'enough is enough' and there is only so much that one small residential road can absorb, without losing all character and community. We have repeatedly provided copious, detailed evidence to the planning department, of the volume of incidents and ongoing issues experienced day-to-day by residents, which are directly proportional to the number of nursing home beds in the road. It is simply not safe, reasonable or fair (for either the residents or the care homes) to increase these problems by a further 15%.

The officers report states that 109 comments were received in support for the scheme, with the main reason being that the extension would provide additional healthcare provision. With further scrutiny however:

- 103 out of 109 of these were submitted via the Applicant's own email address.
- More than 90% of the 'in support' submitted comments used identical wording (form letter), which described the sole basis for support to be the generic need for more dementia care in the UK.
- Not one letter provides any justification for why more of this care should be provided on Belvedere Road, and none of them addressed any of the concern's raised by residents.
- It's notable that the locations for the purported supporters include London, Warwick, Swansea, Bromsgrove, Chippenham, Hampshire, Swindon, Newport, etc. with very few from Redland itself.

In contrast, each of the 112 comments of objection are clearly all written by different individuals. The vast majority of these were from residents (owners, tenants and landlords) of Belvedere Road properties and the immediate surrounding roads, and provide thorough details of the daily experiences of the issues.

When the previous application was rejected at Committee B in May 2020, Committee members rightly commented that "care homes should be built on the outskirts of built-up areas to prevent parking issues and disturbance". It is also increasingly recognised that larger care homes carry more infection risk; research indicates that the likelihood of care homes being infected triples with every additional 20 beds. This expansion is a poor attempt to provide dementia care, based solely on cost savings for the operator.

The report's description of the property as being of an "overarching residential nature" is misleading. The home solely provides intensive nursing and end-of-life care. It's no more residential than a hospital.

This application provides no evidence of any improvements from the 17 bed application which would mitigate any of the negative issues raised, it adds further negative impact to the street, and is entirely insufficient to

20/06030/F : Statement in support of Recommendation to Refuse Planning Permission

justify ignoring the “tilted balance” towards residential accommodation in Bristol. As a community we are relying on the knowledge of our Councillors to uphold the planning officer’s recommendation to refuse.

STATEMENT NUMBER A14

I fully support the recommendation that this application should be refused as it would result in an increased demand for on-street car parking in an area which is oversubscribed, leading to congestion and conflict between road users and would result in harm to highway safety.

Whilst I am grateful that the Planning department recognises the issues experienced, it is worth pointing out that the road safety issues are even worse than those described in their report, and the impact, if this development goes ahead, will also be greater than that reported. In particular:

- The location is on the border of the Cotham North RPS. This means that it is commonly used by large numbers of commuters to the city centre as a free “park and ride”. The resulting stresses on parking have been raised with Local Councillors over a number of years (and since long before this application was submitted).
- The applicant’s parking survey (and also that provided by the WPCA) were undertaken during lockdown periods when commuter traffic has been highly reduced. Although the parking issues have continued nonetheless, as evidenced by information provided by residents and experienced by PINS, it should be recognised that in normal times there are rarely **any** spaces available for longer than the few minutes it takes for a car to leave, and another to take its place. There are frequently cars circling the area, or waiting in the road with engines running, until they can find a space, which all adds to the road safety issues. As lockdown eases, the over-subscription on places will only continue to increase.
- Additionally, the applicant’s car parking survey has been proved to be inaccurate, misleading, and non-compliant with Bristol City Council’s methodology – a full report (validated by an external expert) has been provided to BCC listing the errors which lead to it quite significantly over-stating the spaces available.

Overall, I hope there will be no doubt as to the severity of the existing strain on parking in this area. In terms of the impact of the development on the roads, the report repeats some of the information provided by the applicant, but the actual impact is likely to be significantly greater than stated:

- Firstly it should be noted that the applicant’s own travel survey refers to a net loss of 4 – 5 spaces – this includes increased demand from staff and visitors, loss of spaces to delivery bays, and allows for an offset of reduced parking from residents of the existing flats.
- Residents have raised with Planning that in practice the net loss is likely to be a net reduction of 7 – 9 available spaces during peak hours. A summary analysis of both the applicant’s basis for calculating the net loss, and a more realistic view, is provided in Annex 1. It should be recognised that the applicant’s own estimates are not verifiable or enforceable, so decisions should be based on a realistic, not optimistic, estimate.

It is also worth noting that an external consultancy (Railton TPD Ltd) submitted a letter to BCC, confirming the concerns raised by residents were valid. They stated that “the most conservative estimate would therefore be a net increase in demand of 7 spaces” and “The Applicant does not present any parking survey evidence that is reliable or representative of typical local conditions”.

Overall the greatest concern is that of road safety. There are countless ongoing incidents of unsafe parking (particularly on corners of roads, which cause real hazards, exacerbated by the frequent large vehicles such as ambulances and waste lorries who have to reverse down these roads). Any increase in parking demand

will only increase these issues and the risks to the children in particular who use these roads on the way to and from school. I therefore ask the Committee to reject this application on the grounds recommended.

Annex 1 – Justification of Net Additional Parking Demand

The net impact on parking from the development results from a number of factors. The following table shows the estimated increased demand from these factors, firstly as assessed by the applicant (“Statement of Case – Highways”), and secondly as assessed by residents and external experts.

Assessment from Applicant	Impact	Commentary from Residents/Railton	Impact
<p>Additional Staff:</p> <p>The Applicant proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 staff between 08.00 to 14.00 - 1 staff between 14.00 to 20.00 - 1 staff between 20.00 to 08.00 <p>Of which he expects 1 to drive, with 2 cars at shift change-over.</p>	+ 1 - 2	<p>Additional Staff:</p> <p>The current staffing for 40 beds is stated as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 12 staff between 08.00 to 14.00 - 9 staff between 14.00 to 20.00 - 4 staff between 20.00 to 08.00 <p>An extrapolation for the additional 14 beds would suggest an additional 4 – 5 during peak hours.</p> <p>Glenview was CQC rated “Requires Improvement” in March 2021 (and in July 2019). It is unlikely they will be able to improve without maintaining or increasing their staffing ratio.</p> <p>There is no evidence that only 50% of the staff drive cars. Given the need to cover 24-hour operations, many staff need to drive, as public transport is not reliable or safe during the hours when they arrive or leave.</p> <p>An estimate of 4 – 5 additional staff of whom 2 – 3 would drive is reasonable.</p>	+ 2 - 3
<p>Additional Visitors:</p> <p>The Applicant proposes 2 additional visitors per hour.</p>	+ 2	<p>Additional Visitors:</p> <p>As well as personal visitors, this needs to account for visits such as GPs, health-workers, hair/nails services, prospective patients. Bristol Transport Development Policy 23, Appendix 2 (Page 96) states that for Nursing Homes one visitor parking space should be allowed per 3 bed spaces. Even if this regulation does not apply to the extension, it is a useful guideline as to likely parking needs. This suggests 4 - 5 visitor parking spaces for 14 beds.</p>	+ 4 - 5
<p>Loss of space due to delivery bays:</p> <p>4 spaces will be lost.</p>	+ 4	<p>Loss of space due to delivery bays:</p> <p>Agree that 4 spaces will be lost.</p>	+4
<p>Offset due to reduction from current flats:</p> <p>Assumed reduction in demand of 3 spaces.</p>	- 3	<p>Offset due to reduction from current flats:</p> <p>Agree to assumption of reduction in demand of 3 spaces.</p>	-3
TOTAL	+ 4 - 5	TOTAL	+ 7 - 9

The above clearly shows that there should be an expectation of the net loss of at least 4 – 5 spaces (based on the applicant's own data) and that this could be as great as 7 – 9.

STATEMENT NUMBER A15

Statement to Council Chambers 9 June 2pm: Kate Whitehead

Development Control B Committee meeting: Application No. 20/06030/F: 7 Belvedere Road Bristol BS6 7JG

I refer you to my document submitted detailing the level of disruption on the road immediately outside our home on Belvedere Road, opposite the Glen View Care Home. This log runs into a 32 page document. Please look through it if you have the opportunity. In it are highway safety issues, antisocial behaviour, environmental health issues, parking and traffic disruption. This is not an exhaustive log; it is a visual ad hoc record. This is to provide a small insight into the level of disruption. This recorded at a time when the applicant is on 'best behaviour' due to applications and an appeal in progress.

We live opposite the application site. Our driveway effectively is the home parking and delivery space. The residents bears the consequences of the scale of this development on this short road:

- Bin lorries and large oversized vehicles that service the home can often not leave the road without reversing back up the road due to size, over parking and traffic. Many of them reverse at speed and are dangerously unmarshalled.
- Food deliveries block the road every day for what can often be between 30 minutes and an hour at a time.
- Blocking the road at any given time are suppliers of cleaning materials, medication, taxis, GP vehicles, ambulances, police when incidents arise that can block the road for three hours or more.
- Maintenance caretakers for the homes operate out of multiple vans daily blocking the road.
- Private ambulance vans blocking the road loading bodies - sometimes bodies stacked – while children walk to school
- Staff changeover times result in repeated circling of cars due to lack of parking. Staff park across driveways.
- Clinical waste thrown into unmarked vans blocking the road or on our drive. Even in cold weather the smell is repugnant.
- Visitors for terminal patients at end of life distressingly not being able to park and asking to park on resident driveways so they can rush in and say goodbye. Family members themselves have complained to me about the location and parking.
- Antisocial behaviour of staff, smoking and eating on walls and urinating in gardens
- Verbal abuse directed towards road residents

The refusal of this application does not ease what we already contend with. This continues and we work with this.

A refusal of this application stops an ADDITIONAL increase in disruption to life on this road.

Please chose to REFUSE further development on this short road.

STATEMENT NUMBER A16

Development Control Committee B, Wednesday, 9th June 2021 Statement to Committee concerning Application 20/06030/F - Proposed change of use of 7 Belvedere Road from 3 residential flats to provide 14 additional bed spaces to Glenview Nursing Home

1 My name is Kevin Chidgey and I am making this statement on behalf of Westbury Park Community Association which seeks to safeguard and enhance the physical environment and character of Westbury Park - an area which includes Belvedere Road.

2 We welcome and support the recommendation to refuse the application on parking / highway safety grounds which we had strongly argued for in the detailed representation made by the Community Association in January. We are pleased to see that the Committee report cited the car parking survey conducted by the Community Association in January 2021 which clearly demonstrated parking pressures on local roads.

3 We urge the Committee to support the recommendation which is in line with the decision by the Planning Inspectorate to uphold on appeal the refusal of the previous extension application on highway safety grounds.

The Overconcentration Issue

4 The representation we made in January also pointed to the over concentration of care homes in Belvedere Road which we argued should also be taken into consideration in deciding the application. Our statement read *"There are just three residential care homes for elderly persons in the whole of Westbury Park and Redland which comprises over 100 roads, many of them comprising large houses that could potentially be used as care homes. All three of these care homes are in Belvedere Road in what were previously five large family homes – this probably represents the greatest concentration of care homes in any residential street in Bristol"*.

5 Under section B ("Would the proposed development result in harm to the mix and balance of the community ?") the Committee report rather skirts around the overconcentration issue - "Policy DM2 does not define what percentage overconcentration would constitute", "Officers cannot speculate whether the estimates provided by local residents are correct".

6 It would have been relatively straightforward to confirm the accuracy of the Belvedere Road care homes concentration assessment set out above. This could and should have been included in the Committee report so as to provide context to the extension application and the strong opposition voiced by local residents..

7 Concerning Policy DM2 there does seem to be a case for reviewing the policy / criteria so that it is able to give more effective guidance in the future on what is meant by "mix", "balance" and "concentration".

—

STATEMENT NUMBER A17

I welcome Planning's recommendation to refuse the application on the grounds of highway safety. I strongly believe however that it should also be rejected on the following grounds:

"The proposed development would result in an over concentration of residential institutions on Belvedere Road, which would lead to harm to the mix, balance and inclusivity of the community, contrary to Policy BCS18 (Housing Type) and reduce the choice of homes in the area by changing the housing mix contrary to Policy DM2"

noting that this is the same reason for the Council's rejection of the earlier application (reference 19/03104/F) for the same property, and that this application is not substantially different.

There are currently 3 nursing homes in Belvedere road, which occupy 5 out of 11 buildings on one side of the road. The proposed extension would result in 6 of the 11 buildings being occupied by nursing homes, with a total of 108 beds.

Already, within the entire Redland Ward, there is a vast over-concentration of nursing homes in this one small road of 21 buildings. Data from the CQC website (see summary in Annex 1) shows that:

- 100% of all residential care homes in the Manor Park LSOA are located in Belvedere Road.
- 100% of Nursing Homes (for elderly/dementia care) in the Redland Ward (of 13,000 people) are located in Belvedere Road.

This is a clear demonstration of the over-concentration of nursing homes in this one road, relative to all other roads in the LSOA and Ward.

The concentration density within Belvedere Road itself can be easily calculated. The average household size in the Redland Ward is 2.5 (taken from BCC's "Redland Statistical Ward Profile 2020"). If the development went ahead, 36 of the current 42 addresses on the street would remain residential leading to an estimated average residential population of 90 (further analysis in Annex 2). **The population of the care homes would increase to 108 – significantly outnumbering the residential population of this road.**

This information has been submitted to BCC Planning several times. In Section B of the Report it states that "Officers cannot speculate whether the estimates provided by local residents are correct". **However, they do not need to speculate - the data on which these estimates are based is in the public domain (and is actually produced by Bristol City Council).** Individual household sizes may change over time, hence it is completely reasonable to make a current assessment based on average household sizes, and even within a 17% margin of error the population of the care homes would still outnumber the residential population, should this application go ahead.

This road is very close to several nurseries and to Westbury Park Primary School, and as such is an ideal and desirable location for young families, who also fully utilise the local shops, businesses, and parks. This application would remove three large flats which are suitable and affordable for young families, and make the road increasingly unsuitable for the existing families.

It should be clear that approving the application would lead to the further over-concentration of nursing homes in just one small road, and an increasing unsuitability for other residents. And given that the previous application was rejected on these grounds, this application should also be rejected on the same basis.

Annex 1

This information was derived from the CQC website using the BCC definitions of the Manor Park LSOA and Redland Ward boundaries. The following shows **all** care homes registered by the CQC which are in the Manor Park LSOA, and in the Redland Ward, together with the nature of care provided.

Registered Care Home	No. of Beds	In Manor Park LSOA	In Redland Ward	Dementia (65+) care	Address
Meadowcare	34	YES	YES	YES	2-3 Belvedere Road
Glenview	40	YES	YES	YES	8-9 Belvedere Road
Belvedere Lodge	20	YES	YES	YES	1 Belvedere Road
6 Northumberland Road	5	NO	YES	NO	6 Northumberland Road
35 Cranbrook Road	5	NO	YES	NO	35 Cranbrook Road

(6 Northumberland Road and 35 Cranbrook road provide care for younger adults with mental health conditions.)

Annex 2

BCC's "Redland Statistical Ward Profile 2020 December 2020", Page 15 shows Average household size (persons per household) to be 2.5 for Redland Ward. Given the mix of housing types in Belvedere Road, this is a reasonable figure to use.

A report was produced by the current Case Officer, relating to the previous application for this address (19/03104/F), for Development Control Committee B on 27th May 2020, which stated "On the basis of Bristol City Council's Pinpoint Map (<http://maps.bcc.lan/pinpointplus/>) there are 42 addresses on Belvedere Road, and not accounting for subdivision, a total of 21 buildings."

Three of these addresses are for the existing care homes, leaving 39 current residential addresses. This includes the three existing flats at 7 Belvedere Road, which will be lost if the development is approved, leaving 36 residential addresses in Belvedere Road if the application is granted.

36 residential addresses x 2.5 average persons per household = estimated (on average) 90 residential occupants of Belvedere Road.

STATEMENT NUMBER A18

I live immediately next door to the (already hugely redeveloped) care home at 8-9 Belvedere Road. I have regularly seen the many issues raised by my neighbours in their many objections to this application. These include driveways or the whole road being frequently blocked, pressure on parking, problems with rubbish including clinical waste, and the frequent visits of ambulances and funeral directors.

The care home has no driveway or off-street parking and so there is little privacy for residents when they need to be taken to or from hospital - they have to be wheeled on stretchers to or from ambulances, sometimes a long way, along the pavement and road.

Although I don't have a car myself, I can confirm that there are parking issues - the majority of the time I can see no available spaces. My visitors generally have to park in the nearest pay and display spaces some distance away.

I have lived here since 2006. At that time there were three relatively small care homes in the street. Two of these have subsequently undergone extensive redevelopment which has intensified/extended the use the land/buildings, changed the housing mix, and changed the balance between private homes and sizeable commercial operations.

The recent works at numbers 8-9 involved lengthy excavation works which were extremely noisy, making it almost unbearable to spend time in my property. This excavation work also had a detrimental effect on the appearance of the street. The current application would lead to yet more work like this.

As it stands, of the 11 houses on our side of the street, numbers 1, 2-3 and 8-9 are now care homes. The current application proposes another large extension from the home at numbers 8-9 into number 7. The application claims that this would be a "modest extension" but what is proposed is actually an increase from 40 to 54 beds, an increase of 35%.

To sum up, there has already been a loss of residential amenity and the street is less pleasant to live on than when I moved here 15 years ago. In my opinion, no further redevelopment of this type, of any size, should be allowed. I urge you to agree with the planning officers and reject this application.

Dr Julie Gilg

STATEMENT NUMBER A19

Dear Sirs,

REF: Application 20/06030/F. 7 Belvedere Road, Bristol, BS6 7JG

I am writing to support the application for the extension to Glenview Nursing Home and would appreciate the committee on June 9th to consider the following in making their decision.

I am a community pharmacist trained to help the elderly and have served the Bristol community since 1994 giving help, support, advice and supplying dispensed and counter medication. We have as a team served the complete spectrum of ages from babies to the elderly and can proudly claim that we have served four generations of some families seeing them progress from young families to people who need support in the community or within a care environment.

The two extremities in life where we are the most vulnerable and needy are the very young and the elderly with the older population with increasing illnesses like Alzheimer's and Dementia, left unable to defend themselves. We need to treat them all like Captain Sir Tom Moore.

1. Bristol is no different from the rest of our nation with an increasing aging population but a reduced number of Care Home since local authority homes gradually closed down.
2. The elderly population now requiring care and those in years to come, are people who may have been born, lived, worked and brought up their own families in Bristol. They have been used to the city and its surroundings and NEED to remain in familiar surroundings as their cognitive and physical abilities diminish.
3. In general the support groups, including families and friends, for the Bristol elderly are Bristol based and those needing official managed care also NEED their support groups to stop loneliness and depression. They need to retain in their minds a purpose for living. All activities and hobbies that the elderly might have enjoyed would have been Bristol based, eg. A local public house, a local familiar park or a familiar landmark. These are the cognitive triggers that allow service users to recall memories and experience natural therapies like smiling.
4. Placing our care homes outside of the city in very much an "Industrial or retail park" type of environment impairs this natural care.
5. Our care homes, Key Worker, and the NHS has been praised throughout the current pandemic for the courage and sensitivity they have shown to look after the elderly. Relatives and visitors were able to from a distance with a division of glass or windows supported the very long period of lockdown which was not understood by the most vulnerable in care. This was possible with the local homes in the city.
6. Lockdown has brought many changes in the city where we are now having to reduce speeds, drive behind buses on narrower road lanes, behind recycling vehicles and avoid bicycles and electric scooters but most of all behind and be patient with the multitude of delivery vans. There are more companies delivering consumer goods to nearly every household than ever before. WE ARE HAVING TO BE PATIENT BEHIND ALL OF THESE yet a minority are concerned about the parking situation or the few minutes wait whilst a delivery is done to the care home.

7. The care home should be given designated Ambulance parking grids as this is an essential. Certainly I do not believe anyone will not want their loved ones tended to in an emergency whether they live adjacent to the home or anywhere else in the city.
8. As pharmacists and my fellow colleagues the GP's we need to visit the patients in the home and I can assure you all consideration is given to the neighbours and their property.

It is important, as with all planning considerations, that there is a mix use of the property that Bristol has and that which is under planning. I believe it is essential for the benefit of our elderly to have excellent care homes with modern facilities on our door step so that we do not alienate the vulnerable from the lives they had and their supporting families.

Harinder Singh Chana. BSc(hons)Pharm MRPharm

Amendment Sheet 9 June 2021

Item 1: - 7 Belvedere Road Bristol BS6 7JG

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	No amendments

Item 2: - St Johns Lane Health Centre St Johns Lane Bristol BS3 5AS

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
Page 79	Papers refer to eight parking spaces (plus one disabled) whereas later they refer to correct figure of 13(plus one disabled).
Pages 82 - 90	<p>Pre commencement conditions</p> <p>2. Approval of road works necessary</p> <p>No development shall take place (except demolition) until general arrangement plan(s) to a scale of 1:200 showing the following works to the adopted highway has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate and reconstruct footway/cycle lane to full kerb height using matching materials in place of redundant vehicle crossover on St Johns Lane <p>Where applicable indicating proposals for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing levels of the finished highway tying into building threshold levels Alterations to waiting restrictions or other Traffic Regulation Orders to enable the works Signing, street furniture, street trees and pits Structures on or adjacent to the highway Extent of any stopping up, diversion or dedication of new highway (including all public rights of way shown on the definitive map and statement) <p>No development shall take place over the route of any public right of way prior to the confirmation of a Town & Country Planning Act 1990 path diversion/stopping up order. Prior to occupation these works shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>7. Submission and Approval of Landscaping Scheme</p> <p>No development shall take place (except demolition) until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping. The scheme will include details of tree locations, species, a maintenance schedule for watering and aftercare to ensure establishment, tree pits proposed for the trees.</p> <p>The approved scheme shall be implemented so that planting can be carried out no later than the first planting season following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development whichever is sooner.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>All planted materials shall be maintained for five years and any trees removed, during, being damaged or becoming diseased within that period shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the Council gives written consent to any variation.</p> <p>Reason: To protect or enhance the character of the site and the area and to ensure its appearance is satisfactory.</p> <p>8. Renewable energy – further detail</p> <p>Prior to implementation, details of the PV panels and Ground Source Heat Pumps (including the exact locations, dimensions, design, technical specification) together with calculation of energy generation and associated CO2 emissions to achieve 20% reduction on residual emissions from renewable energy in line with the approved energy statement should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The renewable energy technology shall be installed prior to occupation of the dwellings and thereafter retained.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure that the development contributes to mitigating and adapting to climate change and to meeting targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions</p> <p>9. Noise Sensitive Premises Assessment</p> <p>No development shall take place (except demolition) until a detailed acoustic report on the existing noise climate at the development site has been submitted to and been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The report shall include a scheme of noise insulation measures for all residential accommodation. The noise insulation measures shall be designed to achieve noise insulation to a standard that nuisance will not be caused to the occupiers of residential accommodation.</p> <p>The noise assessment shall be carried out by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant/engineer and shall take into account the provisions of BS 8233: 2014 Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings.</p> <p>The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the use and be permanently maintained thereafter.</p> <p>Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of nearby occupiers. The details are needed prior to the start of work as the acoustic report may require changes to the design details.</p> <p>26. List of Approved Plans and Drawings</p> <p>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.</p> <p>0500-REV 1.1, Revised Site Location Plan received 21 Apr 2021 0501-REV 1.1, Revised Existing Site Plan received 21 Apr 2021 0502-REV 1.0, Revised Existing Elevations received 21 Apr 2021 1100-REV 1.5, Revised Ground Floor Plan received 21 Apr 2021 1101-REV 1.2, Revised First Floor Plan received 21 Apr 2021</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>1102-REV 1.2, Revised Second Floor Plan received 21 Apr 2021 1103-REV 1.3, Revised Third Floor Plan received 21 Apr 2021 1300-REV 1.1, Revised Roof Plan received 21 Apr 2021 1400-REV 1.1, Revised Ga Elevations received 21 Apr 2021 1401-REV 1.1, Revised Ga Elevations received 21 Apr 2021 1600-REV 1.1, Revised Site Sections received 21 Apr 2021 2104-REV 1.1, Revised Apartment Plans received 21 Apr 2021 2105-REV 1.1, Revised Apartment Plans received 21 Apr 2021 SK007, Typical Privacy Screen Details received 21 Apr 2021 SK010, Boundary Fence Details received 21 Apr 2021</p> <p>Revised Energy and Sustainability Strategy, received 2 November 2020 Design and Access Statement, received 8 October 2020 Desk Study and Ground Investigation, received 8 October 2020 Surface Water Storage Details, received 8 October 2020 Surface Water and Drainage Strategy, received 8 October 2020 Travel Plan Statement, received 8 October 2020</p> <p>Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.</p>