

# Development Control A Committee Agenda



**Date:** Wednesday, 30 June 2021

**Time:** 2.00 pm

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

## **Distribution:**

**Councillors:** Richard Eddy (Chair), Donald Alexander (Vice-Chair), Tony Dyer (substitute for Fi Hance), John Geater, Paul Goggin, Tom Hathway, Philippa Hulme, Ed Plowden and Andrew Varney

**Copies to:** Zoe Willcox (Director: Development of Place), Gary Collins, Matthew Cockburn, Laurence Fallon, Stephen Peacock (Executive Director for Growth and Regeneration)

**Issued by:** Jeremy Livitt, Democratic Services

City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol BS3 9FS

E-mail: [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk)

**Date:** Tuesday, 29 June 2021



# Agenda

## 12. Public Forum

Public Statements

(Pages 4 - 73)

Due to Covid Safety requirements we have put the following measures in place:

- All attendees to Full Council 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.

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item

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. Public Forum items should be emailed to [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk) and please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:-

Questions - Written questions must be received 3 clear working days prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your question(s) must be received in this office at the latest **by 5pm on Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2021.**

Petitions and Statements - Petitions and statements must be received on the working day prior to the meeting. For this meeting this means that your submission must be received in this office at the latest **by 12 Noon on Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> June 2021.**

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 28<sup>th</sup> 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.

**15. Amendment Sheet**

**(Pages 74 - 75)**



**List of People Requesting to Speak – Public Participation – DC A Committee –  
2pm on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

**DEADLINES: 5pm on Thursday 24<sup>th</sup> June 2021(Questions), 2pm on Monday 28<sup>th</sup>  
June 2021 (Public Participation), 12pm on Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> June 2021(Statements)**

**A – Dalby Avenue**

- A5 – Roland Oliver
- A6 – Dianne James
- A7 – Charlotte Cameron-Beaumont
- A12 – Max Freed - Applicant
- A13 – Chris Hays – Planning Agent
- A14 – Ian Jenkins – Architect
- A15 – Dan Tapscott – Rapleys
- A16 – Nick Townsend
- A17 – Helen Adshead

**B – 349 to 353 Gloucester Road**

- B2 – Jamie Pyper
- B3 – Councillor Emma Edwards

**C – Clyde Park**

- C1 – Dr Jonathan French
- C2 – Jane Valentine
- C3 – Ian Tidmarsh
- C4 – Tom Gilks
- C5 – Paul Wadsley
- C6 – Simon Bennett
- C7 – Councillor Guy Poultney
- C8 – Martin Buckley

# Public Forum

## D C Committee A

### 2pm on 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021



**1. Members of the Development Control Committee A**

Councillors: Richard Eddy (Chair), Donald Alexander (Vice-Chair), Tony Dyer (substitute for Fi Hance), Andrew Varney, John Geater, Tom Hathway, Phillipa Hulme, Paul Goggin and Ed Plowden

**2. Officers:**

Gary Collins - Development Management, Zoe Willcox, Matthew Cockburn, Laurence Fallon, Jeremy Livitt

Statements/Petitions			
Statement	Request To Speak Made Where Indicated S = Speaker	Name	Application
A1		Andrew Lear	20/05811/F - Plot 3, Dalby Avenue and Whitehouse Lane Bristol
A2		Liz and Tony Hillitt	"
A3		James Burden	"
A4		Michelle Day	"
A5	<b>S</b>	Roland Oliver	"
A6	<b>S</b>	Dianne James	"
A7	<b>S</b>	Charlotte Cameron-Beaumont	"
A8		Paul Smith	"
A9		Kay Oliver	"
A10		Ian Blenkinsop	"
A11		Paul Cox	"
A12	<b>S</b>	Max Freed - Applicant	"
A13	<b>S</b>	Chris Hays – Planning Agent	"
A14	<b>S</b>	Ian Jenkins - Architect	"
A15	<b>S</b>	Dan Tapscott – Rapleys (Daylight and Sunlight Specialist)	"
A16	<b>S</b>	Nick Townsend	"
A17	<b>S</b>	Helen Adshead	"
A18		Susan Hamilton	"
A19		Christine Higgott	"
A20		Andy Kemp	"
A21		Anthony Mace	"
A22		Lisa Zimmermann	"

A23		Lee Rayner	“
A24		Sally Kavanagh and Jon Derrick	“
A25		Anneliese Paul	“
A26		Stephen Wickham	“
A27		David Redgewell	“
A28		Becca Massey-Chase	“
B1		Miranda McCabe	20/00968/F – 349 to 353 Gloucester Road, Bristol
B2	<b>S</b>	Jamie Pyper, Director – Nineteen 47	“
B3	<b>S</b>	Councillor Emma Edwards	“
B4		Tim Prior	“
B5		Richard Maddalena	“
B6		Kieran Wales	“
B7		Rebecca Farrar	“
B8		Adam Dawson	“
B9		Jenny Maddalena	“
C1	<b>S</b>	Dr Jonathan French	21/00746/F – 6 Clyde Park
C2	<b>S</b>	Jane Valentine	“
C3	<b>S</b>	Ian Tidmarsh	“
C4	<b>S</b>	Tom Gilks	“
C5	<b>S</b>	Peter Wadsley	“
C6	<b>S</b>	Simon Bennett	“
C7	<b>S</b>	Councillor Guy Poultney	“
C8	<b>S</b>	Martin Buckley	“

## **STATEMENT NUMBER A1**

Good evening,

I am writing to give my written statement opposing this development for the following reasons :

### Height

The development is too high, it will affect the open space and dent light, as well as affect the feel of windmill hill.

### Density

There is insufficient infrastructure for the number of students anticipated within the local community.

### Public realm / landscape

Increased traffic that the locality is not set up for, also insufficient resources locally. Affect to light from these very tall buildings. that will significantly affect the views and space that the local community have been used to.

Many thanks

Andrew Lear



**STATEMENT NUMBER A2**

We object to application 20/0511/F because we believe the height and density of development would be harmful to residents and the environment.

We endorse the detailed concerns submitted by WHAM regarding the local impact and poor quality design of this application.

We are in favour of the regeneration of this site for good quality mixed housing, including social housing.

Liz Hillitt

Tony Hillitt

## STATEMENT NUMBER A3

Dear Madams and Sirs

I would like to object to the planning application 20/05811/F on the basis of a number of major concerns, which I list below.

I like the major, and he seems in tune and forward-thinking with Bristol, but I think we can solve the housing crisis better than by building for students, rich city-dwellers looking to move from London, and kowtowing to the university (they have so much money that every day on my cycle commute I have to squeeze onto the pavement along Feeder Road, while 2 people patrol a gate into the building site where the Cattle Market Tavern was, that I've never seen used).

When you are in the city you can see across to the hills and green space at the outskirts, and this pays such a high part in health and wellbeing that high-rise developers completely underestimate. It is one of the things what makes our city special, and low-rise developments I fully endorse.

### Height / massing

- Height and massing causing harm to the conservation area in general, used as reasons for refusal for plot 1 (Pring St Hill). These would prevent it from being high quality urban design
- Although it 'complies' with the framework this does not make it good quality urban design
- Concern that height of buildings would stop sunlight reaching open spaces, both those within the proposed development and those within the city farm.

### Density

- The number of students proposed is high and has increased over the time the scheme has been presented to WHaM. The affordable housing element originally mooted at consultation has been withdrawn.

### Public realm / landscape

- Loss of sunlight to the farm may harm the biodiversity there
- Loss of sunlight to the farm may lose the amenity value of the farm
- Arrangements around the river and lack of sunlight may result in rubbish and pollution in the river that will be difficult to remove
- Further information of the shadows cast by the development at other times of the year, different from the summer solstice were requested as diagrams plotted on a plan this has not been forthcoming
- BRE guidance suggests light levels be worked out for open spaces including children's playgrounds and gardens
- What funnelling effect will canyons of tall buildings facing each other have on the public realm?
- Concerns that increased traffic from home deliveries will make the new public realm unpleasant and difficult to use for pedestrians

#### Internal environment

- Concerns about the internal daylighting of the student bedrooms, what are the levels of light going to be?
- Some student bedrooms look directly into other bedrooms across narrow gaps, what will the effect on mental health of the occupants be?
- How have the recent experiences of student life under Covid restrictions been applied to the design, this is not clear. Should we be designing student rooms like this now?
- Tall thin windows that reach the floor will not be good for lighting bedroom as easily obstructed by items on the floor
- Tall thin windows into bedrooms are not a good idea as can lead to antisocial behaviour, such as 'upskirting'

#### Sustainability / regenerative design

- Plans to make use of an as-yet non-existent heat network will not make the scheme sustainable
- Will poor light levels internally drive up energy use?
- Tall buildings typically use more energy than lower rise structures

Kind regards

James Burden

#### **STATEMENT NUMBER A4**

On behalf of the BS3 Planning group I would like to put forward our objections to this application for consideration at the meeting on Wed 30th June.

Objections:

Overshadowing issues caused by height of proposed buildings - both of elements of the development itself and of the City Farm.

Creeping increases in the number of properties since the original plan was proposed - density was not great to begin with, not it is worse. This will not help the residents to not feel 'trapped in' should we have another lockdown at any point in the future.

Overlooking of some rooms into other properties due to closeness of buildings. Lack of adequate light into some rooms.

Thank you for considering this matter,

Michelle Day

## **STATEMENT NUMBER A5**

### **Planning committee A - meeting 30th June 2021**

#### STATEMENT on Planning Application 20/05811/F

Any impartial observer would note that this development is about twice the density and twice the height of anything that might be considered reasonable.

Initially, it was to be for 500 students, about the same population as Bristol Prison. This soon increased to 600, then 700 and now it's over 800.

The officer implies that it is not valid to compare the tall buildings here to those rejected for the Pring & St Hill site, because two of the frontages on this site, at 65 metres and 95 metres, are each shorter than the 135 metre frontage down the road. He omits to mention that this site is 150 metres across.

He does mention the separation between the so-called 'finger blocks' but, as the verified montages make clear, that does not diminish the overall impression of a massive block, 30 metres high, filling 10,000 square metres.

Thank you.

*Roland Oliver*

## STATEMENT NUMBER A6

Statement re 20/05811

S D James

I am here to ask you to refuse this application.

If it was a good plan that would improve peoples' lives, provide homes and allow the area to flourish would 150 locals and the following groups have objected?

**The Conservation Advisory Panel** object to over intensive development, the monstrous scale, mass and design which will cause significant harm.

**BS3 Planning Group** object to the massing and query why its student accommodation when we actually need family homes

**Windmill Hill & Malago Planning Group (WHaM)** who went to all the consultations yet didn't recognise the final plans when they were published as they had changed so much, refer to the points raised by the Planning Inspector when he dismissed the appeal against the refusal for Plot 1

**The Civic Society** who object to the unacceptable impact of massing on Victoria Park and the City Farm

**Bristol Cycling Campaign** who object as the development doesn't adequately accommodate cyclists.

And the **CDG** , who didn't Object but have concerns over cumulative and visual impact.

**Please say 'NO'**

## STATEMENT NUMBER A7

### Statement by Dr. Charlotte Cameron-Beaumont for committee meeting 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021

#### Planning application no. 20/05811/F

When making their decision, I believe the committee should reference the April 2021 report from Planning Inspector, Jonathon Parsons, in his refusal of planning permission for the Plot 1 site (Pring & St. Hill; Appeal Ref 3249159): **His comments about the harm which would be caused to the area by such a development can be applied to this application (Plot 3) equally as much as Plot 1, if not more so; and I believe his decision about Plot 1 sets a precedence, such that his comments should be considered in the decision about Plot 3.**

The Inspector said, (in paragraph 49): *"There would be harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with the CS and SADMP policies"*. The harm which would be bestowed on the surrounding area is, in fact, one of the two key reasons which he cites as grounds for refusing the planning permission of Plot 1 - not only harm to the Conservation Area, **but also other parts of the surrounding area outside of the conservation area** (see paragraph 19 and 21).

He talks about the harm which would be bestowed in some depth: *"The blocks appear as one substantial building"* and, *"Such intensity of development would adversely affect the important low rise qualities of the surrounding area"*. He goes on to say that *"The developments would not function well, add to the overall quality of the area, be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment . . . Consequently, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits."* (paragraph 45). Furthermore, he says in paragraph 46 that: *"There would be harm to the character and appearance of the area in general, (which the Conservation Area would be part of). There are historic and architectural qualities to the Conservation Area, notably its low-lying residential character and appearance, that contribute positively to it. "*

**All this equally applies to this Plot 3 development as much as it does to Plot 1.**

Despite the recent urban design revisions, I concur with the Inspector in his thoughts on Plot 1, and consider that the same is true of Plot 3: ***"[This] proposal would not be high quality urban design due to the abrupt and dominating adverse impact of the blocks which would harm the character and appearance of the area"***. (Paragraph 33).

The fact that this application meets the floor parameters of the Bedminster Green Framework does not mean that permission should be given. The Inspector says: *"These parameters [in the Bedminster Green Framework] are indicative only and have not been subject to testing through proposal led design process. Assessing high quality design involves the assessment of considerations other than floor levels only. Therefore the parameter guidance of is of limited relevance to the assessment of the appeal proposals."* (Paragraph 30).

Furthermore, the *'Malago Green Community Planning Brief'* for Bedminster Green is of a similar material consideration to that of the Bedminster Green Framework, and yet planners and councillors consistently ignore it. This document, developed through many hours of consultation with the local community (unlike the Bedminster Green Framework, in which community opinions were sought, but ignored) states that: *"Buildings should reflect the existing context in terms of footprints and heights . . . The peripheries of the site should match the adjacent context, this is typically 2-3 storey blocks. The centre of the site can rise to 5 storeys with no detracting of visual amenity from Victoria Park or Windmill Hill. Keeping heights of blocks low is essential to allow daylight into open spaces to*

*create an inviting urban environment. Daylight provision should be considered as an essential part of new developments. Efforts should be made to avoid depriving any neighbouring developments of light".* This is still as relevant now as when it was written, and I ask planners and councillors to consider this document when making their decision.

**I also have major concerns about sunlight reaching outdoor areas of Windmill Hill City Farm, as follows:**

BRE guidance, Paragraph 3.3.3 states that: *"the availability of sunlight should be checked for all open spaces where it will be required. This would normally include: children's playgrounds, gardens....."*

The Daylight and Sunlight Amenity (Neighbouring) Study only investigates the impact on the indoor buildings of Windmill Hill City Farm, and not of the outdoor space; whilst the Design and Access Statement (Part Eight), provides a visualisation of the shadows **but only on the Summer Solstice (!)**, when shadows are at a minimum.

My initial investigation (using a web based design & mapping program called SketchUp) leads me to the conclusion that **Windmill Hill City Farm will be significantly overshadowed, and sunlight blocked, in the afternoons of the Spring, Winter, and Autumn.**

I would therefore like to request a professional assessment of the overshadowing caused by the development on the Winter Solstice and both Equinoxes. This should be presented in a pictorial manner so that it can be understood by a lay person.

In many ways, the ability for families to find areas to play in the sunshine during the Winter, Spring and Autumn is in fact more important than that of the Summer, because sunshine is more difficult to find during these months.

**On those clear sunny days of Winter, Spring and Autumn, how important it is for the mental and physical health of children and families (many of whom live in the small, dark terraced houses and flats of this area) to be able to find some outdoor sunshine. I therefore consider any overshadowing to the outdoor areas of Windmill Hill City Farm to be an unacceptable detriment to public amenity.**

Finally, the following list is intended to summarise my objections to the scheme:

- Height and Massing unacceptable (see my earlier comments referencing Planning Inspector's refusal of Plot 1)
- Sunlight blocked to Windmill Hill City Farm – unacceptable negative effect on public amenity space used by families and children (see my earlier comments)
- Number of Students
- Sustainability concerns (tall buildings use more energy; heat network does not exist)
- Tall thin window concerns
- No affordable or social housing included
- Internal daylighting concerns
- Public Realm: **the canyon effect of high buildings on either side will consign the riverbank to shade, and possibly wind; it will also cause overshadowing of Bedminster Parade and East Street; plus the clash in use between delivery trucks and pedestrian/cyclist use on Clarke Street will be problematic given the increased use of home delivery, and may result in the riverbank being a rather unpleasant and polluted place to be.**





28 June 2021

**STATEMENT NUMBER A8 - Written statement for planning committee:  
Proposed Student Accommodation Development on Plot 3 Dalby Avenue and  
Whitehouse Lane – Reference: 20/05811/F**

I write to outline the University of Bristol's support for the proposed development at Dalby Avenue, Bristol.

The University of Bristol supports this proposed development of purpose built student accommodation. The applicant has engaged well with the University, allowing input into the proposals.

The University supports the clusters of 6-12 en-suite student bedrooms over 11sqm which will provide an affordable product in terms of rent, and much valued quality by the student community.

The University supports the location and size of development, being 1.5 miles from the University's Clifton Campus and providing a minimum requirement of 200 new bedrooms in any one location. We feel the inclusion of active frontages and incorporation of active ground floor uses will be the student contribution to the local economy.

The development also responds to emerging planning policy H7, the general provision of which are: to ensure that there will be no adverse impacts on surrounding communities and areas; to be car-free; to make provision for disabled access and disabled parking for occupants and visitors.

The University supports the proposed operation and service to provide a total of 276 bike spaces, a 24/7 365 day a year reception; space allocation for communal study spaces of and 25 fully adaptable rooms which meets our design requirements of 3%.

Taking on key quality indicators as set out in the City Council's Urban Living Assessment, the University is satisfied by the standard of design in these proposals. These relate to the proposal's response at the scale of City, Neighbourhood, Block and Street. We have been particularly interested in placemaking and how the two buildings contribute to the creation of a new settlement.

This scheme meets the needs of the University of Bristol and, we hope the scheme will be brought forward.





## **STATEMENT NUMBER A9**

The mental health of so many students cooped up, especially in these times when it's quite possible we have to self-isolate, worries me. We are responsible for the welfare of these young people who are at a vulnerable stage as they mature to take their place in the world.

And the building has grown since its first inception to almost double what we were told. Having been pleased that here was a developer playing a good tune, it turns out, as ever, they were merely paying lip service to us. Many of us are now in dismay. Its massing is unsightly and unnecessary. It is too much and does not help the resurrection of Bedminster. It is spoilt, as ever, by greed of the developers.

Please let's take a rain check on this and think again.

Yours sincerely,

Kay Oliver

## STATEMENT NUMBER A10

Dear councillors and committee members,

This is my statement for submission regarding planning ref 20/05811/F – the flats around Dalby Avenue/Whitehouse lane, that form part of the Bedminster Green development.

I strongly oppose these proposals in their current form. Principally, the buildings are much too tall for the site and context, and the entire Bedminster Green framework needs to be rethought from scratch. I am in favour of new development in the area, and I am in favour of much of this development being high-density; however the proposed tall structures will create numerous intractable and long-term problems, both for future residents, existing communities and the wider area.

In an effort to keep this brief, I would echo many of WHaM's concerns over the development, as set out below, and some of my own to begin:

Additional concerns (those that are not addressed below by WHaM)

- The design is not high-quality. There is an opportunity to do something fantastic, even world-leading, with all the brownfield space available here. What is proposed is simply pile-em-high stacks of investment property, with little regard to context or future-proofing. I'd also argue that this is a ridiculous location for student housing – placing hundreds of young people some distance from their campuses is immediately going to create large numbers of daily journeys, many of which will not be made by active or public transport.
- I would also argue that development of this kind would simply not be considered for other parts of the city. Bedminster, is a historic conservation area, but feels as though it is having high rises forced upon it in an effort to simply add 'units' and tick boxes. The sense that 'our' history (and our present) is not given as much weight in decision-making as, say, Clifton, is borne out in policies such as the lamppost recycling saga.
- Parking has rarely been mentioned. Simply hoping that most residents will not own a car; will not park in neighbouring areas; will not create additional pressures in the vicinity, is just wishful thinking. The costs of introducing residents parking zones should be considered, and borne by the developers up-front if necessary.
- Little has been said about additional pressures on services and infrastructure in the area, including (but not limited to) whether additional school places have been earmarked and funded; whether a new GP surgery and/or NHS dentist practice will be required, and so on.

Yes, the Business Improvement district representatives of East street are fully behind having additional customers, but there are real costs associated with having hundreds of new residents as well, which seem to have been ill-thought-through.

Height / massing

- Height and massing causing harm to the conservation area in general, used as reasons for refusal for plot 1 (Pring St Hill). These would prevent it from being high quality urban design
- Although it 'complies' with the framework this does not make it good quality urban design

Density

- The number of students proposed is high and has increased over the time the scheme has been presented.

#### Public realm / landscape

- Loss of sunlight to the farm may harm the biodiversity there
- Loss of sunlight to the farm may lose the amenity value of the farm
- Arrangements around the river and lack of sunlight may result in rubbish and pollution in the river that will be difficult to remove
- Further information of the shadows cast by the development at other times of the year, different from the summer solstice were requested as diagrams plotted on a plan this has not been forthcoming
- BRE guidance suggests light levels be worked out for open spaces including children's playgrounds and gardens
- What funnelling effect will canyons of tall buildings facing each other have on the public realm?
- Concerns that increased traffic from home deliveries, tradespeople and others will make the new public realm unpleasant and difficult to use for pedestrians

#### Internal environment

- Concerns about the internal daylighting of the student bedrooms, what are the levels of light going to be?
- Some student bedrooms look directly into other bedrooms across narrow gaps, what will the effect on mental health of the occupants be?
- How have the recent experiences of student life under Covid restrictions been applied to the design, this is not clear. Should we be designing student rooms like this now?
- Tall thin windows that reach the floor will not be good for lighting bedroom as easily obstructed by items on the floor
- Tall thin windows into bedrooms are not a good idea as can lead to antisocial behaviour, such as 'upskirting'

#### Sustainability / regenerative design

- Plans to make use of an as-yet non-existent heat network will not make the scheme sustainable
- Will poor light levels internally drive up energy use?
- Tall buildings typically use more energy than lower rise structures as noted below:

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2017/jun/high-rise-buildings-much-more-energy-intensive-low-rise#:~:text=Researchers%20at%20UCL's%20Energy%20Institute,height%2C%20by%20around%2040%25>

Thank you for your time and attention - Ian Blenkinsop



## **STATEMENT NUMBER A11**

I wish to lodge my objections to this application on the following grounds:

\* the height and density of some of the buildings is still too great. Research shows that high rise buildings are less energy efficient/ more energy intensive than lower rise buildings. Also the density of occupation has increased significantly from the original application

\* the reduction in light levels as a result of the design, size and proximity of the buildings is likely to have a significant effect on the occupants living conditions and overall mental health. In addition, the restrictions imposed on light levels is likely to have a deleterious effect on the neighbouring City Farm in terms of the environment, both the biodiversity and the amenity value of the farm as an essential community resource.

\* finally, I have serious concerns about the future proofing of this development. The pandemic has had a major impact on the nature of the higher education market and, in particular, its accommodation requirements. It may well be that student accommodation is not as viable a future option as previously thought. If this were to be the case there would be a need for re-purposing. The accommodation as currently outlined would not provide the basis for adaptation to high quality habitation for longer term living although why an otherwise transient student population should be expected to put up with lower standards I'm not sure.

In all, I feel this application is not supportable in its current form

Paul Cox



**STATEMENT NUMBER A12 - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A: 30 JUNE 2021**

**ITEM 13a - 20/05811/F – PLOT 3, DALBY AVENUE & WHITEHOUSE LANE, BRISTOL**

**WRITTEN STATEMENT BY MAX FREED, DIRECTOR OF SYDNEY FREED (HOLDINGS)  
ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**

My name is Max Freed and I am speaking on behalf of the applicant.

- This development will act as a catalyst for the regeneration of Bedminster Green, enabling the highway and river Malago improvements through our land transfers to the Council and making large CIL and s106 strategic transport contributions.
- It will help with the revitalisation of nearby East Street - over £5m of annual student expenditure will be a massive boost to the local economy. There will also be significant increase in the number of on-site jobs, both during the construction period and in the years to come.
- This BREEAM excellent development re-uses brownfield land, is sustainable, promotes the use of public transport and is virtually car-free, delivers an additional 40 trees and 1000% Biodiversity Net Gain.
- This has been a collaborative planning application, fully compliant with the Bedminster Green framework with no objections from any statutory consultees or BCC officers.
- The development is delivered with the support of and on behalf of the University of Bristol.

We strongly urge you to follow your officer's recommendation.

**STATEMENT NUMBER A13 - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A: 30 JUNE 2021  
ITEM 13a - 20/05811/F – PLOT 3, DALBY AVENUE & WHITEHOUSE LANE, BRISTOL**

**WRITTEN STATEMENT BY CHRIS HAYS (PARTNER, CUSHMAN & WAKEFIELD) ON BEHALF OF  
THE APPLICANT**

I represent the Applicant in my role as Planning Agent for the application.

The determination of this application requires a weighing of various planning policy considerations:

- Exercising the presumption in favour of sustainable development that sits at the heart of the planning system;
- The adopted policies of the Bristol Local Plan;
- The policy direction given by the emerging Local Plan Review; and
- Other material considerations such as the Bedminster Green Framework and Urban Living SPD.

Taking all of these matters in hand, your officers have concluded that our proposals for Plot 3 represent sustainable development that align with the Bedminster Green Framework and the policy direction for Central Bedminster.

Through the technical information submitted with the application, we have demonstrated that this brownfield development will deliver a wide range of regeneration benefits, that go beyond the site, and which far outweigh the very limited harm that may be attributed to the scheme.

We do this in a manner that protects local amenity and with development that will achieve excellence in terms of climate change adaptability and energy reduction criteria.

With your officers confirming that the proposals represent sustainable development, we urge the Committee to accept the recommendation and grant planning permission.

Thank You

**Chris Hays MRTPI MIHBC  
Partner / Planning  
Cushman & Wakefield**

**STATEMENT NUMBER A14 - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A: 30 JUNE 2021**

ITEM 13a - 20/05811/F – PLOT 3, DALBY AVENUE & WHITEHOUSE LANE, BRISTOL

WRITTEN STATEMENT BY **IAN JENKINS DIRECTOR AWW** ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

Good afternoon – My name is Ian Jenkins and I have worked in Bristol for over 35 years. I am a director of AWW and lead architect for this exciting scheme.

We have worked hard over the past 18 months with Bristol city council's city design group to ensure we create a scheme that enhances and captures the essence of Bedminster. Including the use of colour, with high level coloured metal panels, the bricks and brick detailing, use of glazed bricks, the artistically designed window panelling all echo the historic uses on the site. The depth and proportion of the elevations all reflect the honesty of the design including the variation of height, the sites permeability, and views through and between the buildings.

The sustainability of the design is critical to the scheme, the use of rain gardens, the orientation ensuring good natural light and ventilation to the rooms, highly insulated and the ability to generate electricity on site with the use of photovoltaic panels have all added to the desire to open up the Malago river, regenerate and rejuvenate it, including new tree planting and increasing the ecology with new fauna and flora, the wish to pedestrianise the scheme improve cycleways and help Bristol City Council improve the road infrastructure around the site have all been achieved.

Thank you...  
Therefore, I thoroughly recommend the scheme to the committee.



**STATEMENT NUMBER A15 - DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE A: 30 JUNE 2021**

**ITEM 13a - 20/05811/F – PLOT 3, DALBY AVENUE & WHITEHOUSE LANE, BRISTOL**

**WRITTEN STATEMENT BY DAN TAPSCOTT BSC (HONS) MRICS, PARTNER & HEAD OF  
NEIGHBOURLY MATTERS, RAPLEYS LLP ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT**

Good afternoon Councillors...

I'm Dan Tapscott, a locally based chartered surveyor specialising in Daylight and Sunlight amenity. I sit on the Design West review panel, so understand the challenges of Bristol's changing landscape.

I undertook the detailed and highly accurate assessments in accordance with the Councils policy requirements and have been involved from an early stage in the design process looking at various iterations of the proposal.

The analysis has looked at all the neighbouring properties including the city farm. I have considered the objections received and can confirm there will be no adverse impact in terms of daylight, sunlight or overshadowing to the buildings or green areas to the city farm.

The analysis has also considered the levels of Daylight & Sunlight received within the proposal giving a high degree of compliance in comparison with various Bristol based developments. My involvement looked at the internal arrangement of the rooms as well as optimising the glazing; in particular, the tall window head heights to the study bedrooms mean good levels of light shall be received right to the back of the rooms.

My conclusion is that the scheme has been designed with good quality Daylight & Sunlight as a central concept. It will be a 'good neighbour' as well as a nice place to live.

Thank you.

## **STATEMENT NUMBER A16**

This is an ugly, dense development is reminiscent of the brutal architecture of 80s Eastern Europe, a Moscow satellite town, which can be confirmed by looking at the images of it from Windmill Hill City Farm and Victoria Park. It will irreparably damage the City Farm, probably Bedminster's best asset, by looming over it and cutting down much of its light. It is simply too high, too big and too dense, which why is all local community and planning groups are unanimously opposed to it. Even BID, who have backed every development in Bedminster Green regardless of the quality of housing, have reservations about this one, so it must be bad. Time and time again, the local community has rejected high rise as a solution to the local housing crisis, not that this student development even addresses that need. Highrise blocs are generally unhappy places to live in, their construction is extremely bad for the environment (when are we going to start treating this seriously?), and they can never, ever be made completely safe, as we saw yet again last week!

I am taking part in the Whitehouse Lane redevelopment consultation. It is interesting that everyone involved, residents and planning officers alike, already see Bedminster Green, with its tower blocks and multi-storey car park, as a disaster to be avoided. Approving this development will just compound the disaster. Please refuse it and demand something better for Bedminster.

## STATEMENT NUMBER A17

There is a lot that is good about this application – namely, the public realm, landscaping, transport plans and sustainability plans. All of these show care and appreciation of the local area, and, although not perfect, are to be commended.

However, the massing and height of this collection of buildings is totally out of scale and shows no respect for the neighbourhood. You need to read the Planning Inspector's recent comments about the Pring and St Hill site to put this in context. He recommended that the Appeal for that site should be turned down basically because the proposal was too high and the massing too great and the visual effect as of one huge wall, all to the detriment of the local area. He pointed out that it was completely out of keeping with the existing neighbourhood. All this can be said for this proposal too – the blocks overlap each other from most angles so that all light and views are lost, from Victoria Park, Windmill Hill City Farm, Bedminster Station and from East St. The blocks will loom over the surrounding area, to the benefit of nobody but the Developer. For both the new residents and the existing local residents, lower rise buildings would be more suitable – as proven by countless studies about mental wellbeing and the urban environment. High density and low rise is what is needed here, with lots of green spaces and well designed public realm. The effect of this building on the adjoining Community Farm would be completely unacceptable, casting shade for much of the day and year over animal and growing areas. The photo-montages show how the buildings will totally change the feeling on the farm, which at the moment is green and open and relaxing, paramount for the local community.

The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) says it all. Photograph after photograph shows the open views across the city which local people enjoy at the moment, including the varied Bedminster roofs, the distant hills, and the landmark city buildings between, the views that make living in this part of the city so special. And then the contrast of what it will be like if these buildings were to go ahead. The LVIA concludes that there will be an overall benefit due to the regeneration of the site, and an overall adverse effect due to the large scale of the development, the height and the mass. Which makes me ask, why can't we have the benefit of the regeneration (which everybody wants) but with a sensitive and realistic height and massing which doesn't ruin the local character of Bedminster?

This proposal is also designed to cater for a huge number of students. We were originally told that a much smaller number of students would have housing as part of Bedminster Green. This development has pushed the numbers up and up over the months of developing the plans, so that these final figures are way beyond a manageable number in this community. If the buildings were reduced in height and the student numbers reduced accordingly, we would perhaps get back closer to the original proposals for student numbers.

## STATEMENT NUMBER A18

I object to this development for the following reasons

1. The scale is out of proportion to the rest of the area.
2. The public views over the city from Windmill Hill, Victoria Park, and further afield will be permanently destroyed.
3. Opposition from people who have lived all their lives in the area. The impact of lack of light, the oppressive nature of the design on the area. .
4. The current disputes around tall buildings and cladding following the Grenfell Tower fire.
5. The lack of community 'feel' . I feel it puts a barrier between Windmill hill and East Street. The isolation and loneliness of people in very high rise blocks. They are not usually suitable for families. Didn't we learn from the mistakes of the 1960s?
6. The feeling locally that the planners really don't care what local people think and such a development would not happen in Clifton. There are examples of much more human scale developments at the Brooks Dye Works.
7. The disruption in building these properties will go on for years. Traffic jams will be horrendous. When the airport opens the bus route will become unreliable.
8. The feeling that everyone agrees how awful they are but just don't want to lose face. I would say better that than feel responsible for blighting the entrance to our city. Bristol can do better than this.
9. The maintenance charges are like to be unpredictable and extortionate.
10. I challenge anyone on this committee to live in the middle of one of these blocks or in the shadow of them. A better option is a 4 or 5 story building and upgrading the properties in East Street.

Only today I read this article by David Olusoga: <https://www.bristolideas.co.uk/read/council-estate-memories-gateshead/>. The photograph reminded me of what is planned for Bedminster. The article itself is very moving.

I am writing this on behalf of myself and my Aunt. We have both lived here for almost 40 years

**STATEMENT NUMBER A19**

To whom it may concern

I am writing with objections to the above planning application which I understand will be put to Development Control A this week.

To use all this space for student accommodation is a mistake. So much space with one type of accommodation is not right. It does not meet the needs of families. It does not help the housing crisis. The blocks are too close together in that the only view that many of the inhabitants will get is directly into another block of the same. I am also concerned that as shown there will be not enough daylight within the apartments either. And the narrow spaces between the buildings will funnel cold winds.

When these plans were published and discussed earlier there was a request for information about shadows cast at different times of the year. In the absence of this information I believe that the shadows cast will have a negative effect on the nearby City Farm, both in terms of reducing light levels needed for growing, and also light levels expected by visitors to/ users of this farm and leisure community amenity.

This is one of several development sites within metres of each other, each featuring high buildings. We recognise the need and welcome development but want to see dwellings to rent or purchase, built in an environment that meets the needs of families.

Christine Higgott

Nearby resident and supporter of Windmill Hill City Farm



## **STATEMENT NUMBER A20**

Planning committee A - meeting 30th June 2021

STATEMENT on Planning Application 20/05811/F

Before granting approval I would strongly encourage the committee members to once again look at the proposed visualisations of the scheme.

The angles introduced into the blocks prevent views through the site: from Victoria Park, from the city farm and from East Street. It appears as a very solid mass from most of the angles shown.

In this context please Consider also that this will be another solid mass added to 2 other tall developments that will form a wall between Windmill Hill and Bedminster.

2 residents groups (WHaM and BS3), the civic society, and the Conservation Advisory Panel object on account of the harm this scheme will do in the surrounding context, these are not unfounded concerns they relate to amenities and space that are much loved by the community and that no-one wants to be harmed, concerns raised by the people who live there.

I would also like to add that this is not a sustainable scheme if a good portion of that strategy relies upon a as yet un-built heat network. With only a few years to cut out carbon to avoid catastrophic climate change how many of those years will be spent heating a building conventionally without this measure? This is not a sustainable scheme in our current climate emergency unless it is made to be sustainable from the beginning of its life.

There is an opportunity here for the committee to demonstrate it understands what good design for an established urban site can be. The scheme does not fit within the existing context, it may satisfy the planning policy but that policy is not created with specific individual sites in mind. Look at the visualisations, look at the context and please consider if the size, density and mass of the building are really appropriate for the site. I do not think this scheme should be approved in its current form.

## STATEMENT NUMBER A21

I wish to object to planning application 20/05811/F (student accommodation on Plot 3, which is the NCP car park and Whitehouse Lane site) for the following reasons:

- The height and massing of this development will cause harm to the conservation area in general
- The number of students proposed is high and has increased over the time the scheme has been presented
- The area in general would benefit from a higher proportion of family sized homes (e.g. 3+ bedrooms). This would encourage people to stay and invest in the area as their family grow, rather than encouraging a transient population who are less likely to invest time, energy and money in their local area.
- The affordable housing element originally mooted at consultation has been withdrawn.
- Loss of sunlight to the farm may harm the biodiversity there
- Loss of sunlight to the farm may lose the amenity value of the farm
- Further information of the shadows cast by the development at other times of the year, different from the summer solstice have not been made public
- Plans to make use of an as-yet non-existent heat network will not make the scheme sustainable
- Tall buildings typically use more energy than lower rise structures as noted in this report:  
<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2017/jun/high-rise-buildings-much-more-energy-intensive-low-rise#:~:text=Researchers%20at%20UCL's%20Energy%20Institute,height%2C%20by%20around%2040%25>

Many thanks, Anthony Mace

**STATEMENT NUMBER A22**

Dear Sir / Madam,

I want to express my views about the above planning application - an application which is completely ludicrous for the area in question.

The proposed development is incredibly ugly and does not fit with the area around it. The height and sheer size of the buildings will ruin the neighbourhood; in terms of urban design I have rarely seen anything so unsightly. The impact on sunlight for the whole area will be depressing, as will the impact on the environment; in autumn and winter this will be even more so.

The number of students this development proposes to accommodate is way beyond what the area can cope with - we need affordable, sustainable family homes not YET MORE student flats that are only being built to provide profit for developers. Bristol already has an abundance of student residences - there is however a dire shortage of affordable homes. There are already considerable traffic problems in Bedminster and Windmill Hill, this development would greatly exacerbate the issue. This development would destroy what is a very active community.

Thank you,

Lisa Zimmermann

### **STATEMENT NUMBER A23**

I have concerns over the height that will have a negative impact on the local area in general. With concern that height of buildings would stop sunlight reaching open spaces, both those within the proposed development and those within the city farm, and overshadow the surround houses.

The City farm is a wonderful asset and could be ruined with overly tall development next blocking the sunlight.

Bristol in general not a high rise city and this does not feel in keeping, why can't you build something tasteful like Wapping wharf rather than a new raft of high rise that will be the tragic planning decisions that will blight the area.

The number of students proposed is high and has increased over the time the scheme has been presented to WHaM. The affordable housing element originally mooted at consultation has been withdrawn.

Plans to make use of an as-yet non-existent heat network will not make the scheme sustainable whilst tall buildings typically use more energy than lower rise structures.

Whapping wharf has been carefully planned out and fits with clear visual planning to fit into the local area, after the call on Zoom with the developers its clear they dont have much interest in the visuals or impact but profit.

With just 22 spaces the developer suggesting use of parking on Windmill hill as a solution.

**MAKE IT LOWER & WITH BETTER DESIGN THAT HAS SOME REAL STYLE AND WILL BE A DEVELOPMENT TO BE PROUD OF. DONT RUIN THE AREA FOR A GENERATION WHEN THIS COULD BE A FANTASTIC REGENERATION. WE ARE AN ART AND DESIGN RICH CITY....LETS DO BETTER**

#### **STATEMENT NUMBER A24**

I have concerns over the height that will have a negative impact on the local area in general. With concern that height of buildings would stop sunlight reaching open spaces, both those within the proposed development and those within the city farm, and overshadow the surround houses.

The City farm is a wonderful asset and could be ruined with overly tall development next blocking the sunlight.

Bristol in general not a high rise city and this does not feel in keeping, why can't you build something tasteful like Wapping wharf rather than a new raft of high rise that will be the tragic planning decisions that will blight the area.

The number of students proposed is high and has increased over the time the scheme has been presented to WHaM. The affordable housing element originally mooted at consultation has been withdrawn.

Plans to make use of an as-yet non-existent heat network will not make the scheme sustainable whilst tall buildings typically use more energy than lower rise structures.

Whapping wharf has been carefully planned out and fits with clear visual planning to fit into the local area, after the call on Zoom with the developers its clear they dont have much interest in the visuals or impact but profit.

With just 22 spaces the developer suggesting use of parking on Windmill hill as a solution.

**MAKE IT LOWER & WITH BETTER DESIGN THAT HAS SOME REAL STYLE AND WILL BE A DEVELOPMENT TO BE PROUD OF. DONT RUIN THE AREA FOR A GENERATION WHEN THIS COULD BE A FANTASTIC REGENERATION. WE ARE AN ART AND DESIGN RICH CITY....LETS DO BETTER**

## STATEMENT NUMBER A25

Hi,

I am writing to send in my objection to the proposed development. Here are the points I would like to raise with the committee :

### Height / massing

- Height and massing causing harm to the conservation area in general, used as reasons for refusal for plot 1 (Pring St Hill). These would prevent it from being high quality urban design
- Although it 'complies' with the framework this does not make it good quality urban design
- Concern that height of buildings would stop sunlight reaching open spaces, both those within the proposed development and those within the city farm.

### Density

- The number of students proposed is high and has increased over the time the scheme has been presented. The affordable housing element originally mooted at consultation has been withdrawn.

### Public realm / landscape

- Loss of sunlight to the farm may harm the biodiversity there
- Loss of sunlight to the farm may lose the amenity value of the farm
- Arrangements around the river and lack of sunlight may result in rubbish and pollution in the river that will be difficult to remove
- Further information of the shadows cast by the development at other times of the year, different from the summer solstice were requested as diagrams plotted on a plan this has not been forthcoming
- BRE guidance suggests light levels be worked out for open spaces including children's playgrounds and gardens
- What funnelling effect will canyons of tall buildings facing each other have on the public realm?
- Concerns that increased traffic from home deliveries will make the new public realm unpleasant and difficult to use for pedestrians

### Internal environment

- Concerns about the internal daylighting of the student bedrooms, what are the levels of light going to be?
- Some student bedrooms look directly into other bedrooms across narrow gaps, what will the effect on mental health of the occupants be?
- How have the recent experiences of student life under Covid restrictions been applied to the design, this is not clear. Should we be designing student rooms like this now?

- Tall thin windows that reach the floor will not be good for lighting bedroom as easily obstructed by items on the floor

#### Sustainability / regenerative design

- The Population density will put enormous pressure on existing green spaces

The design does not promote good mental health in terms of light, space and community building.

- Plans to make use of an as-yet non-existent heat network will not make the scheme sustainable
- Will poor light levels internally drive up energy use?
- Tall buildings typically use more energy than lower rise structures as noted below:

<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2017/jun/high-rise-buildings-much-more-energy-intensive-low-rise%23:~:text=Researchers%20at%20UCL's%20Energy%20Institute,height%2C%20by%20around%2040%25>

It is such a shame that Bristol does not have the vision or courage to make brave developments that are based on social health rather than income generation.

I hope the committee can look further than the numbers.

Thankyou

Anneliese Paul

## **STATEMENT NUMBER A26**

Plot 3 Dalby Avenue And Whitehouse Lane Bristol

APPLICATION NO: 20/05811/F Full Planning

DETERMINATION

DEADLINE:

30 April 2021

Proposed redevelopment of the site, including demolition works, to provide mixed use development comprising student accommodation (up to 82 cluster units and amenity spaces) and ground floor business space (628sqm GIA) together with associated parking etc

### **I want to make two points and link them.**

Firstly I took part in a very early pre-consult on this site , and the University actors present came up with an interesting concept of University approved student accommodation (This one) and University non approved student accommodation (The former Pring and St Hill site)

However, the head count proposed at the time on the NCP car park and potential Whitehouse Lane site beyond the Malago stream was much lower and so the implied building volume and height on finite BS3 plot space was much lower. So there was little to object to then and people felt optimistic, until the final head-count inflated and resulting building form emerged as well. And I believe the minimum for a University approval is only 200, so this has ended up four times the University minimum.

Second the Pring and St Hill site was rejected by a planning inspector and Wham clearly think this application would or should be also. But that requires a committee refusal now as a first bold step.

My own feeling is that the resultant building is much too big with grave implications from Windmill Hill, Windmill City Farm (a conservation area view on Philip street), and Victoria Park.

I would urge Committee Members to consider all the very good objections put forward and not be unduly swayed by the University, important City body as it may be, liking a building bigger than the one they first pitched to local people, in a non-campus area. A reduced size might satisfy everyone.

### **Please refuse this application.**

Thank you for reading this objection.

Stephen Wickham

Southville



## STATEMENT NUMBER A27

We would like to support the students flats development on Bedminster green the site is close to Bedminster Railway station for access by train to the Bristol Temple meads station university campus and by train to Clifton Down railway station to the Clifton campus

Metro west future train service to portishead and North Bristol and the Henbury line

Extra trains will call at Bedminster station when the portishead line opens .

Bus service to city centre North Bristol Gloucester Road southmead hospital and cribbs causeway bus station and shopping centre. Bristol Airport and metro bus route to south Bristol and North Bristol metro bus link to UW E campus.

Whilst it's a group of tall buildings we fully support the regeneration of Bedminster green extra students investment in housing and flats will regenerate Bedminster East and North street shopping centre and students will use local bars, cafes and restaurants

We would also like to see investment in cycle and e scoot facilities on site and good quality public realm around the building with seating.

We would also like to see improvements to Bedminster station new entrance which is wheelchair accessible waiting shelter and CCTV cameras.

And important to local bus shelters. the students flats will also include accessible flats for disabled students.

The design fit in with a tall building policy for the city.

By building students housing we can free up Housing in other part of the city for family housing or housing for local people.

If the flats are not being used in the summer the flats could be used for holidays let's for tourists visiting Bristol and Somerset and Gloucestershire.

We think this is the right location for students housing and welcome the regeneration of Bedminster green .

The flats will also form landmark buildings.

We welcome the opening up of the Malago river

We like to see improvements in the cycle Path network.

We fill with investment in community facilities that this investment in a students village on Bedminster green that this will help regenerate Bedminster shopping centre its Town centre and give Bedminster a night time economy.

Please grant planning permission for this Development

Bristol disability equalities forum would like to see improvements to disabled access at Bedminster station. as part of the master plan including waiting facilities and CCTV.

David Redgewell south west transport network and Railfuture Severnside.

## STATEMENT NUMBER A28

Please reject this proposal as inappropriate for the area, of insufficient quality in design and detrimental to the current community.

I am very pro development in this area. And there are some redeeming features to this application - particularly the provision of dedicated pedestrian and cycle routes. However, overall it is hugely disappointing. The generic, uninspiring blocks will create a massing of buildings that cut off Windmill Hill from central Bristol. This is not high quality urban design.

For the topography and the present style of buildings, the development is too large and will dominate and overshadow (literally) the surroundings. There are not enough gaps and the buildings are too high for the context. The visual impact study suggests that the proposal will ultimately cause harm to the local area because the massing is so high and out of character with its surroundings. The views presented from Bedminster Station and the skateboard park in Victoria Park show a monolithic, impenetrable, overbearing block that won't contribute anything to the character of the area. By obscuring the topography of Windmill hill it also goes against the provisions of the Supplementary Planning Document on Urban Living.

In overshadowing the farm, the loss of sunlight may have a detrimental impact on biodiversity. The farm is a beautiful place of huge importance to the community. Nothing should be done that causes harm to it. As a new mum, this space has been a life-line. Overshadowing it with depressing, un-environmentally friendly tower blocks would be a disaster.

The number of new residents will also overwhelm local services. Recently I had to call Bedminster Family Practice, the nearest GP surgery, 23 times before I even got through to be put into the holding queue. Unless there is significant investment planned, then an increasing number of residents will overwhelm the area.

I'd welcome some student housing in Bedminster - but in the context of provision for a mix of families, social housing, older people and young people.

Please reject this application. It is not what local residents want and it is not what the area, or indeed Bristol, needs. The city will regret this development if it is allowed to go ahead.

Thank you,

Becca Massey-Chase

## STATEMENT NUMBER B1

As you can see, we are besieged by developments at the rear of our gardens. Continual noise, parties, illegal building, illegal residents living on the Merton Road site, huge amounts of noise day and night (angle grinders, beeping, cement machine, sawing, drilling, music, radio by day, party bass thudding by night, coming and going of people collecting items from the unit at the bottom of my garden....so on and so forth....

So why on earth would I want to add to this already stressful situation where my (and all of us from 144 up to about 172 ) suffer from?

Every time we could be in our gardens would be the same times as any pub proposed would be there too. Lunchtimes, evenings, weekends, bank holidays, school holidays and every blinking bit of pub licensing hours we would have noise and be overlooked by yet another development.

There are a lot of students in this area, many of whom have had a lousy time through the pandemic with their mental health. If cheap breakfasts from 8.00 a.m. in a proposed Wetherspoons selling alcohol were allowed so close to where they live it would be very dangerous to their health, both mental and physical.

There are already two pubs, the Anchor and the Royal Oak, who at least don't open till lunchtime. What would happen to their trade if a cheap alternative was available?

Additionally there's a moral argument. Tim Martin was a prominent character trying to persuade people to vote for Brexit. Here, we voted 82% to Remain. Tim Martin then promptly left the UK. He did not furlough his staff and treated them very badly. He is NOT WELCOME round here. Neither is the disregard for the residents in Brynland Avenue, neither is the noise it would add to an already noisy residential area from Roger Blessit's continuing development.

We are overlooked by people (who shouldn't be living there but have been for months on end) already. We do not want more. Back bedrooms are often childrens'. They would be disturbed by noise when they are in bed. Voyeurs could be a danger to them from the proposed Wetherspoons. Our gardens, small though they are, used to be peaceful havens. We don't want anything else to add to our stress. Many people's kitchens and dining rooms can be seen from the proposed site. Our ground level is well below theirs so it is easy for them to look down on us.

I oppose the proposed Wetherspoons wholeheartedly and urge you to turn down this application as you have rightly done (thankyou) with their previous applications.

Many thanks,

Miranda McCabe

STATEMENT NUMBER B2

20/00968/F – 349-353 Gloucester Road, Bristol

Statement by Jamie Pyper – Director, nineteen47 (Agent) on behalf of JD Wetherspoon PLC

The proposals will bring back into use a building which has remained vacant for many years and which as well as detracting from the street scene, in no way contributes to the vitality or viability of the Bishopston Centre.

Those who are familiar with JD Wetherspoon, will know that a large proportion of its sales are food led and there is a focus on providing a family and community friendly atmosphere for all to enjoy. In view of the specifics of this location, we have worked closely with planning and environmental health officers to develop a site specific management plan, with particular focus on match days at the nearby stadium. JD Wetherspoon have venues in other similar locations and as such have considerable experience in effectively managing public houses close to large sporting and concert venues and it is pleasing to note that officers are fully supportive of the proposals following this ongoing dialogue and refinement of management policies.

The building requires substantial investment to bring it back into use, something only an operator of Wetherspoon's scale is likely to be able to justify and this therefore provides a unique opportunity for the building to be sensitively restored to support the vitality and viability of the centre by providing an acceptable town centre use which increases choice to consumers, in accordance with planning policy.

Creating a venue which is compatible with surrounding properties and uses has been carefully considered and the management practices and restrictions which are proposed will ensure that the proposals are compatible with these. JD Wetherspoon have many public houses in sensitive locations including next to dwellings, churches and even a chapel of rest, with these all operating without complaint.

A number of objections to this application focus on them not wanting a 'large chain' at this location. However aside from this not being a material planning consideration, it should be noted that due to the size of the unit and the level of investment required to bring it back into use, it is inevitable that only a company of a certain size would take this building on. Furthermore, following the recently introduced Use Class E, without the need for planning permission, this site could be brought into use by a national chain of restaurants. In operational terms, the proposals are not significantly different to this given a large proportion of the sales will be food based. Furthermore, occupation by a restaurant chain would not attract a CIL liability and these proposals will deliver a contribution of circa £212,000 which will be used to support local services and facilities.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the application is viewed as an opportunity to bring about long overdue positive change to this building, securing significant investment within the local area at a time where public houses are frequently closing as well creating circa 50 full and part time job opportunities as well as offering indirect employment by attracting people to the area who undertake lined trips with other facilities.

On the basis of the above, it is respectfully requested that planning permission be granted.



CRAFT WORKS  
Bespoke Framing  
Art & Craft Materials  
Tel: 0117 9421 644

ZINGER  
Stacker

KFC



NUMBER 349

WETHERSPOON

FREE HOUSE



### STATEMENT NUMBER B3

I received a letter from Bristol City Council on the 20<sup>th</sup> June, as a resident of the area to inform me that this application was going to committee, I was not informed as a councillor, however I have been aware of this application for the past year, as so many residents have expressed a concern about it to me and fellow councillor Lily Fitzgibbon during our campaign and since. As you can see from the planning application documents, there have been many objections to the proposal on several occasions. Since this letter was sent out, I have received a high number of emails from resident who have great concern that this application is being considered for approval. I have not received any emails in its favour.

The main concerns are from those who have businesses on the Gloucester road, or residents who live close to the development site. The concern of residents' centre around a worry of noise, anti-social behaviour, and the crowding of the narrow pavement in front of the building. It has been pointed out by many that there is a bus stop in front of the building, and this could cause problems for people waiting for the bus, either for space, or with drunken people leaving the pub and being rowdy while people wait for the bus.

There has been concern primarily from the residents of Brynland Avenue that this extra pub will cause more noise and anti-social behaviour to the area. These residents have already had issues from the industrial estate next door to the site, with loud noise and anti-social behaviour and do not want more. There are two sports grounds in the area, Gloucestershire Cricket Ground and The Memorial Stadium. There is a concern that another pub, and one that has low prices, will create more anti-social behaviour and noise on match days; using the residential streets to move between the pub and the sports grounds.

Another concern from a resident from Ashley Down Road regards page one paragraph three of the recommendation:

*"The change of use is not found to be harmful to the retail function of the area as a sufficient proportion of retail uses would be maintained, **the use would include active frontage and attract people to the area**, supporting adjacent sites and the town centre."*

In a lot of places, the planning officer's support also relies on the argument that the density of public houses is no different to other areas. Just because something is not overrun for one area does not necessarily apply to all areas, especially in an area where its economy relies on its uniqueness and independence.

In the opposition argument, protection against adverse impacts to an area by the way of increased: noise, odour, litter, and potential anti-social behaviour are also well backed up by local and national policy (e.g. Paragraphs 127 and 180 within the NPPF).

I am not overly satisfied by the applicant's noise assessment. For example, the noise assessment of inebriated people leaving the site only seems to have been assessed directly outside the premises, which is not where the impacts will be most felt. It is my belief that even a street or two away, any increased amount of short-term loud noises, will impact on a predominantly family area. A large increase in the amount of short-term loud noises at night, which this establishment has the potential to generate, could affect a lot of people's quality of life, or cause the public to spend money on their own mitigation, which is very unfair.

Furthermore, I am not happy that the scheme does not have a delivery bay. Unloading will therefore occur on the street, which will not help with traffic management on Gloucester Road, a

current problem in the area. Other larger institutions, such as the Co-Operative next door do not undertake street side unloading. These larger institutions, which ultimately gain from being within the local community and subsequently have a larger impact, should attempt to mitigate their impact on the local area as much as possible. A small point but this is just an example of how the applicant is not attempting to put in appropriate measures to mitigate their impact.

It is clear from the number of objections (239) vs supportive comments (59) that this development is generally not supported by a largely residential area. Despite the fact that the majority of comments considered not suitable due to comments relating to the applicant's business as a whole, Some sense of fair play should be shown. Most comments do cite issues relating to generic public houses, even if the name of the occupant is mentioned; I would say this is quite difficult not to do given the applicant in question.

I would implore the committee to show support for the local community, and refuse a development that: is clearly apposed, is being forced on the local community, and has no tangible benefits to the location in which it is being proposed. In this time of uncertainty, where habits are changing, I would not like to see a development build that would be hard to enforce mitigation on, if things change.

I would also add that the previous rejections of the planning application shows the force of feeling in the area. While there are no doubt some supportive residents, the majority are against the development and I believe that the local residents and business owners would feel very let down if these plans go ahead.



## STATEMENT NUMBER B4

The latest submission for this scheme has, to its credit, attempted to address some of the local policy guideline/development plan shortfalls of the many previous applications, as well as making some effort to mitigate the concerns of the police, residents and councillors. However it is worth noting that to date, this application has been overwhelmingly rejected by local citizens. From well over 250 respondents who have commented, 83% have expressed that they do not want a Wetherspoons here, with less than 1 in 5 in favour. Paragraph 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) states:

'Planning policies and decisions should play an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area.'

The application fails on the 'needs' test in this respect, unless 'need' is taken to mean 'imposition' of a development, against the wishes of its citizens. If local democracy is to mean anything, then this rejection should surely weigh heavily in any Planning decision.

The latest revision (Rev 4,15/01/2021) of the Spectrum planning noise impact assessment states:

'The trading capacity is expected to yield safe numbers of around 850 on site.' This number is repeated elsewhere in the report. I was led to believe the customer capacity was 450 persons. Which is it? I suspect, and truly hope, that the '850 customers' is a typo within the report - and in which case this is not inspire confidence in a report that is all about getting the numbers right! In any event, the number of customers at times of maximum capacity is extremely high, and completely out of character with the capacity of the other pubs in the area. The report also states additional extended opening times at various times in the year:

'However, in addition to the above, the proposed use will remain open for an additional hour on Maundy Thursday, Christmas Eve, Boxing Day, New Year's Eve and all Sundays before a bank holiday.'

Why is this not prominently stated elsewhere in the submitted documents or committee report?

Whilst welcoming suggestions to bring 349 Gloucester Rd back into use to serve the Bishopston Community, as a local resident of nearly 30 years, I feel that, on balance, once again I have to object to the planning application as currently submitted for the following reasons:

Paragraphs 8 & 9 of the NPPF state:

'...promotes healthy and safe communities, and requires the planning system to promote social interaction, create places which are safe and accessible, and enable and support healthy lifestyles.'

'.... promotes sustainable transport which includes promoting opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport.'

Paragraph 108 details that development should also ensure that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users.

Paragraph 110 adds that 'development should give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movement, and second, to facilitating access to high quality public transport services. Development should also address the needs of people with disabilities, allow for the efficient delivery of goods and access by service and emergency vehicles.'

Does a super pub with a capacity for several hundred clientele, with a grand total of 5 customer bicycle spaces pass this requirement, or indeed the The Local Plan Review (March 2019) draft policy T1, which states:

'Proposals should minimise the need to travel by private car and maximise opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport.'

It does not, and the begrudging addition of one extra bike space in this application appears to confirm this. Whilst bus routes stop outside the pub, in the current climate it is car usage is on the increase, and residential streets will endure further traffic pollution and parking issues, already stretched by the many restaurants and pubs in the area, and especially dire on cricket and football matchdays.

Policy Development Management DM23 (2014) states:

'Proposals should be supported by a Transport Assessment and/or Travel Plan where development is likely to have a significant traffic impact. The LPA's Parking standards should also be adhered to.'

Although there are references to trade deliveries, and mention of a customer cab 'policy' in the Planning Statement, I cannot see a specific Transport Assessment or a Travel Plan in the submitted client documentation, although the requirement for one is explicitly stated in the Committee report submitted on 23rd June 2021. However I can see the proposal having a significant traffic impact, so would expect a Plan that honestly addresses the transport/travel issues that will result once the Pub is operational, and how Wetherspoons plan to mitigate any negative effects.

DM10 states:

'Food and Drink Uses and the Evening Economy: DM10 states that food and drink uses will be acceptable, provided that they would not harm the character of the area, residential amenity and/or public safety, either individually or cumulatively. Proposals will be assessed by a number of matters.'

Although the Gloucester Rd once was the subject of a CIA (Cumulative Impact Assessment), I note that all CIAs have been dropped as of August 1st 2020, and whilst I disagree with the reasons given for this change in Planning Policy, I note that a CIA can be re-established at the discretion of the Planning Committee. If there ever was a need to reinstate the Gloucester Road CIA then surely with this application pending, now is the time to do it! If not, then where is the rigorous scrutiny of future developments to be documented? To quote from the previous regulations, the CIA exists to: " create a rebuttable assumption that applications for new premises licences or material variations will normally be refused .... unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant that the operation of the premises in question will not add to the cumulative impact already being experienced in the area."

DM14 states:

'Policy DM14: The Health Impacts of Development: States that development should reduce causes of ill health, improve health and reduce health inequalities within the city. Developments that will have an unacceptable impact on health and wellbeing will not be permitted.'

My argument here would not be so much about what goes on inside the pub, but more the repercussions outside. I have experienced a lot of changes in the time I have lived here, some good, some bad. I would have thought that the addition of a very large licensed premises in an already very sensitive and densely populated area would send alarm bells ringing, with a large residential/student population either side of the Gloucester Rd, and cricket and football grounds very close by. I accept that Wetherspoons endeavour to control what happens within their

boundaries to help avoid flashpoints, but it is the Police who will have to deal with any increase in alcohol fuelled incidents on the streets (already a well documented area of concern), and it is noted that they have already expressed substantial reservations around this proposal in this and past application submissions. Will their recommendations and requirements be met as a part of any planning approval?

Within the Development Plan, policy BCS15 addresses sustainable design as follows:

- "Maximising energy efficiency and integrating the use of renewable and low-carbon energy;
- Waste and recycling during construction and in operation;
- Conserving water resources and minimising vulnerability to flooding;
- The type, life cycle and source of materials to be used;
- Flexibility and adaptability, allowing future modification of use or layout, facilitating future refurbishment and retrofitting;
- Opportunities to incorporate measures which enhance the biodiversity value of development, such as green roofs."

Whilst the inclusion of air sourced heat pumps and solar panels is welcome, I cannot see anything around conserving water resources, or any consideration to biodiversity enhancement. Given that the operations will use large volumes of water, and given that the development abuts the Gloucester Road which regularly breaches legal pollution levels, I would have expected these to form a part of the Sustainability and Energy Statement submitted.

I note that the roof terrace curfew will now be from 2100H, which again is welcome, as is the landscaping, although I have no doubt it will be an intrusion on close neighbours sitting in their gardens during the daytime and early evening, with an occasional increase in Dba cited in the noise report (down from 3Dba to 2Dba in the latest revision - not sure why), and which doesn't cater for sporadic but very annoying shouting/singing which will inevitably occur, despite the comment that staff will monitor noise levels. In addition the Planning Statement says the terrace door will be barred to any further customers entering from 2100H. This suggests customers already on the Terrace will still be present after 2100H. A clarification around this 'drinking up time' should be sought prior to any planning approval being granted.

Also there is reference to the exhaust waste stack being '2.5 metres tall, and above any nearby windows'. Somewhat vague in my opinion. Is any dispersion analysis required to ensure that cooking smells do not pervade residential or public areas?

The close residents affected by noise levels from the roof machinery and beer garden have made their feelings abundantly clear via comments submitted for every iteration of this 'change of use' proposal. They are overwhelmingly opposed to the intrusion this 'Super Pub' will make on their lives. Wetherspoons have made various promises and revisions to their scheme to try and improve the situation. Only time will tell if the theory is proven in practice. What happens when and if the pub changes hands? Will the new owner be similarly attentive, and what legal and enforceable requirements will they be bound in this, and other areas, within the Planning Approval system?

For the reasons above, and most importantly due to the overwhelming rejection by local residents, I feel that this application should be refused, and a more creative solution found for the space, that both satisfies any local need, and is backed by its residents.

Regards,

Tim Prior

## STATEMENT NUMBER B5

Over the past fifty years the market has seen the land use change at this site from supermarket to two retail outlets (class A1 and storage and distribution class B8) and was described in the delegated report dated 10 February 2015 that this made good use of the land. This was only brought to an end when in 2008 the land was acquired to move retail from another location to allow for the application of a super store at the rear of this site. On rejection of the main proposal the relocation never happened. This then brought the site to the market when Wetherspoons became the land owners as we understand it and it is under their ownership that the site finds itself in the current state of disrepair. However to suggest that a large pub use is the only good use of land site at this location is simply not true.

We have challenged from the first application their claim of no previous on site parking and the agent's claim that deliveries were made from the main road, when the design of the building was to allow lorry access with the class B8 status recognised by the current case officer that the applicant if granted planning would be required to remove the drop curb that enabled vehicles to enter.

The case office claims the pub would not compromise the BCS7 regulation by the loss of two retail units which was the possible claim four years ago when there was a fifty-fifty split which may not be the case today. The new pub would be located halfway between the other two pubs so how can there be a case for claims that the pub would not create a significant break in retail shops, when on one side to the Anchor pub you have three properties comprising of one retail unit (Co-op), a betting agents (non-retail) and one with no shop front (reclaimed). On the other side of the site you have fourteen properties before the next pub (Royal oak) with only a possible four retail units in this section which contains the biggest retailers Horders which has just closed.

From a trip generation perspective, this is a new land use yet they have concluded the proposal is likely to have the the majority of movement to be on foot. They do not however reference the 50 staff and 850 customers mentioned in the spectrum document. Consequently they do not believe it would have an adverse impact on the highway network. This does not seem possible when the police state "this stretch of Gloucester Road, which is a major transport route in & out of the city". There must be concern on parking, transport and congestion, they go on to say due to the scale of land use a travel plan was required.

With reference to the two new documents uploaded to the planning website on the 15th June 2021, firstly by Spectrum who consider the occupancy to be 850 patrons, which is almost 50% up on the design and access statement 2015 that list the occupancy as 481. This is an extremely worrying statistic. Both new documents relate this to match-days with spectrum statement "It is very rare that 850 people get up and leave a public house all at once. The only time this may happen would be a match day". Therefore this could happen on Gloucester Road if not now but in the future. Although they would not wish this to happen as highlighted in the new operating plan, which expects 6 extra specialists to maintain control on match days, when we have seen in the past police officers on foot, in vans and on horseback escort a small group of away fans past 349 Gloucester Road.

The spectrum document also states "There would be no licensable activities after 21.00 in the proposed external areas". This is not the case as J D W Management plan states "Smokers will be allowed to use the front forecourt area after 21.00 up until the close of the premises. Vertical drinking will be curtailed in the area by the provision of low level tables and seating which will remain in situ and not be removed to increase capacity at peak times". This was not part of the plans submitted and is not included in the noise assessment. We object to use of this forecourt area as it

has the potential to give rise to a level of noise and disturbance arising from patrons use of this area by day and night and would be harmful to the residential amenities of neighbours occupying the upper floors of nearby properties on Gloucester Road.

For this statement alone from JDWetherspoons on their future plans to run the site in a way contrary to planning permission should be reason for the committee to not approve the application.

**STATEMENT NUMBER B6**

Application No 20/00968/F

Site address 349-353 Gloucester Road BS7 8TG

Statement for the Development Committee A on 30 June 2021

I am a resident close by and do enjoy the bustle and vibrancy of the Gloucester Road.

The redevelopment of a derelict site to create 50 new jobs in a fragile economy and to provide some community life cannot be ignored. Those who oppose the development because they look down on the Wetherspoon product offering are also looking down on our pensioners who will attend coffee mornings, families who will enjoy value for money meals and neighbours who do not have spare cash to afford expensive drinks and snacks. It would be a lost opportunity if this development is turned down.

Kieran Wales

35 Dongola Road

## **STATEMENT NUMBER B7**

I object to this application for a number of reasons:

Most of all I feel that we do not need any more cheap, all day alcohol from a physical and mental health point of view. Very few people are in good mental health at the moment and this application cannot ignore the impact of Covid-19 on us all whether at a local or national level. I feel strongly that allowing this application through would be a dereliction of a duty of care on the part of the council. We need to be working together to make community hubs where we can all come together irrespective of age, religion, ethnicity, gender and a Weatherspoons pub is a long way from offering that degree of unity. As such this seems a wildly inappropriate use of this building. There are already 2 public houses on that section of Gloucester Road. Why do we need another. The Anchor and The Royal Oak are successful pubs with wide ranging customer profiles as far as I can see. They are generally managed well but they do create a lot of late night and weekend noise in particular which is exacerbated by the echo off the back of the houses which creates a stereo effect. The rear gardens of Brynland Avenue do not need any more of that level of noise. Many of those houses have young children living there -it is a popular area for young families. Again more noise from a public house and a terrace that overlooks those gardens and families is highly inappropriate.

I do not have any confidence in the management of this proposed public house to manage the noise and the anti social behaviour that this application would undoubtedly bring.

We need a much more imaginative use of this building.

Rebecca Farrar



## STATEMENT NUMBER B8

Dear Committee,

In response to the invitation to submit a statement to this committee, I would like to express my full objection to the change of use of a retail unit (Use Class E) to public house (Sui Generis) including external alterations, extension, and creation of an external roof terrace at 349-353 Gloucester Road (20/00968/F).

The main reason for my objection is, in my view, this development has very few benefits to the local community and does not outweigh the potential adverse effects it has on it. Therefore, on planning balance, I feel it should be refused. A brief summary of my key points are below.

The planning officer's support seems to be based on the local benefit of the scheme, with the creation of up to 50 jobs, split between part time full-time, and the improvement of an unused building; all of which are backed up by local and national policy. I feel some of these points are very much stretching the benefits to breaking point, an example is on page one paragraph three of the recommendation, which is stated below:

*"The change of use is not found to be harmful to the retail function of the area as a sufficient proportion of retail uses would be maintained, **the use would include active frontage and attract people to the area, supporting adjacent sites and the town centre.**"*

In a lot of places, the planning officer's support also relies on the argument that the density of public houses is no different to other areas. Just because something is not overrun for one area does not necessarily apply to all areas, especially in an area where its economy relies on its uniqueness and independence. I feel this quite strongly, a lot of smaller occupants may lose business, when there are plenty of places in Bristol for people to get low priced food and drink.

In the opposition argument, protection against adverse impacts to an area by the way of increased: noise, odour, litter, and potential anti-social behaviour are also well backed up by local and national policy (e.g. Paragraphs 127 and 180 within the NPPF).

I am not overly satisfied by the applicant's noise assessment. For example, the noise assessment of inebriated people leaving the site only seems to have been assessed directly outside the premises, which is not where the impacts will be most felt. It is my belief that even a street or two away, any increased amount of short-term loud noises, will impact on a predominantly family area. A large increase in the amount of short-term loud noises at night, which this establishment has the potential to generate, could affect a lot of people.

Furthermore, I am not happy that the scheme does not have a delivery bay. Unloading will therefore occur on the street, which will not help with traffic management on Gloucester Road, a current problem in the area. Other larger institutions, such as the Co-Operative next door do not undertake street side unloading. These larger institutions, which ultimately gain from being within the local community and subsequently have a larger impact, should attempt to mitigate their impact on the local area as much as possible. A small point, but this is just an example of how the applicant will impact on the area, without proper mitigation.

It is clear from the number of objections (239) vs supportive comments (59) that this development is generally not supported by a largely residential area. It looks like the planning committee have ignored a lot of comments, citing they are not considered suitable due to comments relating to the applicant's business as a whole. Maybe some fair play should be shown

here. A lot of comments do cite issues relating to generic public houses, even if the applicant itself is apposed; I would say this is quite difficult not to do given the applicant in question.

I would like to see some support for the local community, and refuse a development that: is clearly apposed and has limited benefits to the location in which it is being proposed (that I can see).

Mr Dawson - Local Resident (Ashley Down Road).

## STATEMENT NUMBER B9

I have lived in the flat directly adjacent to this property for the last 9 years and worked at the premises that neighbour it for the last 22 years. Given my experience of serving the local community and residing at the precise area concerned with this application I will be hugely effected by this change in land use and would like to strongly object to and challenge the assumptions and judgements made in the latest reports.

The local planning authority notes that due to the significant scale of the building the only other use would be an unneeded supermarket and that a public house is the only other viable alternative. In conversations with other locals and customers, the overwhelming majority have expressed a desire for more shops and businesses in line with further down the Gloucester Road and feel that there is not a need for more eating or drinking establishments. There used to be two retail units at this location (349 - 353 Gloucester Road) and so regeneration that allowed housing with retail/ mixed use units is more in keeping with this section of Gloucester Road.

Given the "significant scale" of the site, to turn it into a pub would have a range of detrimental consequences for the area that outweigh the benefits of "staff opportunities" and "bringing disused property into use" which any other regeneration would also achieve. The authority feels it would not be an over saturation to add a huge eating or drinking venue, yet standing outside this property I am able to see 15 other businesses offering breakfast, lunch, dinner takeaways and alcohol. This is not including the other pubs or further establishments I would see if I walked a few metres up or down the road.

Whiteladies road was very similar to Gloucester Road 30years ago. Too many licenses were granted, large retail units were turned into bars and pubs and the whole character changed. Speaking to the current character of the area it is largely residential with a lot of young families. We are walking distance from 3 primary schools. Only this weekend I received a phone call from a friend who's an estate agent asking if I knew what was happening with the Wetherspoons development as he'd been contacted by two recent viewers (1 with a young family, 1 hoping to start a family) who were no longer interested in the nearby properties they had seen having read that the application was approved. The authority seem to have dismissed many of the objections on the grounds that it is because they have cited their objections are on the grounds of it being a Wetherspoons yet they seem to use this bias to support their argument for it being turned into a pub because of what a Wetherspoons will offer. I feel that those objecting about it being a "Wetherspoons" do so also because of the sheer size of the proposed build and occupancy, the opening hours and the disturbance that comes with that and would still object if it was a public house run by anyone else. Those supporting the application only seem to be doing so on the basis that it's a Wetherspoons and will offer cheap alcohol and food. Those who think it will offer another dining alternative may find less choice available if it's opening forces other small businesses to close. Wetherspoons closed 17 premises in 2019 including 1 in Bristol. If they did that here a few years from now we would be left with an enormous pub which would be potentially hard to find new landlords and deemed again too costly to repurpose.

Noise disturbance has to be my main concern. I'm incredulous at the conclusion that the existing established use of retail, offices, professional services, restaurants, cafe, gyms, health centres and nurseries is considered to not generate less noise and disturbance than that of a pub! The police have issued statements concerned about the increase in public nuisance and alcohol related crime that a pub of this size would generate. The area is subject to a CIA order supported by residents and police directly for this reason. Other businesses have been refused licenses on the grounds of

disturbance to nearby residents where these residents properties were less close to those premises than I am to this one.

The long opening hours means noise disturbance will be experienced from before 7am until after 12.30 am. Staff entering and leaving will generate noise as well as customers. The entrance according to the plans is literally a few metres from my bedroom window. The noise assessment report was conducted in February which is a quiet month for people to be out and about late at night anyway and I do not feel it accurately represents the noise we experience year round. Living on Gloucester Road we accept a level of noise and disturbance but if this pub is allowed to go ahead the disturbance and effect on mine and my neighbours' quality of life will be too great. At no point was I or my neighbour contacted to see if equipment could be put on our properties to gauge noise pollution. Even with all the proposed noise mitigation measures inside the premises it does not stop sound as inebriated customers leave. Given the sheer number of potential customers leaving at these times of the night is hugely problematic. The report seems happy with Wetherspoons management policy on how they say they will deal with problems of noise and behaviour issues yet you only have to look on social media at the videos following the most recent bank holiday to see the fights at other Wetherspoons to see this management policy is not successful in practice. The noise from the beer garden (although closing at 9) will also reduce the enjoyment of our garden and our neighbours garden especially as having a young family we would rarely be out much past 9pm anyway. I am also extremely concerned that under the latest plans submitted the outdoor area at the front street level (metres below my bedroom window) will be allowed to be used for smoking and vertical drinking until 12.30am. I can assure you this will affect my health and well-being.

The only entrance to mine and my neighbours property is via the driveway adjacent to the proposed entrance/exit. I personally will feel more unsafe coming home late at night. The pub will have no control over the actions of its patrons once they have left or been evicted from the premises. We have encountered people using our driveway to take drugs, use as a urinal or place to vomit. You only have to see the state of the pavements in the surrounding streets on the school run Monday morning to see another alcohol venue is not needed in the area.

The level of disturbance will be unbearable on days with sporting fixtures. The latest report suggests as many as 850 customers at one time (a number which seems inadequately catered for in the management proposal) The potential for damage to property, public nuisance, highway disruption and accidents at this point on Gloucester Road would be high given the proximity to our driveway's vehicular access, the bus stop, busy traffic and general footfall on what is already a narrower stretch of pavement and road than elsewhere on Gloucester Road. This will put more pressure on local emergency services.

The other two closest pubs have earlier closing times later opening start times and shorter kitchen opening times which reduces the negative impact on local residents. It is worth noting that both these premises have side roads next to them and no residential properties immediately adjacent.

I feel the plans also put myself and my neighbours at risk from increased light pollution and disturbance from the noise from deliveries/collections and the noise and smells from the plant equipment generated from a massive public house.

Please reject this application

Yours sincerely

Jennifer Maddalena

## STATEMENT NUMBER C1

### Objection to Application Number 21/00746/F

#### 6 Clyde Park, Bristol BS6 6RR

Dr Jonathan French, The Coach House, Clyde Lane, Bristol BS6 6QQ

I am disappointed to say that the officer's report is inaccurate and lacks local knowledge of this conservation area. To be clear, there has been universal criticism from the community, including 60 objections in total from residents, an independent planning consultancy, a heritage expert, RCAS, and two local councillors.

#### **Mews developments in gardens are not recognised/established and will harm the area**

As a local I must stress that developments in residential gardens are not already recognised/established in this area. The site is a residential garden that backs onto a narrow, single lane. The referenced properties in Clyde Mews and The Coach House were brownfield developments on the site of a factory and a derelict printworks respectively. This proposal therefore would be the first case of a mews development in a garden here, setting a precedent by which gardens along the rest of this narrow lane could be developed, as well as across this conservation area and others.

#### **Harm to the conservation area**

Zoe Wilcox, who will be present at the meeting, adopted The Cotham & Redland Conservation Area Character Appraisal in 2011. In this document, she describes the main threats to the local conservation area as being: development or overlaying of gardens resulting in loss of trees, increase in number of HMOs in the area putting increased pressure on the public realm in terms of on-street parking and refuse, continued or increased loss of gaps between houses through development in side plots and gardens preventing views and reducing verdant character, continued or increased unsympathetic roof level alterations that impact negatively on the appearance of the Conservation Area from the public realm. This proposal represents all of these threats and therefore I urge the council to take this opportunity now, in Ms Wilcox's own words, for "positive use of development management powers to prevent development of planned gaps between and rear garden plots where it would have a negative impact on the character of the Conservation Area".

#### **Parking, access, and road safety**

Had the officer visited the site they would know there is no access to Chandos Road down the lane, which is not 100m as described, but a convoluted quarter mile walk. This is therefore not a sustainable location and it is naive to think future occupants will not own at least one car, and immediately appeal to the council for a permit. The recommendation that no permit should be provided for the property is an informative and not binding, so can change in the future. This lane is already congested. Our house has been scraped many times by larger vehicles trying to navigate the tight corner. We regularly have to ask owners of cars to move them to allow access for bin lorries and larger vehicles to the lane, used by 19 households. Had the officer visited the site they would have known there is no turning possible down the lane for lorries, which have to reverse all the way. This already creates danger for the many children who play on the street. There is no space for demolition, erecting of scaffolding, alterations to the wall, or parking of construction vehicles without blocking the lane. There are 5 NHS workers here and we require constant vehicle access. After the build there would still be no possibility for loading or unloading at the proposed site without blocking the lane. The council has a responsibility toward the physical and mental wellbeing of existing residents and the wider community.

#### **Privacy and overshadowing**

On a personal note, the front window would look straight into our bedroom and represents a massive invasion of privacy. The proposed screen is inadequate as it could be easily removed in the future, for example for maintenance or cleaning, and I have low confidence in it being replaced in a timely manner. Replacing a garage with a two-storey building will also clearly cause overshadowing of our property as well as of the adjacent gardens for a significant part of the year.

The local knowledge lacking in the report is key to understanding the strong public resistance to this proposal. We implore the panel to take heed of these concerns and, if they feel unable to reject this proposal outright, at the very least to defer the decision to make a visit to the site in order to reach an informed and balanced verdict. I thank the panel for their time and consideration.

## STATEMENT NUMBER C2

### Written submission and request to speak at the Development Control Committee, Wednesday 30 June 2021

**Application no.** 21/00746/F **Site address:** 6 Clyde Park Bristol BS6 6RR

The officer's report regarding this case fails to address the unsuitability of the location or the validity of the 60 objections received. The recommendations in this report should be rejected and permission to build refused.

The Officer Report incorrectly states that 24 properties objected to the application. The first application received a total of 29 objections and the second a further 31. These included objections from Councillors Cleo Lake and Guy Poultney, plus objections from a Planning Consultant, a Heritage expert, and the Redland & Cotham Amenities Society.

The residents' comments the Officer has put forward create an impression of a 'not in my back yard' attitude. This is inaccurate and fails to address the serious nature of the comments submitted.

Andrew Foyle, an expert in Bristol's architecture and conservation areas, and David Glasson, a Planning Specialist, submitted appraisals which identify harm to the conservation area. These have not been referenced. Several objections also state the application does not enhance or safeguard the Conservation Area and sits in conflict with policies BCS22, DM26 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Many objections eloquently demonstrate how the proposed build is precisely the threat described in the Council's own Cotham & Redland Character Appraisal (2011) as it will remove valuable garden space. This is summarised on pg 43, clause 7.1.5h as follows;

"Landscape & Trees. There are no street trees in the area, though there is a verdant character owing to the views to distant mature trees, framed by distinctive copper beeches. The lack of street trees is compensated for by shrubs and small trees planted in front gardens, and views to rear garden planting via gaps between houses."

This document also states; "The conservation area is weakened by the use of inappropriate materials and the loss of historic views through development over 'planned gaps.'"

The Officer has failed to identify that Clyde Mews is separate to Clyde Lane. Clyde Mews is a collection of six 3 storey 1500 square foot properties built on the site of an old builder's yard. The Coach House is a 3 bedroom 2 storey property on Clyde Mews built on the site of a derelict printworks. None of these buildings have removed green space or gardens, but have removed derelict businesses and introduced 3 bedroom homes to the area, which the LSOA confirms is the requirement for Cotham. Historical and photographic evidence has been provided in 1 Clyde Lane's objection, incorrectly categorised on BCC's planning site as a 2<sup>nd</sup> objection from 21 Clyde Road. There are no mews houses on Clyde Lane.

The report confirms that the LSOA calculation here is 77% flat to 22% housing but fails to recognise Cotham is the most densely populated ward in Bristol. To bring this to life; the 150m area of the junctions of Elliston Road, Clyde Lane and Clyde Mews adjacent to the proposed property is comprised of 26 buildings. These properties house 59 dwellings which currently accommodate in the region of 90 residents in houses, flats and HMOs. This junction is already at capacity, but the Officer is prepared to grant a 2 bedroom 4 person property - the equivalent of yet another flat.

I have been asked to comment on the Government's planning white paper by Thangham Debbonaire MP. The proposal to approve this application directly conflicts with the future for planning. Why wait to adopt important principles such as those summarised below;

"Planning matters. Where we live has a measurable effect on our physical and mental health: on how much we walk, on how many neighbours we know or how tense we feel on the daily journey to work or school."

"Areas that are Protected – this would include sites and areas which, as a result of their particular environmental and/or cultural characteristics, would justify more stringent development controls to ensure sustainability. This would include areas such as ...Conservation Areas, Local Wildlife Sites...At a smaller scale it can continue to include gardens in line with existing policy in the National Planning Policy Framework."

Planning for the Future, Government white paper August 2020

To ignore this direction of thinking simply because it has yet to be introduced is reactive and short-sighted.

The Chandos Road Neighbourhood Association is working with both the Mayor's Office and this Council to introduce more greenery for all residents to enjoy. For Bristol Planning to set a precedent and state that it would not discourage future proposals to remove gardens goes against the national momentum for more urban green space and conflicts with the efforts of a community that's passionate to preserve this heritage green area for the enjoyment of everyone.

The two previous planning applications you are considering today between them offer much needed opportunities for employment, regeneration of defunct land and positive opportunities for the construction industry and small community-based businesses. The application for 6 Clyde Park in comparison does nothing for the housing crisis or the regeneration and growth of the city. It is an opportunity for pure personal profit - at the expense of the community and the conservation area.



**Written Public Forum Statement in relation to planning application no. 21/00746/F for submission to Control Committee A at its meeting on Wednesday 30 June 2021**

**Application no. 21/00746/F**

The decision to grant permission to undertake this development is wrong and deeply flawed.

The Officer Report is misleading and inaccurate and suggests an unhealthy and ill-informed bias towards awarding planning permission regardless of facts, opinions, policies and legislation. It demonstrates a lack of rigour, substance and due respect for the public consultation process.

I might be forgiven for thinking that the Planning Officer and other Officers have not actually been to the site. The Committee should not use this report to support the proposal to grant planning permission.

The following points highlight inaccuracies and misrepresentations made in the Officer Report:

1. There have been in excess of 60 individual objections made, including from Councillors and local amenity organisations. The vast majority of these objections are substantial in their arguments and concerns, with many challenging the appropriateness of the development in relation to BCC Planning and Conservation Area policies. The Officer report describes 24 local properties and lists an unrepresentative and predominantly low key selection of points of objection I would direct the committee to read these substantial objections first hand and in detail, then add this weight of information and opinion to the somewhat lightweight edited points in the Officer's Report
2. The proposed development is in a well-established conservation area where no similar (mews style) properties are present. The location is within residential gardens backing onto Clyde Lane. The 'mews development' referred to in the report as a basis for continued development, is on a site at the end of Clyde Lane (Clyde Mews) and was built on a Brownfield site in c1989. I would direct the Committee to review the objection submitted by Dr Frankish - No1 Clyde Lane (incorrectly added to the portal as a duplicate address No 21 Clyde Road) as this clearly shows the site of this development and confirms that it was not built on residential land or gardens. The proposed development cannot be considered to be as described as 'subservient' as there are no properties in gardens in this immediate area to be subservient to.
3. The proposed development will be a 2 bed 4 bed space property which (subject to legal viability of building across the Line Of Junction on both boundaries, as per



current plans) might just meet the minimum space standards. The resultant c850 Sq Ft (80 Sq M) property will in effect be the same size or smaller than the average 2 bedroom flat in this area. The report identifies that the current flat to house ratio is 77%-22%. This LSOA is recognised as the most densely populated in Bristol. This development will deliver more high density low quality living space with minimal amenity space.

This development will not deliver the type of (3 bed family) housing that BCC has identified as a requirement and will not

contribute to solving Bristol's housing problems, moreover it will support a profit driven development with a likely value in excess of £600k in the heart of one of the most expensive areas of Bristol.

I would direct the Committee to discuss the nature of Bristol's housing needs with Ms Wilcox and her team to establish if this type of development is acceptable within the context of current housing policies and incoming planning legislation .

4. The Officer Report has failed to show understanding of the Conservation Area and Character Appraisal. The BCC Character Appraisal (2011) was (created) and signed off by Ms Wilcox.

I would again direct the Committee to ask Ms Wilcox directly to explain the nature of the Appraisal Document, in particular the Risks and Threats identified in it and the impact from the proposed development in relation to these.

5. The Officer Report has not given reasonable consideration to the loss of privacy and loss of amenity to the immediate neighbours, No 5 Clyde Park, No 28 Woodfield Road and the Coach House. Where the issue of privacy has been considered in relation to the Coach House, the accepted solution to mitigate the impact of a proposed window looking directly into the main bedroom is the fitment of a louvered panel.

This is a wholly inadequate and unviable solution, to address such a direct loss of privacy, especially given the potentially serious nature of consequences from this. The proposed louvre panel can be modified, altered or removed at any time.

I would direct the Committee to carefully study the location of the window and the proposed solution in detail but also consider the realistic likelihood of an enforcement action from BCC should the critical louvered panel be removed. To help answer this question I would suggest (based on BCC data) that the level of successful planning enforcement since 2011 has been less than 25%.

Granting permission to build this property will cause harm to the area, amenity and local residents alike. It will cause further overcrowding, loss of privacy, access and parking issues and if the Officer Report is to be believed, it also sets a dangerous precedent to build a residential street in an area which has no need or capacity for further housing. This will simply allow further opportunity for individuals to cash in on what is recognised as the most expensive area of Bristol, with no value added to the local area, community or City as a whole.

## STATEMENT NUMBER C4

### Written submission and request to speak at the Development Control Committee, 30 June 2021

Application no: 21/00746/F Site address: 6 Clyde Park Bristol BS6 6RR

We are concerned that the OR makes no reference to the loss of amenity to 5 Clyde Park and contravenes Core Strategy Policy BCS21 and Policies DM27 and DM29 that require development to safeguard the residential amenity of surrounding properties in respect of overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of outlook, and loss of daylight. In both our original and updated objections, we tried to highlight how significant the impact this proposed building would be on our home (which adjoins No. 6), with a major loss of privacy and overshadowing of our property and neighbours. Our primary concerns are:

#### 1. Loss of privacy

- The first-floor window at the westerly end will look directly into our property, which will feel like a direct invasion of our privacy. Not only will we have a window looking in at us, but in return we will have unavoidable views into the proposed house which will make us feel awkward.
- The application says *"the proposed dwelling has no windows in either side elevation to avoid any overlooking issues with the neighbouring gardens"* yet the drawings show windows/roof lights in the bedroom and they will be looking out directly onto our garden.

#### 2. Scale

- The application says *"the two-storey element of the building is confined to the footprint of the existing garage in order to reduce any overbearing/overshadowing of the neighbouring gardens"* but the proposed drawings contradict this, showing the two-storey part of the building is almost twice the length of the existing garage. The design seems to contravene what the pre-application presupposes with respect to current building lines by extending significantly further towards the houses of Clyde Park than the existing garage, as well as around 300mm wider than the existing garage.

#### 3. Overshadowing and loss of light

- The application says *"the low eaves and ridge level achieved by sinking the ground floor level result in no significant overshadowing to the neighbouring gardens"* which is inaccurate. The creation of a two-storey property will have significant impacts on the daylight we currently enjoy, overshadowing much of our garden in the morning, as well as later in the day during the winter months. The building would also overshadow the Coach House, resulting in significant loss of light into their home.
- The shadow analysis is misleading and the use of a bird's eye view does not accurately reflect the impact this building would have.

Additionally, the Officer's report appears to have entirely missed or ignored the professional insight of both the planning consultant David Glasson's letter and the Heritage Assessment from Andrew Foyle. I would appeal to this committee to read this assessment, which clearly identifies mews development like this not being previously established or recognised. This was also the conclusion of a separate heritage report undertaken by David Hague in response to a withdrawn application at 3 Clyde Park (ref 20/06226/F).

Furthermore, there appears to be no serious acknowledgement in the OR that this proposed development sits within a conservation area. There is a covenant dating back to 1869 stating that no other separate building should be erected on the properties of Clyde Park. Objections have also been lodged by RCAS and both previous and current Local Councillors.

Before making your decision, I would kindly request that the committee undertakes a site visit to appreciate the situation on the ground and the impact this building would have on the direct neighbours and wider area. We are deeply concerned the construction of this first building would set an unacceptable precedent for the creation of a new street of individual houses along Clyde Lane, creating a whole new development pattern of independent houses that neither complement nor take inspiration from the surrounding architecture and erode the Conservation Area.

**Tom Gilks**

## STATEMENT NUMBER C5

### Development Control Committee Meeting - 30.06.21 6, Clyde Park/Clyde Lane, Redland - Applicn.no. 21/00746/F

1. This development does not safeguard or enhance the Conservation Area (and is contrary to policy BCS22 and the NPPF).
2. The OR (see pp. 10-13) speaks of mews developments having been 'established' in the gardens. It is a basic misunderstanding of the character of the area. No dwellings have so far been built in the gardens of Clyde Park properties; nor have they been there historically. The earliest OS plan of 1884 shows no mews dwellings in gardens but collective mews/coach houses etc. (not dwellings) on the site of the present houses at the end of Clyde Lane. These houses replace a 20<sup>th</sup> century commercial development. The proposed development is harmful to the Conservation Area and CA Appraisal ('CAA') because:
  - (1) it ignores a careful appraisal by the expert heritage architect, Andrew Foyle, (none was provided by applicant);
  - (2) this appraisal identifies harm:
  - (3) this harm is loss of views across and through gardens (CAA p. 49 – this loss is seen as a weakness and a threat to the CA);
  - (4) loss of views to St. Saviours Church (non-designated heritage asset) which is plainly adversely impacted (CAA 7.1.6 & 7.5.3) both from Clyde Lane and from Elliston Road terrace which is itself a heritage asset of importance. The CA appraisal by Andrew Foyle shows these are harms which should be avoided. [OR, pp. 10-13].
3. Committee should not support the alleged principle of further development here because it is contrary to CA Appraisal and because of obvious harm. Officer has not correctly assessed the character of the CA here. The development will not appear as a 'subservient traditional mews property' because there are no such properties here in the gardens. There are no, and never have been, dwellings in the gardens - hence they cannot be 'traditional'. [OR, p. 12].
4. It is contrary to the Clyde Road Lower Super Output Area (LSOA): it is not a family house (as accepted by officer) and therefore does not provide accommodation that is needed in the area. Instead it is flat size (2 bed) with almost no amenity space and cramped. This simply provides another flat where there is an overprovision of flats in the LSOA, as explained in OR, and which is not needed. The OR seems to think this is of no consequence [OR, pp. 9-10].
5. There is obviously a major difference between the residents who have provided a planning assessment by an experienced planning consultant, David Glasson MRTPI, which sets out reasons why the development should not proceed and sets out reasons for refusal. This document is not referred to in the OR. Nor is the expert heritage assessment by Andrew Foyle, MA, which wholly differs from the officer assessment and finds harm to the CA.
6. Given these differences we ask the Committee to defer its decision and view the impact from Clyde Lane and the surrounding area and on the CA and neighbouring properties, particularly no. 5 which was omitted from the OR assessment.

Peter Wadsley

## STATEMENT NUMBER C6

Application No. 21/00746/F

My name is Simon Bennett and I am the brother in law of the applicant.

I would like to make some key points in support of the proposal before you today:

- The Flanagan family have lived at 6 Clyde Park for 55 years
- The family are close knit and are very much part of the local Redland community
- The proposed development is in the existing garden of number 6
- It is highly likely that when built the property will be initially occupied by family members
- The existing garage is now becoming unsafe and will require demolition at some stage
- The family has been through the development management process, and, following an encouraging pre-application response, have always endeavoured to positively respond to officer and consultee feedback on the new mews house that is proposed to replace a dilapidated garage fronting Clyde Lane
- Notwithstanding a surprisingly high level of local interest in the application, the proposed 2-bedroom mews house is small in scale and has been sensitively designed to not harm the amenity of any neighbouring properties
- Moreover, as noted in the officer report, the proposal will be an appropriate and acceptable addition to its mews setting, in keeping with adjoining properties, and, importantly, preserving the character and appearance of the wider Cotham and Redland Conservation Area
- The proposed mews house is a well-considered, sustainable, and high-quality new dwelling that is an efficient use of a brownfield plot of land, and is strongly in line with local and national planning policies
- We are not property developers and the build will be financed by the family

I very much hope that you will accept the recommendation of the planning officer and vote in favour of the proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

Simon Bennett

## **STATEMENT NUMBER C7**

### **Objection to Application Number 21/00746/F)**

**6 Clyde Park, Bristol BS6 6RR**

**Guy Poultney (Councillor for Cotham)**

I would strongly encourage the Committee to reject this application. The development demolishes a small, low garage sited in the garden of 6 Clyde Park and replaces it with a two-storey house fronting onto a section of Clyde Lane which has no other houses on it.

### **Parking**

As acknowledged by the Bristol City Council Transport Development Management on Pg. 5 of the officer's report, *"the area already experiences parking stress due to insufficient parking, any additional vehicles associated with future residents will make this worse for existing residents in the local area."*

This development removes off-street parking spaces and adds demand for additional parking spaces. It also requires the felling of a cherry tree and an apple tree to do so, with no remaining room for on-site replacement. The suggested mitigation – plant trees elsewhere and deny any residents parking permits is inadequate.

### **Mixed and Balanced Community**

As acknowledged in the Officer's report (on Pg. 8) – there is a huge imbalance in this part of Cotham between flats (78%) and family homes (22%). This data is based on 2011 census data – since when the problem has dramatically worsened.

The number of the family homes has been further significantly reduced by the number of HMO conversions permitted by BCC, as well as further subdivision of family homes into flats. The effect of this has been a radical over-densification with huge implications for the residential amenity of the neighbourhood. Local infrastructure has been stretched beyond breaking point, and problems with street waste, parking problems, and noise issues have become endemic.

Policy BSC18 of the adopted Core Strategy states *"...developments should contribute to a mix of housing types and avoid excessive concentrations of one particular type"* that development *"should aim to contribute to the diversity of housing in the local area and help to redress any housing imbalance that exists"*.

There is an existing dramatic imbalance which this development would clearly worsen: it reduces the volume of land designated for large family homes and replaces it with a type of property of which there is already oversupply – adding to the existing and unacceptable problems being experienced by local residents as a result of this imbalance.

## The character or appearance of this part of the Cotham & Redland Conservation Area

Policy BCS21 requires new development to “*contribute positively to an area's character and identity*” and Policy DM26 clearly states “*Development will not be permitted where it would be harmful to local character and distinctiveness*” and “*backland development will be expected to be subservient in height, scale, mass and form to the surrounding frontage buildings.*”

Policy DM27 requires that “*the height, scale and massing of development should be appropriate to the immediate context, site constraints, character of adjoining streets and spaces and setting.*”

As noted in the Officer’s report, Bristol Core Strategy Policy BCS22 requires development to “*safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including Conservation Areas.*” and “*The Cotham and Redland Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2011) states that new development or infill that fails to respect the character of an area, or ignores the predominant building lines, scale, proportions, details or materials etc. can cause **serious harm** to the special interest of the Conservation Area.*”

This development would represent a further act of over-densification – resulting from the desire by developers to maximise the monetary value of every square inch of land. There are no other dwellings on this side of this section of Clyde Lane for the proposed development to be subservient to.

The development proposed adds an isolated two-storey house to a row of back gardens, sheds and small garages. While the proposed building itself may be similar to nearby properties, it entirely ignores the predominant building lines, scale and proportions of its location. It is entirely out of keeping with the existing layout, completely inappropriate to the locality, and causes serious harm to the Conservation area.

Furthermore, these threat are explicitly articulated in the Cotham and Redland Character Appraisal and Management Proposals which include as “Main Issues Affecting Residential Areas” the following:

- Loss of trees
- Loss of ... gardens to infill
- Volume of on-street parking
- Subdivision of properties into flats adding pressure to the public realm.

These problems are all directly worsened by this proposed development. The proposals also note the “*verdant character given by trees and planting in private gardens and street trees.*” as a strength of this locality (pg. 56) and the same document observes that “*Where roads are developed on one side only the existing trees to rear gardens are a valuable feature.*” (Pg. 40). This is precisely the case here – and a strength that would be threatened by the proposed development.

### Garden Loss

Policy DM21 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies sets out three tests for allowing development under these circumstances – none of which are met:

**1) The proposal would represent a more efficient use of land where higher densities are more appropriate**

Higher densities are not appropriate here. The policy concerned clearly states in its explanatory notes that this test is not met unless “the proposed development would not result in harm to the character of the area” (DM21 Bristol Local Plan Review: Retained Local Plan Policies Pg. 38). As previously noted, the locality is over-developed and has become unbalanced in terms of property types which is acknowledged as harmful under Policy BSC18 of the adopted core strategy

### **2) The development will result in a significant improvement to the urban design of the area**

Policies DM30 and DM31 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies require development to “safeguard the amenity of the host premises and neighbouring occupiers”.

The proposed development emphatically does not contribute positively to the area’s character or identity, and actively harms it by contributing further to over inappropriate over-densification in an entirely inappropriate location.

### **3) The proposal is an extension to an existing dwelling**

It is not an extension (as confirmed in the officers’ report on pg. 7)

## **Conclusion**

I would respectfully ask the Committee to acknowledge the precedent this development would set. In this case the developer seeks to maximise the value of the property’s footprint by cramming an additional two-storey dwelling into a garden setting where it is entirely inappropriate.

The development proposed constitutes a significant loss of amenity for neighbouring properties and contributes to recognised problems of over-densification, the further subdivision of properties in the area, and the excessive concentration of smaller dwellings. It cannot possibly be said to be good design.

The development takes a discreet row of back gardens, sheds and small garages and adds a two-storey house entirely out of keeping with its surroundings. Not only is it detrimental and harmful to the character and identity of the area in its own right, it worsens an acknowledged and serious existing harm, and creates a greater potential for more harm in the future.

This has been recognised by past and present local councillors, local residents, neighbouring dwellings, local planning groups, and residents’ associations. I would urge the committee to recognise the overwhelming objections from the local community and reject this application.

Yours sincerely,

Guy Poultney (Councillor for Cotham)

## **STATEMENT NUMBER C8**

I live at 28 Woodfield Road, next door to the proposed development. It is our party wall that will be demolished if this development is approved.

I want to emphasise; this is not an objection for the sake of it. I do appreciate there is a need for new residential properties and I am not a NIMBY.

I also understand that planning officers have an exceedingly difficult decision to make due to the significant number of objections that have been raised.

If this decision is made with a desk-based review of the plans, then this will be a huge mistake. I appreciate that decision makers cannot do site visits for every application submitted. However, in this case, a site visit is imperative to really understand the objections being made.

The garden spaces adjacent to Clyde Lane are beautiful and an oasis of calm which helps with neighbour's wellbeing. If these are built on, they will be destroyed forever to be replaced by a patchwork of new builds from different developers.

To create a row of 'Mews' houses in Clyde Lane will be a fundamental error. If this application is accepted, then developers will be queuing up to build on the other gardens leading onto Clyde Lane. I do not accept the precedent that Mews houses have already been built in Clyde Mews. That development was a coordinated build to replace industrial buildings and the footprint was such that there was space available. This development made sense. Indeed, our garden backs onto this development and we have no issues with it even though we have 6 Mews houses backing onto our garden.

This development is being 'shoehorned' into a space that is not suitable and will create significant problems for local residents. The additional traffic that will be created even after the build is completed will inevitably lead to road accidents as the narrow lane was not intended for this type of build. The residents of Clyde Mews will be blocked in frequently due to delivery vans. I have this problem every day in Woodfield Road where delivery drivers make no attempt to park safely and simply leave their van in the middle of the road during deliveries. As there are a number of medical people living in Clyde Mews who will be on call, those lost minutes could have catastrophic consequences if a delivery van is left in the middle of Clyde Lane,

Turning to the issues with my property:

The plans are deliberately misleading and the scale is simply not correct. Incredibly, our property is not even referenced on the plans as it shows 7 Clyde Road as the neighbouring house. The plans give the impression this development will not impact people's privacy which is simply untrue.

The plan 092-EX-01 refer to one tree in our garden next to the boundary wall. However, they do not include the apple tree to the left of this which is against the boundary wall. Both apple trees, a pear tree and established shrubs will need to be cut down if this boundary wall is demolished. The photos included at the end of this objection give you an impression of the existing boundary wall and the established greenery that will be destroyed,

The proposed development will be built against our boundary wall and will have a significant impact on our quality of life in terms of security when the boundary wall is demolished, noise pollution, and loss of privacy.



The plan 092-GA-06 make assumptions regarding our garden level against the boundary wall. We were not consulted on the plans, so estimates have been used which are inaccurate and misleading. The ground level at 6 Clyde Road is significantly higher than our garden so the height of the development will be potentially higher than the plans demonstrate. The proposal to dig down 60cm is insignificant when you consider the garden level at 6 Clyde Road is significantly higher than ours.

The plan 092-GA-09 seems to imply our boundary wall is higher than it actually is. This plan is again misleading from our perspective and will have a greater detrimental effect than is indicated.

The plan 092-GA-10 includes windows overlooking the development. This plan is significantly misleading from our perspective. There are several windows from our property that will overlook and be overlooked by the development and have been conveniently ignored in this planning application. 1. There are two kitchen windows. 2. Four glass doors leading from our kitchen. 3. One lounge window. 4. Bedroom 1 window. 5. Bedroom 2 window.

The design and access statement mentions this development has been planned 'in order to reduce any overbearing or overshadowing of the neighbouring gardens'. This is simply not true. The new development will be against our garden wall and directly in our eye line from the lounge, kitchen and two bedrooms.

In conclusion, considering all the other public comments regarding wildlife, noise pollution, loss of light etc this planning application must be rejected.

## Amendment Sheet 30 June 2021

### Item 1: - Plot 3, Dalby Avenue And Whitehouse Lane Bristol

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
Page 44	<p><b>RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION</b></p> <p>Since the Committee Report was published, a further 5 comments were received. All 5 comments were in objection.</p> <p>The further points of objection cited were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revisions do not address previous objections made.</li> <li>• Object to student accommodation.</li> <li>• Need for affordable and family housing in the area.</li> <li>• Object to the proposed design and height of the buildings.</li> <li>• Pressure on local services, amenities, parking and green space.</li> <li>• Increase in noise and anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• Insufficient green space provided.</li> <li>• Shadowing and loss of natural light to the City Farm and areas within the site.</li> <li>• Overlooking between the buildings and lack of privacy.</li> <li>• Quality of living conditions and impact on the mental health of students.</li> </ul> <p>Officer Note: In reviewing these points above, it is considered that the Committee Report already addresses the further points of objection raised.</p>
Pages 91 - 108	<p><b>CONDITIONS</b></p> <p>Since the Committee Report was published, amendments are proposed to the following conditions.</p> <p><b>Condition 7 Living Roofs</b></p> <p>Condition 7 is to be amended to read as follows:</p> <p><i>Prior to commencement of development of the relevant building, a method statement provided by a qualified ecological consultant or landscape architect shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for the creation of living roofs on the site which include calcareous wildflowers and do not employ a significant area of <del>Sedum (Stonewort)</del>. This shall include details of the layout and area, construction, design and maintenance of the living roof. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the method statement or any amendment approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</i></p> <p><i>Reason: To conform with Policy DM29 in the Local Plan which states that 'proposals for new buildings will be expected to incorporate opportunities for green infrastructure such as green roofs, green walls and green decks.'</i></p> <p><b>Condition 41 Flood Risk</b></p> <p>The Environment Agency has amended its recommended condition in relation to Flood Risk, Condition 41 is to be amended to read as follows:</p> <p><i>The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment (FRA) by Hydrock (ref 11536-HYD-PH1-XX-RP-FR-0001 dated 30 November 2020) and the following mitigation measures it details:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Finished floor levels shall be set to a minimum of between 8.921 - 9.004 metres</i></li> </ul>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p><i>above Ordnance Datum (AOD) depending on the building location as outlined in FRA Appendix B – Hydrock Hydraulic Modelling Technical Design Note dated 30 November 2020.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Where finished floor levels are below 9.3 metres AOD, Flood Resilience measures referenced in FRA Appendix B – Hydrock Hydraulic Modelling Technical Design Note dated 30 November 2020 (page 6) shall be utilised.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Reason: These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to first occupation and be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.</i></p>

**Item 2: - 349-353 Gloucester Road Horfield Bristol BS7 8TG**

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	No amendments

**Item 3: - 6 Clyde Park Bristol BS6 6RR**

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	No amendments