

Development Control A Committee Agenda



Date: Wednesday, 22 September 2021

Time: 2.00 pm

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

Distribution:

Councillors: Richard Eddy (Chair), John Geater, Paul Goggin, Fi Hance, Tom Hathway, Philippa Hulme, Steve Pearce, 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) and Claudette Campbell (Democratic Services Officer)

Issued by: Jeremy Livitt, Democratic Services
City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol BS3 9FS
Tel:

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Date: Tuesday, 14 September 2021

Agenda

7. Public Forum

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item.

(Pages 4 - 51)

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 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 5 pm on Thursday 16 September.

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 12.00 noon on Tuesday 21 September.

Members of the public who wish to present their public forum statement, question or petition at the meeting must register their interest by giving at least two clear working days' notice prior to the meeting by **2pm on Friday 17 September**.

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.



Amendment Sheet 22 September 2021

Item 1: - Former Car Park College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3HX

Paragraph no.	Amendment/additional information
4.6	<p>Paragraph 4.6 should read:</p> <p>Provision is made for 20% affordable housing, to be secured by legal agreement. This equates to 13 homes within Block B. The breakdown of the affordable housing is 4 x 1 bedroom (including 1 M4(3) compliant); 5 x 2 bedroom (for 3 people) and 4 x 2 bedroom homes (for 4 people).</p>
4.8	<p>Sustainability and Energy</p> <p>The Applicants were invited to give further thought to the provision of Air Source Heat Pumps (ASHP) and PV panels.</p> <p>In response the Applicants commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding the ASHPs, the scheme is committed to the use of this technology and the applicant is confident that it will work. Detailed design for this element can be matter for post determination, via condition. - Regarding the use of PVs, the following statement has been prepared by the application's sustainability consultant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The scheme has been designed taking a fabric first approach to reduce energy demand focussing on optimal form, high performance building fabric and highly efficient low carbon heating via air source heat pumps. The building fabric design is in line with the indicative Future Homes Standard specification outlined in the table below (with ever so slightly relaxed U-values on glazing and wall build-ups). - Under current Building Regulations requirements, the development is predicted to achieve a 37% total reduction in carbon emissions (using SAP 2012 carbon factors). Using the proposed SAP 10.1 carbon factors for , it is anticipated that site emissions would reduce by a total of c.82% from the Building Regulations baseline, surpassing the 75% improving required by the Future Homes Standard. - We believe that achieving this level of carbon reduction without the use of on-site generation demonstrates greater sustainability objectives for the site, whilst reducing operational costs for the residents through minimal heating energy requirements. Solar PV panels were considered (within sustainability/energy statement), but discounted for a number of reasons, notable efficiency/orientation, aesthetics and impact on conservation area, and also provision of sedum roof and ecological enhancements.

Paragraph no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Sustainable City Team</p> <p>The Council's Sustainable City Team have made the following comments: The proposal is for Air Source Heat Pumps which is in accordance with the BCS14 Heat Hierarchy. The exact location of these needs to be shown on plan. Officer Note: These details will need to be provided before development commences on site.</p> <p>In addition, if the proposal is for communal ASHP(s) confirmation of how this system will be managed, metered and billed should be provided to demonstrate that the practicalities have been sufficiently considered and factored into the scheme proposals.</p> <p>The proposals include sustainability measures in line with BCS15 and will achieve a total 37% reduction in CO2 emissions and a 33% reduction through renewable energy, which accords with policy BCS14 (min 20%) requirement.</p> <p>This should be conditioned (as per below).</p> <p>The statement suggests that overheating risk analysis has been undertaken, and that no additional mitigation measures are required to eliminate risk (as assessed under 2020 and 2050 climate change scenarios) – the risk analysis and report should be provided in support of the application to verify this statement.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant should undertake a risk assessment against the 2080 weather file and confirm what measures are likely to be needed in the future to mitigate overheating and demonstrate that the design can accommodate this (either as a retrofit measure(s) in future, or provided up front). This would ordinarily be sought prior to a decision in case any of the mitigation measures required result in a material impact on the scheme, but could be conditioned if this is no longer an option</p> <p>The utilities statement confirms that Speeds of 67 Mbps will be available with the BT Fibre 2 Broadband package, which is in line with the standards set out in the Broadband Connectivity Practice Note March 2018. This should be secured by condition.</p> <p>Recommended conditions</p> <p>Energy and Sustainability in accordance with statement</p> <p>The development hereby approved shall incorporate the energy efficiency measures, renewable energy, sustainable design principles and climate change adaptation measures into the design and construction of the development in full accordance with the energy and sustainability statement (Hydrock, 18.3.21) prior to occupation. A total 37% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions beyond Part L 2013 Building Regulations in line with the energy hierarchy shall be achieved, and a 33% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions below residual emissions through renewable technologies shall be achieved</p> <p>Reason</p> <p>To ensure the development incorporates measures to minimise the effects of, and can adapt to a changing climate in accordance with policies BCS13</p>

Paragraph no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>(Climate Change), BC14 (sustainable energy), BCS15 (Sustainable design and construction), DM29 (Design of new buildings)</p> <p>Renewable energy (Air Source Heat Pumps)</p> <p>Prior to implementation, details of the renewable energy technology (including the exact location, dimensions, design/ technical specification) together with calculation of energy generation and associated CO₂ emissions to achieve 33% reduction on residual emissions from renewable energy in line with the approved energy statement (Hydrock, 18.3.21) should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The renewable energy technology shall be installed prior to occupation of the dwellings and thereafter retained or, in the event that enhanced equipment is developed and becomes available, enhanced.</p> <p>Reason To ensure that the development contributes to mitigating and adapting to climate change and to meeting targets to reduce carbon dioxide emissions</p> <p>Broadband</p> <p>Prior to commencement, evidence of the provision of 'next generation broadband' shall be provided by providing evidence that the development has been registered with a provider. Registration should show the speed rating/specification of the connection in accordance with the broadband connectivity practice note March 2018, or subsequent replacement.</p> <p>Prior to occupation, the development shall be connected to the broadband infrastructure to achieve the speeds stated.</p> <p>Reason: To show that residents and businesses will have access to ultrafast broadband from occupation.</p>
5.4-5.7	Paragraphs 5.4 to 5.7 are deleted.
9.25	<p>Paragraph 9.25 should read:</p> <p>The proposed development would be located at an appropriate distance from surrounding properties. For example, at its closest point, new development (Block B) would be located at least 25m from the rear of Cliftonbank.</p>

Item 2: - Paynes Shipyard And Vauxhall House Coronation Road Bristol BS3 1RP

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	Travel plan date to be added to the plans list (condition 49): Travel Plan, received 17.12.19
	Advice no.3 to be removed – this was added in error. There is no PROW abutting the site.

Item 3: - Hengrove Leisure Park Hengrove Way Bristol BS14 0HR

Paragraph no.	Amendment/additional information
3.2	<p>For clarification:</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 specifies that up to 1,500sqm of flexible Class E floor space will be provided and up to 150sqm for a hot food takeaway (Dominos). For clarification, the description of development proposes up to 1,650sqm Class E floor space, of which, 150sqm could <i>also</i> be a hot food takeaway. This would support a scenario whereby the future 150sqm Dominos unit could operate either exclusively as a hot food takeaway (Sui generis) or as a dual use, i.e. both a hot food takeaway (Sui generis) and a restaurant (Class E(i)).</p>
5.7	<p>For clarification:</p> <p>In an email dated 23 April 2021 from the air quality officer, which followed the submission of further details from the Applicants’ technical team at AECOM, it was confirmed that “the attached technical note has addressed the questions and concerns that I had in relation to the potential air quality impact of construction traffic.”</p>
8.1	<p>The Legal Agreement shall secure the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A financial contribution of £250K will be required to pay for new signals at the crossing. • Affordable Housing- policy compliant i.e. 30% of which 77% must be for social rent and 23% for intermediate tenure such as shared equity • TRO contribution • Travel Plan contribution (£212 per dwelling) • Contribution towards the management and maintenance of The Mounds SNCI: £20,000 is suggested. • Possible contribution to mitigate loss of existing trees on site to comply with the Bristol Tree Replacement Standard – if required. • Fire Hydrants (6) at £9,000 • Allotment contribution (£36,650)

Public Forum

D C Committee A

2pm on 22 September 2021



1. Members of the Development Control Committee A

Councillors: Richard Eddy (Chair), Fi Hance, Andrew Varney, John Geater, Tom Hathway, Phillipa Hulme, Paul Goggin, Steve Pearce and Ed Plowden

2. Officers:

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

		Statements/Petitions	
Statement	Request To Speak Made	Name	Application
A1	S	Dr Paul Main	21/01999/F - Former Car Park
A2	S	Dr Justin Morris	
A3	S	Chris Booy	
A4	S	Francesca Fryer	
A5	S	Tom Macklen	
A6	S	Helen Stephens	
A7	S	Kathryn Davis	
A8	S	Glyn Thompson	
A9	S	Adam Chivers	
A10	S	Rob Duff	
A11	S	Dominic Hogg	
A12	S	Robert Day	
A13		Francis Greenacre	
A14		Bristol Tree Forum	
A15		David Wells	
A16		David Slinn	
A17		Cllr Paula O'Rourke	
A18		Cllr Katy Grant	
B1	S	Marlies Koutstaal	19/06107/F – Paynes Shipyard
B2		Cllr Christine Townsend	
C1	S	Michael Shears	21/00531/P – Hengrove Leisure Park
C2		Bristol Tree Forum	
C3		Cllr Helen Holland	
C4		David Redgewell	
C5	S	Cllr Sarah Classick	

STATEMENT A1 – DR PAUL MAIN (Clifton & Hotwells Improvement Society)

Clifton & Hotwells Improvement Society strongly opposes this Application.

Crucially it fails the test established by a decision of the Planning Inspectorate in November 2003 in relation to a nearby site in Canynge Road. The developer had wished to build a block of flats on land previously occupied by sporting facilities owned by Clifton College. In dismissing the Appeal against refusal to grant Planning Consent the Inspector laid down the principle that unless of outstanding design in its own right a building must blend with its surroundings and not stand out as an assertive feature, otherwise unacceptable harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Crucially, too, he dismissed in making his decision the benefit of the proposal in providing finance to improve the facilities of the owner of the site.

There is no doubt that in the case of the present Application the scale and density of the proposed block on College Road, together with the inappropriate palette of materials, results in a damagingly assertive feature which fails to blend with its architectural context.

The National Planning Policy Framework - Achieving Well-Designed Places - insists that high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings are fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Development that is not well-designed should be refused.



Bristol Zoological Society
Saving Wildlife Together

STATEMENT A2

Planning Application number – 21/01999/F
Proposals for 62 new homes on land at West Car Park, College Road, Clifton
Development Control Committee A – Wednesday 22 September 2021

Dr Justin Morris – Chief Executive, Bristol Zoological Society

Bristol Zoological Society is a conservation and education charity founded in 1835. Earlier this year we launched a new Strategy to 2035, which will ensure a long-term sustainable future for the Society, and our continued mission of Saving Wildlife Together.

Our unique combination of public engagement with hundreds of thousands of visitors each year; our education programmes for all ages from schoolchildren to postgraduates; and our direct conservation action in the UK and around the world ensures that not only can we inspire and educate others to become conservationists but we can also work directly with our partners to save wildlife.

- At least 90% of species at the new Bristol Zoo will be part of conservation programmes to save them from extinction.
- We aim for more than half of the schoolchildren from the west of England to visit the new Zoo each year.
- Our higher education programmes with college and university partners will increase to more than 400 students a year.

As well as providing 62 much-needed, high-quality new homes, including 20% affordable housing, the sale of the site will provide a vital contribution to the funds required to make a new Bristol Zoo a reality.

In line with your officer recommendation we ask members to vote to approve the application and be part of the journey, saving wildlife together.





**Bristol Zoological
Society**
Saving Wildlife Together

STATEMENT A3

Planning Application number – 21/01999/F
Proposals for 62 new homes on land at West Car Park, College Road, Clifton
Development Control Committee A – Wednesday 22 September 2021

Chris Booy OBE – Vice Chair of Trustees, Bristol Zoological Society

In late 2020, Trustees of Bristol Zoological Society voted unanimously to relocate Bristol Zoo to the Wild Place Project site.

As a lifelong resident of Bristol, Chairman of Clifton Suspension Bridge Trust and Bristol Bears, as well as being Vice Chair of Trustees for Bristol Zoological Society, I recognise that Bristol Zoo Gardens has a special place in the hearts of many people.

The decision to relocate after 185 years of memories was not taken lightly, but after making an operating loss in four of the last six years, we had to move forward to safeguard the future of the Society.

This decision followed an extensive process to explore a number of options, as well as taking independent professional advice.

Only through the sale of our property assets will we safeguard the future of our charity; generating the funds to enable us to develop a sustainable and revolutionary new Bristol Zoo; and achieve a significant wildlife conservation impact for generations to come.

Throughout the planning process, we engaged with local people, and groups, like Bristol Civic Society, to create a scheme which meets your officer's approval, achieves best value for the site, and transforms a concrete car park into much-needed new homes for Bristol. A legacy that the Trustees of Bristol Zoological Society ask members to approve.





**Bristol Zoological
Society**
Saving Wildlife Together

STATEMENT A4

Planning Application number – 21/01999/F
Proposals for 62 new homes on land at West Car Park, College Road, Clifton
Development Control Committee A – Wednesday 22 September 2021

Francesca Fryer – Director of Transformation, Bristol Zoological Society

As Director of Transformation at Bristol Zoological Society, I have been leading the planning application for the West Car Park residential scheme.

These plans are for the redevelopment of a 0.51ha brownfield site, which is already developed as a car park. The proposed use will deliver social and economic benefits for Bristol and the Society want to support the city's ambition for more homes, including affordable provision, spur economic growth across local communities, and create new examples of sustainable living.

As a wildlife conservation charity it is also vital to us that the scheme goes above and beyond the standard environmental sustainability requirement.

- The plans contain a net gain of trees across the site.
- A 'fabric first' approach has been taken to construction, including energy-efficient air source heating, exceeding requirements, to reduce heat loss.
- Ecological benefits include bird boxes, bat boxes, and bee bricks; the planting of green walls and roofs, and areas of wildflower lawn and native shrubs of value to insect and bird species.

We have led this planning application ourselves to ensure our legacy at the West Car Park will benefit both the people and wildlife of Bristol.



STATEMENT A5

Planning Application number – 21/01999/F
Proposals for 62 new homes on land at West Car Park, College Road, Clifton
Development Control Committee A – Wednesday 22 September 2021

Tom Macklen – Architectural Director, Barton Willmore

Barton Willmore are the architects and planning consultants working on behalf of Bristol Zoological Society in relation to the West Car Park residential development scheme.

Throughout the design process we have received a wide range of feedback on the plans both before and after submission of the planning application.

We have been keen to engage the community and feedback has been built into the evolving design throughout – for example, prior to submitting the planning application for the site in April, the scheme and materials were modified based on feedback gathered as part of the Society's extensive programme of Community Engagement.

Further revisions have been made to the scheme since the initial application submission, also as a result of feedback, to further improve the relationship to the Conservation Area and setting along College Road, including reducing the height of the northern part of Block A by 1 storey, stepping the building back from College Road, and increasing the level of planting.

Our proposals are firmly in line with the aspirations set out within the Council's Urban Living Supplementary Planning Document – for example all homes are generous in size and compliant with National Space Standards.

The SPD locates the site within an Inner Urban Area, where development density of 120dph is considered an optimum amount. The application proposal of 121dph, as noted within the Case Officer Report would therefore be considered entirely appropriate.

Our heritage consultants' have also informed the proposals for the site. They found that the site's location gives sufficient space to ensure that new structures will not dominate nearby buildings of heritage interest. It is important to note that Historic England have not objected to the proposals.

We have developed the design for this brownfield site as one that responds sensitively to the setting and context of the site.

Bristol City Council Officers have reviewed the submission in detail and have approved the scheme.



Peter Evans Partnership

Transport Planning & Highway Consultants

STATEMENT A6

Planning Application number – 21/01999/F
Proposals for 62 new homes on land at West Car Park, College Road, Clifton
Development Control Committee A – Wednesday 22 September 2021

Helen Stephens, Associate – Peter Evans Partnership, Transport Planning and Highway Consultants

The scheme for the West Car Park is intentionally a low-car development that includes 45 parking spaces. A car club space, electric car charging points, and 151 secure cycle spaces are included to encourage sustainable travel. Residents will not be eligible to obtain permits for on-street parking.

Due to the location of the site, not owning a car is a realistic option for new residents. The site is served by public transport and within walking distance of day to day facilities, Clifton Village and Whiteladies Road.

Vehicle access to the residential development will be from an existing entrance point off Cecil Road, via an improved vehicle junction. The existing point on College Road is unsuitable because of restricted width, and limited visibility from the adjacent boundary walls.

The new scheme will generate less traffic in the vicinity than the site's current use.

We have collected data for the car park use over several years and have undertaken on-street parking surveys as part of our assessment. This has allowed us to gain a sound insight into parking need and availability in the local vicinity.

The West Car Park has been used by staff, and visitors in peak periods. Before the development becomes available, office-based support staff will relocate to Wild Place, reducing the number of parking spaces the Society needs in Clifton. Parking demand will continue to be monitored by the Society until closure of the main zoo site.

STATEMENT A7

As the Director of Tourism for Visit West, I am speaking in support of the proposals of Bristol Zoological Society.

The sale of the West Car Park will enable the initial stages of the development and the delivery of the plans for the new Bristol Zoo.

Overall, the plans for the new Zoo assume a capital investment of at least £47 million over 25 years, and estimates a Gross Value Added (GVA) of £278 million to the regional economy.

This plan, and the positive impact for people, residents and visitors, and wildlife that will result, is supported by the charity's 'Shareholders' (the descendants of those that gave money to purchase the Bristol Zoo Gardens in 1835); strategic partners, such as the University of Bristol and the University of the West of England; and has broad support from the local business community.

This is a real opportunity to make a significant impact for the wider community of Bristol and the West of England

Kathryn Davis

Director of Tourism

Visit West

STATEMENT A8

Planning application number 21/01999/F – development of West car park at Bristol Zoo

Below is the submission of Glyn Thompson, College Road, Clifton

Everybody recognizes the need for more homes but to build an oversized block of flats without any architectural merit in a prominent position in the Clifton conservation area is not the way to solve the problem. The truth is that if allowed, the flats will not be occupied by the homeless families we all care about but by young professionals relocating from London.

Historic England don't like this application, the lead architect appointed on the main Zoo site doesn't like it, the Conservation advisory panel don't like it, the Council's own design group don't like it and the people of Clifton certainly don't like it. There has been a record number of letters of objection from Clifton residents, over 350 in all and the only letters of support are from people associated with the Zoo.

This is not NIMBYism. The neighbourhood would support a well designed less intensive residential scheme which has architectural merit, sustainability and outdoor space, but this scheme has none of those attributes.

This application does not meet planning policy on a number of levels. In no way does it preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of the conservation area. It is not sustainable and there is no real outdoor space for the majority of the homes. Have we learnt nothing from the experience of the last 18 months?

It is shocking how flexible the Planning Officers interpretation of planning policy can be when their political masters put pressure on them.

It is only the Mayor and the Zoo who want this development. The Zoo want the cash and the Mayor wants the density. No one else wants it.

As our elected representatives, I urge you in the strongest possible terms to reject this application.

If you don't refuse it, you will be responsible for a major scar on the landscape. Our children and our children's children will ask, who was responsible for that hideous development and the answer will be you.

STATEMENT A9

APPLICATION 21/01999/F BRISTOL ZOO – WEST CAR PARK PUBLIC FORUM STATEMENT OF ADAM CHIVERS

General

1. The number of those objecting to this application is huge. Notwithstanding that, certain matters are common to all the submissions:
 - (a) The development is over-intensive
 - (b) The buildings are too tall
 - (c) The poor design and over-massing is deleterious to the setting of the surrounding buildings
 - (d) The amenity space is inadequate
 - (e) A significant number of trees would be lost
 - (f) The proposals fail altogether to preserve the character of the Conservation Area; in fact, would do the opposite: significant damage.
2. There are 4 matters of the greatest significance:
 - that entirely independently so many people say the same thing
 - that their objections are supported by the Contributors consulted by the Planning Officer
 - that the Contributors' objections have either been ignored or seriously misrepresented in the report provided to the Planning Committee
 - that nowhere is there any objection to the **principle** of development: only to **this scheme**.
3. None of the fundamental concerns of those objecting (raised to the scheme in its original form) have been addressed by the amended scheme.
4. Since the objectors do not object to the principle of development, the Committee should avoid the temptation to see the choice as a binary one: between approving this particular scheme and frustrating the development of the site.¹
5. It should instead reject the application and, by doing so, encourage the Zoo to come up with a less intensive, properly sustainable, well-designed scheme with proper provision for trees and play areas. If it did so it would
 - (i) satisfy the statutory obligation to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area;
 - (ii) comply with the requirements of the Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note; and as a result

¹ This is a trap that the author(s) of the report to the Planning Committee have invited the members to fall into. See paragraph 22 below.

- (iii) meet with the approval of the objectors; and, most importantly,
 - (iv) create a legacy of which both the City and the Zoo could be truly proud.
6. This note concentrates in the main (see paragraphs 10-16 below) on the fact that those consulted on the application agree with the individual objectors. Despite this however, the report before the Committee has either ignored or, where it was not possible to do so, to misrepresented the representations made by both its External and relevant Internal Contributors (and to do so in a way that is thoroughly misleading). They have offered scant or no reasons for their conclusion. In the circumstances the recommendation of the report that the application be granted can only be regarded as perverse. The application should be refused and a new scheme should be submitted.
 7. The note also draws to the Committee's attention (see paragraphs 17-21 below) the submissions of Dr Dominic Hogg - most notably his dated 16.08.2021 (in response to the revised proposal). Dr Hogg is a well-recognised authority in policy and strategic issues concerning environmental matters. He has led work for the UK Government on climate change. **His submissions are of the utmost importance and should clearly be made available to the members of the Committee.** Regrettably, like the other consultants, his advice has been ignored. No attempt whatsoever has been made to engage in the issues he has raised nor to explain why.
 8. These representations conclude however on an optimistic note and propose a way forward on which everyone could unite and that would be of enormous benefit to the reputation of both the City and the Zoo.

The report of the Planning Officer(s) to the Committee

9. The report is poorly presented. It
 - (a) gives every impression of being thrown together in haste² without proper consideration of the significant issues involved;
 - (b) seriously misrepresents the opinion of the most relevant External Contributor - Historic England;
 - (c) disregards in their entirety the representations of the other most relevant External Contributor – the Conservation Advisory Panel;
 - (d) ignores the representations of its Internal Contributors – the Bristol City Design Group;

² For example, it refers without explanation to level differences across the site (there are none) and to roads in Bristol almost 5 miles away (para 5.7). It contains unfinished sentences (para 7.25). Bearing in mind that at a meeting with certain objectors on 13.9.2021 the Planning Officer said that the number of objections to the application was 'unprecedented' (far more than for the proposed Arena) and having regard to the iconic status of the Zoo property, it could reasonably have been anticipated that more care would have been taken in the preparation of the report.

(e) fails to engage with the numerous concerns raised by Dr Hogg including matters which, on the City Council's own document(s) leave the Committee with no discretion but to refuse the application.

(f) fails even to contemplate the (patently obvious) possibility of a revised scheme that would deal with the objections

and in consequence is **highly** unbalanced (indeed biased).

Historic England

10. The report to the Committee contends that HE '*have not objected to the application.*' This bald statement is thoroughly misleading.

(a) in its submission of 22.6.2021 on the original scheme HE stated (and these are examples only)

*'we advise that the opportunities for **the entire zoo site**³ and other assets owned by the zoo ... are explored through a master planning exercise. We would be very happy to engage with the zoo in partnership with other stakeholders and help identify where opportunities and constraints are within the zoo site and its ancillary assets. We believe that this would provide the best way forward in addressing the aspirations and economic needs for the Zoo. With this in mind, we are concerned that the application proposes development without a full assessment of opportunities for the wider site.'*⁴

'we believe that the site can accommodate a quantum of residential development, but in very general terms the proposed layout, massing and design fails to respond to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

'the existing boundary wall [to be demolished under the Zoo's scheme] ... contributes positively to the Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Appraisal prescribes: 'Where consent is required, resist proposals to remove boundary walls that make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area'.

*'In summary, considered as a stand-alone application, **these proposals would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area without clear and convincing justification.**'⁵*

³ My emphasis

⁴ The Zoo has consistently refused to open up the discussion to a consideration of the 'opportunities for the entire zoo site' as HE proposed. Its wholesale lack of transparency and its misunderstanding of the duties of its trustees to take account of the wider public benefit are serious causes for concern. See the submissions of Adam Chivers dated 30.6.2021 and 10.8.2021 **These should be made available to the members of the Committee.** See also his emails dated 19.8.2021 and 30.8.2021 (attached to these submissions). Note also that Dr Hogg has also had to indicate that the trustees do not understand their duties. See pages 20 and 21 of his submissions dated 16.8.2021.

⁵ My emphasis. No such 'clear and convincing justification' has been attempted.

'Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 194 and 200 of the NPPF.'

(b) In its submission of on the amended scheme dated 27.7.2001 HE stated

*'The amended scheme primarily involves two changes to the previous iteration: the setting back of the College Road apartment block footprint by approx. 1m, so that a lowered portion of the boundary wall can be retained, and secondly the stepping of the northern end of the same block by a storey. **We do not consider that these amendments suitably or meaningfully address our concerns over the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.**'⁶*

'As it stands, the proposed terraced approach to massing against the existing late C19 terraced properties to the south does not meet the requirements to enhance or better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area (para 206 of the revised NPPF). We therefore advise that your authority would still be justified in recommending refusal, given that these amendments do not represent a meaningful change to the previous the scheme.'

and, after emphasising the statutory obligations of the local authority in considering a proposed development in a Conservation Area and the provisions of the NPPA, expressed its considerable concerns on heritage grounds before indicating clearly that the application should **not** be approved in its present form.

11. The position of HE in relation to both the original and the (marginally) amended schemes is abundantly clear:

- (i) they have significant concerns on heritage grounds and
- (ii) if the present scheme were to be approved that would involve a serious failure to comply with the statutory requirements that govern Conservation Areas and the provisions of the revised NPPF.

12. In the report to the Planning Committee it is stated that

'HE fall short of objecting. They do not state that the proposals will cause substantial harm to the heritage assets. The Local Planning Authority is in effect invited to proceed with the determination of the application with caution.'

13. That statement constitutes an egregious misrepresentation of HE's position - see, in particular, the bold passages above. This is alarming.

Conservation Advisory Panel

14. The CAP stated

⁶ My emphasis

'While the principle of residential development of this site is accepted, the Panel considers this application to be over intensive development...

'The large monolithic block on College Road would be overbearing in nature, and is disappointing in design..., particularly the inappropriate form of the mansard...

'There is insufficient parking provision on this site...

'The scheme removes 15 trees with very limited tree replacement...

'This proposal does not respond to the character of the conservation area and consequently does not enhance the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area...

'In summary, it is considered that there are no positive elements of the scheme.

'Consequently, the Panel considers the proposal does not accord with relevant up to date Local Plan heritage policies nor the requirements of the NPPF and provides insufficient public benefits to outweigh the harm caused by the impact of such a poor scheme on relevant heritage assets.'⁷

Bristol CC City Design Group.

15. The CDG made representations in relation to the original scheme. Their comments apply equally to the revised scheme. The CDG contended:

'Without further design development and refinement, we are not convinced that the current massing and appearance along College Road and from Durdham Downs meet the policy requirement to preserve and enhance the special character of the Conservation Area.

'For the internal spaces of the site including parking a clear justification is needed in relation to their amenity value and compliance with the Urban Living SPD. At present these spaces appear tight and dominated by car parking. Softening of these areas through more generous planting, particularly in light of the verdant quality of the wider conservation area, would improve the scheme's contextual response

'The development contains no onsite children's play area which is contrary to the objectives of the Urban Living SPD.

'Greater efforts should be made to reflect the generous front verdant gardens (with allowance for street trees) that characterises the conservation area.

'With regard to layout deficiencies including the absence of children's play space a clear and convincing justification has not been made to demonstrate that this is a result of site constraints.

⁷ My emphasis

*'Private outdoor space and children's play: ... the lack of meaningful communal open space (in part due to the amount of surface car parking) means that 23% of units on site will not have access to any private outdoor space. It would be regrettable if children were occupying one of the 23% of units with no outdoor space.'*⁸

16. The Planning Officer(s) made no attempt to address these concerns in the report beyond drawing attention to the fact that amendments had been made. (None of these amendments are relevant to the CDG representations quoted above). In fact, he just ignored them.

Dr Hogg

17. To avoid duplication, it is not intended to repeat the advice provided by Dr Dominic Hogg but the Committee should consider his submissions – especially those dated 16.8.2021.
18. Dr Hogg draws attention at page 6 to the City Practice Note of 2020⁹ and its key principles applicable to all Sustainability Statements:

(1) Sustainability Statements should address both mitigation and adaptation as set out under policy BCS13.

(2) Sustainability Statements should engage with and address the energy requirements of policy BCS14, the water management requirements of policy BCS16 and each of the key issues listed in policy BCS15.

(3) In respect of each of these issues, Sustainability Statements should set out what possible measures have been explored, which measures have been adopted and integrated into the design and, where relevant, why it was not feasible to incorporate certain measures into the proposed development.

(4) A failure to convincingly address each of these issues will result in a refusal of planning permission.

He makes clear that because of the failure to adhere to key principle 3 of the CCSPN above the application **must** be refused. This is not a matter of discretion: the provisions of the CCSPN are **mandatory**.¹⁰ **If the application were allowed in these circumstances the Committee would be committing the City Council to an *obvious* and, bearing in mind the extent of the proposed development, *serious* breach of its Practice Note within a little over a year of its publication.**

⁸ On the assumption that the units with no private outdoor space will be cheaper, it is likely that a substantial number will be occupied by families including young children.

⁹ Bristol City Council (2020) Climate Change and Sustainability: How to design low carbon and resilient developments: Practice Note, July 2020

¹⁰ See pages 6 and 11 of the submissions of Dr Hogg.

19. Dr Hogg points also to the City's *One City Climate Strategy* also published last year.¹¹ It provides that

2030 goal: All buildings in the city will be carbon neutral and use resources efficiently, ensuring everyone can enjoy affordable warmth in winter and avoid overheating in summer. The related objectives include the following (by 2030): New buildings are carbon neutral and climate resilient (aligning heat provision to the city's heat decarbonisation programme).

Dr Hogg states clearly there is no possibility of this new development (as it has been proposed) meeting this objective.

20. Finally, Dr Hogg draws attention to the failure of the scheme to provide for a green infrastructure or adequate play areas and the fact that it will generate excessive noise. He states that by doing so it '*designs in ill health.*'¹²...

21. The report submitted to the Planning Committee has simply ignored Dr Hogg with no attempt to deal with his advice or provide any explanation for its failure to do so.

Not a binary choice

22. It is highly relevant to any proper consideration of the report sent to the Planning Committee that its author(s) sought to give the impression that the future of the site depended on consideration of this particular scheme and no other. At para 9.28 of the report it was stated that:

'While the density of development is appropriate, it is not possible to achieve both parking and a safe play area.'

Nothing could better illustrate the lamentable failure of the Planning Officer(s) to properly evaluate the site and the need to bear in mind the statutory obligations that arise in a Conservation Area.

Of course, it is possible to achieve both adequate parking and a safe play area. The problem only arises because of the density of the development. A less greedy approach to density would ensure that there were proper parking arrangements, an adequately green environment with sufficient trees/canopies **and** appropriate amenities for children.

The pressure brought to bear on the Planning Department

23. At a meeting with certain objectors on 13.9.2021, the Planning Officer volunteered the information that the Zoo had exerted a lot of pressure on him and others at the Council and that it was 'desperate'. It had demanded that the application be referred for determination by the Committee as soon as possible.

¹¹ Bristol City Council (2020) Bristol: One City Climate Strategy: A Strategy for a Carbon Neutral, Climate Resilient Bristol by 2030. See page 23 of the submissions of Dr Hogg.

¹² See page 23 of the submissions of Dr Hogg dated 16.08.2021.

24. Such considerations are of course wholly irrelevant to the proper determination of planning applications. They are even less apposite when it would clearly be open to the Zoo and its consultants to design a scheme that is sympathetic to the Conservation Area and to the needs of those who would be living on the site. If the Zoo is indeed 'desperate' it is because it has advanced a scheme that is over-intensive and takes no account of the Conservation Area or the concerns that have been raised.

25. In short, the Zoo has been inordinately greedy and has created an entirely avoidable problem. With a degree of transparency and cooperation and a recognition that it has an obligation to act so as to achieve a public benefit in its widest sense, an entirely acceptable scheme could and would have been devised. (This problem has arisen in large part because the Zoo does not understand the obligations of their trustees).¹³

Conclusion

26. The application site (and indeed the main Zoo site) offer

- (i) the Zoo a unique opportunity to produce a scheme that is not only consistent with (but demonstrates its commitment to) its avowed conservation principles and will provide its home for almost 100 years with a permanent legacy of great value; and
- (ii) the City with the chance to further demonstrate its much-valued commitment to meeting the challenges of climate change. As the first authority to declare a climate emergency it has a prestigious reputation. If it allowed this iconic site to be developed in accordance with the present scheme it would cause itself significant reputational damage. On the other hand, if it were to facilitate the creation of a truly sustainable and enjoyable living environment it would create for itself an enormous reputational benefit.

27. This is not an opportunity to be missed.

¹³ See the correspondence attached and pages 20 and 21 of Dr Hogg's submissions.

CORRESPONDENCE

LETTER ADAM CHIVERS TO DR MORRIS DATED 19 AUGUST 2021

Dear Dr Morris

I refer to my attendance at your consultation event this afternoon and my conversation with Francesca Fryer at approximately 3.20pm. She will recall our meeting because I made certain points which were strongly supported by various other attendees in the immediate vicinity. In the circumstances I thought it would be helpful if I recorded those points as follows:

1. On their website, the Zoo claimed that

'We have been through a very rigorous process to explore a number of options as well as taking independent professional advice from a range of sources to ensure we are taking the best possible course of action for the Society's future.'

It maintained that

'As part of our extensive review in 2020, we explored other options for the Clifton site, which included other types of visitor attraction and other types of zoos. Working with professional advisors we do not believe that any will be viable or sustainable over the long-term on the Clifton site.'

You have not however made public the other options that you considered or the reasons for their rejection.

2. I made to Francesca Fryer the very obvious point that this lack of transparency is damaging. It is counter-productive because it is bound to exacerbate existing suspicions. As is clear from the very substantial number of objections to the scheme for the West Car Park (in both its original and amended iterations) there is a wholesale lack of trust in the motives of the Zoo and of its trustees with the overwhelming majority of those who have commented on the planning application considering the trustees to have been greedy: concerned simply and solely with a concern to maximise the development potential of the site with no regard for the legacy which it leaves behind when it vacates the site.

3. The reason for this lack of transparency has to be a matter of conjecture but I suggest that the most likely reason is apparent from the letter which you wrote on 8 April to those who responded to the initial proposal for the West Car Park. In that letter you stated that

'As the Society is a charity, the Trustees are legally required to obtain maximum value from the charity's assets to reinvest in its charitable objectives...'

That, regrettably, is a misconception which Francesca Fryer appeared to repeat in my conversation. It takes no account of the obligation to ensure that in the discharge of its charitable purposes the trustees pay appropriate regard to the overriding need to ensure a

public benefit of its activities. In its legal analysis of (and its guidance on) the public benefit requirement the Charity Commission is clear:

'Since it is inherent in every charitable purpose that it is for the public benefit, the charity trustees' duty to further the purposes of their charity includes a duty to further its purposes for the public benefit.'

4. The interests of the Zoo and of its neighbours coincide in one important respect. The Zoo would benefit from seeking to dispel (or at least mitigate) the cynicism that it has endangered by its lack of transparency whilst those who otherwise would be inclined to object to the scheme for the main site would benefit if they could be provided with proper detail of the *'rigorous process'* which the Zoo claims to have undertaken and thus enabled to make an informed decision. Historically, the Zoo has enjoyed the widespread support of its neighbours. It is an enormous pity that in mishandling the sensitivities of its departure from Clifton it is in obvious danger of seriously damaging its (hitherto excellent) reputation.

5. May I therefore suggest that

5.1 you publish details of the other *'options'* that have been considered and why the conclusion has been reached that none of them *'will be viable or sustainable over the long-term on the Clifton site.'*

5.2 you confirm that you will reconsider your understanding of the Trustees' legal obligations which you asserted in your letter of 8 April in the light of the Charity Commission guidance on the public benefit requirement.

I would be grateful for your reply to this email.

With kind regards

Yours sincerely

Adam Chivers

LETTER: JUSTIN MORRIS OF BRISTOL ZOO TO ADAM CHIVERS DATED 23 AUGUST 2021

On 23 Aug 2021, at 13:09, Justin Morris wrote:

Dear Mr Chivers

Many thanks for your email and for attending our event last week to meet with Francesca and the design team.

To safeguard the future of Bristol Zoological Society we are relocating Bristol Zoo to the Wild Place Project site to create a world-class zoo for Bristol and the West of England. The

new Bristol Zoo will offer spacious, modern facilities, significant growth in our conservation and education work and an innovative and exciting visitor experience. In order to deliver this exciting new vision and to secure the future of Bristol Zoo, the Clifton properties will be sold.

We have been open and honest about our intentions, and following our announcement in late 2020 we have continued to engage residents and other stakeholders in our plans, and the reasons behind our strategic direction. This decision has not been taken lightly; however, it is vital to safeguard the future of Bristol Zoological Society, and ensure an exciting new beginning for Bristol Zoo.

For many years Bristol Zoo Gardens, at only 12 acres in size, has been struggling with the size of our site, declining visitor numbers and restricted parking. The impact of COVID-19 caused us to radically rethink our plans about the future and how we address the fundamental and persistent challenges that we face, in order to save Bristol Zoological Society.

As you mention, as part of our extensive strategic review in 2020, we thoroughly explored other options for the Clifton site. We took independent professional advice from a range of sources to ensure we are taking the best possible course of action for the Society's future – this included looking at the potential for other types of visitor attraction and different types of zoos as well. We identified that these options were not viable financially or operationally sustainable.

Since our announcement last year both zoos have been closed for a further three months as a result of the national lockdown, and the site's parking issues have been amplified following the settlement of a judicial review brought by Downs for People against Bristol City Council, meaning that from 2024 onwards the North Car Park at the Zoo will only be able to be used by people visiting the Downs.

We realise the significance and importance of the Bristol Zoo Gardens site, and it is important to us to leave a legacy for the site we can be proud of. Our vision is very ambitious – to create an exemplar of how much needed homes and public places can be designed to be fit for the future we face. Our architectural team, Penoyre & Prasad have won over a hundred architectural awards, including RIBA National Awards, and are known for prestigious, forward-thinking projects in sensitive locations. Penoyre & Prasad are particularly renowned for their environment-first philosophy and are a natural partner given the importance that Bristol Zoological Society is placing on ecology, biodiversity and sustainable development of the Bristol Zoo Gardens site.

As a charity it is important that we ensure that the sale of our site allows us to achieve best value and deliver our charitable benefits for the long-term, specifically our mission of Saving Wildlife Together. We continue to believe that a residential-led scheme on the Bristol Zoo Gardens site is the best way to do this and provide much needed homes for Bristol at the same time.

We hope that you will continue to engage with us over the coming months as the designs are developed and our plans come to life.

Kind regards

Justin

LETTER: ADAM CHIVERS TO JUSTIN MORRIS DATED 30 AUGUST 2021

Dear Dr Morris

I have now had the opportunity to consider your email of 23 August, ostensibly sent in response to mine of 19 August.

Regrettably it wholly fails to address the concerns which I raised or to answer the two specific questions that I put to you. At paragraph 5 of my email I suggested that you

(1) publish details of the other '*options*' that have been considered and why the conclusion has been reached that none of them '*will be viable or sustainable over the long-term on the Clifton site.*' I explained that it was in the interests of the zoo as well of its neighbours if you were transparent in explaining the alternatives for the use of the site which you had considered and the reasons for their rejection since that would help to dispel the widespread suspicion (verging on cynicism) that you have engendered amongst your neighbours by the way you have dealt with the matter.

(2) reconsider your understanding of the Trustees' legal obligations which you asserted in your letter of 8 April in the light of the Charity Commission guidance on the public benefit requirement. That is necessary to ensure that you and the trustees appreciate their duties and avoid an inevitable complaint to the Charity Commission.

You have avoided dealing with either matter. It is little help to your neighbours for you simply to repeat what is on your website and in your correspondence: they know all about that and it is somewhat insulting to them to assume that your email will be sufficient to assuage their concerns.

I repeat: the great proportion of your neighbours are concerned to work collaboratively with the zoo but are concerned that you have no interest in the legacy which you will leave when you move from the Clifton site.

May I please have a reply which actually addresses the two specific points I raised in my earlier email and which I have repeated above?

Yours sincerely

Adam Chivers

Development Control Committee A – 22 September 2021
Application no. 21/01999/F
Former Car Park College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3HX
Comments of Robert Duff – Earlsfield Town Planning

Dear Chair and Members,

I am Robert Duff, a Director of Earlsfield Town Planning, and am here today to speak on behalf of occupiers of Auburn House, Sutton house, Avonbank and Cliftonbank, which are listed buildings directly adjoining the proposed development site: The site was within the curtilage of 3 of the homes.

The proposed development is contrary to NPPF, to Policy DM31 and the advice of Historic England because it would significantly harm the setting, character, and appearance of the surrounding Heritage Assets. It will also be harmful to residential amenity and not be beautiful.

1. Preserve or Enhance the Character of the Conservation Area

Historic England state that (letters of 22nd June and 27th July);

'We do not consider that these amendments suitably or meaningfully address our concerns over the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.'

'While the existing car park itself does not contribute positively to the Conservation Area, its open aspect and enclosure behind the high stone wall on Collage Road is indicative of the juxtaposition of rows of substantial villas against substantial open, green spaces.'

'the proposed layout, massing and design fails to respond to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.'

'the overriding built form and the concept of a terraced approach of this scale alongside the existing short terrace is of considerable concern.'

'We advise that a reduced massing, specifically with meaningful breaks along College Road could deliver a more contextual form of development. Building heights should be reduced and vertical building proportions should take a clearer steer from those around that define the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.'

'the existing boundary wall ... contributes positively to the Conservation Area.... If development were to be set further back into the site...the boundary wall could be retained in a more meaningful and contextual way.'

The proposal... 'does not meet the requirements to enhance or better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area'.

'We therefore advise that your authority would still be justified in recommending refusal'

This is clearly an objection and one my clients fully support.

Development Control Committee A – 22 September 2021

Application no. 21/01999/F

Former Car Park College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3HX

Comments of Robert Duff – Earlsfield Town Planning

I agree with Historic England that the development will harm the Conservation Area and that the development should be reduced in scale, be set back from College Road, retain the existing wall and openings, and take a clear steer from the existing development around it.

Your Officer has misinterpreted this in the Report and wrongly states to you that historic England has not objected: That statement is simply wrong.

I can find no balanced assessment that seeks to justify the development against the harm it will cause the Conservation area in the Officers Report.

I ask that you refuse planning permission due to the harm the development will cause to the character of the Conservation Area.

2. Harm the Setting of Grade II Listed Buildings

Historic England does not comment upon the impact of the development upon the setting of Grade II listed buildings. They confirm this in their letter of 22nd June by stating;

'Our statutory remit here lies with impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and setting of Grade II buildings, which are in the top 8% of listed buildings'*

Historic England inform the Council that the setting of Grade II listed buildings will be impacted, but then leave it to the Council to assess whether the impact causes harm, which you must give special regard to and give significant weight.

My clients raised this matter in detail in their representations of 2nd June and 17th September.

Yet, notwithstanding Historic England's advice and my clients' representations, I can find no assessment of the harm to the setting of the Grade II listed buildings within the Officers Report. I also can find no representations on the matter from the Council's Conservation Officer.

The lack of any such assessment is contrary to the best practice approach to assessing the effects of development on the setting of heritage asset as set out in the ruling on Catesby Estates Ltd v. Steer [2018] which confirmed the established approach to assessing the effect of proposed development on the setting of heritage assets.

The application site sits within the former gardens of the Grade II listed lodges fronting Clifton Down. The lodges were developed alongside the Zoo and have had a physical relationship with it throughout their existence. The use of the land as a car park did not alter that relationship, retaining the open views between the Zoo and the Lodges.

The Lodges have been the largest structures in this part of Clifton for the entire time that the land has been developed. They will now be dwarfed by a massive structure far larger than anything else in the area, causing massive harm to the setting of the listed buildings.

The harm is significant and justified the refusal of the application alone. The fact that the Officers have not even assessed it in their Report is of significant concern.

Development Control Committee A – 22 September 2021
Application no. 21/01999/F
Former Car Park College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3HX
Comments of Robert Duff – Earlsfield Town Planning

This is a fatal flaw with the Report which I am sure would fail under legal challenge.

3. Loss of other Heritage Assets

Two important non-designated heritage assets are to be demolished;

- A. Most of the high boundary wall onto College Road;
- B. The former Coach House to Avonbank.

Historic England state;

'If development were to be set further back into the site, the impact of any development could be reduced, and the boundary wall could be retained in a more meaningful and contextual way.' (letter of 22nd June)

The remaining coach house is an important heritage asset that should be retained in any development proposal. It would be harmful to demolish it.

The Report does not advise you that these heritage assets are to be demolished, seek to justify their demolition, or give them any weight at all.

This is a further fundamental flaw with the Report. Are you happy to permit the demolition of important Heritage assets without your Officers even considering the impact of doing so?

This is a fatal flaw with the Report which I am sure would fail under legal challenge.

4. Harm to Residential Amenity?

The Report indicates that my clients will suffer no loss of amenity because the new homes will be 25m from their habitable rooms.

Residential amenity includes impact on Privacy, Overbearing effects, Outlook, and Impact of Design.

The Officers Report considers only Outlook and for reasons not explained does not examine any other factor material to residential amenity. It is as if this vital planning consideration has simply been swept aside.

Privacy - Levels of privacy are currently high because the gardens and habitable rooms are not overlooked. The development will cause a significant loss of privacy;

Overbearing Impact – 3 storey houses directly behind the Lodges and a 5 storey block removing all relationship with the Zoo will be overbearing and cause significant harm to amenity.

Development Control Committee A – 22 September 2021

Application no. 21/01999/F

Former Car Park College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3HX

Comments of Robert Duff – Earlsfield Town Planning

Outlook – There is more to outlook than just distance. The current outlook relates to the relationship between the buildings, it is an outlook and relationship that is important for any occupiers of the Lodges. The replacement of this outlook by the development of a 5 storey monolithic structure is of course harmful.

Design – The design of the buildings is in itself harmful to residential amenity: It alters the character of the area, as confirmed by English Heritage, and thus is harmful to the amenity of anyone living within the area, especially those living in beautiful, listed buildings, and viewing the development.

Harm to residential amenity justified refusal alone.

5. Beautiful Development

NPPF requirement for new development to be beautiful, which is a social objective of sustainability (Para 8) and that;

'The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.'

(Para 216)

Do you believe that the proposed development is beautiful? If not, the development does not accord with NPPF and should be refused.

For all of the above reasons, I request that you refuse the application before you and advise the applicants to follow the advice of Historic England and design a development that takes a clear steer from the existing development around it.

Application no. 21/01999/F: Written Statement of Dr Dominic Hogg

By way of background, until recently, I was Chairman of an environmental consultancy based in Bristol, Eunomia Research & Consulting. I set up the company in 2001. The company now employs 130 staff, mainly in Bristol, but also in London, Manchester, Brussels, Athens, New York, Sydney and Auckland. I have spent 25 years in consultancy, advising governments, local government and business on matters of policy and strategy related to environmental issues.

My concerns with the application made by Bristol, Clifton & West of England Zoological Society ('the Zoo') are many, but I will focus on the specific issue of whether the application does what is required to do in respect of climate change. The Council's Core Strategy, the drafting of which started back in 2006, and the associated policies, do not reflect the position of a Council that has declared a climate emergency (not to mention commitments made under the Paris Agreement, and the Government's stated objective to achieve net zero by 2050, as well as the interim 78% reduction in emissions relative to 1990 by 2035). Be that as it may, the Council published, in July 2020, a Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note (CCSPN), which sought to give some greater force to its existing policies through setting out what applicants must do in their Energy and Sustainability Statements. All Statements have to follow the following principles (p.9):

2. Sustainability Statements should engage with and address the energy requirements of policy BCS14, the water management requirements of policy BCS16 and each of the key issues listed in policy BCS15.

3. In respect of each of these issues, Sustainability Statements should set out what possible measures have been explored, which measures have been adopted and integrated into the design and, where relevant, why it was not feasible to incorporate certain measures into the proposed development.

Regarding the second point, specifically regarding Renewable Energy Generation, the CCSPN states (p.17)

The energy strategy should contain sufficient information to demonstrate that feasibility has been fully tested for a range of renewable energy technologies and that a 20% reduction in residual emissions has been achieved. A calculation of the likely energy generated from the renewable technology along with the resultant CO2 emissions reduction should be provided in the energy strategy

The Applicant's Energy and Sustainability Statement states that air source heat pumps are viable. It states that photovoltaic panels (PV) and solar thermal energy are 'possible'. It does nothing thereafter to demonstrate the non-viability of PV or solar thermal.

The CCSPN is unequivocal about what should happen in the event that the Energy and Sustainability Statements fail to do what is required of them. One of these requirements (see the first extract above, bullet 3) is to demonstrate non-viability of renewable energy solutions which are not deployed. The CCSPN says '*A failure to convincingly address each of these issues will result in a refusal of planning permission*'. Since the applicant's proposal includes (for example) no solar PV, and no solar thermal, despite identifying both of them as being possible, and having made no attempt to indicate why they are non-viable, then the only conclusion that can be reached is that, following the clear wording of the CCSPN, the application must be refused. The CCSPN does not use language suggesting the application 'may be' refused, or 'can be' refused: the word used is, 'will'. That the planning officer's report avoids referencing this matter, and recommends approval rather than refusal, indicates a failure on the part of the officers to provide the information which Councillors on the Committee have every right to expect.

Other matters of serious concern relate to the application's absence of any space for play, or indeed, for would be residents to meet (other than the car park). It is virtually impossible to square the proposed application with the content of Section 12 of the NPPF. It is clear that the majority of local residents object to the application and they do so because of its impact on the character of the neighbourhood. Had they had any say in the design of the development, it would look very different indeed. The report to Committee suggests that the only trade off, in terms of space, is with space for car parking. This ignores the trade off against space given over to dwelling numbers, the density of which is inconsistent with the character of the area. Nowhere is the applicant obliged to meet a minimum dwelling density if in doing so, the character of the area would be compromised. Most local residents clearly feel that is the case.

STATEMENT A12

Dear Sirs,

After reading the Summary Report prepared by the Planning Officer ahead of the meeting and noting the recommendation to grant planning permission on the West car park site (No. 21/01999/F), we wish to highlight a couple of salient points which appear to have been glossed over in the report.

Comments from Historic England and the Conservation Advisory Panel

The comments from these bodies briefly noted at Items 7.6, 7.7 and 7.8 cannot be understated. Neither body supports the proposed development in its current form, with particular concern raised around the size, scale and massing of Block A fronting College Road which is completely out of character when compared to the surrounding buildings and those in the wider Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area. This is highlighted by comments such as *“the proposal does not accord with relevant up to date Local Plan heritage policies nor the requirements of the NPPF”*, *“there are no positive elements of the scheme”* and *“the proposed terraced approach to massing against the existing late C19 terraced properties to the south does not meet the requirements to enhance or better reveal the significance of the Conservation Area (para 206 of the revised NPPF).”*

Policy DM27

It should be duly noted that on review of Bristol City Council’s Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan, it could not be reasonably considered that the design of Block A meets the conditions of Policy DM27. This policy states that, *“the height, scale and massing of development should be appropriate to the immediate context, site constraints, character of adjoining streets and spaces, the setting, public function and/or importance of the proposed development and the location within the townscape.”* Given the location of the proposed development site and its setting within the wider Conservation Area, it is evident that the conditions of Policy DM27 are not fulfilled by the current plans, due to the proposed height, scale and massing of the Block A building which would dominate the streetscape and dwarf surrounding buildings and as such we would urge you to refuse the planning application on these grounds.

Daylight and Sunlight Assessment

The updated Daylight and Sunlight Assessment undertaken by Hydrock shows the detrimental impact that a building the size of Block A would have on the quality of life and privacy of those residing at 50 College Road with all rooms showing a reduction in daylight / sunlight and two rooms continuing to be below recommended limits which is unacceptable.

Parking

The lack of parking provision with only 45 spaces allocated for 62 residences also raises significant concerns about the impact on on-street parking in the vicinity, especially in light of the impending development of the main zoo site and that c.20% of the properties in the West car park development would be either 3 or 4 bedrooms.

Conclusion

In summary, we believe that there have been some key planning points overlooked in the recommendation to grant planning permission for the site and we implore you to refuse planning permission for the current proposal based on the highlighted evidence.

STATEMENT A13

Planning Application number - 21/01999/F
Proposals for 62 new homes on land at West Car Park, College Road, Clifton
Development Control Committee A - Wednesday 22 September 2021

Francis Greenacre: former chairman of CHIS and a very local resident

The Zoo's application before you claims that its consultation has been 'robust, wide-reaching and inclusive'. In fact, that consultation process has been exemplary.

I took part in the Community Forum, which was set up by Bristol Zoological Society in late 2020, as a way for local residents, residents' groups, local ward councillors, and representatives of local and other organisations, such as the Bristol Civic Society and CHIS to meet with members of the design team and senior staff from Bristol Zoological Society. This allowed us to have the means and a dedicated time to ask a wide range of questions and to be updated throughout the design development.

The Zoological Society has responded to community feedback and to the observations of your officers and modifications and improvements have been made, notably to the design of Block A.

Beyond the Community Forum the Society has pursued other means of alerting the local community and ensuring a wide contribution to the consultation process through information delivered to local addresses and digital meetings and social media.

I sincerely congratulate the Zoo on the consultation process and I support your planning officer's recommendations.



21/01999/F - Former Car Park, College Road, Clifton, Bristol BS8 3HX - known as the Western Car Park, Bristol Zoo Gardens - Erection of 65 dwellings with associated parking, new vehicular access, and associated infrastructure and landscaping.

Bristol Tree Forum Statement

Our detailed comments on this application are published here:

https://bristoltreeforum.files.wordpress.com/2021/06/btf-comments-21_01999_f-former-car-park-college-road.pdf.¹

This application, as currently formulated, should be refused. If allowed, 16 trees will be removed, thereby reducing the tree canopy cover on the site by nearly 7%. Both the Mitigation Hierarchy (National Planning Policy Framework²) and Bristol's Development Framework Core Strategy BCS9 state that tree removals should be avoided where possible. It should be straightforward to design the site around the existing trees so that none need be lost.

This car park is an integral part of the Bristol Zoo Gardens, which is still in use. Given the announcement that the gardens will soon be closing, this application should not be decided separately from any decision about its long-term future.

We believe that the trees should be retained wherever possible and that the design of the development should be amended to facilitate this. Certainly, none of the trees growing on the boundaries of the site need to be removed.

The application of the Mitigation Hierarchy

The Mitigation Hierarchy is a cascading decision process: only if the preceding choice is unavailable is the succeeding option considered. This is the decision-making order:

1. Avoid - Where possible habitat damage should be avoided.
2. Minimise - Where possible habitat damage and loss should be minimised.
3. Remediate - Where possible any damage or lost habitat should be restored.
4. Compensate - As a last resort, damaged or lost habitat should be compensated.

The appellant has failed to demonstrate that its plans can only be realised if the trees it identifies are removed. The presence of the trees is merely an inconvenience to its preferred scheme and they are being removed for no other reason. This is not enough to justify the removal of the trees growing here as per BCS9 or the National Planning Policy Framework.

We also note that no Biodiversity Survey and Report has been provided even though this is required under Bristol's Planning Application Requirements Local List 1st December 2017. This should have included a Biodiversity Metric Calculation.³

¹ https://bristoltreeforum.files.wordpress.com/2021/06/btf-comments-21_01999_f-former-car-park-college-road.pdf

² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

³ <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/6049804846366720>

STATEMENT A15 – David Wells

Re: Former Car Park College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3HX

With references to the Council Officer's Report and Recommendation.

This application should be rejected. It needs significant amendment.

In Para 7.4 of the Officer's Report and Recommendation he states that 'the vast majority of the representations object to both the initial proposal for the site and the revised proposal' and summarises the objections. Supportive comments only seem to have been received from Trustees of the Bristol Zoological Society.

The Key Issues in Section 9 do not adequately answer the objections, are insensitive to points raised, seem misleading on the advice of Historic England and just express different views without justification.

Para 9.15 quotes Section 72 of the Planning Act 1990 as requiring the Local Planning Authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. In Para 9.19 the Officer says that 'the current site is not identified as making any contribution to the Conservation Area' but obviously the nature of its development will impact the area.

The comments from Historic England in Paras 7.6 and 7.7 clearly express their view that the proposal does not meet these requirements and concludes that 'We therefore advise that your authority would still be justified in recommending refusal, given that the amendments do not represent a meaningful change to the previous scheme' However in Para 9.17 the Officer interprets this as inviting the Local Authority to proceed!

Similarly in Para 7.8 the Conservation Advisory Panel considered the first application to be over intensive development, overbearing with insufficient parking etc. 'The Panel considers the proposal does not accord with relevant up to date Local Plan heritage policies nor the requirements of the NPPF' etc (and the amendments in the revised application were minor). These comments also seem to have been ignored.

With regard to parking, in Para 7.10 (2) Transport Development Management say that surrounding streets will be swamped with overspill parking without Advice 1044!?

In view of the above it seems incredible that the Officer is recommending that planning permission can be granted. Also, in spite of the City's Climate Strategy there doesn't seem to be any intention to achieve at least zero carbon emissions.

The crux of the problem seems to be that a density of 121 DPH is not compatible with this conservation area.

Recognising the need for more housing, the current proposal should be rejected and then significantly amended to satisfy the objections including the comments by Historic England and the Conservation Advisory Panel.

Regards,

John David Wells

Canynges Square

STATEMENT A16 – David Slinn

Dear Sirs,

We wish to bring to your attention the poor advice from the Bristol Planning Department for Councillors to accept their current recommendation to accept the proposed plans to develop the west car park No. 21/011999/F

The report summary and recommendations are out of proportion to that of local opposition to the scheme. Part of at least one listed property will inevitably be damaged should the scheme be accepted. The Planning Department have been informed and chosen to ignore this.

The Planning Department have also ignored the overall impact on the Conservation Area Item 1 9.14

Item 1 7.4 APPLICANTS response to comments from neighbours with adjoining properties was inadequate.

Item 1 7.4 Consultation was inadequate with no reported indication of the proportion of local dissent and opposition.

Item 1 3.4 and 6.1 The land of present car park was covenanted to the Zoo by owners of the villas in Clifton Down for the use of the Zoo solely for horticulture purposes. It has never been used for housing, industry or commerce. Its use as a car park was tolerated by planning only on condition of extra landscaping with trees, which are now to be felled.

The comments from HISTORIC ENGLAND Item 1 7.6 7.7 and 7.8 all of which have a negative impact on the proposal and do not advise support for the proposed scheme.

The comments from the CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL Item 1 7.8 concludes that the proposed scheme does not accord with NPPF and there are insufficient public benefits for the plans to be accepted.

Bristol waste are yet to receive adequate details but happy for further consultation.

Transport and Parking are further potential problems.

Item 7.12 The revised plan to set back buildings 1m in College Road considered to be inadequate June 24th 2021. But as yet not revised or changed.

We consider that even the revised proposals are unacceptable in every way. Hoping that integrity will outweigh political expediency, especially in the light of dubious assumptions made about drainage, heating, and general convenience of the site in relation to transport in general, during construction and subsequently. We trust that all councillors will read the report in detail and refuse to accept the Planning Department's recommendation to give permission for such an unsuitable housing estate in Clifton.

In addition the local facilities are inadequate for social housing clients. ie Only one overcrowded primary school, no NHS dentist, already busy GP practice, no cut price super market in Clifton nearest Crow Lane!!!!!!

Thank you for your attention Ruth Slinn.

19th September 2020.

STATEMENT A17 – Councillor Paula O'Rourke

There are many points about sustainability and building in a conservation area which I could make, but I know others will make them, so I will limit my objections to liveability and density.

The application is for 62 homes giving a density of 121 dwellings per hectare, which, to all intents and purpose, is positive. However, because of the car parking problem in Clifton, the application adds space for parking 45 cars within the scheme. By doing this, they have diminished the liveability of the accommodation planned, as they are shoehorning in homes around the cars.

Let me paint you a picture of the flats described in the report:

A high proportion have single aspect;

There is no daylight in some corridors;

23% have no private outdoor space - no balcony;

Bed space for many have frontage onto the main frontage;

There is no play space for children.

I am sure an application could be brought forward with a density of around 120dph but not with parking for 45 cars. Something has to go! We can't ask citizens to live in the conditions I've described, we must aspire to better living conditions. There is good public transport to Clifton, so car parking within the site should be much reduced and conditioned for specific use.

Paula O'Rourke

Green Shadow Cabinet lead on planning and city design and ward councillor for Clifton

STATEMENT A18

Statement concerning planning application no 21/01999/F

Councillor Katy Grant

Clifton ward

22nd September 2021

Objections to the revised application have focused on several aspects of the development. I see the critical problem with the proposal as its non-compliance with the Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note. The installation of photo-voltaic panels has been ruled out for no legitimate reason – given that PV panels are already installed on the roofs of listed buildings in Clifton. The proposal is MISSING the opportunity to reduce the carbon emissions of this development to zero (air source heat pumps will not make such a reduction, and additionally risk creating significant noise pollution in such a densely-built development). We cannot keep making exceptions - in light of Bristol's emissions commitments and the ever-growing urgency of the climate crisis, this development should be showing best practice in this area. Surely Bristol Zoo of all institutions would be interested in a gold standard on environmental measures.

There are also failures in consideration of the environmental space. The lack of a committed play area on the development for children's play is unacceptable, given that there may be more than 50 children ultimately living on the site. The pandemic has taught us all the value of safe and accessible outdoor space, and new planning designs should reflect that, consistent with Development Management Policy 14.

Applicant's speech – Paynes Shipyard & Vauxhall House, 19/06107/F

Good afternoon Councillors

Your officers have worked diligently with Crest to get the plans for Payne's Shipyard right. They recommend approval, and we hope you will agree.

The plans have been refined over four and a half years, incorporating feedback from the Council, statutory consultees and the local community.

The result:

- Delivers policy compliant affordable housing;
- Meets all planning requirements;
- Opens up the waterside to local people;
- Enables people to walk and cycle into town, and along the river;
- Kicks off the Local Plan aspirations for Cumberland Basin, also known as Western Harbour; and
- Delivers policy compliant renewable energy and significant biodiversity net gain.

We note the Council's recent resolution to use brownfield sites for housing rather than greenfield. Payne's Shipyard fits that brownfield-first ideology.

This is a sensitive, sustainable, forward-looking scheme on a contaminated, industrial site in the heart of the city. It enjoys officer and strong ward councillor support.

Thank you for your time.

STATEMENT B2 – Cllr Christine Townsend

- 1) I welcome the ongoing dialogue with the applicants and their advisers. Despite being a newly elected Councillor I am aware this development has been revised following concerns raised by officers and local residents, for example a reduction in height from 9 stories to 5.
- 2) Unlike many other development proposals, this site is already well served by transport infrastructure, it is close to amenities and to a well-established walking route and a cycling route further along Coronation Road, whilst the proposal proposes upgrades to paths, for example to Vauxhall Bridge.
- 3) This is the development of a brown-field industrial site and as such fits with the need to protect existing green spaces.
- 4) Whilst I would have liked to have seen a higher percentage of affordable housing, I acknowledge that this proposal is current Bcc policy compliant, that the applicant is also the developer so therefore my confidence that this percentage will be delivered is reassured.
- 5) Concerns related to large vehicle access to the site (waste collection and emergency vehicles) have been resolved.
- 6) The developer will also install an additional pelican crossing at the main entrance to the site, further prioritising sustainable transport.
- 7) Nearby residents have raised issues of parking and access to the existing Southville RPZ. It's my view that this scheme needs to be explicitly excluded from the PRZ. It needs to be clear to those who may wish to live here that this development promotes non-private car ownership. This is further enforced by the car-club scheme that will be managed in-house by the resident's management company with the space for such vehicles being within the development.
- 8) The developers say that the energy efficiency measures will deliver a 20% carbon reduction which is policy compliant, and will use solar panels and air source heat pumps, and will connect to a future district heating system when it comes online.
- 9) I welcome the opening up of this section of the New Cut to the public which has not been accessible to the public for decades. As mentioned previously, the development will also include the installation of a river-side path to aid leisure and recreational enjoyment of this part of Bristol's landscape and supports a walking path along the entire length of the New Cut at some point in the future.
- 10) Internal green areas for residents have been incorporated to provide for semi-private spaces that also appeal to children, and overall, the landscaping will include up to 90 new trees and nest boxes to encourage wildlife helping to enhance the natural environment between the New Cut and Avon Gorge habitats.

Hengrove Leisure Park, planning application reference 21/00531/P

Dear Councillors

My name is Michael Shears. I am a born-and-bred Bristolian and I work for the applicants, AEW. We are delighted that officers have recommended approval of our proposals.

Originally, we acquired the site as a commercial investment. However, market changes prior to Covid, but sped up due to the pandemic, have rendered the cinema and bingo unviable and unfortunately despite trying to work with the operators they will be vacating the site.

The proposal is to redevelop an underused brownfield out-of-centre leisure park, which people mainly visit by car, into a vibrant new neighbourhood, designed to encourage walking and cycling.

The scheme:

- Is allocated for residential-led development in the draft Local Plan;
- Is compliant with the Local and Neighbourhood Plan;
- Delivers 30% affordable homes; and
- Is designed to meet carbon and energy requirements.

We are also providing financial contributions to:

- Allotments
- The Mounds
- Improved signalling for pedestrian and safer cycling.

The Registered Provider and residential developer we are working with are looking to submit Reserved Matters by the end of the year, with a target start on site in June 2022.

We hope you grant this outline application and obviously happy to answer any questions if needed.

Many thanks for your time.



Hengrove Leisure Park Hengrove Way Bristol BS14 0HR - 21/00531/P | Outline planning application for demolition and residential-led redevelopment

Bristol Tree Forum Questions to the Planning Officer and the planning control committee

We submitted our comments on this planned development on 22 February 2021 - [Bristol Tree Forum Submission - Hengrove Leisure Park](#).¹

In it we noted the Arboricultural Planning Officer's comments in screening application 20/05651/SCR² (Request for a screening opinion as to whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was required):

The report negates to mention the extensive tree planting within the car park which provides canopy cover and some ecological value. The re-development of the site will likely require the removal of most if not all of these trees and therefore adverse effect on the canopy cover of the site.

Hengrove Mounds are located on the south western boundary of the proposed development and therefore the connectivity of green infrastructure with surrounding environments needs to be assessed.

Despite his view that an EIA was needed, none was obtained.

1. In light of this, why was no Environmental Impact Assessment obtained?
2. What steps have been, or will be, taken to apply the Mitigation Hierarchy before any decision is made to remove the trees affected by this development?
3. How have you reassessed this application in light of the publication of the latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework³
4. How does this proposal comply with Bristol's Development Framework Core Strategy policy BCS9? BCS9 states that *Individual green assets should be retained wherever possible and integrated into new development.*
5. The trees are already planted in straight lines. Why is it not possible to design the buildings around them?
6. If the application is granted and the development is not going to be redesigned as suggested, what plans will be made to relocate as many trees as possible (either on site or elsewhere) that are identified for removal rather than destroy them?

¹ <https://bristoltreeforum.files.wordpress.com/2021/02/bristol-tree-forum-submission-hengrove-leisure-park.pdf>

² <https://pa.bristol.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QKCDHUDN0DG00>

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

STATEMENT C3 – Cllr Helen Holland

“Members will recall the passionate debate at last week’s Council meeting where there was agreement across the Chamber (though approaches were slightly different) about the importance of protecting the city’s Green Belt and green spaces, at the same time recognising current housing need, and the ongoing challenge to meet future demand for housing.

Our commitment to retaining and sustaining the diversity of our ecology and wildlife means we have to look at making best use of previously developed, brownfield sites.

As this report makes clear, the current uses of Hengrove Leisure Park will not stay, even if this application is turned down. The space as currently configured is under-used, and outdated. It was built at a time when car-parking was over-provided, so the appearance of the site is large car parks with the buildings around the periphery. It isn’t an attractive place as it stands.

I have found it sad to read some of the social media about this application, with some people wanting to keep things as they are, while acknowledging that these facilities are not what people want, and even that they don’t themselves use them. Surely we should be aiming for better than this?

As one of the Members for a neighbouring ward, I hear every day from constituents who are desperate to be housed, or rehoused, and feel encouraged when they see developments such as the one on Hartcliffe Campus (Jessop Park) and Filwood Park, as the great majority of those who contact us want to stay living locally. This outline application preserves the very popular play area, contributes towards the important site of nature and wildlife interest at the Hengrove Mounds, would give a policy compliant 30% social and affordable homes, and space for employment uses which could potentially bring more jobs and services to the area than the current uses do.

This application gives us the chance to put into action the ambition we all share to take pressure off green spaces, and optimise a brownfield site which could bring so many more benefits to the local community than it currently does. I hope that you will support the officer recommendation and approve this outline permission.”

Thank you,

Cllr Helen Holland

Labour Councillor – Hartcliffe and Withywood

STATEMENT C4 – David Redgewell

Hengrove way cinema and Bingo hall

We would like to strongly object to the loss of these community facilities.

Whilst we welcome the regeneration of south Bristol and new homes on the old Airport in Hengrove and Whitchurch and would welcome more homes in Whitchurch Banes and North Somerset at Yardley.

With all these new community's once again south Bristol is losing out working class communities need leveling up. There is now no cinema south of the River. With the west of England mayoral transport authority having no extra money for new bus routes to Avonmead cinema for young people to go to the cinema 96 bus has no evening service.

The complex was built as a south Bristol regeneration project the cinema, hotel and restaurants. The nearest cinema will now be Bristol centre and the new cinema complex in Cabot circus, Longwell green or Clevedon and Bath, or a metro bus trip to Cribbs causeway, or on the A4 bus to Bath city centre

So young working-class people and their families have a cinema complex removed for more housing. South Bristol needs a balance community with employment and jobs and leisure and Tourism jobs. I note the view of the city economy Development staff who wish to see land for Economy development and jobs, as does the metro mayor Dan Norris wish to jobs for young people and the leisure jobs.

This leisure complex business model of cinema complex, restaurant and Bolling alley appears to work across south west England. In longwell green , Cribbs causeway Cabot circus, Bath, Cheltenham Plymouth ,Weston super mare, Trowbridge, Taunton and Stroud.

Many cinema complex have reopen after covid 19 and change hands the restaurant and the hotel have reopened.

What evidence is their of a marketing strategy or campaign to sale this cinema complex.

Or was pressure put on the owner by the city council housing department to build more homes in Hengrove.

This site is owned by top London based property company.

As we have said we welcome mayor Rees to Build as many new affordable homes in Bristol especially council houses we are short of homes across south west England

But the young people of whitchurch Hengrove Hartcliffe withywood and Bishopworth need leisure facilities In 2021

Does the city council not understand that many young people do have bus fares to travel across the city to visit leisure complexes and cinema in cribbs causeway by metro bus or on the bus to Bath .

South Bristol matters

We have worked with the Avon and Somerset police and First bus when we had damage to buses Must young people in the area say they have very few facilities in area apart from Hengrove pool or sport facilities in whitchurch or Pool and sport centre in keynsham.

There is a very limited bus service to longwell green via keynsham

The area of Hengrove whitchurch Knowle and Filwood need leisure facilities.

I am also concerned about the lack of meaningful public consultation on these plans during a COVID-19 outbreak when many people were involved in stopping from getting sick not on a cinema complex all of which were closed by the government regulations.

and have now reopening some still next year.

We ask the city council to draw up a planning brief for this area including working with the metro mayor Dan Norris on improvements in public transport links to Hengrove especially completing the metro bus to Hartcliffe withywood Highridge Bishopworth and the city centre.

For the planning committee to visit the site and ask for clear evidence from this London based developer of market campaign to sale the leisure complex

and cinema for the council Director of Regeneration and Employment approach leisure complex operators to under the

Market opportunities for the cinema

With Destinations Bristol. as was the case of Stroud district council

and stick to the local plan on a balance community for south Bristol of housing leisure complex employment land and opportunities.

Not every piece of land in this beautiful city should allocated to housing .

I also note on this location on the Bristol ring road and Metro bus route and fast buses to Bath .

And future mass transit system of light rail.

This site will be mainly middle class homes with a few affordable.

With more outbound commuting by car via the Bristol Ring road to Aztec west Emerson green or Cribbs Causeway, Brislington, Keynsham and Bath for work .as there is very little local employment.

We ask that that the planning committee refuse this planning application ask the developer to come back with a new plan that keeps the cinema complex and also look at incorporating some flats within the plan

And provide fund for cycle and walkway

Impoverishment and bus stop facilities including metro bus.

David Redgewell and Ian Beckey

South west public transport network.

And Railfuture Severnside.

STATEMENT C5

Statement from Hengrove and Whitchurch Park Councillors:

1. We wish to object on the grounds of the scale of the proposed development and the loss of amenity to current and future residents of the area.
2. Whilst we recognise the need for housebuilding - indeed, thousands of housing units have either been recently built, approved, or proposed in our ward, including 1,500 to be built on Hengrove Park immediately adjacent to the Leisure Park site - we believe that this should be balanced with the provision of appropriate leisure and employment opportunities, as well as adequate provision of health and other services.
3. We accept that the site is in the draft local plan. However that document states "The site would be considered appropriate for reconfiguration for residential, new flexible workspace **and existing leisure uses**; or the use of the remaining undeveloped areas of the site for residential uses with flexible workspace." [Our emphasis]
4. The draft local plan includes the following planning consideration in relation to the site: "Include the re-provision of leisure uses if those existing buildings were to be lost". **This does not appear to have been fully considered.**
5. The developers say that their tenants no longer wish to operate - although both have reopened following lockdown. We are not satisfied that alternative leisure uses have been fully explored. For example, the subdivision of existing premises to provide, say, a smaller cinema, casual dining, and a soft play area. We are aware of at least one operator of smaller cinemas who have previously explored options in South Bristol.
6. The developer argues that the site is not sustainable as a leisure venue, as it relies on travel by car, but the nearest alternative cinemas are both 4 miles away, at Avon Meads and Cabot Circus. Avon Meads is not easily accessible by public transport, and both locations make extensive provision for travel by car. Local residents - both current and those who will occupy the hundreds of new units in the area - are likely to either make those cinema trips either by a longer trip by car or rather than walking as they can at present. The nearest alternative Bingo hall is 2 miles away
7. Redeveloping the whole site leaves the south of Bristol - which includes a number of socially deprived communities - with even less access to leisure facilities, despite the huge numbers of new homes in the area.
8. We believe that the market analysis outlined in the report to the committee is superficial, and that **an application seeking permission for the whole site (as opposed to one in line with the draft local plan) is premature.**
9. We are not satisfied that restricting consent for the Class E uses included in the proposal to just Classes E(d) and E(f) as suggested in the report are sufficient to compensate for the amenities lost.
10. We are concerned about the impact of the proposal on the Hengrove Play Park which is the biggest free play park in Bristol, with unique attractions, and as such attracts users from a wider catchment area than most play parks. The park also provides sessions specifically aimed at disabled children. A limited amount of parking is envisaged for this, but we are concerned about the impact that the development

will have on the park (both during and after building). **We believe this impact will be significantly negative and reason alone to refuse this application.**

11. When these proposals were first made, we conducted a survey of local residents.

The following a brief summary of the outcome of that:

- a. There were 236 respondents, 87% from BS14 with a further 12% from neighbouring postcode areas (BS13 and BS4)
- b. 79% of respondents objected to development of the site, with a further 8% objecting to the current plan
- c. Residents overwhelmingly regarded the playpark (98%), restaurants (89%) and cinema (88%) as key attractions of the site
- d. When asked about a range of alternatives if the cinema and bingo hall were shown to be no longer viable, 78% supported the idea of a reduced scale cinema with other facilities. Only 2% who answered supported the proposal.
- e. Other facilities residents would like to see considered are "Casual Dining" (78%), Indoor activities (such as crazy golf or laser quest)(75%), 10 pin bowling (70%), and Kids playcentre (67%).

12. We are concerned that access to the fast food outlets would be through proposed residential streets and suggest that - if the committee were minded to approve - that there should be a condition to improve the segregation of these two aspects of the site.

13. We urge committee members to consider this application in the context of

- a. extensive building on the adjacent Hengrove Park,
- b. the impact of the loss of amenities on residents of Hengrove and Whitchurch Park, neighbouring areas such as Filwood and Hartcliffe, and the south of Bristol in general
- c. the draft local plan which envisages a development of only c.43% of that proposed.

and to reject it as it stands.

Councillors Andrew Brown, Sarah Classick, and Tim Kent