

# Development Control A Committee Agenda



**Date:** Wednesday, 16 November 2022

**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, Farah Hussain, Ed Plowden and Andrew Varney

**Copies to:** Gary Collins, Matthew Cockburn, Philippa Howson, Stephen Peacock (Chief Executive) and John Smith (Director: Economy of Place)

**Issued by:** Jeremy Livitt, Democratic Services  
City Hall, PO Box 3399, Bristol, BS1 9NE

Tel:

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

**Date:** Tuesday, 8 November 2022



# Agenda

[www.bristol.gov.uk](http://www.bristol.gov.uk)

## 9. Public Forum

Up to 30 minutes is allowed for this item.

**(Pages 4 - 54)**

Any member of the public or Councillor may participate in Public Forum. The detailed arrangements for so doing are set out in the Public Information Sheet at the back of this agenda. Public Forum items should be emailed to [democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk](mailto:democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk) and please note that the following deadlines will apply in relation to this meeting:-

Questions - Written questions must be received 3 clear working days prior to the meeting. For this meeting, this means that your question(s) must be received in this office at the latest **by 5pm on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2022.**

Petitions and Statements - Petitions and statements must be received on the working day prior to the meeting. For this meeting this means that your submission must be received in this office at the latest **by 12 Noon on Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> November 2022.**

**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.

## 10. Planning and Development

**(Pages 55 - 60)**



Public Forum  
D C Committee A  
16 November 2022 @ 2pm



1. **Members of the Development Control Committee A**  
Councillors: Richard Eddy (Chair), Paul Goggin (Vice-Chair), Fi Hance, Farah Hussain, Andrew Varney, John Geater, Tom Hathway, Phillipa Hulme and Ed Plowden
  
2. **Officers:**  
Development Management team

<b>STATEMENTS</b>			
<b>Statement Number</b>	<b>Request To Speak Made</b>	<b>Planning Application Number</b>	<b>Name</b>
A1	Y	<b>Application No. 21/04208/F: 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD</b>	Andrew Thresh
A2	Y	“	Dan Delor
A3	N	“	Alan Hosegood
A4	Y	“	Rob David
A5	Y	“	Jason Beech
A6	Y	“	Ben Dubuisson
A7	Y	“	Erica Dubuisson
A8	Y	“	Matt Golding
A9	Y	“	Hamilton Caswell
A10	Y	“	David Wilkinson
A11	Y	“	Chris Binding
A12	Y	“	Colin Pemble
A13	Y	“	Clr Ani Stafford-Townsend
A14	N	“	Simon Stafford-Townsend
B1	N	<b>Application No. 21/01999/F: Former Car Park College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3HX</b>	Helen Gardhouse
B2	N	“	Callum Stewart
B3	Y	“	Harry Quartermain
B4	Y	“	Francis Greenacre
B5	Y	“	Chris Booy
B6	Y	“	Francesca Fryer
B7	N	“	Alex Paul
B8	Y	“	Christopher Jeffries
B9	Y	“	Mark CD Ashdown
B10	Y	“	Adam Chivers
B11	Y	“	Robert Day
B12	Y	“	Glyn Thompson

B13	Y	“	ClIr Paula O’Rourke
B14	Y	“	ClIr. Katy Grant
C1	Y	<b>Application No. 21/06761/F: Land on The North Side of Gas Lane Bristol BS2 0QN</b>	Fergus Sykes and Ben Wrightson
C2	Y	“	ClIr Yassin Mohamud
D1	Y	<b>Application No. 22/00805/F: 155 - 165 West Street Bedminster Bristol BS3 3PN</b>	John Cocking
D2	N	“	ClIr Mark Bradshaw



## **STATEMENT OF OBJECTION ON BEHALF OF HOTEL DU VIN BRISTOL - Statement Number A1**

APPLICATION REF: 21/04208/F AT 1A-C COLSTON YARD, BRISTOL, BS1 5BD

14 November 2022

This statement is submitted on behalf of Hotel Du Vin (HDV) Bristol in objection to the above application. HDV Bristol is a Grade II listed building located immediately to the east of the application site. The hotel is an asset to Bristol, which employs approximately 55 members of staff, and which assists in bringing in tourism and investment into the city. It is regarded as being one of the higher end hotels in Bristol, with guests including celebrities, delegates and investors. It is therefore important that HDV makes a positive impression on its guests, and its setting plays a key role in the experience it offers to its customers.

HDV objects to the proposals as they would have a detrimental impact on amenity and the operations of the hotel, throughout both the construction and operational phases of development. The proposals would also cause harm to the setting of the Grade II listed building that is occupied by HDV.

Whilst we note the Council's Economic Development Officer consultation response stated that businesses can apply to the VOA to have their rateable values reassessed, these measures would not come close to covering the losses that HDV would experience as a result of the disruption caused by the proposal. The disruption would not only affect HDV during the lengthy construction process (ie 18 – 24 months) but it would seriously damage its reputation during and afterwards, as guests would stay elsewhere or outside Bristol.

Whilst we acknowledge that planning permission was granted in 2007 for a relatively similar scheme (ref: 07/01304/F), that permission has now lapsed and the local and national planning policy position has moved on significantly. Furthermore, HDV was not involved in the determination of the previous application as the hotel was under different ownership at the time.

The issues raised by HDV were submitted in an objection to the application on 4 November 2021. However, despite the design of the scheme being revised in January and October 2022, the issues have not been properly addressed and therefore HDV's concerns remain outstanding. As such, HDV requests that Members refuse the application, for the reasons summarised below. HDV would be keen to meet Members on site to explain their concerns.

### **Intensification of Colston Yard and Johnny Ball Lane**

Firstly, the proposed scheme would result in the intensification of both Colston Yard; a quiet back street accessed only via a narrow tunnel, and Johnny Ball Lane; a narrow pedestrian footpath identified as a Public Right of Way that runs along HDV's southern and western boundaries. The increased level of activity, and the associated noise and disruption, would have a detrimental impact on the quiet character of this area, and on the level of amenity that occupants and residents of the hotel currently enjoy.

Whilst we are aware that planning permission was previously granted at 1A for its conversion to an HMO, the current application also proposes an apart-hotel in the adjacent 1B and 1C. The level of activity associated with the HMO (which is proposed to be occupied by students) has the potential to conflict with both the proposed apart-hotel use and also HDV.

The Council's Transport Development Management Officer objects to the application on highways and pedestrian safety grounds. This is on the basis that the pedestrian and cycle movements associated with the proposal at Colston Yard would conflict with the existing industrial uses.

For the reasons mentioned above, the proposal is in conflict with Policy DM23, which expects development to provide safe and adequate access, and protect and enhance the function and amenity of Public Rights of Way.

## **Heritage**

The proposal would appear as a tall, dominant, solid block above the roofs of the listed building occupied by HDV. It would obscure the existing connection with the high-quality historic townscape that currently forms the backdrop to, and makes an important part of the setting of, the listed building and this would cause harm to the significance of the Grade II listed building.

This issue has not been properly addressed through the revisions that were made to the scheme in January or October 2022. The proposal is therefore not in accordance with Policy DM31 (Heritage Assets), as it fails to conserve the heritage asset and its setting.

## **Disruption during construction**

The proposal would result in an unacceptable level of disruption during the construction phase, for a long period of time (72 weeks according to the submitted Construction Management Plan). Johnny Ball Lane is identified as the primary access for construction, which is entirely inappropriate given the associated likely impact on amenity with respect to noise, air quality and mud / construction material. As an example, HDV has an external roof terrace to its Lombard Suite (which is used for special events such as wedding receptions). Noise and dust from construction would have a significant detrimental impact on the use of the roof terrace.

Furthermore, HDV is aware that at times, water runs from the wall that sits behind Johnny Ball Lane onto the hotel's site. HDV is therefore concerned that the proposal and associated construction process will exacerbate this further, given the proposed use of Johnny Ball Lane. HDV is not aware of any surveys that have been undertaken to demonstrate otherwise. Similarly, HDV is also concerned about the impact of the construction process on the stability of the existing chimney that forms part of the listed building.

Another key concern associated with the construction phase is that the Construction Management Plan identifies an area immediately in front of HDV as a delivery and unloading area. This is entirely impractical for HDV's guests and operations, and it has the potential to impact on the hotel's day to day trading. Similarly, a raised ramp is identified along Johnny Ball Lane for plant and materials. There is no indication of the height or any further details of this ramp, and HDV is concerned of the security implications for its guests and property. HDV also currently uses Johnny Ball Lane as a fire escape route, which is likely to be compromised by this proposed ramp. Furthermore, Johnny Ball Lane is a key route through from Lewins Mead by foot up to the Bristol Royal Infirmary and Bristol Royal Hospital for Children.

Of relevance, scaffolding was erected on the application site recently and it resulted in HDV receiving a significant number of noise complaints from hotel guests. The scaffolding also prevented delivery vehicles and taxis from turning properly. This was on a smaller scale than what is likely to be required for the proposal, yet it demonstrates the impact that such works can create if they are not managed properly.

In our view, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the construction of the proposed development would protect the amenity of HDV's guests and nearby occupants. There are instead clear issues with the information that has been submitted with respect to construction management. Given the proximity of the application site to the listed building that houses HDV, the construction process should be agreed in consultation with HDV. However, HDV agrees with the Transport Development Management Team's recommended refusal of the application, which we note still stands in the Committee Report update.

## **Conditions**

As explained above, HDV strongly recommends that the application is refused. However, if Members are minded to approve it, HDV requests that the following comments are incorporated into any final list of conditions.

HDV does not understand why there are two separate conditions requiring the submission and approval of two very similar documents; a Construction Management Plan (Condition 3) and a Construction Management Plan (Environmental) (Condition 10). In our view, the information required by these conditions should be provided in one concise document, which should be prepared in consultation with HDV. Given the proximity of the hotel to the application site, and the concerns raised above, a Construction Management Plan should not be approved unless it has been agreed with HDV.

For example, HDV does not consider that the working hours set out in Condition 10 are acceptable. Construction works at 8am on a Saturday are likely to have a significant detrimental impact on HDV's guests, which will result in complaints.

Furthermore, we request that the following information is included within any Construction Management Plan that is approved, as it is not currently required by either Condition 3 or Condition 10:

- Identification of an area that is suitable for loading and unloading, which must not be located in front of HDV's property;
- Identification of a dedicated compound area, which must not be located in front of HDV's property;
- Details of how Johnny Ball Lane and Colston Yard will continue to be available for the use of the general public without compromise to safety.

Please note that the above list is not exhaustive and, in addition to consultation and agreement with HDV, any submitted document should be considered and agreed by the Council's Transport Development and Environmental Health Officers, and the Fire Service.

We also request that additional pre-commencement conditions are included, which require the submission and approval of surveys that assess the impact of the proposal on the stability of the existing chimney and on the existing water / drainage issue on Johnny Ball Lane.

## **Conclusion**

HDV is significantly concerned that the proposals will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of its guests and the existing occupants of Colston Yard, the operations of the hotel, and on the character of the area and setting of the listed building. HDV is aware that a considerable number of objections have been received from members of the public, community groups and also from the Council's Transport Development Management Officer. This demonstrates the proposal fails to address a number of key issues and concerns, and it is greatly unwelcomed by the local community. As explained above, it is also contrary to planning policy.

On this basis, we respectfully request that Members refuse the application. As discussed above, HDV would be keen to meet Members on site to discuss their concerns.

**Application no.** 21/04208/F

**Site address:** 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD

Dear representatives,

I am writing to **register to speak** at the meeting of the Development Control Committee A on Wednesday 16 November 2022 when they consider the above proposal.

I wish to speak so that I might oppose the proposal on the following grounds :-

1. The developer has just finished developing the first building in the main yard into flats - causing disruption with parking and construction noise which has been a nuisance to everyone working in the yard but especially The Forge next door which has lost bookings (film and photography sessions, business meetings, gigs and wedding receptions), and now proposes another 2 years of this disruption and chaos?
2. The entrance to The Yard and the Yard itself are already too narrow and congested to handle the increased traffic that this development proposes. The photos of the yard in the proposals show it as virtually empty - on most weekdays the yard gets backed-up with parked cars and vans, with people coming and going. The only turning point at the end of the Yard is almost always full of cars by 9.30 so any other cars have to line-up one behind the other and are frequently having to reverse up the alley in number to let each-other out. The entrance alleyway is not wide enough to accommodate a vehicle and a pedestrian, and there is no pavement and with angled low ridge and sharp jagged metal wall protectors on each side there is great risk to pedestrians when vehicles are around and no access at all when they have to park-up in the entrance. Furthermore there are no traffic management systems in place for when vehicles arrive and leave the entrance alleyway. With delivery and service vehicles coming and going and frequently parking across the entrance causing waiting vehicles to stack up and double park whilst owners are found etc. WITH VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS ALREADY SO CHALLENGING the proposal to increase the footfall in this the most critical area of Colston Yard is utterly ridiculous.
3. The scale of the proposed building is just too much for the site. With seven floors this proposal would use up almost every inch of space on the site in this historical conservation area blocking natural daylight and significantly increasing noise and artificial light pollution for the neighbouring residents. With it's emphasis on maximising the number of occupants in small short-term lets this building is only likely to encourage temporary residents with little desire to contribute to or care about the local community.
4. If this proposal is allowed there is a very high risk of it eventually being turned into student lets - We have seen the market for Student letting grow exponentially in the city centre and there are already thousands of places for temporary student lets available nearby. We do not need anymore!

Please consider my arguments and allow me to put at least some of them to you personally in the meeting on the 16th.

Sincerely

Dan Delor

## Statement A3

With reference to 1A-C Colston Yard, application 21/94298/F

As a close neighbour to the above development my comments are

the long term impact on an already very busy Yard and surrounding area will have a big impact on local traders and occupants.

the building process will have a disastrous impact on both Colston St and the numerous businesses in the yard over a long period.

the long term benefits on the area will I believe have a negative impact on what is after all the arts quarter in Bristol.

I feel that the application to be totally unsuitable for such a fragile and historic area and should therefore be rejected.

I do hope that the opinions of the local residents will be taken into account on this very important issue.

Regards,

Alan Hosegood

#### Statement A4

Over the last 10 years Colston Yard has evolved. It's now a creative hub. People come here to think, to create, to produce interesting work for businesses around Bristol and across the world. The appeal is the tucked away nature of the yard. It's peaceful but central, busy but respectful. That's why it's a great place to work. I co-run a recording studio at Colston Yard. Although we've made great efforts to sound-proof the space, the sort of noise that will be created by the construction of a huge building like this will be almost impossible to avoid. The disruption to the access for moving equipment in and out is also a huge worry. I am not against development, but I feel that this is an over sized project and needs to be majorly scaled back.

Many thanks

Rob David

Statement A5

I wish to register my intention to speak regarding:  
On Wednesday 16th November 2022

Application no. 21/04208/F

Site address: 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD

Proposal: Partial demolition, conversion of no. 1A Colston Yard from offices to a house in multiple

occupation and conversion of nos. 1B-C to an apart-hotel (Use Class C1) with a business hub and associated new-build development.

I also wish to oppose said development, as I work and live on Colston St and can see nothing but disturbance for the foreseeable future in a badly chosen site.

Jason Beech

## Statement A6

1. There will still be a loss of light and air to the properties adjoining the proposal. There are residential properties in particular that will be overshadowed by the sheer scale of the proposal.

2. The development is still far too large in scale for the adjoining Colston yard and neighbouring properties. The increased footfall could seriously damage the nature of the live work community and there is no adequate plan in place for dealing with the large amount of rubbish that will be generated.

3. The modern corporate nature of the development is completely out of keeping with the community and small scale way that the area has evolved and will be an unwelcome large scale addition to the area, an area that has previously been built up by small scale individuals and businesses into what it is today.

4. I am not sure if a suitable independent geological survey has been carried out but the nature of the sloping site must put other properties at risk if this is not properly assessed.

5. One of the major issues surrounds construction noise and the disruption caused during the build. For example, the commandeering of parking spaces for months on end would seriously damage the business at the top end of Colston street and their ability to trade. Who also wants to visit an area where concrete pumping is going on 8 hours a day right outside the small businesses. Also the narrow entrance to Colston yard is totally unsuitable for one of the only 2 entrances to such a large construction site.

6. The hours listed in the construction plan are far too long and disruptive for such an enclosed community. At the very least weekends should be construction free and piling should not take place before 9.30 at the earliest. With so many residential properties overlooking the site why should peace and quiet be disturbed for a corporate building adding very little to the nature and development of the area apart from increased disruption.

7. The material yard proposed for the area in front of The Hotel Du Vin is totally unsuitable and has quite rightly been objected to by the hotel itself and St Bartholomew's yard. There must be a very real danger of those businesses suffering fundamental damage if this plan goes ahead.

8. Generally the proposal is only about making money for an outside developer and the fragile ecology of this unique area can only ultimately suffer. I trust you will listen to the overwhelming objections from the community and refuse this development.

Ben Dubuisson (Neighbour)

## Statement A7

There will be a of light and air to surrounding properties, many of which are residential. They will still be overshadowed by this development.

The scale of the development is out of proportion to the area. There is no spare capacity to absorb all these extra people in the area. There are insufficient plans to deal with the rubbish they generate. These residents are not invested in the area and as such do not care about mess and disruption they cause.

I'm not convinced that a proper geological survey has been done about building such a huge building on a difficult site.

The impact this development will have on the community while it is being built is likely to be catastrophic. The traders in the area have survived a difficult period and could be facing a minimum of 2 years of disruption in front of their shops and businesses. Shop owners have already said that placing works units in front of them (as is proposed) will make them close.

Visitors to the historic tourist area will have their experience ruined by noise, dust and ugly building sites. This area is a significant tourist destination and has just recently seen new businesses opening expanding its appeal further.

I do not see how the Colston yard residents will be able to safely carry on their lives with the amount of building works and materials that will be moving through the narrow entranceway.

This whole proposal is about making money for the developer. Nothing is being added to the community. The likely result of this proposal being granted is that a thriving business area with a strong residential community will be decimated for no social gain for the city of Bristol.

The idea that rates reductions will help the businesses is ridiculous as most businesses are so small they do not pay rates.

I sincerely hope that the council will listen to the objections from the community and refuse this development.

---

Erica Dubuisson

**Application Summary:**

Application Number: 21/04208/F Address: 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD Proposal: Partial demolition, conversion of no. 1A Colston Yard from offices to a house in multiple occupation and conversion of nos. 1B-C to an apart-hotel (Use Class C1) with a business hub and associated new-build development containing serviced apartments.

Case Officer: Ben Royston

12th November 2022      Statement A8

**Customer Details:**

Name: Matt Golding

Address: Flat 1, 72 Colston Street, Bristol, BS15BB

12.11.22

**Comment Details:**

Comment Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the planning application

Despite incremental small reductions this development remains a hugely overbearing project for a tiny city centre site with incredibly limited access and no way to support the comings, goings and waste of the large scale transient population it seeks to support.

The Christmas Steps Arts Quarter is a beautiful historic area in the heart of the city, but it's already in a delicate balance between many residential properties, shops and entertainment venues.

As a resident, I along with my many neighbours, many of who'm are families with children or long term residents work hard to keep the area in balance.

I live with my partner and two children in a flat directly overlooking the site of the proposed development. My living room, dining room, bedroom and daughters bedroom all overlook the site, and will be affected by diminished views, light and amenity, both during the prolonged, complex and inevitably hugely disruptive build phase, and then forever after that.

The proposed development will make living and working in our home unbearable for the 72 weeks it'll take to build, and will then block our view and light in perpetuity beyond that. We won't have anywhere to escape.

Construction will be loud, requiring pile driving, heavy equipment and ongoing work which if it ran to time, from 7:30am to 6pm weekdays and 8am to 1pm

Saturdays. I work from home for the majority of the week - and we have a 1 year old baby. They still sleep in the day.

This development does nothing to benefit the area, and offers nothing to the local residents or shops, seeking as it does to profit from short term stays of transient folks. The argument made in a previous planning meeting that Bristol is lacking such venues is an absurdity when contrasted with the message from the Council that Bristol is suffering from an over-abundance of short term lets / AirBnB's to the extent that the city has discussed banning them. We can't possibly have such a problem AND need more short term rentals so much that we need to allow a development of this type to provide them. Put simply we don't lack such properties and we therefore don't need any more - certainly not when they come with this scale of detriment to such a unique portion of the city.

The statement of community involvement stated neighbours had been consulted. Given my property is probably the most exposed to this building work having my view and ability to live work and sleep affected far more than the properties that are claimed to have been consulted, it is ridiculous the developers feel they have done their due diligence whilst undertaking a development which will radically alter my quality of life, and drastically reduce the amenity of my home. The developers seem to have approached this as if it is purely a development of Colston Yard, and not, as is the reality, a development which directly borders a plethora of residential and live work properties which it would directly overshadow and overlook.

Overall this concept is a triumph of greed over sense. It would turn a historic tourist area into a building site and then a rubbish dump and taxi stop. The idea that this could go ahead and not destroy the very special but fragile balance of the existing residents and venues that make this area so unique is naive to say the least.



## **RESIDENTS AND TRADERS**

Chair: Cllr. Ani Stafford-Townsend

Treasurer: Amelie Caswell

Secretary: David Chilton

Planning Scrutiny Committee: Hamilton Caswell

### **Statement A9 to Building Control Committee A on 16/11/22 re 21/04208/F**

On behalf of the Christmas Steps Arts Quarter planning scrutiny committee, this proposal remains hugely unpopular with our residents and traders based in or near Colston Yard. It received an initial sixty-seven objections and since the revision to the plan has received another twenty-eight, making ninety-five objections in all.

Colston Yard's limited capacity is already at fully stretch, and would be totally overwhelmed by the imposition of an unwanted 19-bedroom hotel. Also the modern design is out-of-keeping with the much-loved period character of the Yard. These objections are supported by Bristol Civic Society, the Conservation Advisory Panel, The Christmas Steps Arts Quarter and ward councillor Ani Stafford-Townsend.

Since the relatively small revision to the plans, no-one has withdrawn their objections, and we ask the members of Development Control Committee A to regard all ninety-five objections as still standing.

Hamilton Caswell

## Statement A 10

As a resident and business owner I wish to register my objection to this planning application on the following grounds:

A development of this size and nature is simply too big and wholly inappropriate for the site. Colston Yard has no means of access suitable for a 22 apartment, 7 storey structure, whatever the proposed use might be, both for construction and for potential occupants.

Colston street itself is already full to capacity with traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, much of which now continues late into the night - we don't need any more.

22 'apartments' will generate a considerable volume of rubbish for which there is simply no space - either in Colston Yard or on Colston Street, again we don't need anymore.

No. 68 is fortunate to have a relatively private and quiet rear garden. The proposed structure will simply overwhelm us and many other properties that border the site.

Then there is the proposed construction phase, lasting for up to 2 years, resulting in the loss of parking bays and the intrusion of the noise and other disturbances from the site.

Finally I would make the comment that this 'development' would do nothing that might benefit the area, rather it's possibly the least appropriate scheme for this site, it should be rejected and finally laid to rest.

Kind regards  
David Wilkinson

## Statement A11

I object to the amended proposal, as it stands, for all the reasons argued last year, October 2021.

The revised plans do not adequately address any of the issues previously conveyed to the planning committee: footprint and extent of building; number of storeys and height of roofline; intrusion and impact onto neighbouring properties (Colston Yard, Colston Street) both during the build and in the long-term following completion. The Applicant has made only a notional and insubstantial revision to the Application. As previously suggested, should the footprint be halved and the elevation reduced substantially then I am sure the application would be given a more sympathetic response by the community.

1. The negative impact on the local community will be profound should this development go ahead without further alterations. Congestion in and around Colston Yard, pedestrian and vehicular, will be extreme. The proximity and impact of the building to the rear of the properties and gardens on Colston Street, especially with its southerly footprint extending as far as it does, is totally unreasonable. Disturbance by noise, whether by 'guests' or from the potentially 24/7 air source heat pumps will be unacceptable. The mass of the building's storeys will overpower and infringe unfairly upon the privacy and peace of the existing and long-established residents' homes.
2. Despite the claims and assurances of STP Lettings that this development will be aimed at 'high-end business users' there is no 'demonstrable need' for this kind of accommodation. And there is a real possibility that in the future the building could be let to the student population which would be in contravention to BCC's own guidelines with regard to this particular neighbourhood. This community needs residents who have an interest and investment in the locality. It is already a densely built neighbourhood by the applicant's own admission, but it is a community that is close-knit, involved and interested in acting as guardian to the unique local atmosphere – this needs to be nurtured and supported by the Council rather than carelessly ignored.
3. Access for the build is severely restricted. Any build procedure will have a massive negative impact on local businesses and residents let alone the day-to-day life on Colston Street, Johnny Ball Lane and Colston Avenue / Rupert Street for the 18 month to two-year duration of the build. Where would the site office be situated? Where would the day-to-day materials be stored? According to Structural Solutions' own submission a 'down the hole' hammer and rotary drilled piles will all be necessary for the groundworks preparation. There will inevitably be unacceptable levels of pollution, noise and general disturbance for residents and businesses alike whether the build is accessed from Colston Yard or outside The Hotel du Vin.

A far more detailed description of the build process needs to be submitted and scrutinised before any decision is entertained as to the acceptability and benefits of such an application.

I would urge the Members to reject the Application for the above reasons as well as for the reason that the revised plans are not in accordance with Policy DM31 (Heritage Assets).

I'm not against the development of this land per se; I am against the development on this scale for all the negative impacts that will be inflicted on this community. The architectural merits are evident in the response to the Victorian arches on Johnny Ball Lane, the pitched roofs of Colston Yard and Street. But its the size of the thing – it just too big.

I also attach a petition from the last few weeks objecting to the proposed development:

# SAVE OUR COMMUNITY

The undersigned, object to Planning Application 21/04208/F – conversion of nos. 1B-C to an 'apart-hotel' (Use Class C1) with a business hub and associated new-build development containing serviced apartments.  
Site Address: 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD

NAME

ADDRESS

GIOFFREY BOLLER	8 CLAVINGTON DUCKING, BAZ 4LD.
ANITA BAROZG	~ - - -

# SAVE OUR COMMUNITY

The undersigned, object to Planning Application 21/04208/F – conversion of nos. 1B-C to an 'apart-hotel' (Use Class C1) with a business hub and associated new-build development containing serviced apartments.  
Site Address: 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD

NAME

ADDRESS

Lucy King	BS6 5UD
Andy King	BS6 5UD
HAL OUBUISSON	BS1 5AZ
Frances Wright	BS6 5UF.
Gabrielle Powell	BS2 8DJ.
ROJALE MARK	BS6 6DW
MATT VENABLE	BS6 6DW.
TENEJA TRANK	GL56 0TK
LUCIE BUCKLAND	BS3 4UH
John Adams	BS2 5UF
KIRSTY HODGON	BAZ 5JZ
Rob David	BS1 5SD
Jenny Sanderson	BS7 8QX
Gavin Bridgenwood	BS7 9LU
Xanko Pava	BS6
Dawn Shorter	BS1 5AB
Philip Howells	BS3 1PT.
Roland Bruce	BS2 9XC.
Janet Bann-Roper	SN19 3EL
lauren Boyd	NP16 6TH
Jonny Wisk	BT6 5EA
	S



## **Development Control Committee A – 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022**

### **1A-C Colston Yard, Bristol, BS1 5BD – Application No. 21/04208/F**

#### **Supporting Statement on Behalf of the Applicants**

---

1. For those members who were able to see this site, hopefully they now appreciate the context and understand how the development will assimilate into the existing townscape.
2. Since the last committee meeting further discussion has taken place with the planning officer and in response, amendments have been made to the scheme with its scale reduced at the southern end of the proposed block. Whilst we don't believe this is necessary, it is a concession by the applicants to those occupying buildings near to the site.
3. Developing the site is not without its challenges, but there are no good reasons why it can't take place without appropriate measures to protect existing residential amenity and ensure access is maintained for pedestrians to both Colston Yard and Jonny Ball Lane. As a condition of consent there is a requirement for a very details construction management plan which will need to address the construction process and phasing. The imperative will be to ensure there is limited impact on near neighbours or those passing the site.
4. As a city centre site, it is ideally suited to the proposed site and location. It is highly accessible and will provide bespoke accommodation for which there is an identified need. The development will result in an efficient use of the land and will bring with it many benefits that outweigh any perceived harm. Indeed, the future occupiers will no doubt use the local shops and services which are located around the site.
5. The new building's form and appearance is designed to respond positively to the opportunities and constraints of the site and historic context, the mixed character and scale of buildings within the immediate area. The photomontages and other visuals submitted in support of the application clearly illustrate how the development will assimilate into the context. The resulting architecture will enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, as well as preserve the setting of the adjacent listed buildings. The merits and appropriateness of the development has result in the planning, conservation and economic development officers supporting the proposals.
6. The proposals follow a previous planning permission that was granted consent in 2009 for a mixed use redevelopment that included 18no. new residential units. The latest proposal share many similarities to this. The applicants vision is to create spacious, high-quality visitor accommodation within easy walking distance of all the attractions within the central area, the University of Bristol and Bristol Royal Infirmary.
7. Given the proposals accord with the principles of sustainable development, there are sound reasons for the application to be supported and approved. The development will bring with it a significant CIL contribution to the City's infrastructure.
8. The proposal represents a genuine opportunity to regenerate an under-used and beleaguered site, creating sustainable development and uses which would make a positive contribution to the area. As such, the Committee is respectfully requested to grant planning permission for the development.

## **Statement A13**

**Application ref. no: 21/04208/F**

**Application address: 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD**

I object to this application as not only the ward councillor, but as Chair & member of the Christmas Steps Arts Quarter Residents and Traders Association.

The application is for an overbearing, apartment hotel within a **Conservation area** which includes Grade II and Grade II\* listed buildings such as Christmas Steps, Colston Street and St Bartholomew's Hospital. This proposed development is entirely unsuitable for the actual plot and the location. The plot is rich in wildlife with foxes, goldfinches, great tits and other animals visiting the neighbouring gardens, balconies and windowsills, despite efforts to clear it. The city centre has low levels of tree canopy and green spaces, pockets such as this plot require protection.

### **Traffic, Access & Highway Safety:**

Proposed site plan misleading, access into the yard is shown as an open route when it is in fact a low height, single storey tunnel.

Access rights to the Yard should be shared between the freeholders with Yard access. To my understanding, their consent and approval has not been sought or obtained. In some cases, they have not been contacted & consulted by the applicant.

Construction traffic. Construction will be from the Colston Street side. Colston Street is the only street in the Christmas Steps Arts Quarter that has currently got on street car parking for residents & businesses, plus the only loading bays for the area. Colston Street is also currently part of a cycle lane & traffic consultation for the area that is considering options such as narrowing Colston Street. Construction traffic would cause extreme disruption for the area.

Car parking. Regardless of developer intention, there will be additional car traffic as a result of this development. Colston Street is already at traffic and car parking saturation, with the nearest car park continually full with resident visitor, business customers, and the staff, patients and visitors to the hospital. There is not the capacity for this development.

The closure of Johnny Ball Lane for an extended period would be the loss of a crucial walking route for the area and the hospitals.

### **Economic impact:**

The impact of the build on the surrounding businesses would be astronomical. The Active Travel scheme running through the area, which is due to be actioned in the same time scale as this development makes permanent the cycle lanes on Perry Road. Depending on the final design, the parking bays on Colston Street would be the only remaining on street parking. To lose several spaces for construction use would cause an already stretched situation for shoppers, hospital visitors and deliveries beyond capacity.

The Christmas Steps Arts Quarter is a filming location for many film and TV productions. Colston Yard itself is a regular location, for which residents are compensated, as are Christmas Steps and Colston Street. When this happens, both the local area and the city is financially benefited. The construction work would prevent this for the several years it would take to complete.

In the process of commandeering several parking spaces, the shops immediately opposite the spaces would have their access, their light and their marketing potential hindered as shoppers may not be able to easily pass by or view them. In uncertain trading times, this would have an unacceptable economic effect on the area. Many businesses would be very likely forced to close.

The infrastructure of the area is already under strain when it comes to waste collection and parking, but also importantly the digital infrastructure struggles to meet the demands of the existing residents and traders. 40 more units would increase the strain.

**Privacy/overbearing:**

The proximity to homes and businesses on Colston St is too much and too overbearing. The rear of Colston is south east facing, and a development so high would block out much of the light especially to lower units. The design also includes much potential of over looking and loss of privacy for the residents.

**Noise, odours, Pollution:**

Sound bounces around this enclave like an amphitheatre. The noise during construction would be incredibly detrimental to residents and businesses alike. The building through which Colston Yard is accessed is inhabited by many businesses, and includes at least 5 therapists who require a calm, quiet setting in order to provide much needed mental health support. The noise from the construction would prevent the therapists from carrying out their therapeutic work.

Air pollution would be much increased through construction traffic of material deliveries and construction workers.

**Neighbourhood consultation:**

The applicant met with a small group of residents, including myself as Chair of CSAQ & ward councillor in June 21 to discuss plans. Due to the covid rules of the time, the group was limited to 6 people. At the meeting and following the meeting, many issues and objections were given in response to the application. Unfortunately none of this feedback was accepted by the applicant, and no action was taken to address the issues raised. Furthermore, local residents and businesses with access rights to the Yard but with postal addresses on Upper Maudlin Street have not been contacted or consulted. The many objections that have been submitted in response to the application are as a result of our own community engagement not due to any engagement or consultation from the applicant.

This raises many concerns about how respectful the construction period would be towards the surrounding neighbours. To date no further engagement has with the community has been undertaken, despite the removal of covid restrictions.

I have included below an image of the entrance to the site, to help envisage the restrictions of this development. The wide ranging impacts of this development to the many, many surrounding residents and businesses vastly outweigh any benefits to one business.

I request that this be rejected today by the committee, or at least deferred pending a site visit to enable the committee to view the complexities of the site and surrounding area.

Cllr Ani Stafford-Townsend  
Chair of Christmas Steps Arts Quarter Residents and Traders Association  
Chair of Development Committee B

Cllr Ani Stafford-Townsend (them/they)

Green Party Councillor for Central Ward, Bristol

Green Co-Shadow Cabinet Member for Culture, Communities, Equalities & Public Health

Committee Chair for Development Committee B

Statement A14

Application ref. no: 21/04208/F

Application address: 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD

I would like to strongly object to this development, both as a local resident on nearby Upper Maudlin Street and with my experience having run a psychotherapy practice on Colston Street for the past 8 years.

Whilst this application has technically been amended following rejection at its previous committee consideration, the change that has been made is incredibly cosmetic and fails to address the many objections local residents and traders have repeatedly raised.

My objections are as follows:

- this development will create long-term traffic mayhem on Colston Street, the knock-on effects of which will severely disrupt traffic flow along Upper Maudlin Street and around the Bear Pit. I understand that the committee is undertaking a site visit, so you will all likely see for yourselves the state of traffic along Colston Street.

Not only will some of the only on-street parking in the area be taken out of action by construction works, but the build up of traffic at the crucial set of traffic lights will mean gridlock. Councillors need to understand the impact this will have on the independent shops that trade on Colston Street. When traffic builds up on Colston Street, the retail areas of these shops suffer the impact of increased air pollution. I invite Councillors to imagine working in a retail space, only a few metres away from gridlocked traffic, for several hours a day, most days of the week.

This traffic will also impact on the ability of the Christmas Steps Arts Quarter to attract the footfall it needs to sustain these independent businesses. In short, the more pleasant an area is to walk around, the more footfall it attracts, and the more its shops flourish. The reverse is also true. Losing independent business from the locality would have a serious detrimental impact on amenity in the area.

- the loss of access to Johnny Ball Lane for at least a year, very likely longer, would have a big impact on me as a local resident. Johnny Ball Lane offers a vital walking route directly into the centre and is one I use several times a week. There is an accessibility impact here for people who can't manage the Christmas Steps. There is also temporary accommodation for families with children in the children's hospital on Upper Maudlin Street. Johnny Ball Lane is a vital access route for these families. Finally, there is accommodation in the mews on Johnny Ball Lane for medical students, so this is also a vital access route for those medics.

- as a psychotherapist, I am particularly concerned about the wellbeing impact of this development on local residents, myself included! The development will clearly impact the level of light available to existing residents. Exposure to a good level of natural sunlight is vital for wellbeing, and a lack of such exposure is strongly associated with Seasonal Affective Disorder. The impact of noise from construction will include loss of sleep and increased

stress for local residents. The increased air pollution will impact on the physical health of residents, especially those with respiratory conditions like asthma.

Overall, I ask Councillors to imagine living close by to this development. To imagine losing precious sunlight in an already built up area. To breathe in increasingly dirty air. To have your home invaded by construction noise, and your local area gridlocked by increased traffic. To see independent businesses you care about reluctantly leave the area. And to see the character of a unique area of the city rapidly transformed by yet another generic development.

Please reject this application

Simon Stafford-Townsend

Statement B1

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write regarding the Former Zoo car park application . I cannot attend the meeting on 16th November.

I object strongly to the plans for 62 dwellings. The revised plans are not materially different to the initial quashed plans. Significant harm will be caused to the area including Grade 2 historic villas backing onto the zoo car park. Deeds associated with these houses former gardens are available which forbid any buildings higher than two storeys on the land. A heritage wall and original Victorian glass house will be destroyed along with about 15 trees some of which are protected trees. There is a lack of street parking for an extra 100 cars. Traffic flow and pollution will be increased causing environmental harm to the area. Even Historic England admits harm will be caused. Please reconsider and look to demand a sympathetic and environmentally progressive scheme to which Bristol can be proud.

Thank you

Helen Gardhouse



**Bristol Zoological  
Society**  
Saving Wildlife Together

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 16 November 2022 2.00pm  
Agenda Item 10.b)

**Statement in support – Callum Stewart, Communications Executive, Bristol  
Zoological Society - STATEMENT NUMBER B2**

Dear Councillors,

While I am an employee of the Zoo and very supportive of this application, I also write to you as a young person living in Bristol, and only too aware of the struggles many of us face with housing.

In its most recent annual survey the National Housing Federation – the body representing housing associations – reported the average Bristol home costs £364,000...12 times the average income. If I wanted to buy an average priced home I'd have to be earning more than £83,000 a year...and that's with a 20 per cent deposit. And I didn't join this amazing charity expecting to earn that kind of money!

Life for renters is equally challenging, and – as highlighted in the Mayor's State of the City speech – there are more than 17,000 households on the housing waiting list in Bristol, with 1,000 households in temporary accommodation.

Of course, not everyone could afford to live in Clifton. Not everyone would actually want to live in Clifton. But when so few new affordable homes get built in this affluent part of Bristol, why would anyone say no to the affordable homes being proposed. They fully comply with your own policies, with rents set at Local Housing Allowance rates, to make them as accessible to as many people as possible.

At a time when young people are equally concerned with the climate emergency, these new homes turn a now-redundant car park into a highly sustainable place for people to live in energy-efficient homes. So, in my opinion, the application addresses two key things that young people are most concerned about: affordable housing and sustainability.

What's not to like?

Yours faithfully

Callum Stewart  
Communications Executive  
Bristol Zoological Society



**STATEMENT B3**

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 16 November 2022

**Harry Quartermain – Planning Associate, Barton Willmore now Stantec**

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.

The application was originally submitted in April 2021 as part of the Society's strategy to relocate. Bristol Zoo closed the doors on its site in Clifton for the last time on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2022. The development site, which was previously used as a staff car park for the Zoo, is now surplus and is classified in planning terms as 'previously developed (or brownfield) land'.

This planning application is for 62 houses, 13 of them affordable houses, on this brownfield site – in a sustainable urban location that enjoys excellent access to amenities, services, and public transport.

This Committee debated this application, and resolved to approve it, in September last year. As you will be aware, the reason that we're here discussing this application for a second time is due not to the merit of the proposed development, but rather to ensure that the process by which a decision is made, is robust, and to ensure that Councillors are presented with complete and accurate information at the time of any decision.

Since this application was last brought to the Committee, further changes have been introduced to the development to further improve the appearance and performance of Block A. In response to these changes, Historic England have accepted that any harm caused by the development to the surrounding conservation area has been minimised, and is now at the lowest end of 'less than substantial harm'.

Also, to ensure that we have been as thorough as possible, and in light of the updated Part L of the building codes, we have provided an updated Sustainability Statement for the scheme. This includes consideration of photovoltaic cells, which have now been added to part of the roof of Block A.

Beyond these minor changes, the scheme remains unchanged from that which was approved last year.

The Officer's Report outlines the scheme's compliance with applicable local planning policy, and local and national planning guidance. Members are encouraged to support this development, and the Officer's recommendation for approval of it, as it will provide much-needed homes in a desirable location, and represents the best possible use of this previously developed land.

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 16 November 2022 2.00pm  
Agenda Item 10.b)

**Statement in support – Francis Greenacre - STATEMENT NUMBER B4**

Dear Members,

I am a resident of Cecil Road, immediately opposite the proposed development, as well as a former chairman of Clifton & Hotwells Improvement Society (CHIS). I fully support this application.

Following the revisions made to the previous applications, further detailed improvements have now been made to Block A on College Road. These significantly improve its articulation and character and make it more compatible with the adjacent Victorian terrace.

Misconceptions concerning the dominance of Block A are likely to continue and deserve to be refuted. The height of the new cornice to Block A is lower than the roofline of nearby buildings, including the Pavilion, Cecil Road semis, 48 College Road and Sutton House etc. The fifth storey of Block A (above the cornice) is just over 1 m. higher than Cecil Road's roofline, under which I live. But this fifth storey is within a well-recessed mansard roof, which is barely visible from street level.

The surrounding Conservation Area is already impressively various in building type, style and scale, as historic England now admits, and this restrained development represents a positive improvement on the 'large brownfield car park' it succeeds. There have been further improvements to the development's sustainability. There will be a decrease in traffic in comparison with times when the Zoo was open and there will be a slight increase in the number of trees and of biodiversity.

Finally, as I noted when this application previously came to this Committee, the Zoo's consultation process has been exemplary. They have responded to community feedback and to the observations of your officers and Historic England and modifications and improvements have been made, notably to the design of Block A.

I support your planning officer's recommendations and hope I will have the opportunity to address your committee very briefly on 16th November.

With best wishes

Francis Greenacre



**Bristol Zoological  
Society**  
Saving Wildlife Together

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 16 November 2022 2.00pm  
Agenda Item 10.b)

**Statement in support – Chris Booy OBE, Vice Chair Trustees, Bristol Zoological  
Society - STATEMENT NUMBER B5**

Dear Councillors,

We fully appreciate your time, once again, to consider our application to build new homes on what is now a surplus car park in Clifton.

As I'm sure you are all very aware, we have finally closed Bristol Zoo Gardens as part of our strategy to create a world-class new Bristol Zoo at our Wild Place Project site on the edge of Bristol. This will be a new kind of zoo where visitors and animals will be immersed in the natural landscape, in a way that was simply not possible at our Clifton site.

The new Bristol Zoo will be much more than an exciting visitor destination. At this time of climate and ecological crisis, the new Zoo will be a centre of global understanding and action. Animals will be chosen for the greatest conservation impact; our education and scientific research programmes will grow significantly to form a new conservation campus; and our conservation action in the field, saving wildlife from extinction, will increase both at the Zoo, in the Southwest and around the world.

However, we also fully understand this kind of change can be unsettling, given our long presence in Clifton. So, please let me briefly explain why this application is so important to our strategy.

The West Car Park was used primarily for staff parking and is clearly no longer needed. To help deliver our strategy we need to sell both our Clifton sites. So, the funding we will secure from the sale of this brownfield site is key to our plan.

However, we haven't simply applied for outline planning permission to then just sell the site to the highest bidder. Instead, we have worked diligently on a really high-quality, detailed and highly sustainable scheme, so we can be confident that what we propose is exactly what gets built.

While we will be moving from Clifton, it is vital to the Society that we leave a really positive legacy. And I really believe this development will be part of that, bringing much-needed high quality market and affordable homes to a part of Bristol that, for most, is unaffordable.

Yours faithfully,  
Chris Booy  
Vice-Chair of the Trustees, Bristol Zoological Society





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 16 November 2022 2.00pm  
Agenda Item 10.b)

**Statement in support – Francesca Fryer, Director of Transformation, Bristol Zoological Society - STATEMENT NUMBER B6**

Dear Councillors,

I think you'll all be aware this application – to build 62 new homes, including 20 per cent affordable – was previously approved by your committee. Our planning adviser Harry Quartermain will explain in his statement why it has come back to committee again.

I'd like to very briefly explain two things: why it is a highly sustainable scheme, and how it has been designed to be sympathetic to its setting in a Conservation Area.

The site is – of course – a surplus car park, previously used by staff until the Zoo Gardens site was closed in September. We are proposing a mix of 1, 2 and 3-bed apartments and 4-bed mews houses. These are all high-quality homes, offering spacious, flexible living spaces with good natural light and ventilation. The majority of apartments are dual aspect or single aspect south-west facing and enjoy private amenity space. The remaining homes have full height glazed windows opening onto 'Juliet' balconettes.

Even though the application was previously recommended for approval, we have spent the past months reviewing the design and sustainability of the scheme. I am delighted Historic England have confirmed that they consider heritage impacts to have been minimised after changes were made to the previous scheme. Those design changes include re-shaping windows, parapets and banding to Block A to be more sympathetic to the Conservation Area.

The scheme already proposed a robust series of sustainability measures, well-above regulatory and policy requirements. That included air source heat pumps and a connection to the district heat network. But – to further bolster the scheme's sustainability – we've now added solar panels to the mansard roof of Block A, with panels positioned to maximise sunlight whilst minimising their visibility within the Conservation Area.

We have worked closely with our neighbours throughout the life of this application including through our Community Forum. While we have not been able to convince Clifton & Hotwells Improvement Society to support our application – even with the further changes we've made – others do back the proposal.

This is a really sustainable and high-quality regeneration of this brownfield site, and I ask you to support our application. Thank you.

Yours faithfully

Francesca Fryer, Director of Transformation, Bristol Zoological Society

c/o Bristol Zoo Gardens  
Clifton, Bristol BS8 3HA  
T: +44 (0) 117 428 5300  
F: +44 (0) 117 973 6814  
E: info@bristolzoo.org.uk  
bristolzoo.org.uk

## **A5/AP Committee Statement**

### **Planning Application number – 21/01999/F Proposals for 62 new homes on land at West Car Park, College Road, Clifton - STATEMENT NUMBER B7**

#### **Development Control Committee A – Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022**

Barton Willmore, now Stantec are the architects and planning consultants working on behalf of Bristol Zoological Society in relation to the West Car Park residential development scheme. We have developed the design for this brownfield site as one that responds sensitively to the historic setting and context of the site.

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, benefit from ample natural daylighting and are 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. The homes have been designed tenure blind, providing high quality accommodation across a range of sizes from one to four-bedroom homes which benefit from external amenity spaces in the form of balconies and gardens.

We have been keen to engage the community and consultees and feedback has been built into the evolving design throughout. Further engagement has occurred during the latest review of the design, including key stakeholders such as Historic England, and we have carefully listened to feedback received. This has led to a series of design amendments to further improve the relationship to the Conservation Area, including alterations to the Block A elevation, revisions to the roofscape and the addition of PV panels – all of which have positively improved the proposals.

Sustainable design has been pivotal in the development of the designs with a fabric first approach adopted throughout. The addition of PV panels has been carefully designed alongside the use of Air Source Heat Pumps to provide renewable energy generation whilst balancing the provision of sedum roof. The energy strategy has been considered holistically alongside biodiversity enhancements such as a net gain of trees, living walls and sedum roofs. This has been balanced against the historic setting and future proofed to provide the ability to connect to the District Heat network in the future.

Our heritage consultants' have informed the proposals for the site from the outset, resulting in a scheme that responds positively to both the character of the surrounding context and the wider conservation area. The detailing of the adjacent Edwardian terrace has been used to drive the elevational changes. This has resulted in a high-quality considered proposal, borne out of its context and the additional amendments to the roofscape have further reduced the visual impact. This proactive engagement has resulted in Historic England having no objection to the application on heritage grounds.

This development will provide much needed high-quality, sustainable homes, which respond sensitively to the historic context of the site.



Alex Paul, Senior Architect

## Statement B8

I am making this submission in my capacity as one of the Planning Coordinators for the Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society and a representative for that Society on Bristol City Council's Conservation Advisory Panel.

CAP's opposition to this Application - both in its original and modified form - entirely endorsed by CHIS, could hardly be more uncompromising in its condemnation of the substantial harm that would result to the Conservation Area were the development ever to be built. It has no other merit than to exploit a sensitive site for maximum financial gain. All other considerations, whether environmental or architectural, have been subordinated to this single end. In no respect does the scheme show regard for its setting as defined in the Character Appraisal for Area 2 of the Conservation Area, nor can it remotely be said to enhance it. Attempts by the Applicant to mitigate some of the worst features of the development's design fail woefully to address its shortcomings. As CAP concludes, there are no significantly positive elements to the scheme. Indeed, everything about it runs directly contrary to the recommendations of the independent Commission - Building Better, Building Beautiful - set up by the Government, not to mention the Government's own stated wish that local residents have greater involvement in Planning decisions affecting their neighbourhood. Rarely can a proposal have aroused so much local outrage. Approval would signal that this City is prepared to sacrifice almost all standards of development on the altar of monetary profit.

Christopher Jeffries



**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.**

**Second Bristol Tree Forum Statement - STATEMENT NUMBER B9**

Our first statement to Committee is available here:

<https://bristoltreeforum.files.wordpress.com/2022/11/btf-statement-to-planning-committee-a.pdf>

Paragraph 179 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states: 'To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should: ... identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.'

Paragraph 180 states: 'When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused'.

Despite our repeated requests (see the annexure below), the planning authority has failed to oblige the applicant to obtain biodiversity evidence as required by Part 1, Section three of the Planning Application Requirements Local List (This is the 2022 edition. The 2017 edition, applicable at the time this application was validated, had the same requirement). The applicant has produced an ecology report, but this is not the same as biodiversity evidence. As a result, no biodiversity evidence has been produced.

However, we have undertaken our own calculation of the 'measurable net gains for biodiversity' required by the NPPF. We have used the latest biodiversity net gain calculator published by Natural England - BNG 3.1 - and applied it only to the trees found on site (we have no information about the other habitats). On this basis, we calculate the following:

1. There are 24 trees on site. These have a baseline Urban tree habitat area of 0.2901 hectares. We have assumed that the trees are in Moderate condition and so have a habitat value of 2.32 habitat units.
2. 16 of these trees will be removed. These have a habitat area of 0.0432 hectares, leaving 0.2469 hectares being retained.
3. 17 trees will be planted on site. They will produce 0.0692 hectares of Moderate condition Urban tree habitat after 30 years and generate 0.21 habitat units.
4. In order to meet the BNG 3.1 Trading requirements for Urban tree habitats and achieve at least a 10% net gain, a further 30 trees will need to be planted off site. This will generate 0.37 habitat units of Small category Urban tree habitat in Moderate condition after 30 years. This will result in a biodiversity net gain of 10.30%.

Under BTRS, only 28 replacement trees will be required as opposed the 47 required using BNG 3.1. Planting only 28 trees under the BTRS requirements will result in 'significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development'.

In these circumstances, paragraph 180 of the NPPF requires that requires that 'planning permission should be refused'.

You may also refuse planning permission on the basis that the applicant has failed to comply with by Part 1, Section three of the Planning Application Requirements Local List by not producing a biodiversity survey and report which was a prerequisite for validation of the application.

**13 November 2022**



## Annexure

Email sent on 12 November 2022

Dear xxx,

I see that you have now released your report to DCC A for its 16 November 2022 meeting recommending that this application be granted.

I note that you have said nothing at all about the issue we raised you as far back as 5 July (and before - see our attached statement to DCC A when this matter was last before it) and that, despite our repeated requests, you have failed to explain why the applicant has been allowed to proceed with their application despite being in contravention of Part 1 Section 3 of the Planning Application Requirements Local List May 2022 (which it also failed to do in its original application). This requires a biodiversity survey and report be adduced for 'all developments in or adjacent to':

1. A Special Area of Conservation - The Avon Gorge and Leigh Woods.
2. A Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) - The Avon Gorge and Leigh Woods.
3. Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) - Clifton and Durdham Downs.
4. A Wildlife Corridor.
5. A Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) - the Avon Gorge.

This is a Part 1 requirement, which: 'sets out what supporting information is required'; it is not optional. This same requirement was in place when this application was first validated - see the attached 2017 iteration of this document.

The applicant's Ecological evidence (21\_01999\_F-ECOLOGICAL\_REPORT-2925088) identifies these sites as 'adjacent areas':

### **3.5 Adjacent Areas**

The areas adjoining the site consist of a mixture of houses, roads and gardens, some of which are well-established and include large trees.

The closest part of the Clifton Down SNCI has a mixture of amenity grassland, scrub and woodland, with small areas of species-rich grassland around rock outcrops on steeper slopes. The closest part of the Avon Gorge SSSI has secondary woodland although there are more important habitats, including limestone grassland and crevice communities with assemblages of rare plants, within 300m of the application site.

The site also falls within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) of the Avon Gorge and Leigh Woods SSSI. IRZs are zones around each SSSI which reflect the particular sensitivities of the features for which it is notified and indicate the types of development proposal which could potentially have adverse impacts - See - <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>.



Given that this site falls within this criteria - it is close enough to be considered 'in or adjacent to' these sites, why has not such evidence been required before this application was allowed to proceed?

We note that you have said nothing about the need to achieve some degree of positive biodiversity net gain (BNG) as a result of this proposal - The BNG percentage varies depending on who you ask, but it is agreed that it should be greater than zero.

We are also surprised that you have ignored our original comments in your report (attached), even though these still apply to the Committee's deliberations.

xxx - I have copied you into this email given that you are the Chair of DCC A. Please consider our complaint and advise what steps will be taken to address this issue before your meeting on the 16th and before any decision is made whether to grant this application or not. Can you please ensure that the contents of this email are placed before the committee's members.

## Statement B10

I have seen the submission made by one of the Planning Coordinators for the Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society (CHIS) who is also a representative for that Society on Bristol City Council's Conservation Advisory Panel (CAP).

I cannot improve on that submission which accurately summarises the views of the hundreds of people who oppose this application. The Planning Officer responsible for producing a report to the Committee has failed to record the level of opposition to this scheme – approximately 98% of those whose views are recorded on the Planning Portal.

In reality the amended application differs little from the original scheme. The amendments are minimal.

As has been pointed out, the opposition of CAP and CHIS to this Application - both in its original and modified form – is clear and obvious. It reflects the 400+ objections recorded on the Planning Portal. The scheme would cause substantial harm to the Conservation Area. It has no merit other than to exploit a sensitive site for maximum financial gain. All other considerations, whether environmental or architectural, have been subordinated to this single end.

In no respect does the scheme show regard for its setting in a Conservation Area, nor can it remotely be said to enhance it. Attempts by the Applicant to mitigate some of the worst features of the development's design fail woefully to address its shortcomings. As CAP concludes, there are no positive elements to the scheme. Indeed, everything about it runs directly contrary to the recommendations of the independent Commission - Building Better, Building Beautiful - set up by the Government - not to mention the Government's own stated wish that local residents have greater involvement in Planning decisions affecting their neighbourhood. Rarely can a proposal have aroused so much local outrage.

Approval would signal that this City is prepared to sacrifice almost all standards of development on the altar of monetary profit.

The Committee should appreciate that of the 400+ objections it is almost impossible to find one that objects to the principle of housing on this site. This is most emphatically **not** a case of Nimbyism – just of overriding concern at the lamentable (greedy and unimaginative) design of this

scheme which will leave a permanent scar on the Conservation Area. The choice facing the Committee is not between this scheme and no housing development. It is between this scheme and one which makes a proper and significant contribution to the City's need for additional housing but which at the same time respects the statutory obligation to ensure that any development preserves or enhances the Conservation Area.

To grant permission for this development would represent a substantial failing of duty when the Applicant has the chance to leave a legacy of which it, and the City, can be justifiably proud.

Adam Chivers

## Statement B11

After reading the Summary Report prepared by the Planning Officer ahead of the meeting and noting the recommendation to grant planning permission for the West car park site (No. 21/01999/F), as direct neighbours of Bristol Zoo we wish to bring the following important points to your attention.

### **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 revised 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 cannot reasonably be assumed that the conditions of Policy DM27 are fulfilled by the current plans, due to the proposed height, scale and massing of the Block A building which would dominate the streetscape at the north end of College Road 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 Hardelot (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 raises significant concerns about the impact to on-street parking in the locality, especially in light of the impending development of the main Zoo Gardens site. Even following the Zoo's closure, we are often unable to park our cars outside or even in the vicinity of our property and this will only be exacerbated by development of the West car park site.

### **Drainage**

The drainage from our property is often sub-optimal, particularly during wet periods with waste water slow to drain away to the main sewers and we have serious concerns that adding a further 62 properties to the already creaking drains at this end of College Road will lead to greater problems going forward.

### **Lack of public amenities**

The nearest local GP surgery on Pembroke Road and local schools are already at capacity and struggling to cope with present demand. It often takes 10 days to get a phone call back

from the GP and the situation will only deteriorate if this level of additional housing is approved.

**Conclusion**

In summary, we believe that there have been some key 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.

Robert Day

## **Statement B12**

Statement of Glyn Thompson

This application is not about Bristol Zoo. They will be gone very soon. It is about the appearance and use of a large piece of land in the centre of the Clifton Conservation area.

Please don't be taken in by the Zoo's expensive PR campaign. The Zoo will leave with 10's of millions of pounds whatever. Please focus on what is proposed and what will remain for the next 100 plus years.

The Council's own Conservation Advisory Panel don't like this application, the lead architect appointed on the main Zoo site doesn'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 500 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 and is sustainable with outdoor space but this scheme has none of those things.

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

This application does not meet planning policy on a number of levels. It does not add to 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 Covid?

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 extra housing numbers. 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 B13

STATEMENT FOR DC ON WEDNESDAY WHICH I WILL ATTEND TO SPEAK TO.

I was pleased to see the amendments to the design of the application as I do think that it makes the development more appropriate for a conservation area. However, I am concerned about an error (as I read it) in the report.

The report considers the revised statement from English Heritage with its more positive summation. But on p21 of the report there is a statement which purports to be the Conservation Advisory Panel's (CAP) final statement. However, it isn't.

In the report the introductory sentence to the CAP comment is;  
*'The Conservation Advisory Panel made the following comments on the original proposal, prior to amendments being made to the scheme.'* Followed by the statement made earlier in the summer.

However, in the application there is another statement from the CAP with the following first sentence;

*'The panel did not consider that the relatively minor changes to the design reduced the substantial harm that would be caused by the original proposal and repeated its previous objection:'* Followed by the earlier statement.

So, the CAP did respond to the amended plans - but did so negatively - and the report does not include the second statement but puts in the first statement with an added comment to say they didn't respond.

The consequence of this could be that any reader of the report would deduce that English Heritage changed their view on the amended plans and are more positive, and the CAP just didn't make a second comment. This has the effect of allowing members to project a similar change of mind on the CAP.

This is a concern (if the facts are as I state them from my reading of the application) and I fail to understand how it could have happened on an application which was previously quashed due to procedural mistakes.

## LIVEABILITY

On a second point, I still cannot support this development on the following grounds:

- No play area for children, as that would not be safe with cars on the site. I believe we should build communities where children can play and this could happen if the number of cars was reduced and parking only given to vehicles which would be shared use (car clubs), and for disabled blue badge holders. For example, 15 vehicles which the community could share. Remember, cars spend about 95% of the time parked! It is not acceptable to say that the Downs are nearby - children need to be able to play safely outdoors to develop in body and mind. If the application is

approved, I would strenuously insist that Advice 1044 is conditioned with no parking permits on the highway.

- Lack of dual aspect and the heat report concern me. The Heat Report says that some of the flats will need mitigation by 2080, surely, we should be building better and for adaptation. I live in a flat in Clifton, and on hot days, I rely on being able to open windows front and back to let cooling air in.

Paula O'Rourke  
Rt Hon Lord Mayor of Bristol,  
Green Councillor for Clifton

## Statement B14

I am writing to object to the proposal under consideration for the Western Carpark site on College Road.

I would also like the Zoo to be able to sell the site and continue with the move towards Wild Places, and I support the provision of housing on a brownfield site at a time when there is a genuine housing crisis on in the city, and I believe this site is appropriate for housing. So a residential housing scheme will bring significant benefit, but the profile, scale and scope of the site is such that the design needs to be exemplary.

My objection is based on the sustainability concerns that have been raised around the embodied carbon, and operational carbon of the development. Where there is a housing need, a presumption in favour of sustainable development applies in the NPPF. But the key here is sustainable development, which is lacking in this application.

The main points are:

1) There is no calculation as to embodied carbon in the application 2) Despite the addition of PV panels to the roofs of some buildings in the site, and the claim by the applicants that this brings the residual CO2 levels down to beyond the policy requirement level, there are insufficient calculations to demonstrate the claims on energy efficiency that the applicant is making. We were promised an updated energy and sustainability statement in late October 2022, but this has not been forthcoming. These calculations are a requirements of the Climate Change and Sustainability Practice Note (CCSPN) 3) The Council is currently applying outdated sustainability standards as the Local Plan has not yet been updated, and BCS14 is the only applicable policy. Despite being the first council to call a climate emergency, the Council's Core Strategy does not reflect the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. In this context, all developments in Bristol should make clear reference to the NPPF, and yet there is no reference made in this application.

Further to this, it is stated that the current design will have to be retro-fitted for heat mitigation by 2080, which surely suggests that the design should be revised at this stage to include these mitigations. On a further, heat-related note, the provision of shady, outdoor space will become ever more significant for adults and children alike as temperatures rise in Bristol. The current scheme does not provide a safe play/recreation area which is green and car-free, which should already be a ringfenced part of the design. Providing this will mean displacing planned car parking, but this would be a foresighted design feature on the part of a charitable organisation committed to conservation and environmental stewardship. As I said in my opening, this development is just too significant for the Bristol Zoological Society not to impose gold standards for climate and the environment. And if it won't do this itself, the Council must impose these standards.

Cllr. Katy Grant  
Green Councillor for Clifton

## **Committee Written Statement**

**Project name:** Land North of Gas Lane, Bristol

**Application Reference:** 21/06761/F

---

Watkin Jones is an experienced developer and manager of student accommodation. Watkin Jones has completed five other projects in the City in recent years, with the recent scheme at Wilder Street being awarded a 2022 Bristol Civic Society Design Award.

The proposed development will deliver much needed, high-quality purpose built managed student accommodation comprising 260 bedspaces in a highly sustainable, brownfield location.

The site is within an Enterprise Zone, and is allocated within the Local Plan as a mixed-use regeneration area, including new homes. Furthermore, emerging policy identifies this location as an area that is suitable for new student housing. As such, the proposed development is acceptable in principle, and is supported by the University.

Student accommodation contributes towards an authority's housing land supply. On the 2.5:1 ratio basis, the 260 bedspaces proposed would equate to 104 dwellings, making a significant contribution to the housing land supply targets as well as relieving pressure on the local private rental housing market.

The proposal would also include 237 sqm of flexible commercial space which could be used as offices and/or retail space creating activity and vibrancy in an area which is subject to significant regeneration.

The proposal will contribute towards a number of significant economic benefits in the local area both during the construction and operational stages, including:

- Supporting a number of full time employment roles on-site (28 net new jobs) and in the wider economy;
- Direct and indirect construction jobs in association with the build of the project;
- The proposed students and their visitors generating over £2M expenditure per annum in the local economy;
- Introduction of a number of economically active persons contributing to the local workforce; and
- Release of HMOs back on to the market resulting in additional Council Tax.

The development provides an extremely high-quality living environment for the future occupiers. The development includes a private courtyard area for students. This is in addition to the private external amenity area at roof level and the internal amenity space for students at the ground level and the communal lounge at the roof level.

The scheme provides a total of 5.62sqm of private amenity space per student (excluding living, kitchen and dining areas). This exceeds the 5sqm of private amenity space which the Urban Living SPD guidance seeks scheme to provide for 1-2 bedroom C3 units. Furthermore, it exceeds the amount of amenity space per student that has been accepted at numerous other recently approved student schemes (Chanson Food ref: 19/02664/F, Plot 3 Bedminster ref: 20/05811/F, Land bounded by Redcliffe Street, St Thomas Street and Three Quarters Lane ref: 21/04306/F).

The proposal is for a car free scheme, which is in line with the adopted standards for student accommodation. However, the proposals include significant highways improvements on Gas Lane,

Freestone Road, and Dings Tunnel which would significantly improve the environment for walking and cycling, as well as creating a traffic calmed environment which will benefit other regeneration sites expected to come forward in St Philips.

Despite other landowners owning land/buildings within the Council's identified public route between Gas Lane and Freestone Road, the applicant has designed the scheme to allow for the delivery of a new pedestrian route known as Freestone Passage, which is envisaged within the Spatial Framework. As sites to the east come forward the context for this route will inevitably improve.

The proposal represents efficient and effective use of brownfield land. The proposed development seeks to redevelop a currently visually unattractive site which is due to become vacant due to the relocation of the existing business to a more modern premises. The proposal offers an immediately deliverable solution to securing development and regeneration of the site.

The site does not contribute to the visual attractiveness of the Conservation Area and the development will improve the local area, providing a high quality and immediately recognisable development reflecting the architectural detailing of the locality. It will create an activate ground floor frontage creating a vibrant relationship between the building and the wider street scene.

The applicant has worked extremely closely with the Council's City Design Officers and Historic England and has made a number of amendments during the course of the application to overcome some initial concerns on design detail, but not the regeneration principles. The scheme has a beneficial impact on the significance of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the Grade II\* Listed St Vincent Works.

The finished floor level of the student social spaces and commercial areas on the ground level are 10.98m AOD which provides a 'freeboard' of 0.8m to the Design Flood Level of 10.18m AOD. This has been agreed as an appropriate level in conjunction with the Environment Agency.

There is an outstanding comment from the EA, however this is a request for additional information/clarification on certain points. One of these points relates to the modelling, which was issued to the EA in August 2022. Furthermore, this is a well-established model that has been used/accepted at other projects such as the Silverthorne Lane application which is in very close proximity to the site.

Further details of flood storage compensation and maintenance have been requested. On other sites, details of maintenance have been required to be provided via condition, which would be acceptable to the applicant in this case. The Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority responsible for this aspect, has no objections to proposed emergency access/egress in the event of flooding.

Proposed landscape and biodiversity enhancement will be delivered through planned additional soft landscaping and the long-term management of the landscape, without compromising the Conservation Area's more urban character.

The proposed development would include PV arrays that would result in a 20.5% improvement over residual emissions. The scheme has been designed so that it is ready to connect to the city's district heating network. The development is being designed to target a BREEAM New Construction 2018 Excellent Rating.

In summary, the proposal is for a high-quality development that is entirely in accordance with the relevant national and local planning policy and guidance. There are no material considerations or impacts which would outweigh the benefits of the scheme and compliance with the Development Plan.

Statement C2

**GAS LANE COMMITTEE SPEECH – Cllr. YASSIN MOHAMUD**

Good afternoon Chair, and good afternoon committee members.

I am Councillor Yassin Mohamud, the ward councillor for Lawrence Hill.

This site and this application has huge potential to help revitalise an area which is currently hugely under used and neglected and makes good use of an unsightly brownfield site in a sustainable location.

The location on Gas Lane is adjacent to the proposed major new campus development plans from the University of Bristol and is well suited to providing high quality student accommodation to meet this new demand.

This would result in positive activity in the local area and bring a wide range of social and economic benefits for local businesses and residents.

Comments that have been received from residents and local businesses are supportive of the scheme and I'm sure that the new student population would enhance the vitality and viability of this area.

I am happy to see the applicant has engaged with the local community and worked closely with Council Officers over the last 2 years to address their concerns.

It is also welcome to see the numerous sustainability measures proposed with the scheme being car free, highly energy efficient, benefiting from the district heating network and achieving the BREEAM "Excellent" standard.

I am strongly in support of this application and I hope you will agree with the Officers recommendation and also support this scheme.

Thank you for your cooperation.

155 - 165 WEST STREET BEDMINSTER BRISTOL BS3 3PN

Planning application ref. 22/00805/F to be considered at Development Control Committee A on Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022 - **STATEMENT NUMBER D1**

## COMMITTEE STATEMENT

The proposal seeks to redevelop the existing car showroom and industrial unit at 155-165 West Street to deliver purpose-built student accommodation and flexible office space.

It is considered that the development will deliver the following benefits:

- Significant improvement to the street scene in terms of design and quality of built form.
- Increased footfall and spending to benefit local businesses.
- Meeting student demand in the most appropriate manner, namely through purpose built and professionally managed accommodation, with no loss of family housing. The proposal also accords with policy DM2 and the Council's emerging *Purpose-built Student Accommodation and Shared Living Supplementary Planning Document*.
- Biodiversity enhancement through new garden area and green wall.
- Incorporation of energy efficiency measures and renewables (Air Source Heat Pumps) to deliver a total saving on residual CO2 emissions of 68.6%, which is considerable.
- A flexible office unit and student management office at ground floor level will increase activity and surveillance to West Street.

Some of the key concerns raised by neighbours are addressed below:

**Student demand** – the submitted Student Market report by Carter Jonas indicates that there is a significant undersupply of purpose-built student accommodation in the city - even with the pipeline of forthcoming student development taken into account - and that the proposed site represents an appealing and sustainable location for students to live.

**Location** – the site has excellent bus and cycle links to Bristol's Colleges and Universities, including UWE Bower Ashton (9 min cycle), Boomsatsuma (9 mins cycle, 12 mins bus), University of Law (9min cycle, 13 mins bus), UOB Temple Quarter (11 min cycle, 21 mins bus), City of Bristol College (11 min cycle, 17 mins bus), BIMM (13 min cycle, 16 min bus), and UOB Woodland Road (18 min cycle, 24 mins bus).

**Parking** – a car club space will be provided by the developer for use by students and all local residents. In addition, parking surveys - carried out to the satisfaction of Transport Development Management - indicate that the surrounding roads are not overstressed.

**Noise & disturbance** – the scheme includes a variety of measures to minimise the risk of disturbance. It is a purpose-built student development with a highly insulated building envelope and self-contained refuse and cycle store. It will operate in accordance with a robust Premises Management Plan that will be implemented by a professional management company. The development includes a management office onsite that will be manned by a member of staff, and the communal areas will be monitored by CCTV.

It is recognised that student development can be controversial, but in this instance the developer and the Council's planning department have worked hard to find a suitable solution for the site. There is undeniably a high demand for student bedspaces in the city and it is considered preferable for this to be satisfied through purpose-built and managed accommodation, rather than converted family houses run as unmanaged HMOs.

On this basis, we respectfully request that members vote to approve the proposed development in line with the Officer's recommendation.

## **Statement D2**

### **Statement to Development Control A Committee – 16<sup>th</sup> November 2022**

**22/00805F 155-165 West St Bedminster BS3 3PN** (Item 4 on agenda)

Unfortunately, I'm unable to attend the meeting but wanted to share my views on the above application. I am supportive of the proposed development.

The intended site is a disused car showroom, garage and surrounding area fronting West St (A38).

It is a prominent location which risks remaining empty as it is highly unlikely that another car dealer or similar operator will want to occupy this building – so, as local councillor, I am concerned about an empty frontage and decaying building, which would detract from the wider efforts to improve this street.

The developer has engaged with the local community and kept me updated throughout. We have discussed various improvements and he has been receptive - incorporating several new measures into the proposals.

While I am aware of concerns about the over-supply of student accommodation in the area, I take the view that bespoke housing for students can help relieve pressure on the existing housing stock. We have seen much sub-division of family homes leading to poor quality living space and additional parking pressures in tight residential streets.

The use of modern methods of construction is innovative and a way forward for building new homes, so I welcome this as the build time and disruption for local people and businesses will be reduced. I have discussed with the applicant how he might contact the South Bristol Construction Skills Hub and assess whether an onsite apprenticeship or similar learning about MMC construction could be facilitated.

Parking is the main concern for many in Bedminster Ward. While the developer cannot prevent car ownership by residents, he has agreed with my proposal to fund a designated car club vehicle and bay - this is providing access to a vehicle for residents of the scheme and others nearby, without encouraging car ownership.

We have also discussed management of the building, particularly after hours, and I have been reassured about the arrangements in place.

The applicant also proposes to trial a shared workspace aimed at local SMEs and people working from home who would welcome a separate place to work. This is another example of adopting proposals from residents.

I understand that TDM and Sustainability officers have no issues with the proposals and that conditions are likely to cover detailed aspects of the development. I therefore support your officer's recommendation to approve subject to conditions.

**CIlr Mark Bradshaw**

Labour Co-op Councillor for Bedminster

15<sup>th</sup> November 2022

## Amendment Sheet 16 November 2022

### Item 1: - 1A-C Colston Yard Bristol BS1 5BD

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	No amendments

### Item 2: - Former Car Park College Road Clifton Bristol BS8 3HX

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Since the preparation of the Committee Report, an additional 7 representations have been received each objecting to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The density of the proposed housing is too high and will result in poor living conditions.</li> <li>- The changes to the scheme are minor and do nothing to overcome earlier objections.</li> <li>- The 'institutional' looking design of the buildings.</li> <li>- "New development must respect and respond to this scale and form. The large monolithic block on College Road would be overbearing in nature, primarily due to its height and position close to the front of the site, and is disappointing in design, particularly the inappropriate form of the mansard."</li> <li>- Insufficient parking provision.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Bristol Tree Forum</b></p> <p>The Bristol Tree Forum have made the following representations:</p> <p>"Despite our repeated requests, you have failed to explain why the applicant has been allowed to proceed with their application despite being in contravention of Part 1 Section 3 of the <a href="#">Planning Application Requirements Local List May 2022</a> (which it also failed to do in its original application). This requires a biodiversity survey and report be adduced for 'all developments in or adjacent to':</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A Special Area of Conservation - The Avon Gorge and Leigh Woods.</li> <li>2. A Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) - The Avon Gorge and Leigh Woods.</li> <li>3. Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) - Clifton and Durdham Downs.</li> <li>4. A Wildlife Corridor.</li> <li>5. A Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) - the Avon Gorge.</li> </ol> <p>This is a Part 1 requirement, which: 'sets out what supporting information is <u>required</u>'; it is not optional. This same requirement was in place when this application was first validated - see the attached 2017 iteration of this document.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>The applicant's Ecological evidence (21_01999_F-ECOLOGICAL_REPORT-2925088) identifies these sites as 'adjacent areas':</p> <p><b>3.5 Adjacent Areas</b></p> <p>The areas adjoining the site consist of a mixture of houses, roads and gardens, some of which are well-established and include large trees.</p> <p>The closest part of the Clifton Down SNCI has a mixture of amenity grassland, scrub and woodland, with small areas of species-rich grassland around rock outcrops on steeper slopes. The closest part of the Avon Gorge SSSI has secondary woodland although there are more important habitats, including limestone grassland and crevice communities with assemblages of rare plants, within 300m of the application site.</p> <p>The site also falls within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) of the Avon Gorge and Leigh Woods SSSI. IRZs are zones around each SSSI which reflect the particular sensitivities of the features for which it is notified and indicate the types of development proposal which could potentially have adverse impacts - See - <a href="https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx">https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx</a>.</p>  <p>Given that this site falls within this criteria - it is close enough to be considered 'in or adjacent to' these sites, why has not such evidence been required before this application was allowed to proceed?</p> <p>We note that you have said nothing about the need to achieve some degree of positive biodiversity net gain (BNG) as a result of this proposal - The BNG percentage varies depending on who you ask, but it is agreed that it should be greater than zero.</p> <p>We are also surprised that you have ignored our original comments in your report (attached), even though these still apply to the Committee's deliberations."</p>
	<p>In the event that Members are minded to approve this application, then the following Advice Notes should be included on the Decision Notice:</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
1	<p data-bbox="403 286 767 320"><b>Works on the Public Highway</b></p> <p data-bbox="300 353 1428 521">The development hereby approved includes the carrying out of work on the adopted highway. You are advised that before undertaking work on the adopted highway you must enter into a highway agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 with the council, which would specify the works and the terms and conditions under which they are to be carried out.</p> <p data-bbox="300 555 1406 689">Contact the Highway Authority's Transport Development Management Team at <a href="mailto:transportDM@bristol.gov.uk">transportDM@bristol.gov.uk</a> allowing sufficient time for the preparation and signing of the Agreement. You will be required to pay fees to cover the council's costs in undertaking the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="395 723 783 757">I. Drafting the Agreement</li> <li data-bbox="395 757 1310 790">II. A Monitoring Fee equivalent to 15% of the planning application fee</li> <li data-bbox="395 790 863 824">III. Approving the highway details</li> <li data-bbox="395 824 858 857">IV. Inspecting the highway works</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="300 891 1428 1025">NB: Planning permission is not permission to work in the highway. A Highway Agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 must be completed, the bond secured and the Highway Authority's technical approval and inspection fees paid before any drawings will be considered and approved.</p>
2	<p data-bbox="403 1059 842 1093"><b>Minor Works on the Public Highway</b></p> <p data-bbox="300 1126 1428 1261">The development hereby approved includes the carrying out of work on the adopted highway. You are advised that before undertaking any work on the adopted highway you must enter into a highway agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 with the council.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1294 1348 1395">You will be required to pay fees to cover the council's costs in undertaking the approval and inspection of the works. Contact the Highway Authority's Transport Development Management Team at <a href="mailto:transportDM@bristol.gov.uk">transportDM@bristol.gov.uk</a></p> <p data-bbox="300 1429 1428 1563">NB: Planning permission is not permission to work in the highway. A Highway Agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 must be completed, the bond secured and the Highway Authority's technical approval and inspection fees paid before any drawings will be considered and approved.</p>
3	<p data-bbox="403 1597 938 1630"><b>Excavation Works on the Adopted Highway</b></p> <p data-bbox="300 1664 1428 1798">The development hereby approved includes the carrying out of excavation works on the adopted highway. You are advised that before undertaking any work on the adopted highway you will require a Section 171 (Excavation) Licence from the Highway Authority which is available at <a href="http://www.bristol.gov.uk/highwaylicences">www.bristol.gov.uk/highwaylicences</a></p>
4	<p data-bbox="403 1832 762 1865"><b>Street Name and Numbering</b></p> <p data-bbox="300 1899 1428 2098">You are advised that to ensure that all new properties and streets are registered with the emergency services, Land Registry, National Street Gazetteer and National Land and Property Gazetteer to enable them to be serviced and allow the occupants access to amenities including but not limited to; listing on the Electoral Register, delivery services, and a registered address on utility companies databases, details of the name and numbering of any new house(s) and/or flats/flat conversion(s) on existing and/or newly constructed streets</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>must be submitted to the Highway Authority.</p> <p>Any new street(s) and property naming/numbering must be agreed in accordance with the Councils Street Naming and Property Numbering Policy and all address allocations can only be issued under the Town Improvement Clauses Act 1847 (Section 64 &amp; 65) and the Public Health Act 1925 (Section 17, 18 &amp; 19). Please see <a href="http://www.bristol.gov.uk/registeraddress">www.bristol.gov.uk/registeraddress</a></p> <p>5 Highway to be Adopted</p> <p>The development hereby approved includes the construction of new highway. To be considered for adoption and ongoing maintenance at the public expense it must be constructed to the Highway Authority's Engineering Standard Details and terms for the phasing of the development. You are advised that you must enter into a highway agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. The development will be bound by Sections 219 to 225 (the Advance Payments Code) of the Highways Act 1980.</p> <p>Contact the Highway Authority's Transport Development Management Team at <a href="mailto:DMengineering@bristol.gov.uk">DMengineering@bristol.gov.uk</a> You will be required to pay fees to cover the council's costs in undertaking the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Drafting the Agreement</li> <li>II. Set up costs</li> <li>III. Approving the highway details</li> <li>IV. Inspecting the highway works</li> </ol> <p>To discuss the requirement for sewers contact the Highway Authority's Flood Risk Management Team at <a href="mailto:flood.data@bristol.gov.uk">flood.data@bristol.gov.uk</a> You should enter into discussions with statutory undertakers as soon as possible to co-ordinate the laying of services under any new highways to be adopted by the Highway Authority.</p> <p>N.B. The Highway Authority's technical approval inspection fees must be paid before any drawings will be considered and approved. Once technical approval has been granted a Highway Agreement under Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 must be completed and the bond secured.</p> <p>6 Highway Condition Survey</p> <p>The development hereby approved includes the carrying out of a Highway Condition Survey. To agree the extent of the area to be surveyed contact the Highway Authority's Transport Development Management Team at <a href="mailto:transportDM@bristol.gov.uk">transportDM@bristol.gov.uk</a></p> <p>7 Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS)</p> <p>The development hereby approved includes the construction/provision of a sustainable drainage system. You are advised to contact the Highway Authority's Flood Risk Management Team at <a href="mailto:flood.data@bristol.gov.uk">flood.data@bristol.gov.uk</a> before any works commence.</p> <p>8 Restriction of Parking Permits - Existing Controlled Parking Zone/Residents Parking Scheme</p> <p>You are advised that the Local Planning Authority has recommended to the Highways Authority which administers the existing Controlled Parking Zone/Residents Parking Scheme of which the development forms part that the development shall be treated as car free / low-car and the occupiers are ineligible for resident parking permits as well as</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	visitors parking permits if in a Residents Parking Scheme.

### Item 3: - Land On The North Side Of Gas Lane Bristol BS2 0QN

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
p.133/p.140	<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Modelling files are being discussed and the topographical survey has been provided. The Environment Agency has been re-consulted on the additional information and if the objection can be overcome, officers are seeking delegated authority to progress these discussions and to add conditions as necessary. If the objection cannot be overcome, the application will be brought back to committee to determine.</p>
p.135	<p>Historic England:</p> <p>Following our previous advice and discussions on site, we encouraged a much greater horizontal emphasis to the building form and its detailing, steering from the character of existing low-slung buildings and significant boundary walls in the area. The amended scheme better expresses this in its form and articulation. The use of rubble stone for the ground floor plinth on Gas Lane will help interpret the prominent and substantial stone walls found throughout the recently designated Conservation Area.</p> <p>While the impact from Viewpoint 1, looking east along Gas Lane would be lessened from that of previous iterations, there would still be a harmful impact upon the primacy of the Grade II* building. We have had sight of an alternative LVIA view (not included in the formal re-submission), taken from a point slightly east of Viewpoint 1, and this appears to emphasise the brick cornices and string courses with heavier shadowing in the rendered image. We therefore advise that, in the event of approval, the detailing of the elevations is such that the horizontal elements are sufficiently robust to articulate the linear form of the building, countering the verticality of the building.</p> <p>While we acknowledge other consented developments within the Conservation Area and the scale and height of some individual elements, the proposals for this site would still counter the low-slung nature of existing buildings, providing much of the character and appearance. Therefore, together with the impact on the primacy of St Vincent's Works, there would still be a degree of harm, this being less than substantial, as defined by the NPPF. We therefore advise that the harm is weighed against the perceived public benefits but giving the great weight to the conservation of heritage asset (NPPF, para 199).</p> <p>(Officer note – details of this element are required by condition nos. 16 and 17. Full comments are available on the application website.)</p> <p>Additional Condition:</p> <p>Prior to commencement of any works of demolition and site clearance, a Level 4 record of the Methodist Chapel identified in the Heritage Note May 2022 shall be made in accordance with guidance in Historic England's 'Understanding Historic Buildings – A Guide to Good Recording Practice' (2016) and shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and deposited with the Historic Environment Record, Bristol City Museum and the Bristol Record Office.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological or architectural importance within a building are recorded before their destruction or concealment.

**Item 4: - 155 - 165 West Street Bedminster Bristol BS3 3PN**

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
224	<p><b>Condition 41 – List of Approved of Plans List</b></p> <p>Plan list corrected, specifically the drawing number for no. 113 P5 'Proposed Elevations Sheet 2 of 2' has been corrected to dwg no. 113 P6 'Proposed Elevations Sheet 2 of 2'. For the avoidance of doubt, no material change has been made to the plan itself.</p>