

Public Forum

D C Committee B

6pm 12 January 2022



- 1. Members of the Development Control Committee B**
Councillors: Ani Stafford-Townsend (Chair), Chris Windows, Fabian Breckels, Andrew Brown, Lesley Alexander, Amirah Cole, Tony Dyer, Guy Poultney, Zoe Goodman
- 2. Officers:**
Gary Collins - Development Management, Peter Westbury, Zoe Willcox, Matthew Cockburn, Luke Phillips, Stephen Rockey, Laurence Fallon, Allison Taylor



| Statements/Petitions | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Number | Request To Speak Made Where Indicated S = Speaker | Name | Application |
| 1 | S | Lee Madan | 20/04125/F - The Old Dairy Durnford Street BS3 |
| 2 | S | Mrs Billie-Rae Jackson | |
| 3 | S | Ben Larcombe/Michael Orr – CSJ Planning | |
| 4 | S | Councillor Christine Townsend | |
| | | | |
| 5 | S | Cllr Phillipa Hulme | 21/03346/F - 2 Bishopthorpe Road Bristol BS10 |
| 6 | S | Richard Worsnop | |



Hello, please can I register to speak at the Development Control Committee B meeting on Wednesday 12 January 2022 to discuss my objections to the development 20/04125/F - The Old Dairy Durnford Street Bristol BS3 2AW.

Here is my written statement:

Firstly, nobody objects to a sensible development at a reasonable height which blends in with the existing homes. We understand there is a housing crisis and building reasonable homes at an appropriate height would be fine with us. But the current proposals for blocks of flats and tall town houses are completely out of keeping with the immediate area and would absolutely devastate our community. The unnecessary height of the townhouses and flats are so close to our homes they would completely overshadow our windows, especially in the winter when the sun is lower in the sky, and massively invade our privacy. Also, the plans would see the existing warehouses knocked down which is very bad for the environment and history of the area - surely they should be retaining and restoring the existing buildings as part of the development and show some respect to the history of the old dairy.

The development is far too close to neighbouring homes for any buildings to be allowed to be built above a first floor. At a push if there has to be a second floor these should be within a dormer roof. The current plans show no consideration whatsoever to neighbours - not only do the houses have a second floor, there is then a peaked roof on top of that again, which will increase the footprint of these imposing properties and the size of the shadow the homes cast over us.

The current plans for flats go way beyond a first floor too and would have an equally devastating effect. The flats and houses are so close to our homes that any window above a first floor will look directly into our gardens and hugely invade our privacy and quality of life. There are even balconies that look out over our gardens in these plans. It is astonishing that the developer would not have even shown the basic level of consideration to us with their plans. It's all so unnecessary because if the development was a reasonable size and design we would support it.

But unfortunately the developer has tried to squash too many homes onto the site by building too far upwards so they can maximise their profits. They have ignored the fact it is so close to our homes, and also ignored the fact that Ashton is built on ash, meaning they will have to dig extra deep foundations here anyway. So if they really want to achieve extra floors to the properties they should build down with a lower ground floor level, which would cause less disruption, less invasion of privacy and less loss of light, rather than building upwards. They have to dig down anyway much deeper than normal due to being in Ashton and the fact the ground is made of ash, so why not make the most of this and get their extra floor at lower ground level, which would allow them to cram the extra space into these homes they seem determined to do, but in a way which shows more consideration to the area and causing less problems for their neighbours.

Another major concern is the ugly design of these homes and flats which are completely out of character with the existing homes nearby. Our houses are all render, stone or mock tudor, so surely the development has to be one of those styles to fit in. But the developer has just gone for cheap bricks which would look completely out of character, an eyesore and not fit in at all. Again it shows no consideration for the area or the environment they would be ruining. Again, they have just gone for the cheapest possible design and not taken into account the local area.

We are only a few hundred metres from the North Somerset countryside, but these properties have been designed as if they are in a town centre and it is not in keeping with Ashton at all.

The lack of parking spaces is also a huge concern, especially as public transport is so unreliable in the area. It is not walking distance to the city centre, so people will need cars realistically. Only the other day someone was killed on a bicycle on these narrow streets so riding a bike is not always safe.

The lack of parking in the area is already a massive problem for residents, so to add more properties without their own parking spaces is going to make a bad situation even worse. The development urgently needs fewer properties, and more parking spaces.

The narrow access roads are also a massive worry as bin lorries already get stuck here and ambulances cannot get through in emergencies. The developer's "solution" to add yellow lines on the road is not a solution at all - that will remove much needed parking spaces and creates additional problems for us. If they are going to widen the road then they should genuinely widen the road, not wipe out the existing parking spaces which we need. I do think the developer should also be made to add some extra parking spaces on their land too which anyone can use, to help address the crisis in the area with a lack of parking which already exists.

Overall, this design is appalling and will cause too many problems for the area to be allowed to go ahead in its current form. We would ask that the council rejects the proposals, and insists that any new proposals submitted are a more appropriate height, with a more realistic number of properties onsite, retaining and restoring existing buildings, with additional parking and a higher ratio of parking spaces, widening access roads and increasing (not reducing) the number of spaces to park available for the neighbourhood, and the design of any new buildings be in keeping with neighbouring properties. We are just asking for a reasonable development which blends in, and doesn't invade our privacy or overshadow our homes, it is not much to ask. Please help.

Thank you, Lee

Written Public Forum Statement

Application no. 20/04125/F

Site address: The Old Dairy Durnford Street Bristol BS3 2AW

Dear Sirs and Madams,

Happy New Year to all. I hope you don't mind me getting in touch but I thought it was important to relay the strength of feeling in the area against this proposed development. It would destroy our area.

Our main objections are the size and scale, and in particular height, of the development and the fact it is out of proportion to the neighbouring terraced two up, two down houses. They have tried to shoe-horn far too many properties into such a small site in an area which already cannot cope with the number of properties. The density of the development does not work.

Residents drive round and round for hours trying to find a parking space already. The last thing we need is more properties without adequate parking for those new homes.

We absolutely do not want buildings as tall as the awful ones being proposed due to loss of light and extreme loss of privacy.

They would cause so many problems to the dozens of houses in their wake they would be overshadowing.

This is not the city centre it is the back streets of leafy Ashton.

Also where are the trees and green spaces and electric charging points? It feels like there's no future-proofing with these plans.

And the look of the homes and flats are not in keeping with the look of the homes already here.

Please throw these plans out.

Best wishes,

Mrs Billie-Rae Jackson

COMMITTEE SPEECH – 20/04125/F – DURNFORD STREET

Dear Members,

My name is Michael Orr/Ben Larcombe from CSJ Planning in Bristol. I am the planning agent for this application.

- I commend the Officer Report recommending approval, concluding that the proposal is in accordance with the Development Plan 'as a whole'.
- The Officer recommendation is the result of extensive, positive negotiations between the Local Planning Authority and the application, which followed a detailed Pre-Application submission in 2019.
- The proposals will boost much-needed housing delivery,
- It includes threshold compliant affordable housing, ranging in size and tenure including both social rent and shared ownership.
- It also provides for a varied mix of market housing types, including 7 No. family-sized houses fronting Durnford Street.
- The proposal commits to a 'day-one' connection to the Bristol District Heating Network, to be secured via S106.
- The sustainable credentials are enhanced by a solar PV array, which will further reduce carbon emissions in accordance with policy.
- It also provides further benefits, including a new pedestrian route linking Durnford Street through to Baynton Road. This will facilitate swift, safe and convenient access to Greyville Smyth Park and improve pedestrian connectivity in the area generally.
- Recognising the sustainable location, the amount vehicle parking is limited, with generous provision of cycle parking, in excess of the policy standard.

In conclusion, it is a scheme of high quality urban regeneration that is worthy of planning permission.

I respectfully ask for your support. Thank you.

Public Statement – Old Dairy 12/01/22

Cllr Christine Townsend Southville ward

Consultation - the developer has stated that C19 has limited their ability to engage with the community - this has not prevented other developers in other areas of the ward. As a ward councillor I have received no contact from this developer which is unfortunate as it is possible that some of the further objections listed below could have been ironed out earlier.

Parking - The area of the ward is outside of the existing RPZ, indeed literally the other side of the road. The extension of the RPZ has been the main call from residents since the RPZ was introduced many years ago the other side of North Street and despite numerous professional consultations the current administration has refused to move this forward. I have received no evidence or reassurances since being elected that there is an intention to do this, despite it being a promise from both the Labour candidates who claimed it had been agreed by the then Transport Cab Member Kyle Dudd.

This area is in the Ashton Gate parking catchment and has suffered from serious match day parking issues ever since. Dangerous parking with fans using road corners, parking across residents' dropped curbs and on pavements - this is a health and safety issue around emergency vehicle access and residents wishing to walk on pavements with buggies/wheelchairs, needing to enter the road in order to see around these parked cars in order to cross.

I am confused by the plans as to where the 23 car parking spaces will be as 4 to my reading are on Baynton Rd - I invite the developer to explain how these spaces will be accessed only by its' residents as Baynton Rd is a public highway. Again, there appears to be covered access to the parking for the market value units only, will those living in the affordable/social units have parking spaces? see 'poor door' comments below

EV charging points - it appears that these are only available in the 'covered' parking area i.e. the market rate units (see below for my 'poor door' comment)

Cycle Storage - again it appears from my reading that there is division between the quality of those to be accessed by the people living in the market unit compared with the affordable/social units.

Affordable Housing - the 20% is not to the Local Plan policy, the Affordable Housing Practice Note has not been updated by the administration, since March 2021. I disagree with the

officer view that 20% is acceptable. None of the town houses are in this category - Bristol needs affordable/social housing for families and their children, this development provides only affordable/social within the flats, children need space to grow and thrive, especially as we come out of the pandemic, this development fails in this regard.

'Poor Door' Entrances - there is a separate entrance for those who are intended to live in the area of the development where the developer is proposing to build the affordable/social rent and these units have staircase only access - the market units have a lift. I am utterly opposed to this it separates residents on the grounds of their social status and is divisive and it fails to provide communal spaces of equal standing something completely unwelcome and an approach the Green Party is against. My understanding is that the Bristol Labour Party is also against this

Public Sector Duty Requirement - given what the data tells us regarding those who are most likely to need social housing I invite officers to explain how the PSDR has been fulfilled. This is a vital element of the Equality Act and cover legally protected characteristics as committee members will know. Social housing residents are overrepresented by those with disabilities and those on low-incomes which sees further concentrations of people and families from BAME backgrounds, some reflecting minority religious faiths. Such housing is also required by people in the older age bracket also a protected characteristic under the law. The PSDR is a legal requirement for all those in the public sector it requires active steps are taken to reduce disadvantage experienced by these groups of people – different entrances, car parking access/facilities, cycling amenities and the absence of a lift for those in the affordable/social units hard wires this disadvantage into the design – it will not, by definition ever change.

The PSDR is not just a 'nice to have' if private profit allows it a legal duty on every employee within the council and on us as elected representatives. I am amazed that officers are recommending this proposal are voted through given evident built differences, by design, this application proposes. The lived experience of residents within this development are markedly separate.

I urge that committee rejects this application.

Comments for Planning Application 21/03346/F

Objection by Cllr Philippa Hulme for DC-B on 12 January 2022

Application Number: 21/03346/F

Address: 2 Bishopthorpe Road Bristol BS10 5AA

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension and change of use from dwelling house (C3a) to large HMO (sui generis) (resubmission of planning application 21/00960/F).

Case Officer: Patrick Boxwell

As my voting record on DC-A shows, I generally support well-considered development to meet Bristol's considerable housing needs. However, this development would have many detrimental effects, which have been recognised by the 22 neighbours who have taken the time to object to it over Christmas and New Year. Please refuse planning permission for these reasons:

Damage to street scene

The extension would damage the currently balanced and attractive street scene, which is of particular concern given the prominent corner position of the semi-detached pair.

Noise

Many of the objections mention noise. With 7 occupants, the HMO would be crowded. Residents would use their bedrooms to entertain guests as well as to work, study and listen to music, quite possibly late at night. Some may go outside to smoke and for barbeques and so on. Soundproofing will reduce some of this noise, but not all of it. The extra noise will be challenging to neighbours working from home or putting children to bed, and will damage their health and well-being.

Parking

Most councillors hear a lot about parking. In this case, residents' concerns are fully justified. The surrounding streets are always full of parked cars, thanks to the nearby Southmead Hospital. An extra 3 or 4 cars cannot be accommodated in the surrounding streets.

I urge you to please refuse permission for this development, which is inappropriate in an area where family homes are in great demand.

I would like to speak at the Planning Committee meeting on Wednesday 12th January to object to this application on the grounds of:

- The manifest opposition in the neighbourhood to this proposal because of noise disturbance and parking/road safety concerns
- The disturbance we will experience as adjoining neighbours and the long term psychological effects of this
- The detrimental effect to the visual appearance of the house and curtilage
- The inappropriateness of remodelling the house to repurpose as an HMO when there is demand for family houses like this

Kind regards
Richard Worsnop
112 Wellington Hill West
BS9 4SL