

Public Forum

D C Committee A

2pm on Wednesday 8th June 2022



1. Members of the Development Control Committee A

Councillors: Richard Eddy (Chair), Paul Goggin (Vice-Chair), Fi Hance, Andrew Varney, Marley Bennett, John Geater, Tom Hathway, Phillipa Hulme and Ed Plowden

2. Officers:

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



STATEMENTS & PETITIONS			
Planning Application	Statement Number	Request To Speak Made (R)	Name
21/00548/H – 92 Princess Victoria Street	A1		Pam Townsend
	A2		Ranolph Harrison
	A3		Timothy Davidson
	A4		Martyn Gallop
	A5		Mike Hogg
	A6		Charlotte Waelde
	A7		Dudley Brewer
	A8		Mark Harris
	A9		Gareth Hammond
	A10	R	Colin Doak
	A11		Rosalind Newton
	A12		Peter Luce
	A13		Stephen Newton
	A14		Jonathon Dixon
	A15		John Barrett
	A16	R (Audio or Video recording to be provided before the meeting and played at the appropriate point during Public Forum)	Kathryn Green
	A17		Mark Taylor
	A18		Carolyn Baker
	A19		Jan Killick
	A20		Chloe Sarosh, Zubin Sarosh, Richard Flook and Philip Butler
	A21		Nigel Killick



	A22		Steve Smith
	A23		Councillor Katy Grant
	A24		Judith Storr



**List of People Requesting to Speak – Public Participation – DC A Committee –
5pm on Tuesday 31st April 2022 for Questions, 12pm on Tuesday 7th June 2022
for Statements**

A – 92 Princess Victoria Street

A10 – Colin Doak

A16 – Kathryn Green (Audio or Video recording to be provided before the meeting and played at the appropriate point during Public Forum)

STATEMENT NUMBER A1

Dear Planning Committee

I have already written in relation to application 21/05548/H for 92 Princess Victoria Street Bristol BS8 4DB, regarding the proposed third-floor extension, second-floor refurbishment, including associated demolitions, voicing my objection and it is on file.

In addition I would like to remind you that the proposed development is in breach of the relevant tests of policy BSC22, DM27, DM30i, DM32 and paragraph 197c of the NPPF.

I am therefore asking that the Development Control Committee turns down this application or they will be condoning the above breaches of their own and NPPF policies.

Yours Sincerely

Pam Townsend

STATEMENT NUMBER A2

In relation to planning application 21/05548/H - 92 Princess Victoria Street Bristol BS8 4DB, it is my understanding that this application is going to committee.

Allow me to stress once again (as with my previous two comments on the planning application and its insufficient update) that this planned construction will dominate the Princess Victoria Street skyline, casting my yard in shadow (there has been no light impact survey undertaken) and does not fit in with the historic character of the mews buildings on the street. This would breach the Developmental Control Committee policies DM27, DM30i, DM32 and BSC22.

Kind regards,

Ranolph Harrison

96 Princess Victoria Street

STATEMENT NUMBER A3

I write as a long-term Clifton resident with regard to the planning application for an extra floor on this property.

I object to this proposal on the grounds that,if approved, the building would be out of scale in terms of height and out of character with the surrounding built environment in this part of Princess Victoria Street which is predominantly of a mews house/ cottage style.

T.J. Davidson

4 Canynge Square, Clifton,Bristol

STATEMENT NUMBER A4

Planning Application Reference 21/05548/H - Proposed 3rd Floor Extension, 2nd Floor Refurbishment Including Associated Demolitions - 92 Princess Street Bristol BS8 4DB

The proposed application is quite simply injurious to the overall character and appearance of Princess Victoria Street and this section of the Conservation Area.

92 Princess Street is already one of the dominant properties in the street in relation to its height; the appearance of the property and the street would negatively suffer from any increase in height, undermining the street's overall look, feel and cultural ambience.

Most significantly it palpably fails to accord with and therefore breaches a number of policies, namely:

DM27 – requirement for proposals to be appropriate to the context and character of the street;

DM30i – requirement for extensions and building alterations to respect the broader street appearance: extensions including altered roof forms to be physically and visually subservient to host building;

DM32 & BSC22 – requirement for applications to conserve or enhance the elements that contribute to the special character and appearance of a Conservation Area;

NPPF Para 197c – requirement for applications to enhance, positively contributing to, local character and distinctiveness.

In conclusion, this application fundamentally fails to meet and is therefore in breach of the reasonable standards set out in the aforementioned policies. On this basis it would be a dereliction of civil duty for this application to be approved, undermining the very standards and principles on which approval should be judged against.

STATEMENT NUMBER A5

Dear Sir / Madam,

I submit this written statement in relation to application 21/05548/H for 92 Princess Victoria Street Bristol BS8 4DB, regarding the proposed third-floor extension and second-floor refurbishment including associated demolitions. I will not be attending in person on 8th June but wish this written statement to be tabled and formally considered by the Development Control Committee.

The relevant policy framework for assessing this application would appear to be the adopted Local Plan (Bristol Core Strategy "BCS" and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Plan "SADMP"), relevant supplementary planning guidance (Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2010) "CACA", SPD 2: A Guide for Designing House Alterations and Extensions (2005), the Urban Living SPD (2018) and PAN15: Responding to Local Character, A Design Guide (1998) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

As such, the proposed development is in breach of the relevant tests of policy BSC22, DM27, DM30i, DM32 and paragraph 197c of the NPPF and contrary to policies BCS21, DM27vi and DM30iii.

Should the Development Control Committee approve this application, they will in effect be condoning the above breaches of their own and NPPF policies.

Yours faithfully,

M.J.Hogg.

STATEMENT NUMBER A6

I am writing in connection with the application for a proposed third floor extension and second floor refurbishment at 92 Princess Victoria Street, Clifton, Bristol, BS8 4DB – application number 21/05548/H.

As is well known, the Council has promulgated a number of policies with respect to proposed development in the Clifton conservation area and Princess Victoria Street.

Each of these policies seeks to ensure that the distinctive character of the area is retained and that any development should be appropriate to the context and area. As the policies acknowledge, Princess Victoria Street is of an 'intimate scale with a mews-like character of 2-3 storey modest terraced buildings'. Clifton & Hotwells Character Appraisal and Management Proposals para 7.1.8k.

The addition of a third storey to a building in an environment which is intended to be intimate and modest will change the character of the street, dominate the host building and detract from the local character and distinctiveness of Princess Victoria Street. As such permitting the application to proceed would be contrary to the Council policies BSC22, DM27, DM30i, DM32 and paragraph 197c of the NPPF.

Yours faithfully

Charlotte Waelde

6 Princes Buildings

Garden Flat

STATEMENT NUMBER A7

Dear Sir/Madam,

reference the above and further to my e mail of 23 February 2022 objecting to the above, I note this application is now to come before the Planning Committee on Wednesday 8 June.

The contents/arguments of my 23 February mail were based simply on the obvious/common sense observations that the proposed development of 92 Princess Victoria Street were totally out of character/unsympathetic with the established, attractive and cherished historic norm of the street and area in general.

However,since the above I have been looking into the matter in a little more detail and have noted some of the Council's rules/clear guidance re planning policies/applications in the geographic area of Princess Victoria Street,namely BSC22,DM32,DM30i,DM27,Para 197c of the NPFF,Clifton & Hotwells Character Appraisal and Management Proposals para 7.1.8k.It is clear to me and I suspect anyone else reading the planning considerations detailed, that to approve the above application would be in direct contradiction/breach of the requirements/standards set by the Council.

The application should therefore be refused, yours faithfully,

D J P Brewer

STATEMENT NUMBER A8

Dear Councillors, I have previously expressed my objection to this application on the grounds that it would spoil the appearance of this part of Princess Victoria Street. My recent visit to Clifton in April reinforced that view and I understand that the application would in fact contravene a number of planning policies relating to the conservation area. The Committee should be mindful of the importance of retaining the scale and character of these coach houses, as highlighted in the local area appraisal.

Regards

Mark Harris

STATEMENT NUMBER A9

Dear Sir,

I write, as a long-term champion of the architectural delights of Clifton, to object to the above planning proposal on the grounds that it is in breach of policies BSC22, DM27, DM30i, DM32 & paragraph 197c of the NPPF. There is not much point having these carefully thought-out policies, if you then disregard them. It is important to retain as much as possible of the modest mews character of Princess Victoria Street. The development proposed would be a thuggish intrusion, because of its scale & design & would adversely impact the character of the conservation area.

Regards,

Gareth Hammond

STATEMENT NUMBER A10

PLANNING APPLICATION REFERENCE 21/05548/H PROPOSED THIRD FLOOR EXTENSION, SECOND FLOOR REFURBISHMENT, INCLUDING ASSOCIATED DEMOLITIONS 92 PRINCESS VICTORIA STREET BRISTOL

OBJECTION SUBMITTED BY COLIN DOAK, 94 PRINCESS VICTORIA STREET, BRISTOL

COLIN AND HIS WIFE HAVE LIVED IN AND AROUND PRINCESS VICTORIA STREET FOR 40 YEARS

We are not anti-development, only anti inappropriate development. We have a number of serious concerns about this application.

The application remains policy noncompliant; the design is of insufficient quality that harms the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and Princess Victoria Street; and it adversely harms our privacy and amenity, particularly the enjoyment of our garden.

We cannot support this application and respectfully ask that the Committee refuses this contrary to the officer's recommendation.

THE IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The applicant's Design, Access and Heritage Statement states:

"There are no overlooking issues"

This is simply not true. If approved, this building will become substantially taller than ours. There will be both the perception of and actual overlooking of our garden, irrespective of the use of 'opaque' glazing on all the proposed dormers. Plus such a large roof top extension, which is essentially a fourth storey, will create a significantly dominant and overbearing building. Yet no site visit was made, with no viewing of the proposal from my property.

Bristol Core Strategy 21 states:

'Development in Bristol will be expected to....safeguard the amenity of existing development'.

4.21.13.states: "Consideration should be given to matters of privacy"

This application is contrary to this policy, as it is also contrary to DM27vi and DM30iii.

We are now being told that all the dormer windows are using opaque glazing. This is a shocking statement. It confirms our position that there will be overlooking from these windows, but the use of opaque glazing will surely create substandard living conditions for the occupants as they won't be able to see out. How can this be appropriate development?

It is, however, useful to note that despite this assurance there is no annotation on the proposed plans nor any conditions that control this. Therefore despite this rather strange

proposed use of obscure glazing there is no way to enforce this. The reality is that normal glass will be used, which will result in overlooking of our garden.

Having taken legal advice, my solicitors point out:

"The fact that the proposed development will overlook your rear garden, being the only private outside space you possess, is a relevant planning consideration which the LPA are required to have regard to and this is confirmed by case law - *Multimedia Productions v Secretary of State for the Environment and Islington Borough Council [1989] JPL 96*.

On this basis the LPA should refuse consent"

In conjunction with overlooking of our garden, the application will result in a large and overwhelming building next door to us. This will result in the loss of natural light and will over shadow our garden.

The case officer's report that the extension will result in overshadowing our garden. But despite repeated requests for this to be assessed it has not been done. Our neighbours' development proposal to add another story to this property cannot be done at the expense of our amenity.

Contrary to the case officer's report we contend that he has not been able to make a fully considered and balanced decision and has not fully considered the impact of the proposal on my property and amenity. **Consequently, my legal advice is the LPA should refuse consent**

THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL ON THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE CONSERVATION AREA

Your Conservation Area Character Appraisal makes it very clear that the intimate and modest scale of development within the western end of Princess Victoria Street is an intrinsic and vital element of the character of this part of the Conservation Area. It further cautions that roof level alterations can have a significant impact on the relationship with adjacent buildings and on the character and appearance of the area. Yet this proposal does exactly that.

It will harm the transitional scale of the buildings within this part of Princess Victoria Street. It will undermine the integrity of what makes this area special by changing its intimate, small-scale character.

The harm this causes is not outweighed by any public benefit. Only private benefit for the applicant.

Recent appeal dismissals have confirmed that Planning Inspectors do agree that upward extensions will harm the setting of host buildings and have a wider impact on the character and appearance of a streetscene.

Despite the case officer's support, it is clear that the proposal will have a detrimental impact on this part of Princess Victoria Street. This is endorsed by the Conservation Advisory Panel, your heritage advisors.

a) **The Proposal**

The applicant has submitted an elevation which purports to show the current roof lines:



It implies that the roof of Number 90 is currently much higher than that of Number 92. This is, at best, **totally misleading**.

The reality is that the roof of Number 90 is set **very far back** from the front of the building



Thus from the street the parapet of Number 90 hides the apex of its roof so that one sees a more or less continuous roof line (or more accurately, parapet line).

From the street, the front of Numbers 90 and 92 appear to be of the same height, and Number 92 *already* towers over the discreetly scaled 94 and 96



The applicant has then submitted an elevation which purports to show the future roof lines.



It implies that the roof of Number 92 will be on a level with the roof of Number 90.

This is, again at best, totally misleading.

In fact, the proposed roof top extension (fourth storey) of Number 92 will dominate the sky above Numbers 90, 94 and 96. It will be over-scaled and totally out of character



The picture below shows the current roof/parapet line as seen from the street.

Number 90 is the tall, light blue house in the middle ground.

Number 92 is the tall light brown house beside it in the middle ground.

Numbers 94 and 96 are the two, less high stone houses in the foreground



It takes little imagination to see how the proposed Third Floor extension on Number 92 will **unnecessarily dominate the skyline** in this part of Princess Victoria Street, creating an ugly, jagged, abrupt, semi-high rise totally inappropriate in its context.

It will no longer be a transitional building. It already stands as one of the tallest buildings on Princess Victoria Street. This will only add additional height that is inappropriate within the street scene that will undermine its special character.

b) Planning Considerations

The application site is situated within Character Area 8 (the Clifton Spa Terraces) of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation area.

Your Clifton & Hotwells Character Appraisal and Management Proposals state at **para 7.1.8k** that: "Princess Victoria Street (1820-1870) is of a distinctly more intimate scale with a mews-like character of 2-3 storey modest terraced buildings.....**Further west are coach houses the scale and character of which it is important to retain.....**".

This application does not accord with this test.

Policy DM27 requires applications to ensure that, amongst other things, the height of a proposal is appropriate to the immediate context and the character of the street.

This application does not accord with this test.

Policy DM30i requires extensions and alterations to buildings to respect the broader street scene, with extensions, including altered roof forms, physically and visually subservient to the host building.

This application does not accord with this test.

BSC22 and **DM32** require applications to conserve or enhance the elements that contribute to the special character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

This application does not maintain a modest mews-like character (far from it) and thus does not accord with this test

Para 197c of the NPPF requires applications to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

This application does not accord with this test.

SUMMARY

46 comments were submitted to the revised application. **ALL objected.** CHIS objected. The Bristol Conservation Advisory Panel objected, confirming this **"is an unacceptable scheme....that cannot be supported"**

The level of objection received is because this is not a good proposal and the revisions made to date are just tinkering, they have not resolved the principal issues.

STATEMENT NUMBER A11

Dear Sirs

I am aware that the above Planning Application has been referred to the Planning Committee. Furthermore, this application now has a recommendation that it be approved by the relevant Planning Officer.

Frankly, I am dismayed by this knowledge. I reiterate, having known Clifton over the years, Princess Victoria Street is proportionally pleasing in architectural terms. The proportion ratio of walls to windows, of light and aspect were carefully considered when the street was conceived. In allowing this application through, it spoils this flow. We are custodians of our historic homes and of our streets in which we live. Planning permissions given today should be in keeping with that idea of responsible custodianship. My view is that this application is not in keeping.

Of course I am going to cite the Application runs counter to the stated policies of the Council (BSC22, DM27, DM30i, DM32), and also Paragraph 197c of the NPPF. Yet in addition this is contrary to the Council's Clifton & Hotwells Character Appraisal and Management Proposals at para 7.1.8k. And this, in my view means that we acknowledge that Princess Victoria Street is a lovely street. Not for one moment do I think this is the place to let the push of development make its negative impact.

I feel that this application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully,

Rosalind Newton

6 Parkhurst Fields

Churt

STATEMENT NUMBER A12

Dear Sirs,

I gather there is a forthcoming planning committee meeting to discuss the proposed works to the above property.

I have known Mr and Mrs Doak for many years and regularly visit Clifton. I find the proposed planning application abhorrent as it will severely damage the look and feel of the surrounding buildings and the line and style of the whole immediate vista. Clifton has a coherent architectural charm and sense of place. By building " a box" on to the current building , the owner will create a building totally out of local style, destroying lines of sight, and diminishing a local architectural gem. Prince Charles has used the term"carbuncle" in the past; it would be very sad if the council created an opportunity to create one for Bristol.

I hope my views are considered.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Peter Luce

STATEMENT NUMBER A13

Dear Sirs

I understand that the above Planning Application has been referred to the Planning Committee with a recommendation by the relevant Planning Officer that it be approved.

Although I am not a local resident, my wife and I visit Bristol when we can and both know and love this area.

With that in mind, I find such a recommendation astonishing. Not only would there be a negative impact, in my view, on a small area of special architectural interest, but, as I understand it, the Application runs counter to the stated policies of the Council (BSC22, DM27, DM30i, DM32), and also Paragraph 197c of the NPPF. It is also contrary to the Council's Clifton & Hotwells Character Appraisal and Management Proposals at para 7.1.8k. To approve this Application would of course also set a precedent for similar Applications in the future.

It seems to me that Planning Committees have a duty to resist the tide of self-interest that leads to such Planning Applications being made, not least when they run counter to known policies. I encourage the Committee to reject this Application.

Yours faithfully

Stephen Newton

6 Parkhurst Fields, Churt, Farnham

STATEMENT NUMBER A14

Please note the following objection to the Planning Application 21/05548/H - 92 Princess Victoria Street Bristol BS8 4DB.

The front and rear elevations show the height of the proposed roof to be the same as that of No. 90. While this is true, it does not represent what is actually seen at ground level. From the street, the parapet of No. 90 hides the apex of its gable roof so that one sees a more or less continuous roof line (or more accurately parapet line) as one looks along Princess Victoria Street, which is only broken by the lower height of Nos. 94 and 96. However, the Mansard roof proposed for No. 92 will be visible from the southern side of the street. The resulting heightening of the roof line, exaggerated by the contrast with that of No. 94, will be unsightly and detract from the overall appearance of the neighbourhood.

As quoted in the June 2010 Clifton & Hotwells Character Appraisal and Management Proposals, one of the predominant characteristics of this area is that the "pitched, gable or mansard roofs ... [are] concealed behind parapet. This roof will not be concealed. The same document says "Further west are coach houses the scale and character of which it is important to retain." This proposed development will not retain the "scale and character".

I ask that the Planning Application be rejected.

Jonathan Dixon

19, Clyde Road,

Redland

Bristol,

STATEMENT NUMBER A15

Dear Sirs

I write to oppose this application on the grounds that it fails to meet the City's planning requirements on the following grounds:

DM27, DM30,& DM32.

This application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully,

J. A Barrett.

Written Statement to support the decision to grant planning 92 Princess Victoria Street BS8 4DB – Application no. 21/05548/H

STATEMENT NUMBER A16

Princess Victoria Street is a highly eclectic mix of old and new properties.

We moved into No 92 in the belief that an extension in line with the precedent set at number 88 would meet local planning guidelines. Planning officers have since recommended the proposal for approval, following alterations to original plans. It is in line with government policy to develop brownfield sites.

The accommodation needs to be brought to an acceptable living standard to become a liveable home for a modern working family. Two small bedrooms have been divided into three tiny rooms with just one communal living space, one tiny bathroom, and a combined kitchen/hallway.

One of my immediate neighbours has been supportive, but the other has chosen to wage a significant campaign against our proposal.

This perhaps explains why 17 objectors do not live in Clifton and of those only 3 even live in Bristol. The campaign (evidence attached) has included leafleting, e-mailing, and stopping people in the street as well as providing example letters to the Council.

While we have received support from a number of our neighbours, we have asked them not to get involved for fear of causing further unnecessary division in the street.

We have considered moving, but I cannot let my teenage daughters see us being bullied out of our new home.

We moved into 92 Princess Victoria Street on March 11th, 2020. As a single mother I chose the house partly because it is close to my children's schools and my work, and because I need all key services to be within easy walking distance.

Our home is in a row of terraced properties towards one end of the street close to the junction with Sion Hill. Numbers 90 and 92 were built in the 1970s to replace a row of garages. Originally numbers 88, 90 and 92 were all three storey town houses. Number 88 added a fourth floor (planning granted in May 2017) in a manner which is broadly in line with this application.

The proposed design is deliberately similar to, and in keeping with neighbouring properties, and it is consistent with the wider area given the variety of roof heights and styles.

Thank you for considering our application.

Dear Councillors,

I write in relation to application 21/05548/H for 92 Princess Victoria Street Bristol BS8 4DB, regarding the proposed third-floor extension etc. **STATEMENT NUMBER A17**

I am interested as a lover of the unique character and street scene of Clifton in general and this lovely street at its heart. To the interested observer there seems to be no basis to approve the application in its current form when looked at against the Council's own stated policies.

The scale and design of this proposal is in contravention of the Council's policies in relation to height (DM27) and maintenance of the character of the street as formed by the existing buildings (DM30i).

Indeed the proposal, far from enhancing or conserving the special character of the Conservation Area, rather detracts from it in an obvious way thus conflicting with BSC22 and DM32. Nor does it make any positive contribution to the local character (NPPF para 197c.)

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Mark Taylor

1 College Square,
Newport

STATEMENT NUMBER A18

21/05548/H - 92 Princess Victoria Street, Bristol BS8 4DB

This application for a third floor extension is inappropriate in a Conservation area and in Princess Victoria Street and is in breach of several tests of policy.

Adding extra floors to houses in P. V. Street will change the character of this Street and will be detrimental to its historical value.

Mrs. C. Baker

Sion Hill

STATEMENT NUMBER A19

Hello

Please see below my comments objecting to planning at 21/05548/H - 92 Princess Victoria Street Bristol BS8 4DB on several planning grounds. I have submitting these via the planning portal but understand they need to be submitted by Tuesday 7 June. Hence this email.

Kind regards

Jan Killick

STATEMENT NUMBER A20

To whom it may concern

I write to represent the owners and tenants of the four flats that make up 12 Caledonia Place. We share a mutual disappointment that such plans have made it to this stage with a recommendation for consent. Our objections are as follows:

1 – Loss of light. The raising of the roof line will detrimentally affect the light in our small garden and bedrooms, plus that coming into the basement and first floor flats. We have taken advice on this and, joined with our neighbours at number 11, believe we have a case to sue against this infringement on our right. We would welcome a visit from planning to see what an affect this would have.

2- Loss of privacy. The raising of the current roof level will allow residents at no 92 to look into 3 bedroom windows at no 12 , our kitchen and garden. The Human Rights Act, in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, which includes the home and other land.

3 - This a historic area with conservation status and PVS is a much loved street. It seems unfair to buy a coach house in the expectation that you will change its style and size to suit your purpose. If granted then what stops the next house doing the same, all the way down the street until you have completely lost the original architecture that makes the street so special.

3 – Caledonia Place is Grade 2 * listed. To update the roof on our kitchen (less than 20 feet from proposed works) we had to consult with planning and heritage to ensure the works done fit within those guidelines (as they should) It dosent seem to make sense that such a huge change can be granted just feet away.

4 – Ultimately we feel so sad for our neighbours, particularly those adjoining 92 and 11 Caledonia whose garden will be now be entirely overlooked and light limited. There was a huge number of objections to these plans and as a community of neighbours, we hope that our concerns wont be sidelined.

We would welcome a site visit from the planning team to view the proposed plans from Caledonia Place.

Thank you for your time.

Best wishes

Chloe Sarosh

Zubin Sarosh

Richard Flook

Philip Butler

12 Caledonia Place

STATEMENT NUMBER A21

Dear Sirs

I would like my objection to yet another assault on the historic environment within the Clifton conservation area. The proposed change to the height of the building and its roofline contravene the principles of BCS22: Conservation and the Historic Environment and should not be allowed and the character of Princess Victoria Street retained

Nigel Killick

STATEMENT NUMBER A22

Dear member of Planning Committee

Re 21/05548/H - 92 Princess Victoria Street Bristol BS8 4DB. Extra storey etc.

The officers report draws a very different conclusion from those of many objectors and fails to consider a key requirement of policy BCS21 which is not met by the proposed development.

The very thorough report draws a different conclusion to that of many of the objecting members of the public who, like myself, believe the proposed development will be detrimental to the character of this part of the conservation area.

This appears to be a result of the report focusing on the proposed development as viewed from directly across the road, from which perspective there may well be some merit to the report's assertion that 'the setback (of the proposed additional floor) would create the effect of a lowered roof ... and (therefore) would not disrupt the overall roof pattern of the area'.

However the proposed development will more usually be viewed from further away by people walking along Princess Victoria Street towards either Clifton Village or the Avon Gorge Hotel. From these perspectives the setback of the extra floor would not create the effect of a lowered roof and therefore would disrupt the roof pattern.

More fundamentally the report states that per your policy BCS21 this development should 'positively contribute to the character of the area'. The report then goes to great lengths to minimise the negative impacts of the development but does not even once suggest that it makes a positive contribution to the character of Princess Victoria Street or the wider Conservation Area.

It may be that in planning parlance 'positive contribution' has a different meaning to that understood by the public, but the fact is that at no point does the report suggest that this proposal would make a positive contribution so it is difficult to see how this scheme meets the requirement of PCS21

Given the failure to satisfy policy PCS21, the widespread public realisation that it will be detrimental to the streetscape, and the fact that the proposed development does not provide any benefits to the city (it provides neither an additional dwelling or even an additional bedroom) the application must surely be refused.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Smith

2 Princes Buildings

STATEMENT NUMBER A23

Statement to the committee.

I would like to lodge an objection to the proposed upwards extension of the third floor at 92 Princess Victoria Street. Despite the way that the elevation has been described, and the accompanying images, I believe that the addition will significantly alter the roofline, and thus the streetscape, in what is otherwise a generally very low-rise, mews-feel street. Princess Victoria Street is in the heart of Clifton Village and in the heart of a conservation area, and the proposed elevation would significantly affect not only the amenity and comfort of neighbouring houses, but of the feeling on the street itself. The plans for the new roof show a structure very close to the frontline of the houses, and thus much more visible than the neighbouring roofs.

The addition will not do anything to address the housing problems faced by Bristol, as it will just provide more space to an individual household, and the benefits will all be private, rather than public.

Katy Grant

Cllr. Katy Grant

Green Councillor for Clifton

STATEMENT NUMBER A24

Planning Application 21/05548/H - 92 Princess Victoria Street, BS8 4DB

Mon 06/06/2022 17:00

To: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk <democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk>

To all Members of Development Control Committee (A) attending AGM on Wednesday, 8th June, 2022

With regard to application 21/05548/H for 92 Princess Victoria Street BS8 4DB I wish to bring to your attention the following points.

1. The Clifton and Hotwells Character Appraisal and Management document states that "Princess Victoria Street (1820- 1870) is of a distinctly more intimate scale with a mews-like character of **2-3 storey** modest terraced buildings. The east end contains the shopping heart of Clifton, retaining a number of original shopfronts with a mix of independent shops adding to the charm. **Further west are coach houses, the scale and character of which it is important to retain**".
2. In the Bristol Development Core Strategy document, policy BCS21 states, amongst other things, that "Development in Bristol will be expected to **contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness**".
3. The officer's report to this committee states that "Policy BCS21 states that development should be of a high quality and **should positively contribute towards an area's character**".

Nowhere in the report submitted to you nor in any other document available to the public is any claim made that this proposed development **contributes positively towards the area's character or identity** or that it **creates or reinforces local distinctiveness**. Yet the report claims that the application accords with policy BCS21 and the proposal complies with BCS21. This despite the addition of a **fourth storey** being at odds with the council's own appraisal document for Princess Victoria Street (see 1.) The crux of opposition to this development is that it will be detrimental to the streetscape, particularly by rudely interrupting the flow of rooflines as viewed from either approach to this, the west end of the street, and dwarfing no.94, its immediate neighbour, (despite the lower roof line in the revised plans).

This application does not accord or comply with Bristol City Council's own development policies and should be rejected.





I also note that although the application states that opaque glass will be used to avoid the overlooking of neighbouring properties, this does not seem to have been proposed as an enforceable condition. How easy it would be for the current or subsequent occupiers to replace the opaque glass with clear glass at some future date, thereby creating an overlooking issue complained of by several objectors who fear the loss of their privacy.

Judith Storr

2 Princes Buildings