

# Public Forum

## D C Committee B

6pm Wed 26<sup>th</sup> Oct 2022



- 1. Members of the Development Control Committee B**  
Councillors: Ani Stafford-Townsend (Chair), Chris Windows, Fabian Breckels, Andrew Brown, Lesley Alexander, Marley Bennett, Lorraine Francis, Katja Hornchen, Guy Poultney.
- 2. Officers:**  
Gary Collins - Development Management, Peter Westbury, Matthew Cockburn, Luke Phillips, Stephen Rockey, Phillipa Howson, John Smith, DSO



<b>Application</b>	<b>Statement Or Petition</b>	<b>Request To Speak Made Where Indicated S = Speaker</b>	<b>Name</b>
22/01736 – Land Surrounding Dove Lane, St Pauls	A1	S	Yuved Bheenick
	A2		David Redgewell
21/06128/F and 21/06129/LA – 80 St Andrews Road, Montpelier	B1		Graham Davidson (Cllr Tim Wye)
	B2	S	Emma Lanham
	B3		Richard Maidment
	B4	S	Piers Calascione
	B5	S	Colin Pemble
	B6	S	Jessica Wallwork
21/04574/F – 66 to 70 Church Road, Redfield	C1	S	Usman Yaqub



# **Land Surrounding Dove Lane St Pauls Bristol**

## **Speech to Bristol City Council Planning Committee**

**26 October 2022**

Good evening Councillors. I am Yuved Bheenick, Development Director at Places for People, and I am responsible for the overall delivery of Dove Lane.

The planning application before you today represents a high quality, well designed scheme, which is fully compliant with planning policy and the Council's objectives for the site, and will provide much needed open market and affordable housing.

The site is allocated for redevelopment and already benefits from an implemented planning consent for a development similar to that now proposed. However, the new proposals strive to deliver a much better overall scheme and in doing so will deliver more affordable homes by almost three-fold from 25 to 72 – 54 Social Rented and 18 designated as First Homes.

The new scheme ensures the Council's aspirations for sustainability and tackling climate change are met, by including a day 1 connection to the city-wide district heat network, encouraging sustainable active travel, and achieving a biodiversity net gain in excess of the Government's proposed 10% target.

The proposals have been influenced by positive discussions with officers at Bristol City Council, as well as extensive consultation and community engagement, developing good relationships with the local community and key local establishments. As a result, the scheme is supported by key stakeholders including the independent Design Review Panel and Historic England.

We are fully committed to the delivery of the scheme, and aim make a start on site at the earliest opportunity. I can confirm that infrastructure works have already been undertaken which include the necessary services and roads, and create a level

platform for development. If the committee resolve to approve the application today we aim to have the first homes completed by the end of 2024/early 2025.

Places for People are excited about this new scheme and the opportunity to develop the site, providing a new development that the local community and city can be proud of.

Overall, the application before you represents a significant opportunity to bring a currently vacant, underused priority site, back into active use, and we hope the Council will continue to work with us and approve the proposals today.

**End.**

Yuved Bheenick  
Places for People  
26 October 2022

## STATEMENT A2 – David Redgewell

We welcome this housing Development progressing and pleased to see mayor Rees is getting work moving on this Brownfield land with 358 new homes 54 affordable homes and 18 first time homes. The site been derelict for so long. There is a need also for a disabled adapted homes within the scheme to standard. We would like anti graffiti paint on the new homes.

The site has good walking and cycling route to the rest of the city centre and Cabot circus. We need more cycling storage facilities.

But we are very concerned about the loss of local bus frequency on service 5: from Downend Oldbury court Fishponds Broomhill Stapleton, Eastville park, St Werburgess ,st Paul's,Bristol city centre.

This has been replaced by service 47:

Yate bus station, westerleight pucklechurch, Emerson green, Downend oldbury court, Fishponds, Fishponds St werburge St Paul Bristol city centre

But with frequency of hourly day time

No Evening or Sunday services.

This bus service need discussion with the west of England mayoral combined transport Authority mayor Dan Norris

As it's only being funded of bus services recovery grant until 31 st march 2023 .

As number of cars are reduced and theses are affordable housing the public transport Network bus service needs discussions a point made to metro mayor Dan Norris by local councillors In ward to get back 30 minute services in the day and hourly evening and Sunday.

We must have sustainable transport and public transport with housing with a city centre location.

We wish to the reduction of car park space in this city centre location .

The scheme needs drop kerbs and pavement improvements within Georgian buildings and street that join this site.

The new homes are close to 2 sports centres st Paul's and cotham and parks and open spaces.

But we welcome this Development moving forward it's been far too long awaiting regeneration of this important city centre site.

We ask the committee to grant planning permission.

David Redgewell South west transport Network.

Bristol disability equalities forum

**STATEMENT NUMBER B1 - 21/06128/F & 21/06129/LA - 80 St Andrews Road Summary of  
Objections**

for consideration by the Councillors of Democratic Bristol

**[This is a long document that Councillors may not be able to read in full prior to the Committee meeting. So instead of my speaking, on the last page there is a one minute summary].**

1. Except some of the tenants of 93 Richmond Road, an HMO owned by the applicant, all the residents, not just the owners, of this Grade II listed terrace, object to this proposal. So do The Montpelier Conservation Group, the Conservation Advisory Panel, Councillor Tim Wye, and other residents in Richmond Road and St Andrew's Road. These plans have been resubmitted three times, and there have been a total of 66 objections, and only 6 of support. Three or four of those were from the applicant's tenants. The final set of plans raised 21 objections and no letters of support.

2. We want to make it absolutely clear that we do not object at all to the construction of a single or even a one and a half storey building on this site. At the end of this document we have provided an outline compromise: we are willing to abandon our objections to residential development if the applicant is willing to build a smaller one bed home. This should also fulfil the Council's need to build more houses, which the Officer's Report makes clear is a key reason for his recommending the application. The housing mix is considered on p.4 of this doc.

### **Heritage and Listing**

Attached to the Grade II listed terrace 73-93 Richmond Road, there is a deed or covenant, drawn up at the time the terrace was built, limiting any building in the rear gardens to a Coach House, which are now garages, to a height of not more than 15 ft., and excluding the construction of any residential buildings. To date these restrictions have been observed, and the consequence is that all buildings in the back gardens of the terrace are single storey and ancillary to the host houses, having, as the Montpelier Conservation Group point out, 'little impact on either the houses or the gardens'. The MCG also believes that 'the survival of all the rear gardens in this manner is extremely unusual' and 'their loss would harm the whole terrace'. It also preserves the integrity of the curtilage of the listed terrace.

The Case Officer asserts that the current validity of the deed is a legal not a planning matter, though citing no authority. But that is not the point. The point is that the listing should now be taken as protecting what the covenant created, limiting the size and purpose of any back garden development. Historic England reminds that within the curtilage of a listed site, all features of interest or value, not just those nominated in the listing, must be considered in respect of the potential harm done by the development. So does this report, citing the NPPF on p.13: '*great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance*'.

But the development as proposed would cause substantial harm in several ways. The principal effects of increasing a roof height significantly over 15ft is that the building will begin to overbear the host house and overshadow the adjacent gardens. One reason that earlier applications were rejected was because the excessive roof height was detrimental to the neighbouring houses and gardens. That it would also have overborn the host house, 93 RR, does not seem to have been recognized in the various decisions. But in this recommended application the only major changes to the outline structure have been to the roof height and the roof design.

The set of plans prior to these were of a double-pitched roof, the second pitch lower than the first, and designed to articulate with the coach house roof of 91. It was an attractive design, but it was a

full two storey building, and described as such in the HDA. Presumably the case officer asked the applicant to make it less overbearing, or as we might have expected, to reduce it to 'around two storeys' – the applicant stated that the Case Officer once advised him that a 'mews-style dwelling of around two storeys would be acceptable'.

That is not what happened. The second lower pitch was removed and replaced by a flat roof, considered below, and the first pitch raised so that it was higher than the previous and much more overbearing – in fact the ridge sticks out beyond the roof line of 82, creating more shadow than 82 over its neighbours – the design of which was rejected for this site when permission was granted for the building of 82-88. But, to appear to comply with the officer's suggestion, this higher, more massive structure is described in the third version of the HDA as 'one and a half storeys'. So now the one and a half storey building is higher and larger than the previous two storey building. The words are designed to conceal the facts. It is difficult to understand why the officer should recommend a building that clearly defies his own advice.

But 'around two storeys' is a very indeterminate description, which the applicant has interpreted as one and a half storeys. What does that mean? One storey is a habitable space; two storeys one habitable space on top of the other. A half storey is presumably not habitable – at least not legally. The garage of 87, like that of 91, has a loft or attic in the centre of which one can stand up, and can be used, for instance, for storage or a study. It is that kind of use that is implied in the term 'one and a half storeys', and not a second legally habitable space. But the overall height of the garage of 87, like that of the Coach House is 'around two storeys', for that is the height of two rooms of 7ft. one above the other, legally uninhabitable because of the relation of floor space to roof pitch. Considered either in the light of the Case Officer's indeterminate prescription, or of the applicant's inaccurate description of his plans as 'one and half storeys', we arrive at a structure not significantly higher than that of the garages of 91, 87, 79 and 75. Fundamentally, whichever way you cut the cake, these garages represent something like the maximum height of buildings that could be described as 'around two storeys' or 'one and a half storeys', beyond which they would begin to overbear and overshadow their host and neighbouring houses.

### **Setting a precedent**

If this de facto two storey application were successful it would also set a precedent for constructing two storey buildings in the back gardens of this listed terrace. If there is any doubt, on account of its much wider footprint, that this proposal will lead to the domination of neighbouring houses and gardens, then there is no doubt that a two storey building in any garden of the rest of the terrace would overbear, overshadow, and cease to be subservient to, several houses either side of it. The heritage that the Grade II listing sought to preserve would be all but destroyed. It is difficult to see how such destruction could be described as other than 'substantial harm'.

Our proposed, single or one and a half storey compromise is based on the fact that although a single storey residential building in the grounds of 93 would set a precedent for residential development, in practice the much smaller footprint of the gardens of the rest of the terrace, given the minimum standards for a residence, would make single storey development impossible, and therefore the heritage would be conserved.

### **The flat roof**

The applicant will no doubt claim that the flat roof ameliorates the overbearing and overshadowing of neighbouring houses and gardens, particular 91. With the two storey part of the proposal immediately adjacent, higher than the previous, rejected application, this claim is barely credible. It has already been noted that it will more overbear and overshadow the gardens of 82 and probably 84 than either of those do their neighbours; and again, as noted, it will do exactly the same to its host house in a manner that can only be considered seriously harmful, and contrary to its listed status. The sloping roof lines of 82-88 were presumably designed to reduce as far as possible the overbearing

overshadowing of their original host houses and gardens. This design self-evidently more overbears and overshadows the listed site, and is therefore more harmful than that rejected. It makes no sense.

It is difficult to regard flat roofs as anything but featureless and unattractive. They are simply cheap and simple solutions to practical problems – having little or no design value at all. This flat roof does nothing, or worse than nothing, to improve the appearance of this side of St Andrew’s Road (an important consideration in the applicant’s HDA and the Officer’s report). It is a reversion to the cheapest methods of construction used when Montpelier suffered inner city decay, and whatever planning rules there were, were not enforced. Since then the three or four garages that have been built or restored have all had pitched roofs, reflecting the heritage of the terrace (what coach house would have had a flat roof?) and considerably improving the appearance of the street. Although too high, the plans for the previous application presented a double-pitched roof. If revived, by matching the single pitch of 91, this would significantly improve the appearance of the building, and be in keeping with the heritage of this listed terrace.

The green roof is no more than a nod to ecological concerns, and as the Officer’s report implies, unlikely to be sustained: *‘The approved scheme shall be maintained in perpetuity unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.’* It seems likely that the LPA will agree, or this clause wouldn’t be in there; and if they don’t agree they won’t be able to enforce it. So it will decay into a tuft of brown weeds. And if the applicant is serious about green roofs, here is a link which describes how they can also be fitted to pitched roofs:

<https://www.permagard.co.uk/advice/green-roof-construction>

Alternatively, more sustainable and more ecological, would be two banks of solar panels on the east side of each pitch.

### **Access to St. Andrew’s Road**

This is the site description in the Officer’s report, p.2: *‘The space behind the garages links through to the rear of no. 93 Richmond Road via steps that lead down to the ground and basement levels.’* (‘The so called ‘space’ is the original garden, now the applicant’s builders’ yard.) This is correct as far as it goes, but it ignores the fact that one can also enter 93 through a door in the garden level conservatory / annexe – an original feature of all these houses – and used as a means of access by the occupants of the terrace as much as they use that from Richmond Road. That is, there is uninterrupted flat level access from the house to St. Andrew’s Road. The Report states that *the residents of the host dwelling (No.93) do not benefit from having access to the rear of the site or garaging’* Currently, they may not. But that is because it was the applicant’s decision to bar his tenants from access to St. Andrew’s Road, not the consequence of the layout of the property.

#### **i) Disabled access**

Clearly this is a perfect route for disabled access. Unfortunately the Case Officer has taken the applicant’s assertion at face value, and to say that the *‘rear access is not considered to be a disabled/accessible entrance to the property, and as such there are no concerns that the development will have any harmful impact in terms of disabled access to the property’* is entirely mistaken in the face of the facts. And the importance of disabled access cannot be so lightly dismissed. The access to this terrace from Richmond Road is up—or up and down if entering by the semi-basement—two and sometimes three sets of steps. Anyone who has mobility problems would find negotiating so many steps very difficult, and impossible for anyone in a wheelchair without the help of at least one, more likely two, people. The rear, level, ground floor access will make it much easier for anyone with a mobility problem to get in and out of these houses. The ground floors are also adaptable to single floor living, therefore making the houses unusually flexible family homes, capable of housing various kinds of family structure.

#### **ii) Maintenance access**

The Report continues: *'the residents of the host dwelling (No.93) ... have no reliance on the application site and all servicing and access takes place from the Richmond Road frontage'*. Again, incorrect. The applicant himself has used the rear access to bring in scaffolding to repair and paint the back of 93. Imagine trying to get scaffolding poles through the house. Therefore such servicing, if not by the tenants, will always require access from St. Andrew's Road. Equally, it is much easier to get heavy or awkward goods into the house by the rear, level access than up the front steps.

### iii) Family access

With access to St. Andrew's Road, many of the normal needs and functions of family life are enabled that would otherwise be made more difficult or impossible. Bicycles can be brought in and stored in a shed, not left in the front hall; wheelie bins can be taken in or out without having to go up or down any steps, difficult even for able people; larger and heavier items such as washing machines easily and safely brought into the house. This also enables the front gardens to be front gardens and not storage spaces for black boxes, green boxes, food waste bins, wheelie bins and bicycle racks – now all in the concreted and unattractive space at the front of 93 – which is the only house in the terrace that doesn't have a front garden.

To sum up, the rear access is a key feature of the heritage of this terrace, and its loss would do great harm, contrary to the intentions of the listing. Its maintenance would make it much easier to reinstate the heritage of the house, making it a flexible family home. Removing the rear access is more likely to limit its future to an HMO.

### **The Housing Mix**

One of the Officer's reasons for recommending this proposal is that census data suggests that *'the Upper Montpelier (LSOA) has a proportion of flats to houses at 35.7% flats and 64.2% houses'*. The Report concludes that

*there is an imbalance between flats and houses within the local area (Upper Montpelier LSOA) and that there is more of a need for flats and smaller units rather than houses in the area. The proposed construction of a two bedroom dwelling house is therefore considered acceptable in relation to mix and balance, as it will introduce a smaller type of accommodation in an area dominated by larger houses. The application is considered acceptable on this basis.*

Therefore the suggested compromise should also be acceptable.

However it should be noted that the houses in the terrace 73-93, presumably designated as 'larger' and 'dominant', already contribute to the desired level of mixed types of accommodation. Many have one bed flats in the semi-basement, with enough space permissible for two people. These flats are accessed via the front garden, as so they have associated and available green space. Families live comfortably above, with access to the rear garden and St Andrew's Road. One house has been divided into two, two bedroom flats. Thus in terms of accommodation these houses are not quite as large or as dominant as might be assumed, and should be considered as making a positive contribution to the balance of domestic units in Upper Montpelier.

### **The Curtilage of Listed Sites**

Should the curtilage of a listed site be broken up? The question arises because the applicant has designated the proposal as a separate property, and therefore intends to split the current curtilage in two.

The Report (p.13) recognizes that this is a problem:

*this will be the first residential development constructed to the rear of one of the Grade II listed buildings which make up the terrace Nos. 73-93 Richmond Road ... a previous scheme which sought to introduce a dwelling at the application site (as part of a wider proposal) was refused (LPA ref: 06/02827/F and 06/02931/LA) partially*

*due to the subdivision of the listed garden and impact on setting of the listed building (No.93 Richmond Road). As such, the dwelling proposed in rear curtilage of 93 Richmond Road was excluded from the approved application (LPA ref: 07/04562/F and 07/04561/LC) which was ultimately deemed acceptable as it would have not led to the subdivision of the curtilage of a listed building, as was considered to be unacceptable in the previous case.*

This is not very clearly expressed, but what it means is that because the back gardens of 97-101 Richmond Road were not part of a listed site, splitting the curtilage to create 82-88 St. Andrew's Road was acceptable. Hidden behind the double negatives, it also says that splitting the curtilage of 93 'was considered to be unacceptable'. If unacceptable then, why acceptable now? The only thing that has changed is the size of the building. So there seems no reason not to apply that restriction to this application. The integrity of the curtilage of this listed house, as the curtilages of all the houses in this terrace, is part of their heritage, originally protected by the covenant, and now by the listing. The Case Officer has raised this as a planning problem, and so it cannot be dismissed as he dismissed the existence of the covenant as a legal problem.

However, inconsistent with his own advice, and without explanation, the Officer considers the problem resolved, describing the site as containing two properties:

*Both properties are in the ownership of the applicant. The site falls within the historic curtilage of No. 93 Richmond Road, which is Grade II listed. It is group listed as part of the terrace of buildings at Nos. 73-93 Richmond Road. The site is located in the Montpelier Conservation Area. In recent time several residential properties have been granted planning permission and constructed along St Andrews Road.*

By conflating Conservation status with Listed status, and noting that residential properties have been constructed elsewhere along St. Andrew's Road in the Conservation area, the Officer believes he has solved his problem.<sup>1</sup> But he has glossed over, or not remembered, the principle he himself set out, that curtilages of listed properties should not be subdivided, and that such division is unacceptable in planning policy. Therefore his rationalization for giving permission is countered by his own advice.

Much more weight is given to the protection of listed sites than to sites just in Conservation areas. The Report quotes from Section 16 of the NPPF: '

*when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation ... This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.*

We do not think that the Officer has provided a 'clear and convincing justification' of his decision, and we therefore believe that before any permission is granted this problem should be addressed. Our view is that the integrity of the curtilage should be retained.

### **Unresolved problems**

The applicant has yet to resolve party wall, drainage and foundation problems relating to the properties either side of the proposal. The Case Officer simply advises the applicant that these should be resolved separately, outside the planning process. He has not made it a stipulation that these should be dealt with prior to planning permission being granted. We are not confident that the applicant will do this prior to starting work on the site. It would be too easy, for instance, to dig foundations, as planned, immediately adjacent to the wall of the Coach House, which has no foundations. The owners of 91 worry that as a consequence such foundations as there are will be undermined, and the wall may crack or subside. The applicant may or may not take responsibility,

---

<sup>1</sup> Several times in his report the Case officer and other Council officers have given examples of non-listed development as a reason for permitting residential development on this site. We think that, in this respect, they have made an inadequate distinction between listed and non-listed sites.

but think how much time, energy and worry the owners of 91 are likely to suffer in order to achieve a redress—not to mention the fact that the wall may have to be taken down and rebuilt, and the Coach House unusable during that time.

It is our view that outstanding difficulties with the owners of 91 and 95 should be resolved in principle before permission is granted.

### **The Compromise**

To reach a compromise with the applicant, the residents of the terrace and others objecting would require three conditions to be met: that access to St. Andrew’s Road is maintained, whether or not the curtilage is divided; that the building is limited to a single storey; and that the roof is pitched.

We believe that such a compromise is possible. The minimum space standard for a one bed home is 39 sq.mtrs.\* According to the drawings, the footprint of the proposal is 56.5 sq. mtrs. An access path 1 mtr. wide down the side of the building would be approximately 8 sq mtrs. That would leave 48 sq. mtrs in which to create a dwelling, substantially exceeding the minimum requirements. And if that access path were to lead directly from the rear door of the annexe/extension of 91 to St. Andrew’s Road, then all the potential problems associated with the foundations of the Coach House would disappear.

We also believe that that is a balanced compromise. Each party will have resigned a significant principle or ambition, and yet overall each party will have realized most of what they want.

### **Conclusion**

Although we are asking the Councillors to reject this application, we do so in the hope that we can work together with the applicant in order to achieve a solution which will fulfil his needs and resolve our objections.

Graham Davidson

On behalf of all those who have previously submitted letters of objection

\*[https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Minimum\\_space\\_standards](https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Minimum_space_standards)

\*\*\*\*\*

### A ONE MINUTE, 186 WORD SUMMARY

The houses 73-93 Richmond Road are a Grade II listed terrace with, to date, no residential development in their back gardens. An original covenant restricted development to non-residential buildings not more than 15 ft. high, ancilliary and subservient to the host houses. The terrace inherited what the covenant had helped to create. A Grade II listing applies to the whole curtilage of what is listed, and this proposal is within that curtilage. As the Case Officer noted, in principle curtilages of listed sites should not be subdivided. Creating a separate dwelling will create a separate curtilage.

If that problem is overcome, the heritage of the site, as protected by the listing, should be respected. This would limit any building to around 15 ft, subservient to the host house. This proposal is two storey and would overbear the host and other houses and gardens. Should the curtilage be allowed to be subdivided, we, every resident of the terrace, and others, have offered the compromise of a pitched-roof, single storey, residential building with rear access, which would help protect the benefits derived from the covenant and the listing.

**STATEMENT B2 – Emma Lanham**

Good evening

At the moment there is absolutely no residential building at the rear of our terrace.

If you grant this application a precedent would be set for residential development within the curtilage of this beautiful grade 2 listed Terrace.

It would be a huge decision with inevitable far reaching consequences.

Something would be lost forever.

Montpelier Conservation Group and your own conservation advisory panel are both strongly opposed to this application.

There are 66 objections posted on the website.

As a terrace we are fully united in our opposition.

I urge you to reject it.

If the pressure for housing is so great that you are minded to allow residential development, a compromise would be a one bedroom, single story dwelling that is completely subservient to the main house.

Both parties would compromise. Something would be lost but something valuable would also be preserved.

## STATEMENT B3 – Richard Maidment

My comment for the council committee meeting on 26/7/22 discussing application 21/06218/F (80 St Andrew's Road)

The planning system is designed to offer extra protection to listed properties and I feel that the effect of the listing of 93 Richmond Road and adjoining terrace could have been more sympathetically dealt with in the planning officer's report, which seems not to make a distinction between the listed terrace and the Montpelier conservation area in general. Although there are precedents for building in rear gardens in the conservation area (in St Andrews Road in particular), up to now there has been no new residential building within the curtilage of the listed buildings in the area and this permission would in itself be a precedent.

The applicant sought to minimise the effect of the listing by registering the proposed development under 80 St Andrews Road rather than the listed property in whose grounds it would be built at 93 Richmond Road and the heritage statement contains notable omissions about the history of the listed terrace, with little effort to correct them in the various revisions. The officer's report rather misses the point when it describes the original covenant restricting development to the rear of the listed terrace as a legal and not a planning matter. Although it is almost certainly no longer enforceable in law its existence has helped to preserve the nature of the terrace over nearly two centuries and surely that, and other historical details, are just the sort of information that should have been included in the heritage statement of a planning application relating to the history of a listed building.

The report mentions the need for new housing as a policy reason for recommending the application but according to the neighbour notification list, 93 Richmond Road already contains seven residential units, named as a basement flat and flats 1 – 6. This level of occupation already causes unavoidable cluttering of the front garden and it makes the practical objections relating to access and maintenance of the listed building particularly important if further development is being considered. The application also contains plans for a small new garden behind 93 but states elsewhere that the tenants have no access to the rear, which suggests that it is proposed to make alterations to the listed building to allow access which should surely have been made clear in the plans.

The report and application make supportive reference to advice given by the planning department but often without directly referring to the public objections which have already been made. For example, the conservation officer states, "I'm satisfied that there is no significant harm to the setting if [sic] the Rear of the Listed Building and that the proposed development is proportionate. The principle of development on the rear edge is reasonable" but there is no real explanation or justification for his opinion. The principle of development within the curtilage of the listed building is central to the application and, in view of the many detailed heritage and conservation objections raised, I think it deserves further consideration by the committee.

Richard Maidment

**Development Control Committee B – 26th October 2022 80 St Andrews Road,  
Montpelier BS6 5EJ – Application Nos. 21/06128/F & 21/06129/LA Supporting  
Statement on Behalf of the Applicant**

We note the advice notice to not allow any resident to allowed to apply for parking permits or visitor parking permits.

While we understand the reasoning behind this advice we respectfully ask the committee to consider a restriction to allow no more than a single parking permit.

Also, we ask for the restriction on visitor parking to be re-considered. Thinking about real world scenarios this restriction would be unfair & potentially a compromise to any residents' health & safety. We think it only appropriate to allow this. All visitors to Bristol residential parking areas should, we feel, be treated equally. We ask for this advice to be removed from the application.

Piers Calascione

## **Development Control Committee B – 26<sup>th</sup> October 2022**

**80 St Andrews Road, Montpelier BS6 5EJ – Application Nos. 21/06128/F & 21/06129/LA**

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

---

1. The application proposes a residential dwelling on a brownfield site that is located within a highly accessible part of the city. As well as providing flexible accommodation, the development will result in an efficient use of the land, demolishing a dilapidated garage block and replacing it with a high quality place to live.
2. The building's diminutive form and scale, along with its appearance is designed to respond positively to the local context and mixed character of buildings that define the St Andrews Road. The information submitted with the application clearly illustrates how the development will assimilate into the street scene. The development will enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (the site is on the very edge) and also, it will preserve, if not enhance, the setting of the adjacent listed buildings that front Richmond Road.
3. The proposal has been carefully designed to ensure the amenity of near neighbours is preserved by following recognised good practice and avoiding any adverse overlooking, loss of day or sunlight or by having an overbearing presence.
4. The design includes a variety of measures to ensure the house has a high environmental performance and the inclusion of renewable energy sources (air source heat pump and solar panels) will go a long way to reducing future energy costs as well as significantly reducing residual carbon emissions. It also incorporates a green roof and landscape design measures that will enhance the site and make a positive contribution to bio-diversity.
5. The dwelling will introduce passive surveillance over the street and assist with addressing anti-social behaviour that occurs.
6. It is noted that the development has proved controversial with some, but following feedback from the planning, design and conservation officers, the scheme has been amended to address concerns raised. The merits and appropriateness of the proposal follows several other residential developments that have taken place in recent years on the southern side of St Andrews Road.
7. The proposal will make a far more efficient and effective use of the site, providing new 'windfall' residential accommodation for which there is a recognised need. The development accords with the three principles of sustainable development and it will have tangible social, economic and environmental benefits. Given the proposals accord with the principles of sustainable development, there are sound reasons for the application to be supported and approved.
8. The planning officer is recommending approval on the basis it complies with adopted policies and guidance and as such, the Committee is respectfully requested to endorse the officer's recommendation to grant consent for the development.

## **STATEMENT B6 – Jessica Wallwork**

Is there not space to preserve the land situating a Grade II listed terrace with gardens in a densely populated and central area of Bristol? And when the people living there know and are trying to tell you what will be lost?

The properties provide many options for living. We live with children and my mother and we are aware that we would not be able to live here if it were not for access at the back. If the current owner of 93 Richmond Road opened the back doors, the tenants could benefit from their garden also.

The applicant does not live here and continues to be vague in the detail of his plans. The light in the proposed living spaces is compromised, not to be overlooked when more people are working from home.

Our community has spent time considering and responding honestly and sincerely. The listed terrace with gardens is an asset to Montpelier and to the City.

“In return for these spectacular gifts of the Earth, say to yourself: ‘What am I going to do about that? What is my accountability in return for everything I’ve been given?’”

From *Braiding Sweetgrass*, a book by Robin Wall Kimmerer, a botanist and professor at State University of New York’s College of Environmental Science and Forestry, and the founder and director of the Center for Native Peoples and the Environment.



Members Of DC Committee B -

**STATEMENT NUMBER C1**

24<sup>th</sup> October 2022

EMAIL ONLY

Dear Councillor

**Application for planning permission - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a mixed use development comprising 8 residential apartments and houses, 2 ground floor commercial units (Class E) and 1 office unit (Class E) Ref: 21/04754/F**

**66-70 CHURCH ROAD, REDFIELD, BS5 9JY**

The application at the above site has reached Committee following a 13-month process with your Planning Officers. Prior to this, formal pre-application consultation was undertaken with the Council and local stakeholders, including nearby residents and businesses and local Councillors.

We urge Members of this Committee to support the recommendation for approval and grant planning permission for this long term vacant and undeveloped site which is located on a key route into the City Centre. The site was last considered by Committee in November 2019 when two applications were submitted. The message was clear that the site had to be considered as one and that issues relating to height, scale, mass and overlooking needed to be addressed.

The application before you is a culmination of three years' work which has included formal pre-application consultation with planning and urban design officers who supported the principle of the height, bulk, scale and mass of the building and the design and appearance on the corner of Church Road and Dove Lane.

Pre-application consultation was also carried out with local residents on Cowper Street to explain how the revised proposal was set back from the shared boundary a greater distance than the existing building on site and that the proposed height of the houses would not create any overlooking.

A meeting was also held with the Octavius Hunt factory in respect of the siting of the houses adjacent to the access to the factory. The proposed plans were also presented to local Councillors to explain the changes that had been made.

The scheme before you is for 8 flats and houses and commercial office and retail space on the ground floor fronting Church Road as a genuinely mixed use development. The height of the building is three storeys on the Church Road/ Dove Lane frontage reducing to two storey houses further along Dove Lane and is appropriate to the local height, scale and mass.

The design and appearance have been discussed in detail with the Council's Urban Design officers as part of the pre-application consultation, for which we are also grateful.

The proposal also delivers:

- A mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom flats and houses with private amenity space and access to shared space.
- The units contribute towards meeting the acute housing shortfall identified in Bristol (confirmed by not meeting the 5 year housing land supply or Government's housing delivery targets), as outlined in the Committee Report.
- As a result of this shortfall in the supply and delivery in housing, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is triggered by paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF which is a significant material consideration to which substantial weight is attached.
- The site is in a sustainable location, with bus stops outside the site on Church Road and it is also a short walk to Lawrence Hill station.
- No on-site car parking is proposed in accordance with the Council's wider sustainability objectives, but secure on site cycle storage is provided for each house, flat and the commercial floorspace.
- The building design respects and reflects the local character, constructed as a terrace faced with red brick.
- Detailed landscaping of the private gardens and shared amenity spaces.
- The height is acceptable and one storey lower than the rear of the existing terrace on Cowper Street.
- There is no adverse impact in respect of overlooking to neighbouring properties, particularly to the rear on Cowper Street as there are no habitable windows on the first floor looking out to the rear.

Given the collaborative work that the applicant, architect and consultant team have undertaken since this site was considered by Committee in November 2019 with your planning and Urban Design officers, as well as local residents and businesses and local Councillors, we respectfully request that you support the Recommendation and grant planning permission subject to the proposed conditions.

Yours sincerely



**Stuart Rackham**

**Rackham Planning Limited on Moorfields Ltd (the applicant)**

CC: Moorfields Ltd; Studio Yaqub Architects