

Zoo Application Comments Summary

22/02737/F

Appendix 2 - Neighbour Comments

DC Committee date 26th April 2023

Notes:

- This document includes comments from neighbours and other members of the public. For comments from stakeholders such as statutory consultees, internal contributors, interest groups, and neighbour associations, please see Appendix 1 'Contributor Comments'.
- Some comments included within this document are duplicates, meaning this document exaggerates the number of comments received in response to this application. As explained within the Committee Report, in total, 475 objections and 59 support comments have been received (as of 17.04.2023).
- It has not been possible to include all figures, tables, or pictures included within the original comments within this document.

Index

First consultation phase	
15th June 2022 – 6th November 2022	3
Second consultation phase	
7th November 2022 – 15th January 2023	151
Third consultation phase	
16th January 2023 – 17th April 2023.....	271

First consultation phase

15th June 2022 – 6th November 2022

STANCE	COMMENTS	DATE RECEIVED
1. O	This space should be left purely as conservation and public area of nature - there is no logical reason to fill more of the overpopulated area of Clifton with inadequate housing.	15-Jun-22
2. S	I am writing in support of the proposed design for the Bristol Zoo Gardens development. Whilst it is progressive in addressing Bristol's need for housing, it is also in keeping with the Zoo's history, recognising and celebrating Bristol Zoo by presenting a proposal that is sensitive to the setting and site heritage. The proposal combines living space with a strong community offer. The proposed accessible gardens, café, and children's play area will help to ensure that the site remains a centre for the local community, continuing to provide a social focal point for the Clifton Downs area. In addition to the green space and play park, a proposed exhibition space for community activities presents a brilliant opportunity for local groups and charities such as We The Curious to engage with the wider community in a vibrant relevant setting, a valuable additional asset for many charities and community groups in the region. What better environment to talk about bio-diversity and climate related issues than nestled in the middle of one of Bristol's most important green spaces? The importance of these vital green spaces has also been considered by the designers, protecting the gardens and increasing biodiversity, with a 38% biodiversity net gain through the development, contributing to Bristol's action on the climate and ecological emergency. Finally the proposed plan will deliver 200 much needed eco-friendly homes to Bristol residents, in a thoughtfully designed and constructed environment.	15-Jun-22
3. S	I think this is great scheme. It successfully finds a way to keep the gardens open to the public, while providing housing we really need in Bristol. Clifton lacks affordable housing and to provide even a limited amount is critical. It will also allow the creation of a new zoo and for Bristol to be at the forefront of zoo design and conservation in zoos. Zoos must evolve. They must innovate to address the global ecological emergency, especially the decline of species and destruction of their habits. Bristol will and should lead this work.	16-Jun-22
4. S	I'm very much in favour of the redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens and feel the land can be put to very good use. Having more homes, including affordable homes, in the heart of Clifton can only be a positive thing for our city. Now that the zoo is relocating I'm pleased to see there will still be open space and accessible community landscape for local people to enjoy.	16-Jun-22

5. S	The scheme proposed by the Society should be seen as an exemplar of how modern developments can balance the need for quality housing, conservation and community. The development will provide essential modern new homes, a new accessible community space for all of Bristol, and a hub of conservation and biodiversity. This will engage new audiences from across the city through cultural arts activities and wildlife engagement providing access for all for the first time in the sites history. The design creates a space for all of Bristol to enjoy while maintaining the heritage and remembering the history of the site and should be supported in its entirety	16-Jun-22
6. S	These proposals appear to have been well thought out and represent a positive future for a site that Bristol Zoo are clearly unable to continue running. As a local resident I completely back the opening of the site to free public access and fully support the creation of badly needed new homes for Bristol. I am also extremely impressed by the way in which the Zoo have handled themselves throughout this process and have full confidence in their ability to deliver the scheme as proposed.	16-Jun-22
7. S	The Zoo needs more space and has decided to move outside the city. It will maintain control of the redevelopment of its historic site; retain a presence there and offer the public access to its gardens. The housing development around the walled edges will be on mostly already developed land. Whilst it might have been good to maintain all as it was, this must be as good and as responsible a compromise as it is possible to make. I hope that this application is approved.	16-Jun-22
8. S	I support fully Bristol Zoological Society's plans. These are carefully thought-through and respond well to the needs of society in the 21st century - a century in which the global challenges of biodiversity loss and climate change will affect every person on the planet. Their plans to provide free public access, in an historic and sensitive site, with the aim of world-class public engagement are excellent and admirable. I wish them every success.	16-Jun-22
9. S	The world has changed. This proposal wins on many fronts, but two are important. 1. The zoo needs to move on and is trying to do better. 2. This is a great opportunity to achieve a very rare thing: new homes in Clifton. This never happens. Let's support a move towards sustainable development and animal welfare. This application is to be commended.	17-Jun-22

10. S	I am writing as Chair of Trustees of Bristol Zoological Society to support our planning application for the development of the Bristol Zoo Gardens site. I know that we have taken time as Trustees to carefully and thoroughly think through the best way to preserve the architectural heritage and natural heritage of the site, supported by our management team and professional advisers. We are delighted that our proposals enable free access to our beautiful gardens for the general public, as well as contributing much needed housing for Bristol. We will be increasing biodiversity on site by 38% through our sustainable housing design and landscaping. And the sale of the site will support our future, at the new Bristol Zoo site at Wild Place, where our animals, reptiles and birds will be living in habitats which more closely reflect their natural environment and from where we will continue our Bristol based, national and international field conservation programmes.	17-Jun-22
11. S	I am a Trustee of Bristol Zoological Society and I am also a near neighbour. This scheme has been carefully thought out and I strongly support it. I am particularly pleased that there are included a good number of flats. Smaller sized accommodation in this area is in very short supply. This results in a situation where older people continue to live in very large houses because understandably they don't want to leave the area they have lived in for a long time. There is consequently a shortage of larger housing for younger families. This scheme therefore addresses a specific social need - as well as the general need for more housing in Bristol. The proposed repurposing of the iconic entrance building will be a great asset to the local community (and to Bristol generally). I am also very pleased that there will be free public access to the gardens (not currently the case) and that environmental concerns have been addressed so sensitively. This will be big step towards the development of a new Bristol Zoo where animals will be housed in a manner more closely representing their natural environment and around 80% of species will be of conservation concern.	17-Jun-22
12. S	As a local resident I support these plans wholeheartedly. The proposed new sustainable housing is sorely needed in the local area, which is currently witnessing a housing shortage crisis. This is especially the case for young families that want to stay in the area but need a larger space. This will also help free up smaller flats and houses for first-time buyers. 20% of these new homes will also be affordable housing. The amount of homes proposed is not excessive for the local area. There are enough schools, accessible roads, and community assets nearby to facilitate the minor increase in residents locally. The proposed development would be in keeping with the local community and surroundings, and would fit naturally into the existing space. The public park will be of great benefit to the local community, providing a much needed green space with facilities for people who may otherwise find the Clifton Downs inaccessible. The proposed conservation Hub is also essential to support the work of the Avon Gorge and Downs Wildlife Project. I have every confidence that this will be a real community asset.	17-Jun-22

13. S	<p>This is a well-conceived redevelopment of the site of the current Zoo, which will provide a welcome new public space in the retained gardens. The gardens will be of social and environmental benefit, with a children's playground and new planting. The proposed housing is welcome given the pressure on accommodation in the city. The plan to ensure that 20% will be affordable, 75% social rent and 25% first homes is commendable and supports the city's commitment to increasing the stock of affordable housing. In addition, the redevelopment of the site will enable the creation of a new Bristol Zoo at Wild Place that will play an important role in fostering conservation work and providing new skills by educating the next generation of conservationists. This aligns well with the city's commitment to addressing the ecological emergency.</p>	17-Jun-22
14. S	<p>As a member of the Bristol Zoological Society staff team, and passionate about Bristol, I support this application. It can secure a future for the conservation charity as well as a legacy for the gardens of which we can be proud. The key reasons for my support are as follows: - The application provides free, public access to the gardens, with a new café, exhibition space, a children's play area, and use of the Terrace Theatre for community, cultural and educational activities - It enables the protection of the Gardens and historic buildings such as the Monkey Temple, with a 38% biodiversity net gain - 201 high-quality, eco-friendly new homes will be built for Bristolians, including 20% which will be affordable Architects Penoyre & Prasad have taken inspiration from the landscape and its history, to design an exciting and beautiful development with community at its heart. This will allow people from different generations and backgrounds to come together with wildlife in a truly wonderful space. It will enable the 186-year-old conservation charity to continue its work, by developing a world-leading zoo at its Wild Place Project and building on its important conservation work across four continents -- from forestation programmes in Madagascar to support endangered lemur populations to protecting western lowland gorillas in Equatorial Guinea.</p>	17-Jun-22

15. S	<p>'As the former CEO of Destination Bristol I am very aware of the challenges the industry faces - and the need to continue to invest in attracting local, national and international visitors to Bristol and the wider Bristol region. I fully support this application. The Clifton site has been a wonderful home to the zoo, but times change, and we need to change too. The proposals to invest in the New Bristol Zoo on the edge of the city where Wild Place Project already exists is the obvious way forward...creating a really wonderful conservation-focussed attraction that will continue to be part of what makes Bristol such a popular and attractive destination for visitors. It is fairly obvious the existing site is no longer suitable. But I think the Society's approach is sensitive, attractive and will leave a great legacy for the Society in Clifton. Opening the grounds as a beautiful park is a really welcome gesture and gift to the wider community. It was not my role to comment on the housing need in Bristol, but it is clear to everyone that more homes are needed across the whole city including in Clifton. I have publicly stated my support for the strategy the Society is taking - and that the alternative proposals for the Zoo Gardens should not distract from the important work the Society does in conservation and attracting tourism spending, one of the key economic drivers of this wonderful city. John Hirst Former CEO Destination Bristol2012 to 2021</p>	18-Jun-22
16. S	<p>I strongly support the initiative proposed by the Bristol Zoological Society. This transformation will secure free community access particularly important to connect with nature in urban spaces, will retain habitat for species within the city, create eco-sustainable homes, and enable the new Bristol Zoo. Martín Zordan CEO at the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA)</p>	20-Jun-22
17. S	<p>I am writing to support the planning application for Bristol Zoo Gardens. As Director of Conservation and Science for Bristol Zoological Society and a Bristol resident, I believe the plans for developing the Bristol Zoo Gardens site greatly benefit Bristol. The housing plans will create a sympathetic and ecologically sustainable housing solution for the Clifton area and a valuable community asset.</p>	20-Jun-22
18. S	<p>Sounds like a sensible move.</p>	21-Jun-22
19. S	<p>It's fantastic that much-needed, quality homes will be built in Clifton and I'm delighted to hear that the historical gardens and lake will be preserved and made free for all to enjoy. I believe that the proposed new Café will also be great for families living in the area.</p>	21-Jun-22
20. S	<p>I think it's great that the legacy of Bristol Zoo in Clifton will live on in the presence of good quality, eco-friendly low-carbon homes, in a green space. Meanwhile, Bristol Zoo can continue to grow and expand for the better at the new site with an even greater focus on conservation.</p>	21-Jun-22

21. S	Very impressed that the charity have been courageous to re-evaluate their assets considering the challenges of the future. This ambitious plan not only benefits the animals, conservation and educational value of moving to a new site but it also creates more quality housing and accessible community gardens, considering all aspects of sustainability. I am honoured to have recently joined the Bristol Zoological Society from Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust in Jersey, as well as relocating to Bristol, I am excited to be part of this evolution into what a zoo can be and positively impact on the future wellbeing of our community and help save wildlife together.	21-Jun-22
22. S	As a Trustee and shareholder of Bristol Zoological Society I am fully supportive of this application. The application has the unanimous support of the Board of Trustees of the Society as the only viable option that will support the continued existence of the Society and its work in conservation at its new location at Cribbs Causeway, while providing much needed high quality housing, including affordable housing, in Clifton. In addition, I support this application for the following reasons: - Providing free, public access to the gardens in the daytime, with a new café, exhibition space for community activities, children's play area, and more - Protecting the Gardens and historic assets, with a 38% biodiversity net gain - Delivering approximately 200 high-quality, eco-friendly new homes for Bristolians - the sale of the Clifton site will support our future and help build a new Bristol Zoo at the Wild Place Project, where around 80 percent of species are linked to our conservation work, living in spaces more closely reflecting their natural habitats. - responds sensitively to the historic and natural environment	21-Jun-22
23. O	Find the swap from a world renowned zoo to what appears to be a tenement block of lego apartments rather baffling. It appears the planners are trying to pull the wool over our eyes with buzz words about 'other worldliness' and 'sustainability' however we all know this all boils down to greed and generating profits hiding under the guise of conservation..? The zoo should be modified because it is run down however the land could be used purely for recreational purposes and smaller animals rather than an ugly apartment block. The apartments are too many and way too high and do not benefit nor fit into the surrounding area, putting a giraffe into the brick work honestly is the work of school children.. This needs a massive rethink and should be refused on the grounds of parking alone. Bristol deserves better than this.	22-Jun-22
24. O	Find the swap from a world renowned zoo to a tenement block of apartments disgusting.	22-Jun-22

25. O	Find the swap from a world renowned zoo to what appears to be a tenement block of lego apartments rather baffling. It appears the planners are trying to pull the wool over our eyes with buzz words about 'other worldliness' and 'sustainability' however we all know this all boils down to greed and generating profits hiding under the guise of conservation..? The zoo should be modified because it is run down however the land could be used purely for recreational purposes and smaller animals rather than an ugly apartment block. The apartments are too many and way too high and do not befit nor fit into the surrounding area, putting a giraffe into the brick work honestly is the work of school children.. This needs a massive rethink and should be refused on the grounds of parking alone. Bristol deserves better than this.	22-Jun-22
26. O	Find the swap from a world renowned zoo to a tenement block of apartments disgusting.	22-Jun-22
27. O	The objections raised so far are mostly not just NIMBY neighbours. Most people do not object in principle to the development of the zoo gardens to provide housing. Many of the local residents are not living in multimillion pound properties, but flats and apartments in sensitively converted older buildings, and some (mostly compatible) modern multi occupancy buildings. It is in the interest of all people in Bristol , not just those fortunate enough to live in Clifton, to maintain an attractive environment, with open green space and well designed buildings. This development raises concerns about the density of residence, and the height of the residential buildings proposed. This is particularly an issue in Northcote Road and Guthrie Road. Three stories would be preferable to 5 and 6, and more compatible with the surrounding environment. The buildings along Clifton Down are more acceptable, as they will be set back behind the existing mature trees. We need to have a more spacious environment, less dwellings packed in to a small area, and less high rise dominating the development. As other commentators have stated, there must be a secure way of sustaining the gardens for public access with a high standard of maintenance guaranteed for the future.	23-Jun-22
28. O	The zoo has been very effective in public consultation and discussion at their series of meetings, and some of the suggestions and ideas expressed by local people have been taken into consideration. Overall the plan has shown some sensitivity to effects on the Clifton environment and the presentation of enhanced gardens with free public access is to be commended. I regret the fact that once again the zoo and Bristol City have decided to crowd as much accommodation into this space as possible, greatly increasing the density of population in this restricted area. The buildings, while having some sensitivity in design , are again taller than are suitable for this site. Four stories would create much less visual impact than the planned six.	23-Jun-22

29. O	<p>My original objection is pasted below and I see little in the revised planning proposals that counters any of the points previously made by me or other objectors. Savills have proffered a reduction in the number of residential units from 201 to 196 and a tacit acknowledgement that the space within its footprint would soon become ghettoised, necessitating the imposition of opening hours for the gardens. That does not translate into the returning of this part of our city's landscape to the people of Bristol. In short, the revisions comprise slightly fewer ugly boxes crowbarred into a wholly flawed concept. Original Objection: The developer's ability to put housing on this site obviously provides its motivation for pressing forward with this development and the funding to relocate the zoo. But the plans are wholly inadequate for several reasons: 1) Unhampered public access to this space which surrounded by high walls and the proposed housing will create an unsafe ghettoised space, especially after dark 2) The proposed new buildings are utilitarian, almost comedically Stalinesque, over-storeyed, and will self-evidently prove, if they are built, to be an utter eyesore talked about for years afterwards as the Clifton Carbuncle. What ever possessed the architects, planners or others to proffer such a build? 3) There is inadequate provision of social housing and first homes 4) The plan encourages car usage contrary to the sustainability policies put in place by Bristol City Council. 5) More imaginative schemes, even ones focused on creating a social/community space, and one that has a wider geographical, i.e., regional, draw would be infinitely preferable to this proposed plan. There is other less expensive derelict and unused land in the City that would be far more adequate and provide better affordable housing. The leaflet pushed through Clifton letterboxes recently is insulting. The implied choice to be made is a false one. One can support both good development and conservation action; one need not come at the expense of the other.</p>	24-Jun-22
-------	---	-----------

30. O	<p>The developer's ability to put housing on this site obviously provides its motivation for pressing forward with this development and the funding to relocate the zoo. But the plans are wholly inadequate for several reasons: 1) Unhampered public access to this space which surrounded by high walls and the proposed housing will create an unsafe ghettoised space, especially after dark 2) The proposed new buildings are utilitarian, almost comedically Stalinesque, over-storeyed, and will self-evidently prove, if they are built, to be an utter eyesore talked about for years afterwards as the Clifton Carbuncle. What ever possessed the architects, planners or others to proffer such a build? 3) There is inadequate provision of social housing and first homes 4) The plan encourages car usage contrary to the sustainability policies put in place by Bristol City Council. 5) More imaginative schemes, even ones focused on creating a social/community space, and one that has a wider geographical, i.e., regional, draw would be infinitely preferable to this proposed plan. There is other less expensive derelict and unused land in the City that would be far more adequate and provide better affordable housing. The leaflet pushed through Clifton letterboxes recently is insulting. The implied choice to be made is a false one. One can support both good development and conservation action; one need not come at the expense of the other.</p>	24-Jun-22
31. O	<p>The planned development of the Bristol Zoo facility is unacceptable: - no account is taken of the amenity value of the current working zoo to the people of Bristol ; especially to young families. Better efforts must be made to replace the current poorly-run Zoo business with a new, more-viable business, maybe including animatronic animals, climbing and zip-wires, children's play areas and upscale restaurants. - the planned density of housing is too much; no account is taken of the need to provide facilities (schools, doctors, dentists, road improvements, internet connections) for the increased population in this already-crowded area. - the proposed high-rise cube buildings are ugly in themselves and do not match the architecture of the surrounding conservation area. - the proposals to manage traffic and parking by the new residents by prohibiting parking permits are naive and do not take into account times when parking is currently free. - no details are given about how the proposed public spaces and lake will be maintained, nor how they will be paid for and kept free in the future.</p>	24-Jun-22
32. O	<p>I note that there is no guarantee of perpetual public access to the gardens. Indeed, access gates with keypads, such as are proposed for the pedestrian gate on the boundary alongside Clifton Down Road, are definitely not 'open access'. Whilst the site is currently gated, there is no reason for this to be perpetuated. To create a ghetto, albeit one with wealthy residents seems undesirable. The revised proposals do not address the concerns raised by myself among others to the original high density and physical height of the block of flats, N1 etc. . Amendments to the layout within the blocks are immaterial when the block itself is the problem.</p>	24-Jun-22

33. O	<p>Whilst it seems inevitable that the Zoo site will be used for building it is still important that the area be used for the benefit of as many and diverse individuals as possible. This includes access as an open space and housing provision for people of limited means or with disability. It seems sad that the committee in charge of housing development should be willing to accept a 20% provision of such accommodation in return for a guarantee of the work being commenced quickly (short term benefit) whereas the full 40% legal requirement would be of major long term benefit. The original much vaunted open access to the site and provision for its long term maintenance now seems at risk. The suggestion that ongoing costs of this should be borne by the residents (apart from those in social housing) and this necessitates the maximum number of residents and the minimum of those in social housing is a spurious way of reducing the % of social housing. I would suggest that there should be a sum of money put in trust by the developers for the grounds maintenance from the outset.</p>	24-Jun-22
34. O	<p>The density of the proposed housing, in particular high rise Block N, is too great for the area. The character of Clifton Down Road is of individual buildings the majority of which were originally designed as single family dwellings although I accept that some are now subdivided into flats. A monolithic high structure would adversely impinge on the area and should be avoided. The existing boundary wall currently conceals the buildings within the zoo grounds, that should remain its purpose.</p>	24-Jun-22
35. O	<p>My original objections are unchanged by the revised proposals. The proposed development is in a Conservation Area The design of the houses is totally out of keeping with the Victorian houses in the neighbourhood and indeed most of Clifton. What's more they are high, much higher than most of the perimeter of the existing site so will stand out very prominently. I don't object to new houses being built but it is a Conservation Area and therefore the design should be in keeping with the surroundings and the heritage of Clifton.</p>	25-Jun-22
36. O	<p>Through the enormous mass of documents revising the plans, I couldn't see anything addressing the awful external nature of the proposed development. The proposals are still totally out of keeping with the visual appearance of the local area and would be a blot on the landscape. Any development must fit in with the rich architectural character of this part of Clifton - the proposals have total disregard for the fact this is a Conservation Area.</p>	25-Jun-22
37. O	<p>Received a letter from the Zoo and the pictures on the first page showing a park area all look great. I looked at the next page and see 6 story buildings are being proposed. 6 stories is far too high and out of keeping with the general nature of Clifton. Any new build should be no higher than the typical Victorian properties in Clifton and designed in a style far closer to the other Victorian buildings in the area - not modern high rise blocks of flats. These are visually out of character with Clifton.</p>	25-Jun-22

38. R	I approve in principal of the plans outlined in the leaflet. HOWEVER, why does the architecture have to be so ugly, boxy and brutalist? No amount of greenery can obscure that. The gardens are beautiful, very natural looking and free-flowing to move around, and these huge ugly boxes will not fit in at all; they will stand out like very sore thumbs indeed. Surely some gentler, softer, less grating design would be more suitable and pleasant. The photo looks like downtown Beirut rather than a lovely English garden!	25-Jun-22
39. S	This is a sensitive, eco-friendly design for modern accommodation which will fit into the surrounding built environment without being an imitation of it. The Zoological Society has, quite rightly, acknowledged it's responsibility to ensure the site is developed in the best possible way and managed carefully in the future. I wholeheartedly support this application.	25-Jun-22
40. S	I am pleased to support this well thought out application. It will provide much needed homes in a nice area. The community is well provided for in this scheme and the gardens are also looked after. On a wider perspective the disposal will funding which will enable animal conservation for endangered species to continue in a more appropriate setting at the Wild Place Project. Strongly supported.	25-Jun-22
41. S		26-Jun-22
42. O	I have previously commented on the plans to redevelop Bristol Zoo for residential purposes and whilst I was broadly supportive to these proposals, I was very disappointed with the unpleasant visual aspects of the proposed design. As a long-standing local resident is a matter of great concern that the unsightly eyesore which constitutes this design has not been significantly modified in the latest proposals. Indeed, it is hard to discern what changes have been made and good design cannot be replaced by the meaningless spin set out in the Design Guide. Therefore, I must continue to express my disgust at the unsympathetic nature of these proposals which are wholly out of keeping with the surrounding historic area. I must also emphasis that successful design does not stop at the site boundary but must produce a development which fits into the local environment comfortably. The current proposals fail on these grounds and so should not be allowed to proceed unmodified. Moreover, permitting this ill-fitting development to proceed, will set an unhealthy precedent for the future and could easily lead to a rash of similarity ill-conceived development proposals in the Clifton district which will destroy the ambience of the local area. Hence, the applicant should think again and devise something more keeping with the situation of the site.	26-Jun-22

43. O	<p>Whilst I consider that it is a shame that Bristol Zoo feels it must move from its historic and easily accessible site in Clifton to a much more remote and unsustainable location adjacent the M4 motorway as this seems rather contrary to its ecological and conservation objectives, I broadly welcome these proposals. This is because I believe that a carefully designed residential development is the best alternative use of this site. I also consider that it is laudable that the applicants seek to maximise the number of dwellings present and at the same time preserve its gardens. Likewise, I welcome the potential to reduce fly-parking arising from the removal of the Zoo. Nevertheless, I have many concerns about these proposals as they stand. My primary concern is that the buildings are too tall and will overshadow the adjoining properties and dominate this part of Bristol. Thus even a casual visit to the area in which the Zoo is situated will indicate that with the exception of the prominent landmarks provided by several church towers, the Cathedral Spire and the tower of Clifton College, the buildings surrounding this site are of a relatively uniform 3 or 4 storey height. This is true not only of the immediately adjacent area, but of most of the Clifton and Clifton Down areas. As this is not true of the current proposals and I fear the that will visually dominate this area unacceptably. I consider this to be particular problem in respect of Clifton College where it seems that the range of historic buildings adjacent to Guthrie Road will dominated by the new buildings and this will ruin the College's setting by creating an unwelcome intrusion into its backdrop from the south. Whilst placing the taller buildings on the northern site of the site where the ground rises would seem to be sensible, those on the other sides must not be allowed to overshadow the existing buildings on Guthrie, Northcote and College Roads. The current proposals fail in this respect. Likewise, a casual visit to the area in which the Zoo site is located will indicate that most of the building are constructed in the warm colours provided by red sandstone and creamy limestone walls. However, the current proposals seem to be finished in a rather drab cold colour more befitting of a 1970s multi-storey municipal car park than this location and they will do little to enhance its appearance. I notice that the brochure I have receive makes a play of the fact that this development will sit 'sympathetically within the walled gardens' already on the site. To be successful this development must also be sympathetic to the area outside this wall and in this respect, I consider that it fails dramatically. So more need to be done to harmonise this development with its wider surroundings and not just eth former zoo site itself. Consequently, whilst I would not wish to see a pastiche of the surrounding Victorian architecture, I feel a design more in keeping with its neighbourhood in terms of height and colouration could readily be devised. Hence, I feel it rather smacks of something being parachuted in from outside with little thought for its neighbours and needs to be significantly changed. I also consider that Guthrie Road is very busy with Clifton College pupils in term times and so steps must be taken to maximise their safety during the construction of this development. This could best be achieved by the implementation of a Construction Management Plan. As I note that no such document is provided in spurt of this application, I would suggest that it is necessary to devise one forthwith. This strategy must be based on the premiss that works access to the site is obtained only from Clifton Down Road and the large vehicle are not routed through the surrounding residential areas. Overall, therefore, whilst this proposal has much to commend it, I feel that it has a number of fairly obvious shortcomings which must be addressed before it is approved. Under these circumstances I must object to it.</p> <p>Paul Johnson Town and Transport planner</p>	26-Jun-22
-------	---	-----------

44. O	I am disappointed to note that the latest proposal are very little changed from their predecessors meaning that the chance to create a feature which enhances the locale is being lost. It is difficult to see why the promoters are continuing to believe that grey is a sensible colour for such a prominent development as it more suited to bunkers, machine-gun nests, multi-storey car parks, gasworks and other such utilitarian structures. Indeed, its hard to believe that anyone who has spent any time at all in Bristol has noticed that it rains a fair bit and so the use of warmer colours is highly desirable. In short the local residents are the people who will have to live with this development and their opinion on its appearance deserves to take precedence over imported architects. Regards Paul Johnson	26-Jun-22
45. S	This is a rare and unique development that will ensure that this historic site is enhanced and preserved for future generations, whilst creating much-needed eco-friendly housing. The new site has been carefully designed to preserve and enhance native species biodiversity. Additional native planting plus wetland creation is planned and the existing lake will be deepened and the non-native fish species removed, to maximise its biodiversity potential. There are many rare plants within the gardens and they have been carefully identified and list, so that they will be preserved. There are also many specimen trees that will have TPOs added, to ensure that they are preserved. The specialist horticultural and scientific teams at the Bristol Zoological Society aim to be part of the long-term management of the site, to ensure that species are maintained correctly long-term. For several decades, BZS has been working closely with the Avon Gorge and Downs and the proposed visitor centre will provide a much-needed centre for this important committee and provide meeting room and cafe space so that visitors can learn more about this amazing SSSI and its endemic species, so close to a city centre. For the first time in the history of the Zoo, the grounds will be open for the public to enjoy, free of charge. Historic buildings will be restored so that the visitors can enjoy a truly unique experience within a beautiful setting.	27-Jun-22
46. S	Supporting this is supporting a fantastic team to continue to provide conservation, education & Animal care.	27-Jun-22

47. O	<p>I object to this application on many levels: History The 12acre walled site of Bristol Zoo Gardens was well chosen as the world's first provincial zoo, within easy reach of the city centre and adjacent to the Downs and Avon Gorge, a phenomenally rich resource for the study of geology, paleontology, archaeology and biodiversity. Its visionary founders, including Isambard Kingdom Brunel, would no doubt be appalled by the thought that the gardens might now become a housing estate at a time when general education for bio-diversity is so much more urgent than it was 187 years ago. The retention of the entrance building as a visitor information centre is a welcome but relatively token gesture. Diversity Bristol Zoo is the one reason many people of all backgrounds and incomes come to Bristol, and especially to Clifton. Without a significant multi cultural attraction on this site Clifton becomes an even more exclusive monoculture with little else but expensive housing and speciality shopping. There is no good town planning reason why a mature 'green' public and educational attraction of this nature, a healthy mixture of learning and entertainment, should be regarded as a potential site for housing development. The public access statement and optimistic illustrations of diverse members of the public enjoying the gardens are unrealistic. Who is realistically going to go out of their way to walk around an exclusive housing estate other than to see how the other half lives - or to annoy the hell out of them?! In time this right is likely to be curtailed by the residents and the management company's lawyers, whatever provision is currently promised. Accessibility It is all the more vital to retain cultural attractions and centres of education within the urban area if we are to have any chance of moving away from car dependency, which has to be one of the principal aims of Bristol's declaration of a Climate Emergency and desire for carbon neutrality by 2030, an ambitious target by any standards. Three generations of my family have enjoyed walking, cycling or taking the bus to the Zoo and its gardens since the 1970's. We have been members and I am now fortunate enough to be one of the small band of shareholders and feel a deep responsibility to defend the site against inappropriate development, for whatever reason. The need for enabling development for another site lying in another authority has never been a planning principle and should not influence a decision, which should be based on sound planning considerations alone. Affordability Bristol is a city of extremes in terms of wealth and housing with a concentration of wealth in Clifton and the surrounding area. A provision of 20% 'Affordable' housing, largely 1 bed units, is a gesture, but little more than that in an area with particularly high prices. 'Affordable' is a relative term and on sites like this proves to be well out of the reach of the majority of those seeking to acquire a first home or rental in their own city. Low Density This proposal serves very little purpose in terms of contributing to Bristol's severe housing need in either quantity or type. 201 homes, at under 17 units per acre (41 units per hectare), represents a suburban density. It is a minor contribution, both in relation to the opportunities it destroys and in the ability to develop much higher densities, that still respect the urban context, on 'brownfield' sites. Health & Environment As a city and society we face an existential threat from climate change and the loss of bio-diversity. Our young people's physical and mental health is at stake. In response Bristol has led the way in terms of a declaration of a Climate Emergency and we need to get radical if we are to have any chance of even denting the ambition to be carbon neutral by 2030. At the very least new developments in Bristol should aim for carbon neutrality and planning permission should not be granted for any plan that fails to do so. Car access Cars have never had access within the walls of Bristol Zoo Gardens, the only vehicles being maintenance vehicles. This should remain the case. The proposal to provide parking for 124 cars,</p>	27-Jun-22
-------	--	-----------

	<p>including 4 disabled spaces, within the development ensures that the development will not meet the aim for carbon neutrality and will damage the environmental quality of life on the site. Any development of this easily accessible site should be car free, with the exception of vehicles for disabled occupants and visitors and a small electric car club, a possible total of 10 spaces. There is a huge opportunity to provide for the increasing number of people who are dispensing with car ownership, in favour of walking, cycling and public transport, and who will buy in to a car-free future. The car parking provision follows the advice of the property agents and planning consultants who know what has gone before but lack the imagination to take the necessary leap to a cleaner and healthier future.</p> <p>Design This site demands a very special approach to design and layout. Yet again we have nationally respected architects imposing the wrong solution on a much-loved Bristol site within the Clifton & Hotwells Conservation Area. Even the published illustrations provided to persuade us fall far short of what we should expect on this exceptional and very visible site. The 5 & 6 storey blocks of flats facing the Downs, Northcote Road and Guthrie Road are underwhelming and relatively utilitarian when seen against the richness of Clifton's architecture. It does not have to be complicated or decorative but it should be built in appropriate natural materials and lift the spirit - which these boxy elevations will fail to do, even with profiles of animals built into the brickwork!</p> <p>In particular the provision of parking at ground level results in bland ground floor elevations and raises the height of the blocks of flats up one storey more than would otherwise be necessary to achieve the same density. A scheme without the need for road access could produce a much more 'organic' and memorable solution that is in the spirit of the place. It is this level of design ambition that this very special site demands, as is well illustrated by the preliminary 'OurWorld Bristol' designs by LDA which received a very positive response to its Pre Planning Application.</p> <p>Landscape The proposed removal of well over one third of the mature trees on the site would be unnecessary with a different approach to the layout and use of the site. It should be a guiding principle that any re-use of the gardens is subject to the retention of at least 90% of the existing trees. The landscape as planned results in excessive road surface and the shared public and private paths is bound to result in a plethora of 'keep out' & 'residents only' signs such as have cropped up elsewhere in similar situations.</p> <p>Precedence Precedence is not always a good planning defence, but if planning is granted for housing within the Zoo Gardens, what defence is there for building housing over the adjacent Clifton College playing fields at some future date?</p> <p>Charitable Status The Zoo Trustees have been wrongly informed that they have a responsibility to achieve maximum price for the land. This is patently untrue. Their responsibility is to achieve best value in accordance with their charitable purposes, which could equally mean an appropriate re-use of the site for educational and environmental purposes.</p> <p>Lobbying There has been strong lobbying, by the Zoo administration to the City Council administration and evident pressure by the Mayor's office on senior planning officers, which is against the spirit of the quasi-judicial role of the planning process which is meant to be independent and immune from political and corporate pressure of this nature. As shareholders we have been asked by the Zoo administration to support this application, a perfectly reasonable request, so it is not surprising that the early barrage of support has come either from those directly involved with the Zoo, or by those who have been canvassed by the Zoo to do so, with a majority of those supporters seemingly having addresses outside the city. I do fully understand that the nature of zoos has to change and that the Society has set its sights on funding the further development of its Hollywood Estate, sited outside the city adjacent to junction 17 on the M5. In</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>recognition I have not objected to the development of the Zoo car park on College Road, which is likely to result in a site value in excess of £10 million, although I am deeply disappointed by the quality of its design and layout within the fine Clifton & Hotwells Conservation Area and hope proper advantage will now be taken following the revocation of that planning permission to retain the historic garden walls and improve the environmental performance and its design to reflect the importance of its setting. Conclusion There's a host of reasons why this planning application for the development of the historic Zoo Gardens should be refused, both positive in terms of more appropriate alternative uses, and negative in terms of an unwarranted change of use and character to the detriment of the environment. The possibility of a planning refusal being overturned at appeal is extremely low whatever may be inferred. This is an exceptional decision that has to be taken on behalf of the people of Bristol by its elected planning committee members, free of influence or pressure from the administration.</p>	
48. S	<p>The proposals are sympathetic to the history of the site. It is great that the residential housing is being kept in line with the existing built footprint, and the stunning gardens and open space is being retained for the community to enjoy for years to come.</p>	27-Jun-22

49. O	<p>The objectives and approach of the proposal are ambitious and themselves easy to support however I object to the application primarily due to the quality and certainty offered by the management plan. In my reading the success of this proposal relies on how it will be managed, the quality of the public space, if it will feel public and if it will be retained as public space in perpetuity. I object to the application as it fails to spell out clearly how it will meet its own objective of recreating the gardens as a public space for future generations. I am sure there are many issues to the proposal that could no doubt be improved too which no doubt others and officers may remark upon having leafed through the submission materials at greater length. The high level management plan itself cites a number of schemes, where the most comparable (those being almost exclusively residential) having limited public enjoyment and for the most part being private where, those that I am familiar with, are managed by vehicles that behave primarily in the interest of the fee payers and not the users. Often 'gated communities' even if starting with public access move over time to restrict access and make it feel unwelcoming to the public. Even where public rights of way are present often these private communities are quite effective at diverting or extinguishing them, putting up gates or security apparatus or other paraphilia to discourage public enjoyment of spaces. Whilst it would be nice too see this heritage asset conserved and publicly accessible a management plan that offers no certainty on management approach, such as voting power, make up, accountability or trumping mandate such as a clear charter or other legal mechanism. It is a shame that we are not in a position that a public or publicly minded body can be a custodian of the space such as it being adopted by the council. In addition, the design takes too literally the 'walled zoo gardens' design cue and creates a even bigger continuous wall of buildings and private homes that do little to create new openings, this is likely to sum to the gardens feeling unwelcoming and quite exclusive irrelevant of whether the gates are open or not. Before I can support the proposal I would like to see the better resolved management plan and the design to better support a welcoming and opening environment that better creates a gardens, play area and former animal houses that with some confidence and certainty we can all say are not only public when the scheme is built but also in 5, 10, 20 years time and for future generations. If the proposal is unable to create the public space it laudably strives for and ultimately becomes private then I am quite sure there are other ways to deliver public benefit alongside this development opportunity such as more efficient use of land, more housing, play area located in the downs, relocated animal houses and so on.</p>	28-Jun-22
-------	--	-----------

50. O	<p>The objectives and approach of the proposal are ambitious and themselves easy to support however I object to the application primarily due to the quality and certainty offered by the management plan. In my reading the success of this proposal relies on how it will be managed, the quality of the public space, if it will feel public and if it will be retained as public space in perpetuity. I object to the application as it fails to spell out clearly how it will meet its own objective of recreating the gardens as a public space for future generations. I am sure there are many issues to the proposal that could no doubt be improved too which no doubt others and officers may remark upon having leafed through the submission materials at greater length. The high level management plan itself cites a number of schemes, where the most comparable (those being almost exclusively residential) having limited public enjoyment and for the most part being private where, those that I am familiar with, are managed by vehicles that behave primarily in the interest of the fee payers and not the users. Often 'gated communities' even if starting with public access move over time to restrict access and make it feel unwelcoming to the public. Even where public rights of way are present often these private communities are quite effective at diverting or extinguishing them, putting up gates or security apparatus or other paraphilia to discourage public enjoyment of spaces. Whilst it would be nice too see this heritage asset conserved and publicly accessible a management plan that offers no certainty on management approach, such as voting power, make up, accountability or trumping mandate such as a clear charter or other legal mechanism. It is a shame that we are not in a position that a public or publicly minded body can be a custodian of the space such as it being adopted by the council. In addition, the design takes too literally the 'walled zoo gardens' design cue and creates a even bigger continuous wall of buildings and private homes that do little to create new openings, this is likely to sum to the gardens feeling unwelcoming and quite exclusive irrelevant of whether the gates are open or not. Before I can support the proposal I would like to see the better resolved management plan and the design to better support a welcoming and opening environment that better creates a gardens, play area and former animal houses that with some confidence and certainty we can all say are not only public when the scheme is built but also in 5, 10, 20 years time and for future generations. If the proposal is unable to create the public space it laudably strives for and ultimately becomes private then I am quite sure there are other ways to deliver public benefit alongside this development opportunity such as more efficient use of land, more housing, play area located in the downs, relocated animal houses and so on.</p>	28-Jun-22
51. O		28-Jun-22

52. O	<p>The following represents a slightly revised version of the comments originally posted on August 7th. CHIS strongly opposes these depressingly unimaginative and potentially destructive proposals which are entirely unacceptable. The scheme includes half a mile of modern blocks of Flats several storeys high adjacent to all the Zoo boundaries which will dominate and overpower the neighbouring streets. This is especially the case along the west perimeter which would face the monolithic block proposed for the West Car Park site, permanently altering the feel, landscape, treescape, and skyline of the Conservation Area. The scheme takes little, if any, account of the heritage, character and sense of space that makes this historic neighbourhood special, if not unique. Despite strong concerns expressed during various public consultations, it has been the experience of residents that most of their concerns have either been dealt with only at the most basic or cosmetic level or just completely ignored. The following points summarise some of the most blatantly pernicious aspects of the proposals : 1. 196 dwellings represents a massively over-dense development of the site. 2. Given the provision of only 100 parking spaces the circular access drive is likely to be permanently littered with cars and so appear even less discreet than the plans suggest. 3. The potential impact on the Conservation Area is poorly considered. In particular, the impact on the surrounding listed buildings and gardens of a development so monolithic in its scale and massing has not been justified. Especially appalling in this respect is the block on the northern boundary, 4. The proposed terracing is not appropriate in this area. 5. The loss of trees will be compounded by the inevitable damage to the roof systems of many other trees by infrastructure work. We urge rejection of this highly damaging Application.</p>	28-Jun-22
53. O	<p>The minor modifications recently made to this Application entirely fail to address the concerns of CHIS who consider it to be clearly contrary to BCS 22. It represents an over-intense and overbearing development which would, without reasonable justification, adversely affect the character of this part of the Clifton Conservation Area and the setting of its listed buildings. Our views are entirely in line with those of Bristol City Council's Conservation Advisory Panel of which CHIS is a member and whose letter of 20 November 2022 sets out in some detail the architectural poverty of the scheme and its detrimental impact on heritage assets.</p>	28-Jun-22

54. O	<p>The Clifton & Hotwells Improvement Society strongly opposes these depressingly unimaginative and potentially destructive proposals which are entirely unacceptable in their current form. The scheme includes half a mile of modern blocks of Flats several storeys high adjacent to all the Zoo boundaries which will dominate and overpower the neighbouring streets. This is especially the case along the west perimeter which would face the monolithic block proposed for the West Car Park site, permanently altering the feel, landscape, treescape and skyline of the Conservation Area. The scheme takes little, if any, account of the heritage, character and sense of space that makes this historic neighbourhood special, if not unique. Despite strong concerns expressed during various public consultations, it has been the experience of residents that most of their concerns have either been dealt with only at the most basic or cosmetic level or just completely ignored. The following points summarise some of the most blatantly pernicious aspects of the proposals :</p> <p>1. 201 dwellings represents a massively over-dense development of the site. 2. Given the provision of only 100 parking spaces the circular access drive is likely to be permanently littered with cars and so appear even less discreet than the plans suggest. 3. The potential impact on the Conservation Area is poorly considered. In particular, the impact on the surrounding listed buildings and gardens of a development so monolithic in its scale and massing has not been justified. Especially appalling in this respect is the six storey block on the northern boundary. 4. The proposed terracing is not appropriate in this area. 5. The loss of trees will be compounded by the inevitable damage to the root systems of many other trees by infrastructure work. We urge rejection of this highly damaging Application which, far from leaving a worthy legacy, would irrevocably damage one of the finest sites in Bristol.</p>	28-Jun-22
-------	---	-----------

55. O	<p>The objectives and approach of the proposal are ambitious and themselves easy to support however I object to the application primarily due to the quality and certainty offered by the management plan. In my reading the success of this proposal relies on how it will be managed, the quality of the public space, if it will feel public and if it will be retained as public space in perpetuity. I object to the application as it fails to spell out clearly how it will meet its own objective of recreating the gardens as a public space for future generations. I am sure there are many issues to the proposal that could no doubt be improved too which no doubt others and officers may remark upon having leafed through the submission materials at greater length. The high level management plan itself cites a number of schemes, where the most comparable (those being almost exclusively residential) having limited public enjoyment and for the most part being private where, those that I am familiar with, are managed by vehicles that behave primarily in the interest of the fee payers and not the users. Often 'gated communities' even if starting with public access move over time to restrict access and make it feel unwelcoming to the public. Even where public rights of way are present often these private communities are quite effective at diverting or extinguishing them, putting up gates or security apparatus or other paraphilia to discourage public enjoyment of spaces. Whilst it would be nice too see this heritage asset conserved and publicly accessible a management plan that offers no certainty on management approach, such as voting power, make up, accountability or trumping mandate such as a clear charter or other legal mechanism. It is a shame that we are not in a position that a public or publicly minded body can be a custodian of the space such as it being adopted by the council. In addition, the design takes too literally the 'walled zoo gardens' design cue and creates a even bigger continuous wall of buildings and private homes that do little to create new openings, this is likely to sum to the gardens feeling unwelcoming and quite exclusive irrelevant of whether the gates are open or not. Before I can support the proposal I would like to see the better resolved management plan and the design to better support a welcoming and opening environment that better creates a gardens, play area and former animal houses that with some confidence and certainty we can all say are not only public when the scheme is built but also in 5, 10, 20 years time and for future generations. If the proposal is unable to create the public space it laudably strives for and ultimately becomes private then I am quite sure there are other ways to deliver public benefit alongside this development opportunity such as more efficient use of land, more housing, play area located in the downs, relocated animal houses and so on.</p>	28-Jun-22
-------	--	-----------

56. O	<p>The objectives and approach of the proposal are ambitious and themselves easy to support however I object to the application primarily due to the quality and certainty offered by the management plan. In my reading the success of this proposal relies on how it will be managed, the quality of the public space, if it will feel public and if it will be retained as public space in perpetuity. I object to the application as it fails to spell out clearly how it will meet its own objective of recreating the gardens as a public space for future generations. I am sure there are many issues to the proposal that could no doubt be improved too which no doubt others and officers may remark upon having leafed through the submission materials at greater length. The high level management plan itself cites a number of schemes, where the most comparable (those being almost exclusively residential) having limited public enjoyment and for the most part being private where, those that I am familiar with, are managed by vehicles that behave primarily in the interest of the fee payers and not the users. Often 'gated communities' even if starting with public access move over time to restrict access and make it feel unwelcoming to the public. Even where public rights of way are present often these private communities are quite effective at diverting or extinguishing them, putting up gates or security apparatus or other paraphilia to discourage public enjoyment of spaces. Whilst it would be nice too see this heritage asset conserved and publicly accessible a management plan that offers no certainty on management approach, such as voting power, make up, accountability or trumping mandate such as a clear charter or other legal mechanism. It is a shame that we are not in a position that a public or publicly minded body can be a custodian of the space such as it being adopted by the council. In addition, the design takes too literally the 'walled zoo gardens' design cue and creates a even bigger continuous wall of buildings and private homes that do little to create new openings, this is likely to sum to the gardens feeling unwelcoming and quite exclusive irrelevant of whether the gates are open or not. Before I can support the proposal I would like to see the better resolved management plan and the design to better support a welcoming and opening environment that better creates a gardens, play area and former animal houses that with some confidence and certainty we can all say are not only public when the scheme is built but also in 5, 10, 20 years time and for future generations. If the proposal is unable to create the public space it laudably strives for and ultimately becomes private then I am quite sure there are other ways to deliver public benefit alongside this development opportunity such as more efficient use of land, more housing, play area located in the downs, relocated animal houses and so on.</p>	28-Jun-22
57. S	<p>As a local resident I fully support the application, which will help to ensure the ongoing conservation and education work of the Society. The plans are sensitive to the history of the site, whilst providing public access, play areas and a positive net biodiversity gain.</p>	28-Jun-22

58. S	As a former employee of the Society I fully appreciate and understand the challenges faced by the organisation and I think the Zoo team, Trustees and Shareholders should be commended for these well considered plans. This is a fantastic scheme for the people of Bristol, which also facilitates a sustainable future for the Society. This is a win win! As well as developing much needed homes, this plan makes the gardens accessible to all. The Society have listened to feedback and are effectively gifting this privilege to the people of Bristol - something they should be commended and celebrated for. There is no doubt that the Zoo has outgrown its Clifton site and the move to Cribbs is 100% logical. Clifton is a residential area - and it makes perfect sense to develop this land into housing. The scheme includes new homes located mainly in areas where there are already built structures, with 20% being affordable. Historic assets like the Bear Pit and Monkey Temple will be preserved and restored and there is a biodiversity net gain due to establishing a wide variety of new habitats. The sale of this land will enable to Society to develop the new Bristol Zoo - which will be an incredible asset to the region - home to some of the world's most threatened species, bigger enclosures that more closely reflect animals' natural habitats and a world leading conservation learning centre and conservation medicine centre. This truly will be a forward thinking zoo for the 21st Century. This scheme has my full support.	28-Jun-22
59. R		29-Jun-22
60. R		29-Jun-22
61. O	The leaflet received through my letterbox looks wonderful and sounds wonderful for the people of Bristol. Unfortunately the buildings shown in the computer-generated pictures looks truly awful. They look like some housing project in the Eastern Bloc. Neo Brutalism is the phrase I think. Flat roof, just row upon row of tall boxes with no architectural merit at all. It looks very ugly and uninspiring. Clifton's architecture is uplifting but these plans are not. The Zoo's attempt at making as much money as possible. It will be a sad day when the Zoo leaves Clifton and an even sadder one if we have these plans as a replacement. It will stand out as a huge blot on the landscape, surrounded by beautiful buildings, nasty, looming blocks, with no reference to the surroundings at all. At least the parking/home ratio is better than the Zoo Parking Lot proposal but that's the only sensible thing about it. I trust the the Bristol Planning Department will refuse this application. Any submission should take into consideration the beauty of Clifton, a heritage area, so that the structures blend in with the area. Thank you for your consideration. Geraldine Davies	29-Jun-22

62. S	Our charity (The Natural History Consortium) brings together the region's nature organisations, and was formed through partnership working between the Zoo and others around the city. Twenty years later, we work closely with Bristol Zoo teams who generously share their learning, resources and commitment to conservation with organisations across the region, and beyond. This project is an invaluable opportunity to give public access to the gardens, improving connection to nature and play opportunities for children. There is a clear benefit to provide sustainable housing in a city that faces a housing, as well as ecological, crisis. We are hugely excited for the conservation, learning and communication opportunities of the new Bristol Zoo, and will be seeking to support all areas of this work and share it widely through our Festival of Nature programme as well as to organisations across the UK. We have supported early thinking around the Wild Place site and developments, and supported numerous pilot activities and on-site programmes to ensure that the offer builds on other environmental initiatives in the city. We look forward to working with others to bring this activity to a much wider regional audience of visitors, schools, and tourists.	29-Jun-22
63. S	The existing Zoo Gardens in Clifton can not provide appropriate facilities for the work that the Society now undertakes, or offer sufficient space for animals. The proposal to develop the Zoo Gardens will provide well designed and sustainable housing, including affordable, whilst offering free public access to the preserved gardens. The sale will enable the Zoo to be developed in more appropriate spacious grounds at Wild Place. The new Zoo would be a significant attraction for Bristol and beyond whilst removing traffic from the City.	29-Jun-22
64. O	I am a parent with a child at Clifton college. I have concerns over the windows overlooking parts of the school and the privacy of the children. I also have huge concerns over the vehicular access. The area around the school gets incredibly busy at times. I think within the school community people /drivers are generally very tolerant, safe and patient with each other at passing places and with the children's movements. But it has its moments regardless. But the increased volume of cars from the development will increase the risk of accidents/road rage in the general crazy time that is pickup and drop off. I would strongly suggest the main entrance of the development is positioned well away from the school community.	29-Jun-22

65. O	<p>On Behalf of The Avenue Residents Association. BS8 A number of residents of The Avenue have asked the Residents Association to object to the plans as proposed. There are numerous objections but they can be summarised as follows: 1) The density of the proposed development is far too high. It is clear that the Zoo's only interest is to maximise profit without any regard to the legacy it will leave. 2) The height of the buildings will significantly impact light on adjacent properties and will be an eyesore. 3) The design of the proposed is out of keeping with existing properties, looks awful and will age in a very short period of time. 4) The comments on parking are naive and frankly ridiculous. The Avenue will be clogged with residents and their visitors. 5) The traffic access onto Guthrie Road will cause severe congestion and will be a safety hazard especially during busy hours at the school. Even at the moment it can take 10 minutes to access Pembroke Road from The Avenue during school drop off. There have been several near misses with school children already. There has been no consideration of vulnerable road users. Regards The Avenue Residents Association.</p>	29-Jun-22
66. O	<p>As a Bristol resident and parent I am very concerned about this proposed development and strongly object to the plans presented. Whilst I understand there may be a need for the zoo to move from this historic location, the plans put forward for the development of the site would seem to have a number of issues that have not been considered. This development neighbours a school, and in fact children circulate the area from other nearby schools too both in the morning and afternoon. I am a parent of schoolchildren in the area there. The amount of traffic, parking and access considerations seem to have been overlooked in the context of safety for nearby residents and also school children and parents dropping children off to school. There are many children in the vicinity, particularly along Guthrie road, the Avenue, College Road and Northcote road where all the school building are. This feels like an extremely dangerous development as regards the safeguarding and safety of children. By necessity, children have to travel between buildings or for pick-ups and drop-offs, and for the older children, they will be unaccompanied by adults so are at huge risk of a road accident or other more horrific risks, particularly in the winter when it is dark. The school is co-ed so there will also be potentially vulnerable pupils walking on the pavements and crossing roads in large numbers, as well as individuals late at night. There are many evening functions and boarding houses in the area leaving students particularly at risk. I would strongly object to the plans on that basis alone. In addition to that however, and again with the safeguarding of children playing in school playgrounds, or walking between classrooms, these unsightly and far-too tall buildings being proposed present a real risk for those children. These children will be overlooked and could easily be targeted or abused. There is already an issue with poor lighting in the area from a safety perspective, but the large buildings will further block sunlight and create more danger. Apart from the final design failing to take these issues into consideration, the designs as presented also fail to take into consideration the character and historic importance of the architecture in the area. They don't seem to fit and would create an unsightly, out of character set of eyesores. This is a conservation area after all. Given the lack of consideration in the aspect and overall plans, I would also be very concerned that the actual construction process itself has been equally poorly considered. These building works will take some years, which will mean construction taking place throughout the schooling year and in particular through the periods of public exams. Having come from a few years of Covid where</p>	29-Jun-22

	<p>children have been massively disadvantaged, I can not imagine supporting a scheme that will force this disadvantage of heavily disrupted education and examinations being perpetuated. Given these will be the particularly difficult years when results are re-normalised, this will be of great disadvantage to the futures of hundreds of students in the schools in the area. Seemingly, this is not a concern of these developers. So on the basis of these concerns, I would like to record a strong objection to the plans as presented. Kind Regards</p>	
67. O	<p>As a mother of daughters whom attend Clifton College, I worry some what on the childrens safety if this proposal goes ahead. Parking and traffic isnt great down the documented roads already surely this development will only make it worse. Park and play area?, with this being open to the public is this going to bring youths to the area thus more space to graffiti, damage and a show ASBO behaviour? Will this attract homeless and drunks to the area? How will this be patrolled.? I dont believe this development will bring anything positive to the area. I</p>	29-Jun-22

68. O	<p>I live in the close vicinity of Bristol Zoo and my 3 young children attend Clifton college. We spend lots of time in and around the zoo area and surrounding streets at a variety of times of the day. It appears that the scale of this planning development has taken absolutely no consideration to the already severe pressure on traffic at the beginning and end of the day. Traffic is frequently already backlogged all the way back to the suspension bridge at the end of the day and in the morning we have observed how traffic is consistently building against the A4176 in the mornings. There will be a huge volume of traffic with the addition of over 200 more dwellings. This will not only detrimentally impact the air surrounding our houses and school from the standstill traffic but also cause huge safety concern for the large number of school children on foot attending both our and the other schools in the areas. There is already significant pressure on drop off at the school which will become completely untenable with the additional traffic. Bristol council would be showing a complete disregard for the safety of children if they proceed at this scale. Further to this, the proposal to build 5 story buildings alongside Northcote road will significantly alter the character and charm of the area of significant architectural beauty and integrity and seems unfathomable in a conservation area where development on residential properties. They dwarf the scale of current buildings and will significantly harm the visual environment. The proposal does not take into consideration the close neighbours or show any regard to the functioning of the school which is in such close proximity to the development.</p>	29-Jun-22
69. O	<p>Having read the design documents as well as comments made by others, there are some very obvious areas where significant changes and improvements must be made. It must be possible with enough thought and reflection to generate proposals that are not so divisive. Here are my main points: 1. The proposed buildings are of materials and designs that do not fit with the surrounding historic and beautiful architecture. They are immature, trendy and lacking in any kind of sensitivity. 2. The proposed heights again, are not in keeping with the surrounding architecture - the proposed buildings are too tall. 3. The whole design looks far too modern and ugly - too much like a design statement that will be a source of temporary pride for the very few and a source of long-lasting upset for a great many. There are very few places in Bristol that are so beautiful - most have been severely spoiled by limited, short-lived ideas of what constitutes improvements. This design is not an improvement. It spoils the whole area and needs to be started afresh. Thank you.</p>	30-Jun-22
70. O	<p>As a parent at Clifton College, I am highly concerned with both the increased traffic the redevelopment into this number of residential properties and the change of tone for the area. There have already been a number of near miss events with children, young and old being in danger of being run over by cars. A development of this nature and size will only increase this potential for one of these near misses to become a tragedy.</p>	30-Jun-22

71. O	<p>Having examined the plans for the Zoo (a place I have regularly attended with my children for the past 12 years). I have considerable concerns about the proposed plans for it's development. From a building perspective I understand that the Zoo have been told they can only build where current buidlings/enclosures exist and sadly this is contrary to what would be best for the neighbours. In particular the College (where I work). It would place some tall 4+ storey buildings around the edge of the site overlooking the neighbouring houses and in places over looking the school playgrounds and boarding Houses. The height itself would be considerably overbearing compared to the height of the buildings surrounding and it would act to block light from classrooms and houses. In truth, for the neighbours, it would be far better for the buildings to be lower and more central to the site. Furthermore the access to the site, if not planned correctly, will cause huge issues for all involved. All roads that surround the Zoo are very heavily utilised. Not just by vehicles passing but by school buses stopping and by pedestrians (children) walking by. This is hugely concerning at the best of time but has the potentially to be very dangerous during the constructions period. At the College the safeguarding and protection of the students are central to all we do the development of the site in this proposal appears contrary to that. The idea that permission would be granted for tall buildings to look directly into the boarding houses of young children is inconcievable. I understand the need for the Zoo to make money from the site but it is clearly a case of cramming as much accommodation as possible onto a school side to make money at all costs. Given the nature of the surrounding area in terms of building types and use (the College). This particular proposal should never be allowed to proceed.</p>	30-Jun-22
72. O	<p>Dear Sirs With regard to the proposed planning on the former Zoo site, I feel I have no choice but to object to the proposed plans I fully appreciate that we need more housing and that this site could be used for this , but why in a conservation area would such an ugly, overbearing and completely out place development be proposed ? I live in this area and I even have to get permission to maintain and cut my trees , yet you are seriously proposing this development , I am sorry but it simply does not sit and leaves many unanswered questions So much could be done with this site for it to provide dwellings but in keeping in an area we have all been made fully aware is Conservation and must be respected There is no Conservation considerations with these's plans How very sad that yet again large developers are allowed to destroy beautiful area's with ugly buildings , why are we destroy our heritage that we will never get back</p>	30-Jun-22

73. O	<p>Dear Sirs Although I thoroughly appreciate that we need more homes , I find it impossible to understand why on this beautiful historical site we would consider such a plan The infrastructure surrounding this site simply makes no sense ,the roads can't cope with the existing traffic , the doctors surgery cannot even offer existing patients appointments due to volume and where are the school places going to be found? I understood that bristol Council were very green and wanting us off the roads , as there are no local school places you are going to have parents needing to drive children to an available school , how is this environmentally friendly and working with the Councils policies , its a total contradiction to what the council are preaching to us Furthermore , the proposals so close to a school , where there are children walking around and crossing roads , how can you not even consider their safety fo all sorts of reasons , we have a duty of care to our children. This is a beautiful ancient site that we are going to desecrate with housing , surely the alternative plan for a virtual zoo is amazing , educational, forward thinking and firmly puts Bristol on the map as a city that really does care about the environment actions speak louder than words and the existing zoo can only benefit from this . It is so sad to see that no imagination is been given to this site , I despair for the future of our children and young people</p>	30-Jun-22
74. O	<p>I am very familiar with the Bristol Zoological Gardens site in relation to Clifton College. As such, my serious concerns lead me to object to this planning application especially with its inclusion of 201 homes. Specifically, my concerns relate to the following: 1. Safety regarding use of public highways, particularly that related to children on the routes of Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue. 2. The possibility that proposed new buildings will overlook areas of school grounds and buildings. 3. The possibility that the proposed developments adversely impact areas of school regarding daylight/sunlight. 4. The impact on this remarkable Conversation Area and the heritage that it embodies. 5. The very likely possibility, in my view, of site construction causing operational difficulties for the school.</p>	30-Jun-22
75. O	<p>My children attend Clifton College and I am extremely worried about these plans. How can such a beautiful plot have so many houses on? How will the already busy roads cope with the amount of cars these houses will bring? How are the children's safety who use these roads to get to their lesson houses going to be kept safe? I strongly object</p>	30-Jun-22

76. O	<p>As a member of staff at Clifton College, I am very concerned about about a number of points with regard to the redevelopment of the Zoo site into residential units. The parking and access in the surrounding roads is already very busy. Clifton College is a large school with many parents dropping off/collecting their children each day. Combined with the neighbouring houses, the roads can be quite dangerous at times with lots of children close by and I feel this will only make the situation worse. I am also very concerned about the height of the residential buildings and the proximity they are to Clifton College's boarding houses. It is qute clear that the residents of the new development would overlook into the school's buidlings which is a huge safeguarding concern. It quite clear there has been no thought into how this development would impact the Zoo's neighbours especially Clifton College and the children who attend it.</p>	30-Jun-22
77. O	<p>I strongly object to the plans to build a luxury housing estate on the site of the Bristol Zoo Gardens. The gardens have been open to the public for 186 years. The queues of people visiting the Zoo before it closed demonstrates its significance to generations of people of Bristol. The historical and environmental damage this development will cause are not justified. The whole of the beautiful gardens and planting on this site should be preserved with its mature trees, historical herbaceous border, various ecosystems and the amazing biodiversity it offers (per the BZS website) for future generations to enjoy. Examination of the financial reports for the Zoo show that the Clifton site is financially viable. Losses have been generated by millions of pounds being spent on consultancy fees to facilitate the sale of the site. Although there were no visitors during lockdown, the Zoo received £2.5million in business continuation insurance. Indeed the Zoo generates far more money and visitors than the Wild Place. The Zoo has misled the public into believing that the sale of the Clifton site is necessary as the only option. This is not the case as the KPMG report they commissioned includes other possible courses of action - none of which were presented to their shareholders. The Clifton site is listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space. It should stay this way. There is much public goodwill and support to explore options that will keep this site as a public green space rather than a luxury gated housing estate "Saving Wildlife Together" is the motto of the Zoo. The Council should start by saving the wildlife and biodiversity of the Clifton site by saying No to the Planning Application.</p>	30-Jun-22

78. O	<p>I strongly oppose the plans for the zoo gardens for the overbearing nature of the proposed blocks of flats that show no sympathy for the Clifton conservation area and the neighbouring buildings. lack of sympathy the design shows for this conservation area and its neighbouring buildings, the poor quality of the public park, loss of sunlight to neighbouring streets and the access issues around Guthrie Road. The proposed buildings give the appearance of a prison block and are totally unsuitable for a conservation area. The perimeter buildings are too overbearing, too large and extensive, too close to the perimeter and have no sympathy in scale or design to the neighbouring buildings. The new buildings completely overshadow and dominate the Zoo entrance building. The view of the site from the Downs will be a wall of modern buildings that remove the feeling of openness and visual amenity from the Downs where currently the buildings are well below the tree line. The main access point on Guthrie Road opposite the school is completely inappropriate for such a large site. This is a street with chicanes to slow traffic, which makes it hard for traffic to move along it. On top of that, the stretch of road next to the site entrance is used by the school to load and unload school buses several times each day- other streets being unsuitable for this purpose. If the main entrance is located on Guthrie Road, the number of dwellings on the site needs to be decreased significantly. The public park is hidden away within this gated community with controlled access. The wall of tall surrounding buildings will deprive the park of sunlight and make the area feel walled in. The access roads within the site represent further loss of green open space. The beautiful heritage gardens will be ripped up along with established trees. This is not conservation. The neighbouring streets will lose sunlight for much of the year as they will be overshadowed by the excessively tall, uninterrupted blocks of flats.</p>	30-Jun-22
-------	---	-----------

79. O	<p>I strongly object to the plans for the Bristol Zoo Gardens. The layout of the site, with overly tall buildings around its perimeter, and narrow gated access makes it feel unwelcoming to the public. Much of the public garden space shown on the plans is actually access road and should not be classified as garden space especially as most of the car parking spaces are in the central part of the site. There is no similarity to the amenity of the current zoo gardens. There does not seem any guarantee that once the development is completed that public access will be maintained to the gardens in the long term. Such access is more assured if the public gardens form a solid area fronting onto Clifton Downs Road rather than lost within the gated community. I object to the loss of a visitor attraction that brings people into Clifton from outside Bristol. The community conservation centre is unlikely to have the equivalent economic value to the area and this negative impact has not been taken into account in the economic report. The public gardens have been dubbed down into an area surrounded by and crossed by access roads that are overlooked and shaded by excessively tall buildings around its perimeter and within it. I object to the amount of traffic that will be generated around the local roads of the site by this volume of housing plus that of the West Car Park site. No account seems to have been taken of parking needed by visitors to the residents of these sites. The loss of the car parks on Clifton Down Road is not mentioned. These visitors and the Clifton College drop off/pick up traffic will create substantial parking problems in the area with cars driving around looking for parking spaces, on top of all the additional traffic wanting to access the site. All this excess traffic is of a concern for the safety of the pupils of Clifton College who spend a lot of time each day walking between buildings in this area. The density of the development is too great to maintain public safety around this site. I object to the design of the perimeter buildings. These are all too tall, reducing the light into the public gardens substantially. The surrounding roads will feel like dark alleyways - especially College Road with blocks of flats situated close to the road on both sides. The architectural design bears no relation to the historical buildings that have been preserved nor to the surrounding buildings of Clifton conservation area. I object to the view of the site from the Downs with its 6 storey tall buildings built up to the boundary wall. The frontage should be no more than the current two storey height.</p>	30-Jun-22
-------	--	-----------

80. O	<p>I think that there are far too many properties proposed for the Bristol Zoo site, I am concerned about the surrounding buildings in Guthrie Road and Northcote Road, owned by Clifton College, being seriously overlooked, one of which is a boarding house for younger pupils, which currently overlooks the sea lion and penguin enclosure. I am also particularly concerned about the extra traffic generated by large demolition trucks and delivery vehicles, which will cause major disruption particularly at school pick up time and the associated risk with pupils crossing the roads, Clifton College is a very large campus and all our pupils need to cross roads around the back and sides of the zoo to access different buildings for lessons, we also have deliveries to our kitchens throughout the day and use a large fleet of mini buses which need access in and out of Guthrie Road all day. Another concern is the parking, some of our employees have parking permits and will find it difficult to use the permits that they pay for if the roads are filled with contractors vehicles. Clifton College is a residential college and so there are a vast amount of pupils on site 24/7, the college also operates six days a week, so this development will have a major impact on school life and safety. I object to this development as it currently is and would like to see less properties built and some type of viable scheme to address the safety and access issues I have raised.</p>	30-Jun-22
81. O	<p>I am very concerned about the impact the proposed development could have on the safety of the children attending Clifton College. 1. The loss of the Bristol Zoo car park for drop-off and pick-up will increase the traffic on the surrounding roads to dangerous levels. 2. The volume of construction traffic is likely to impact the children's ability to safely move between the school buildings. 3. The noise/building dust from a large development could have hugely negative implications for their wellbeing and learning. 4. Construction period safeguarding concerns - with a large volume of contractors coming and going, how will the children's privacy be protected? 4. Future safeguarding concerns - ensuring the new buildings from having direct sight of the playgrounds/into classrooms. 5. Reducing the available light into the classrooms/play areas could have a significant impact on the mental health of the children.</p>	01-Jul-22

82. O	<p>I appreciate the Zoo needs to do something with the site if it's not sustainable to run in it's current form and that housing is the obvious choice, however I'm concerned about the impacts on the school that neighbours the zoo on multiple sides. Firstly the amount of traffic/heavy vehicles that will be moving around through construction and after will make it difficult for the children, especially younger ages to move around the school safely. After construction has completed there will be a lot more cars looking for parking in the area given the number of proposed spaces meaning lots more cars moving around hunting for an on street space. Even if parking is provided for all residents then opening up new car entrances on Guthrie Road and Northcote Rd so close to the school will increase traffic in areas with children crossing regularly. Secondly I'm concerned around the number of homes that will be overlooking the school and the impacts this could have. Finally the construction itself and the noise generated will have an impact on teaching at the school and wellbeing of the pupils given close proximity.</p>	02-Jul-22
83. O	<p>While I understand the viability of the site as a Zoo is no longer there and funds are needed to relocate to the larger site, as a local resident and parent of a pupil at Clifton College, I object to the proposed plans for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The density of housing. This is too great and the design of the perimeter buildings are too tall. This will result into a loss of light onto the central public gardens proposed, neighbouring houses and Clifton College. There is also a safeguarding issue where buildings will overlook Clifton College classrooms, play areas and boarding houses. - The loss of opportunity for a community facility/visitor attraction for the benefit of Bristol City and beyond. The public gardens proposed will not be a go to destination. They are too embedded within the site, surrounded by overly tall buildings. The Community Conservation Centre feels like a token effort and unlikely to bring the same economic value to the area. - Increased traffic around the site. The construction and then cars used by residents and their visitors will have a negative impact on the safety of Clifton College pupils who travel on foot to/from school and between lessons walking around the perimeter all day into the evening, including weekends for Saturday school and boarders. - Architectural design bears no relation to the historical buildings within this Clifton conservation area. They will date really quickly. I believe the proposed plans will have a negative impact for the all of the above reasons and I strongly object in particular because of the impact on the safety and safeguarding of pupils at Clifton College. 	02-Jul-22

84. O	<p>I am concerned about this proposal for the following reasons: 1. The (road) safety of children attending Clifton college. This development backs on to both the prep and main school. At regular times of the day you will see lots of children crossing the roads to move between school buildings. They tend not to cross at the pedestrian crossing and take the shortest route across the road often without due consideration to the traffic. I am very concerned about the planned increased traffic around the site. There is also no parking for parents who pick up and drop off at the school which will further add to general congestion and safety issues. 2. There are 201 houses and 120 car parking spaces planned. The latest census information from Bristol Council (2011) showed the average car ownership was 1.04 cars per household. Other estimates suggest that this has risen to 1.39 in the south west over the last 10 years. Whilst cycling spaces have been provided it is naive to think this will not cause a problem on the surrounding roads and within the site itself. 3. The flats surrounding the perimeter of the development overlook boarding houses and are too close to the stunning and historic buildings of Clifton College. These proposed buildings will ruin the general area aesthetics of the area.</p>	02-Jul-22
85. O	<p>Disgusted that the council would do this right next to a large school, the traffic is already a problem and with all the machinery and noise will be added stress and disruption to the pupils. The building proposed is not even nice to look at. It will block natural light, be a strain on resources, take potential green space and all the added traffic and dangerous machinery will be a health and safety issue. Sounds like a greedy project to line someone's pockets and I like the majority object. It's not even planned to be affordable. No need to create more stress and grievance to a bottle necked area anyhow and right next to children. An accident waiting to happen too</p>	02-Jul-22
86. O	<p>I must object strongly to these proposals and ask you to consider carefully the what this is asking. I live locally to the zoo and commute into the area every day. The traffic flow around the local area is already a significant challenge and there are a large number crossing the roads at these times. Therefore, I have significant Highways safety concerns, especially along Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue. The zoo is a wonderful site and we are very sad to see it go, however it would such a shame to see this replaced by 201 homes and would not be of benefit to the local area. History would not look favourably on such a decision. It would ruin the appearance of the Conservation area and the character of such an important area would be lost. With a boarding school as its neighbour these homes would look over into an education establishment which is simply not appropriate. Please do not allow this proceed, it is not right. The city of Bristol is doing so much that is positive and this would not be in tune with that. The local infrastructure and environment cannot cope with this addition and the history of this special corner of our city would be lost. Thank you for considering my objection</p>	02-Jul-22

87. O	I write to object to this planning application on two grounds. Firstly, that the proposed boundary buildings, for example Blocks E and F, are much too tall. The Street Elevation of Clifton Down is particularly out of scale with the neighbouring buildings and streets. This area of Clifton is a Conservation Area and as such new building should either preserve, or enhance the area. These bleak blocks of housing that are noticeably taller than the surrounding houses fail on both these counts. Secondly, that the present buildings are architecturally intrinsically interesting, much of it Listed, but the proposed boundary dwellings show no link with this historic site. The proposed boundary dwellings (eg Block E1, E2) look like off-the-shelf designs, not site-specific buildings.	02-Jul-22
88. O	Raising concerns over highway safety on what is an already busy road particularly around school drop off/collection times.	03-Jul-22
89. O	Dear Sir or Madam, I am writing to you concerning the proposed development of the Zoo gardens in Clifton and would like to make the following points and a counter suggestion. For sake of brevity I am making them in point format. 1. The suggestion as described makes no mention of the soon to be ongoing development in the Zoo car park off College Road. So it is not just the 200 households as described in the Zoo gardens in the reference above, but the two developments together and considerably more households will add considerably more pressure on traffic congestion including parking. 2. There are two main schools in the area: Clifton High at the other end of College Road, and Clifton College (including a prep School and a nursery) along College, Guthrie and Northcote Roads. At present the area is primarily an educational and residential area, but if the developments were to go ahead, this delicate balance would be destroyed. 3. There will/would be considerable congestion at schools' dropping off and picking up times. The assumption is made that at least some of the residents of the proposed development would be dropping off picking up their own children at the same or similar times. There is already an unacceptable amount of illegal parking, occasional drive blocking and 'frustrated driving' at these times especially and the situation would become much worse. 4. The proposed height of the developments is clearly unacceptable especially for the residents of Northcote Road, and College Road, with an increased lack of sunlight. I am sure the residents will make this point and others more in depth and clarity than me, but I can sympathise with their predicament. 5. There seems to be little provision for residents' and guests' parking within the development. There would be more households than allocated parking spaces. At a recent meeting at Clifton High School, this issue was raised and the response from the floor was that peoples' behaviour will change. Gasps could be heard in the audience. There seems to have been no provision for social services (carers etc) attending the elderly and others. Never forget we are living with an ageing population. Much correspondence of this nature tends to be of a critical nature with few, if any alternative or positive suggestions. May I briefly make a couple of my own. 1. The development should consider having the same 'density' of proposed housing/residents as the surrounding area, Canynge Road, Northcote Road, The Avenue etc. Of course, provision for the fact that both Schools have extra land (playing fields etc) should be taken into account. 2. Architects might consider at looking at revolutionary parking techniques. (Singapore, for example where admittedly small cars were parked on large balconies adjacent to their owners' flats. One drove ones car into a lift and drove out onto the balcony of ones own flat). 3. The boundary of the development seems finite, perhaps guided by existing walls and	04-Jul-22

	<p>possible legal constraints. The development could be extended by for example incorporating the existing car park at the top of the Avenue/Northcote Road, enabling the developers to reduce, for example the height of the proposed properties along Northcote Road, College Road. In conclusion, I wish the Zoo every possible success in the future and its legacy in Bristol and beyond is an excellent one. However, the developer's proposals I have read and heard, as they stand, seek to undermine that legacy. In short the proposals if enacted unchallenged will be an example of levelling down, not levelling up. Thanking you for your kind attention. Kind regards Paul Bartlett. MA</p>	
90. O		04-Jul-22

91. O	<p>Dear Development Management Team Re: Bristol Zoo Gardens - Application 22/0737/F - Objection to Bristol Zoo Planning As a deeply concerned resident of 6 Northcote Rd and unofficial "Chair of the Northcote Rd Residents Association" I object to the above application on several grounds. I am not an expert but have tried to read and understand the 200 documents provided as best I can and their implications. If I have unwittingly misinterpreted anything I hope allowance will be made for this. I also hope there will be plenty more time to get independent expert advice and for more genuine dialogue and consideration to be given before any decisions are made. Key General Objections and Comments: 1. The sheer scale, length, height and form of the proposed perimeter residential blocks as it currently stands will significantly damage rather than preserve or enhance the character of this beautiful, historic Clifton Conservation Area in general, beyond the Zoo Gardens. It will dominate and intrude into the local neighbourhood in the adjacent streets. It will significantly reduce the sense of spaciousness and residential and visual amenity that is currently a feature of this area. It will significantly deprive people of the views of sky, sunlight and the glimpses of mature trees as they live work and play (the children in Clifton College) in the neighbourhood. 2. These same characteristics of scale, height and proximity have resulted in numerous breaches of BRE planning guidelines for reductions in daylight and sunlight within the proposal adversely affecting many of the directly neighbouring properties, residents and children. This is already causing many people significant stress and worry about a real deterioration in their living and home working environments. The scale and impact of the losses of daylight and sunlight for most of the neighbourhood adjacent to the Zoo has been significantly under-represented. The report provided by the Zoo's daylight and sunlight surveyors appears to include many significant errors and numerous omissions in the presentation of its data. However, if this scheme were approved, based on the data presented and contained within the reports it appears there will be significantly darker and gloomier winters for much of the neighbourhood and almost all of the adjacent residents. This is contrary to impressions implied by the surveyors' written conclusions. In an environment when we are increasingly understanding the importance of mental health and wellbeing for adults and children and we are aware of the vital importance of daylight and sunlight, surely we should not be choosing to breach BRE guidance in such an important aspect merely to aid additional profit for the few. 3. The scheme does not appear to be as environmentally positive as implied which is extremely disappointing for a proposal from the Zoo. 4. The suggestion that a few access entrances will make the gardens a wonderful unique community asset that many people beyond the neighbours will visit, seems overplayed in an area where the magnificent Clifton Downs are adjacent. 5. Although the scheme clearly satisfies the planning requirements for social housing there would seem to be very little social benefit that a 20% price reduction on price and 30% reduction on rents in c.40 Clifton properties (built over several years) which command almost twice the price of other properties in many other parts of the city. Thus, this development should not be considered as a major social benefit nor a reason to build an unnecessary large numbers of homes to maximise the profits for the Zoo if it is to the immediate and permanent detriment of the local community and the historic character of the conservation area. This is especially true when there are so many more and better located brownfield sites elsewhere that can build higher quantities of more affordable housing. 6. Even if permission were given for a reduced scale of lower level housing to a more environmentally suitable scale (perhaps 50%) one questions whether this really is the best use of such an absolutely unique heritage 12 acres</p>	04-Jul-22
-------	---	-----------

	<p>site. No matter how nicely it is dressed up, the greater likelihood is that this proposed development will simply become a pleasant, affluent housing estate with some nice gardens and a nod to social housing. It will not really do anything to help the less well off and most needy, nor will it contribute anything substantial to the housing shortage. It will perhaps provide c.60 new homes per year, (12 "affordable") with the first phase completed in 3-4 years' time. Neither will it provide much of significant benefit to remaining non-Clifton Bristol residents. Overall, the development seems much more likely to leave a permanent, unwanted and "visible legacy of darkness" for its neighbours depriving them of far more pleasure and amenity in the short and long term than it will ever return. Without being a planning expert but just by walking around the perimeter it is fairly easy to imagine that many of these problems and most of these objections might be resolved - quite simply, by reducing the existing heights of all the blocks of flats by two storeys around the entire perimeter. Of course, this would limit the potential profit from this particular development and this particular site. However, this profit can only be realised and is only significantly increased by the agreement for change of usage to allow the development of high value housing. This is why we very much hope and are relying on Bristol City Council to make the right long term decision for both Clifton and Bristol. Its role is not to maximise profit for developers. If it does make the right decision then it can help ensure the Zoo and its trustees do leave a legacy they can be proud of rather than a "dark legacy of resentment" to the Clifton Community in which the Zoo has resided for over 150 years. If this current application were approved the latter legacy would seem to be the more likely outcome. The Northcote residents have been very frustrated, disappointed and distressed that the zoo planning team have pursued this planning application with such apparent disregard for the clearly expressed concerns and constructive suggestions made during consultations with their neighbours. The Zoo team have produced a number of impressive professional documents in support of their proposal. However, these appear to provide a rather flattering gloss over the plan's defects and its limitations and impacts. The zoo has repeatedly made it clear to us that the planning application has been submitted with the intention of extracting the maximum potential value for the site, albeit within a significant number of constraints due to the special and unique historic characteristics of this site. This proposed plan demonstrates that intent very clearly. More Specific Detailed Objections and Comments: Breaches in BRE guidance for Daylight and Sunlight: Devla Patman Redler report The Zoo team's Savills surveyor has admitted that these surveys are something of a "dark art" so I thought I would look at these closely upon the advice of a professional planning consultant. It was pointed out that surveyors are unlikely to produce reports for their clients which suggest that the proposed scheme's viability is threatened as a result of breaches in the BRE guidance on light reductions. Disturbingly, there appear to be a significant number of clear errors and even large numbers of omissions in at least some of their tables of source data provided in their appendices. By using N/A in certain rows of their appendices they have omitted to show and include many dozens of windows that that experience adverse effects of greater than 20% reduction for the Vertical Sky Component and 20% reduction in the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours. Each of these 20% reductions in light represents a breach of BRE guidance. I estimate there are many dozens of errors and possibly hundreds of omissions. This has resulted in significantly incorrect percentages being quoted and I have not found the report to be impartially or fairly representative. All the errors and omissions seem to be in the favour of the development despite the many breaches of the BRE guidance with subsequent</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>widespread negative impacts on much of the neighbourhood. 6 Northcote Rd For example, at 6 Northcote Rd, First Floor where we live, the summary table only shows a reduction in VSC of greater than 20% on 1 window rather than for the 3 windows that the data clearly implies - if the calculations had been completed correctly. These 3 windows represent 100% of our most important living space as they are our prime living and working space 16 hours/day in a post Covid working from home environment. As far as we can envisage, we will actually lose almost all sight of the sky from the room and simply be looking from all parts of the room and beyond at a plain brick wall just 21 metres away. This wall will tower several metres above our windows and the skyline on this floor. This brick wall "feature/view" will intrude into and throughout all the key living spaces in our flat even including the kitchen. The data would also appear to indicate that we may lose more than 20% of our Annual Probable Sunlight from especially in the winter months when sunlight is scarce. However, this data is not highlighted in the report. The impact of such developments on our lives and wellbeing would be massively detrimental, especially as one of us is prone to SAD in winter. We don't really understand the NSL calculations so we can't comment usefully except to say that in light of the data and the presentation of what we have seen so far in this report we are deeply concerned and very distrustful. Elsewhere: Across the report we note numerous VSC errors and omissions: Table 10.2 6 Northcote Rd should indicate that 5 out of 17 windows (29.4%) have more than 20% reductions in VSC (failures) rather than 3 out of 17 failures (18%) as reported. Note this equates to a significant 63.3% error in favour of the proposal. 5 Northcote Rd indicates only 1 window out of 11 has more than 20% reductions in VSC (9%) when the data shows 4 failures (36.3%) 4 Northcote Rd indicates 1 out 11 windows (9%) fail when there are actually 3 failures (27.3%) 3 Northcote Rd indicates 4 out of 14 windows fail (28%) when there are actually 7 failures (50%) 2 Northcote Rd indicates 7 out of 15 windows (47%) when there are actually 8 failures (53%) 1 Northcote Rd indicates 8 out of 15 windows (53%) fail when there are actually 10 failures (71%) Pooles House indicates 17 out of 71 windows (24%) fail when there are actually 23 failures (32%) Everything appears to have been significantly (mis)represented in favour of the development - I have estimated 71 errors and as many of these houses are split into flats the percentage impacts of these losses can be very significant for different households. Annual Probable Sunlight Hours As far as I can see the tables in the appendix are full of N/A's which do not generally show the percentage sunlight reductions nor do they show the calculations for the amount of APSH lost across hundreds of windows Pt. 4.15 states: o Sunlight will be adversely affected if there are 0.8 times former sunlight hours during either period o The reduction in sunlight will over the whole year will be greater than 4% APSH Pt. 10. states: If the overall annual loss is greater than 4% of APSH, the room may appear, colder and less cheerful and pleasant. However, for the data provided for the Northcote Rd residential properties it would appear that over 95% of the windows will get a reduction in APSH greater than 4%. Over 90% of windows will get reductions of over 20% light in the winter months, some from existing low levels of light, especially the lower floor flats. This is a significant adverse impact for very many people which has not been highlighted in the surveyors' report The level of both errors and omissions in this report would appear to significantly undermine the accuracy and validity of the numbers quoted and potentially, the conclusions about the adverse impacts of this development. If the same level of omissions or errors is true across the whole report, across all the properties it appears to massively underplay the impacts of the loss of daylight and sunlight on the direct neighbouring communities to the Zoo's perimeter. The</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Townscape and Visual Assessment The proposed development is in a wonderful, unique and historic conservation area where the guidance states that: See Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, section 72, paragraph (1)</p> <p>72General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.</p> <p>(1)In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any [F1functions under or by virtue of] any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Much has been done within the inevitable constraints of the site itself within the walls to preserve the main beautiful features as far as possible - given the desire to build hundreds of housing units! Unfortunately, this has resulted in the housing being pushed to the perimeter wall. Here, it is clear that in many cases the net effect is the opposite of preserving or enhancing the conservation area within which the Zoo sits. The biggest problem seems to be the sheer scale, length height and form of the structures in such close proximity to the neighbouring residents and streets. While some of the structures might work in some places as small infills in a district, this entire development is on a very different scale. i) There is almost 600 metres of a continuous modern blocks flats which is entirely out of character with the conservation area. The combination of height, continuity and proximity to the wall especially on the narrower streets such as Northcote Rd will overpower and dominate the neighbourhood like nothing else in Clifton. While the properties are claimed to enhance the sense of a "walled garden", the fact they tower 50 - 60 feet above the wall in many places creates more of a sense of a "walled city or fortress". Some have called it Stalinesque. In general, 2-4metre walls with a one or two storey storey structure previously behind them (not always solid but see through) now have 4 or 5 storey buildings proposed - rising up to 60 feet higher than before. ii) The flat roofs do not complement the pitched roofs of the Clifton roofscape but obscure them in places. In some cases, they also bring the tops of the buildings closer to the street and their neighbours creating a more domineering impact. iii) The height and proximity to the streets and other properties obscures the sky, plus key glimpses of mature trees and the historic buildings such as Clifton College which are so much part of the character of this historic neighbourhood. This is especially true on the South end of Northcote Rd where residents live and work and children study and play and walk to and from classes. It also clearly applies to views from Guthrie Rd. iv) The level of loss of sky and sunlight loss in winter for the hundreds of people who walk along Northcote Rd every day and live or work or play in many of these neighbouring properties will be substantial. It will create even longer darker winters that will surely be to the detriment of the hundreds of people affected, just when we are all at our most vulnerable. It is noticeable that the proposal is very sparse on images at street level. These would give a much better sense of what the potential impact of the proposed development would be. Many pictures are plans, aerial photos or simply, rather flattering sketches. A walk around the perimeter looking up easily shows the difference. Mostly, it is very hard to see how the proposal can be said to be "preserving the character" let alone "enhancing it". Elsewhere in Clifton, where buildings of comparable heights exist they are rarely directly opposite, so close to each other or so close to the pavements or thoroughfares. They are either at least 28 - 35 metres away from each other and set back from the pavements or they have many "look throughs". These elements help sustain and create a sense of spaciousness and sky that characterise the neighbourhood. The report summary Pt. 8.9 clearly states that the development will "increase the effect of urban closure," "provide increased visual closure of the local street views" and "substantial adverse</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>effects" for "private residential properties on Northcote Rd." Apart from the improvements of replacing some low quality buildings at the top of Northcote Rd, the only beneficial effects acknowledged in the report appear to be the few glimpsed views into the site through the proposed new access points. At best, these "positive" effects have been acknowledged as slight. The larger number of adverse effects in the report are either judged as moderate or substantial. The photos 37 -47 in the appendix provided in support of this judgment regarding the level of adverse effects experienced really do not give any accurate sense or feeling of the adverse impacts of this development - which are a lot more powerful than implied. The report suggests the adverse impact for Northcote Rd is moderate. Maybe this is partly because it states that this is a "strongly urban environment". However, despite some urban features especially at the North end this categorisation does not seem so true at the South end where the Victorian terraces and residential buildings are. Photo 42 does show that the lower end of Northcote Rd feels more suburban rather than urban as described in the report. This photo also shows that at least 30% of the mature greenery viewed from this location would be obscured by the proposed development - which is obviously an adverse impact. Clifton is a spacious suburb and the high levels of sky and visibility and mature trees visible throughout. These characteristics help it retain this spacious feeling even when more urban features are occasionally present. The increased height of the buildings and greatly increased sense of closure along Northcote Rd especially at the southern end of Northcote Rd will completely destroy this sense of suburban spaciousness. The report does however acknowledge the severe adverse impact and high sensitivity of the scheme for the residents of Northcote Rd at the South end. This makes it all the more surprising and disappointing that the proposal was not adapted in this respect, especially given the constructive suggestions made by the residents during the consultations for some appropriate height reductions and cut throughs. These were ignored, much to our considerable distress and frustration. Environmental Concerns I am not an environmental expert but how likely is it really that several years of building works and demolition, uprooting over 100 mature trees, introducing 200 new homes, 400 new permanent residents plus 100+ cars is actually going to support or enhance the environment? I see the Tree Forum in a public comment has suggested that the Zoo's claim of an improvement in its sustainability is wrong and that there will indeed be a significant deterioration. I do not understand how such a unique 12 acres site, relatively undisturbed/stable for so long with so many mature and unique trees and vegetation habitats can be considered appropriate to redevelop in this way on this scale for so little housing and social benefit</p> <p>Conclusions It is understandable that the trustees of the Zoo and their team of experts may feel they need to put in as strong a plan as possible so that they can maximise the potential profit for the site and so that feel confident that they are not at risk of being sued for not fulfilling their fiduciary duties. However, the scale of this scheme proposed and the apparent disregard of almost all the valid major concerns expressed by the neighbourhood during consultations has been enormously disappointing and distressing. The omission of helpful images at ground level which could have been produced plus the volumes of omissions and errors in data presented need to be rectified and clearly presented and made available for all to see and understand. For a site of this size the detrimental impacts need to be better explained and understood. I believe the Council might consider an independent review or new reports for these items. If this current proposed scheme were approved, I believe the Zoo's legacy would be far from what it desires. While doing very little to address the crisis of affordable housing, the proposal</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>currently risks leaving an embittered darkened neighbourhood permanently diminished in many of its unique and precious qualities, surrounding quite a posh housing estate. The profit from approving the change of usage and this scheme would clearly benefit the zoo and the developers by millions of pounds. However, it would be at the direct expense of Clifton which would suffer years of massive disruption as the site was transformed for such a large project plus longer term enduring negative impacts of something that so clearly fails to preserve and enhance the character of the area in many important respects. Surely, if housing has to be approved, at the very least a much "lower rise" solution is required. This would benefit the internal zoo site residents as well as the entire neighbourhood. Alternatively, could the zoo and the Council give something like the OurWorld proposal a better consideration for a more fitting and suitable legacy for the benefit of the whole of Bristol? If this change of usage and the scale of this residential development were to be allowed by Bristol City Council now, this could be a massive, opportunity lost for this historic unique site, forever. This would appear to be for the sake of a few expensive dwellings benefiting a few hundred mostly quite privileged and affluent people, plus some profit for the property developers and some extra "windfall" millions which are desired but not actually required by the Zoo - which is a charitable trust. All of this would be at the expense of Clifton, its unique and outstandingly beautiful neighbourhood and conservation area and of no significant benefit to the remainder of Bristol. We all understand the reason for the loss of the Zoo which is a very sad loss for the city and the neighbourhood. It has brought much life and vitality and happy memories to so many for over hundred years and will be greatly missed. Surely, we all deserve something more fitting in its memory, than a large, overbearing, "rather posh housing estate".</p>	
--	---	--

92. O	<p>Dear Matthew As you are the Case Officer for the above, I am writing to ask for your advice and help regarding a number of matters concerning the Bristol Zoo Planning Application Ref. 22/02737/F and in particular, I have questions regarding the processes likely to be involved from now. I am a resident of 6 Northcote Rd and Chair of the Northcote Rd Residents Association. You will have seen various objections, concerns and fears expressed from different Northcote Rd residents, who are almost certainly the Zoo's residential neighbours potentially most adversely affected by the proposed development. This was acknowledged in the townscape assessment and to us personally, by the Zoo planning team. Our Primary Concerns Our concerns have been primarily based on the potentially overpowering, overbearing, overshadowing and intrusive impacts of the immediately adjacent proposed blocks of flats planned so high and so close to us all. In our particular part of the neighbourhood at the bottom end of Northcote Rd, the incongruence of the design and its scale and potential adverse impacts on the townscape in an historic conservation area plus the significant losses of daylight and sunlight, really are much larger than the planning application and some of its supporting documents imply. There is nowhere in this part of Clifton where such large-scale block of continuous modern housing development exists directly opposite other housing in such close proximity. We have been particularly concerned by the quality, limitations and implications of two documents supplied in the application: 1. The daylight and sunlight survey: acknowledged privately as a "dark art" by Geraint Jones the Savills surveyor, this was full of inaccuracies, with dozens of omissions and seemed utterly misrepresentative of the effects of the development. Some more but not complete detail about the levels of omissions and inaccuracy is contained in my personal, previously submitted objection. 2. The townscape and visual impact assessment: where the suggestion that this was all an urban rather than suburban landscape (only really true for some parts of the wall) and a few select photos in the appendix gave no impression at all of the impacts of the scale of this development in reality as experienced at ground level. For example, appendix photo 45 seems to imply that two mature trees and a significant amount of sky will not be obscured by the 5 storeys intended block, which they surely will be. Indeed, the overall planning application is very light in demonstrating this real ground and street level visual impact - using just a couple of highly selective sketches. This seems surprising for the most major development in Clifton for decades where surely everyone should be getting a much fuller and proper representation of the proposed outcome. Given the huge negative impact of these current planning designs on what I believe you call the "residential and visual amenities" of the residents of Northcote Rd, we are all very worried that decisions are now going to be made based on what we believe to be either inaccurate, substandard, biased or misrepresentative documents. And, although we know that loss of private views and property price losses are of no relevance to planning decisions, for some of us the potential adverse impacts in the current proposal are genuinely heart breaking. If implemented, they would seriously diminish the quality of our lives and our living. This would be true if we stay or if we leave after having incurred the costs of moving and the devaluations of our properties Our Questions We are exceptionally keen to know that the planning process will allow our concerns and our alternative viewpoints and/or documents to be properly considered. This is especially so given the undoubted potential scale of damage to our mental and financial wellbeing from these current plans. However, we freely admit we do not know how best to ensure this can happen. Are you able to advise us please? We have become increasingly worried partly because of what everyone feels has been a "sham tick box neighbourhood consultation" process by</p>	04-Jul-22
-------	---	-----------

	<p>the Zoo's team and partly because some of the documents commissioned by them seem biased and misrepresentative - perhaps unsurprisingly. In their clear pursuit for maximum profit, the Zoo planning team repeatedly seem to have shown almost complete disregard for the concerns expressed by neighbours on all sides of the Zoo including the West Car Park and Clifton College. If possible, we would like to know the following please: i) What is the process from here on in and where or how do we at Northcote Rd get our concerns properly explored? ii) What happens on the Monday 12th September determination date/what is the process? iii) What is likely to happen or could happen after this date? iv) Is there anything we could do privately in advance that would help/or we could do afterwards? v) Will there be another independent light survey commissioned? vi) Will there be a requirement to model ground level and street views of the development from inside and outside the zoo? Will they be independent? If so, who will pay for them? vii) Would it make sense for the neighbours to commission some of these services and if so, by when would they now be needed? Could we be given access to some of the Zoo's team data/models already built to help do this? viii) Would it be helpful to submit some more illustrative pictures and corrected photographs of the visual impact at ground and street level even if not terribly sophisticated? Would it be helpful to submit these with some constructive suggestions? ix) Would it be possible for you or a representative of the Planning Committee to meet briefly with us and literally see things from our points of view? And if so, when? (A late afternoon as the sun drops is quite illuminating!) In our experience, once people have seen the current heights of the proposed development in relation to the existing trees and buildings on Northcote Rd a short 5 minutes' walk is sufficient to reasonably visualise how (shockingly) overbearing the impact would be. This is all due to the combination of the proposed building heights and their proximity to the street. It is immediately obvious that huge amounts of sky and practically all glimpses of mature trees and of the historic buildings, plus almost all the late afternoon sunshine will be obliterated. It is these characteristics that give this part of the neighbourhood its character and keep it feeling suburban and spacious, despite some low-level urban features being present. Once these features or characteristics are lost, the Northcote Rd area becomes much more urban, more enclosed and quite a lot darker for much of the afternoon and early evening. Some of these elements were slightly acknowledged but in a very understated way in the townscape assessment.. In our personal instance at 6 Northcote Rd, the proposed outlook changes from looking at broad skies and trees stretching almost a mile away to simply looking at a 50ft -60 ft high brick wall just 66 feet away, with barely a glimpse of sky from any window - intruding and dominating all our key living and working spaces. To visualise this potential change is truly shocking and deeply dispiriting. It is a genuinely distressing experience I now have many times each day, every day since the planning application was submitted - after the last consultation we were all shocked by the absence of any fundamental changes. I would really welcome an opportunity for you to visit us so that you can so simply and easily visualise all this. The adverse impact here at this end of Northcote Rd is evidently many times worse and much more instantly visible than that of the West Car Park. Yet, if there were a meaningful conversation with the neighbours we feel these particular concerns might be reasonably addressed with some reductions in heights and scale or increases in distance in the right places. The Northcote Rd residents are not inherently opposed to plans for housing. However, we have become very upset by the Zoo's approach which has come across as feigning interest, feigning sincerity and feigning concern. They have proposed a scheme with almost complete disregard for</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>our clearly expressed key concerns and constructive suggestions and which is directly and very evidently at the significant expense of our own mental and financial wellbeing. The current application clearly seeks to maximise their profit with complete disregard and at huge direct emotional and financial costs to their direct neighbours. (They can only get an extra million pounds because we, collectively, lose a million pounds so to speak!). While we appreciate both the Zoo's needs for money and Bristol's needs for housing it is surely not the responsibility of the Council to maximise the profits for the Zoo, to the clear disadvantage of the existing neighbouring community. The legacy the Zoo's team are proposing to leave Clifton after 186 years does not currently appear to be either an inspiring or a happy one for its erstwhile neighbours. We are now very much hoping and relying on the Planning Committee to help address this matter fairly - obviously, with full regard to planning law and planning guidelines. We understand there are many stakeholders and demands including present housing needs and Zoo trustees to be taken into account. As the Northcote Rd residents who are directly adjacent, we have been acknowledged as the most adversely affected of the residential neighbours. We simply cannot see how the current plans for our neighbourhood can reasonably be argued to preserve and enhance the neighbourhood's character. More detailed examination and understanding of the significant reductions in daylight and sunlight plus the obliteration of almost all views of historic buildings and trees from within the terrace and at street level show the development would significantly damage the neighbourhood's character for us all and massively diminish the quality of very many more lives at our end of the development than it will ever enhance. We would like to be reassured we will be given a proper and fair chance of proper representation regarding our expressed concerns and we would very much like to understand how best we might achieve it. Any advice you can give will be greatly appreciated. Please do forgive the length of this letter. I know things are slow in August but given the pending September 12th determination date I would greatly appreciate your prompt acknowledgment of your receipt of this and welcome your response and advice as soon as possible, please. Many thanks and best regards</p>	
--	---	--

93. O	<p>As a resident of Northcote Road, I wrote in July 2022 and then again in November 2022 to outline some of my objections to Bristol Zoo's proposals for building large residential buildings on the main Zoo site. Since then our Northcote Road Residents' Association has received the final report from the professional organisation which we commissioned to carry out a light survey - outlining the light issues which would affect all eight of the houses in our road - caused by the planned building of the blocks of flats in such a very close proximity to our houses. You are most likely aware that the Zoo planners do accept that the houses in Northcote Road would be the most seriously affected by the new buildings so I hope that you will be making special note of the objections brought forward by Northcote Road residents. It is clear that the enormous height and form of the proposed buildings will have a more overbearing impact than I had anticipated. Despite some assurances given to us during several Zoom meetings with the planners, no significant adjustments have been made from the original plans - our suggestions have been disregarded. It is now clear that the proposed buildings will totally change the environment of all the dwellings here. Top floors will lose their views completely. The main living room in my flat, which I have long claimed to have one of the best views in Bristol, will lose this view completely as well as a significant amount of sunlight during the day. Flats and floors lower down within all six houses in Northcote Road will lose much more daylight of course. All of us living in this road are likely to experience a feeling of being enclosed by these buildings. I am not objecting to the principle of new housing being built on the main Zoo site (though I am very much more in sympathy with the "Save Bristol Zoo Gardens" campaign) - it is principally the height of the buildings proposed all round the perimeter which I object to. I should add that the actual loss of light and views to our homes has only become clear when I looked at the new visualisations that the Northcote Road Residents Association have commissioned. The Zoo's published images for what Northcote Road would look like are seriously misleading. In general, it is clear that more and more people living in Clifton, as they find out about the Zoo's plans, are realising that that the proposed flats would be totally unsympathetic and out of character with being placed in a Conservation Area. I urge you to reject these plans.</p>	04-Jul-22
-------	---	-----------

94. O	<p>I wrote on July 4th 2022 to object strongly to Bristol Zoo's proposals for building large residential buildings on the main Zoo site. I write as a resident of Northcote Road, immediately adjacent to some of the enormous blocks of flats being proposed. Since my last letter, revised proposals have been submitted by the Zoo. My original criticisms remain but I would like to make some additional comments. The Zoo has made the most minor and cosmetic of adjustments to their plans and these revised plans just do not address (at all) the concerns raised by myself and my neighbours. The plans for high density and totally inappropriately tall blocks of flats remain and the proposed development is quite clearly totally inappropriate for this conservation area. The visualisations commissioned by one of my neighbours show clearly the completely overwhelming impact the buildings will have. It is no exaggeration to say that they will have a devastating impact on the totality of the local environment - and not just where I live in Northcote Road. The massive block housing developments proposed - very close to the adjacent roads (some of which are very narrow) - are totally out of character with the environment of this part of Clifton. A few particular points arising out of comments made recently on the planning website (Summary of Design Changes and Revised Documents): - The planners have stated that the buildings opposite Clifton College are "in keeping with the local character". Having lived and worked within the buildings of Clifton College for 34 years, I assert that this statement is very wide of the mark. - I dispute the statement that "a traffic analysis demonstrates that the proposed development would generate less traffic than the average daily traffic associated with Bristol Zoo and would cause a reduction in local on-street parking". I have observed local traffic and parking in the area (Northcote, Guthrie and College Roads) for over 40 years (at all times of day) and, knowing the number of units of accommodation proposed and about the limited amount of parking which will be provided on site, I cannot accept this statement. - It is also stated that the noise during the construction phase is not being considered as part of the Noise Impact Assessment. I would suggest that it is vital that consideration of the noise impact during construction should be included as this will be of huge importance to local residents over a period of, I estimate, 5 years of clearing the site and construction of new buildings. The noise and general impact of such a large construction site - in very close proximity to many living spaces - is likely to be enormous and, I predict, is very likely to have a seriously adverse effect on the mental wellbeing of local residents, myself included. Finally, I would like to express great concern about the future of the Zoo's Education Centre (next to the Clifton College Music School). This was a new build just a few years ago and, as I have seen myself, it is a "state of the art" building able to be used for all kinds of educational purposes. As I walk past it each day, I can see that it is, thankfully, still being used. However, the proposed building plans have one of the large residential blocks in the place where the education centre now sits. This obviously means that the Education Centre will be demolished. This is nothing short of criminal - to destroy such a new and useful facility; a terrible waste of resources. I know that the Zoo plans to build a new Education facility at The Wild Place but this will cost a great deal of money and, being much further from the centre of Bristol, make it more difficult and costly for students to reach. This - and the elimination of the wonderful herbaceous border - are just two examples of the needless destruction that will take place if the Zoo's plans are allowed to go ahead. I urge you to reject these plans</p>	04-Jul-22
95. O		04-Jul-22

96. O	<p>As neighbours and members of the nearby school community, we are compelled to lodge our Objection to the Bristol Zoo Redevelopment scheme. While we are wary of change in the current status quo and community harmony, as well as expected construction inconvenience, we do accept that change is inevitable. However, we strongly object to the scheme as it stands. We have reviewed the scheme in considerable detail given the importance it has on the community around us. It is our opinion that the current proposal is superficial, paying bare lip service to the various stakeholder needs. It has clearly not paid due consideration to the effect that the construction of 200 dwellings will have to the complex tapestry of the surrounding area. Among many issues we have with the current proposal, our key objections are as follows: 1) Impact of road safety on surrounding area. Currently the area around College Road/ Guthrie Road/ The Avenue is relatively low density in terms of traffic, with most drivers requiring access only for the school and therefore considerate and sympathetic to the safety needs of students who are walking from different parts of the school. The proposed access points in the scheme cut through all of these roads and introduce traffic from 200 dwellings (including private cars and visitors to all of these homes, from service providers, delivery men etc) into an area where road safety is absolutely imperative. The scheme provides only 100 carparks which we believe grossly underestimates the true parking needs of a development of this size. The overflow parking will then flow through to nearby access roads thereby further jeopardising traffic and road safety. 2) Structures oppressive. The high buildings (5 storeys significantly higher than average nearby home) built on the perimeter of the site present an oppressive eyesore, ruining the open skyline of the area and preventing free flow of light. It also introduces privacy issues versus existing residential and school buildings that will be then looked into. Clifton is a beautiful, low density living environment. It commands a premium over nearby communities exactly because of serene and harmonious environment it offers residents. The sheer size of this proposal stands at odds with the architectural and community needs of the area. There is inadequate infrastructure to support 200 new dwellings and the proponents of the proposal has failed to think through the full impact of what they have submitted. Their proposal fails to inspire any confidence that they have deeply considered the complex range of competing needs in the area and are committed to ensure the continued harmonious of life for everyone around the area. We therefore strongly object to the current proposal.</p>	04-Jul-22
97. S	<p>Having lived and worked in Clifton for many years I am writing in support of the planning application for the redevelopment of the Zoo site to provide a residential development with associated amenities. It provides the city with much needed housing, including provision of affordable housing. Furthermore the development is sensitive to and protects the history and landscape value of the site. Public access will be retained and a conservation base for the Clifton and Durdham Downs will be provided at the current main entrance. This is a carefully planned and designed development which has my support.</p>	04-Jul-22

98. O	<p>Having read the updated design documents there are no material changes to alter such an inappropriate development for the site, in particular the over sized "blocks" of flats, so there is still some obvious areas where significant changes and improvements must be made. Key issues; - Height of development not in keeping with surrounding buildings & conservation area - Loss of a unique amenity for the whole of Bristol in a unique and irreplaceable site/area - New buildings because of significant height increase will overlook into school areas - New buildings because of significant height increase will mean loss of light to existing properties - Negative visual impact on existing buildings close by of significant architectural appeal - Road safety and traffic impact on what are already congested small city streets (all of which surrounding the site are in effect single track), with significant pedestrian use by school children - Allowance of public traffic/cars onto the site for the first time in its history seems wholly inappropriate - Limited access to the site/gardens for the public Bristol & the Zoo should be leaving a far better legacy on a site that has sustained them for 200 years - the current scheme's approach appears to be simply squeeze as many units on the site that they can get away with, rather than leaving a legacy that is appropriate for both Bristol, Clifton and the Zoo. Whilst I understand and support the need for more new homes especially affordable in our city, adding 201 homes is very minor. Also I note 80% of the properties proposed do not need to be "affordable" so I'm sure will some be the most expensive properties in Bristol in terms of price per square foot - therefore I believe this scheme in its current form is wholly inappropriate and I hope will be refused until a scheme is proposed that befits this wonderful site and our city. We will only get one chance at getting this development right so please reject this scheme in its current form!</p>	04-Jul-22
-------	---	-----------

99. O	<p>Having read the design documents as well as comments made by others, there are some obvious areas where significant changes and improvements must be made. Key issues; - Height of development not in keeping with surrounding buildings & conservation area - Loss of a unique amenity for the whole of Bristol in a unique and irreplaceable site/area - New buildings because of significant height increase will overlook into school areas - New buildings because of significant height increase will mean loss of light to existing properties - Negative visual impact on existing buildings close by of significant architectural appeal - Road safety and traffic impact on what are already congested small city streets (all of which surrounding the site are in effect single track), with significant pedestrian use by school children - Allowance of public traffic/cars onto the site for the first time in its history seems wholly inappropriate Bristol & the Zoo should be leaving a far better legacy on a site that has sustained them for 200 years - the current scheme's approach appears to be simply squeeze as many units on the site that they can get away with, rather than leaving a legacy that is appropriate for both Bristol, Clifton and the Zoo. Whilst I understand and support the need for more new homes especially affordable in our city, adding 201 homes is very minor. Also I note 80% of the properties proposed do not need to be "affordable" so I'm sure will some be the most expensive properties in Bristol in terms of price per square foot - therefore I believe this scheme in its current form is wholly inappropriate and I hope will be refused until a scheme is proposed that befits this wonderful site and our city. We will only get one chance at getting this development right so please reject this scheme in its current form!</p>	04-Jul-22
100.	<p>This proposal has my full support and looks to be exactly what is needed in this area to support the ever growing need for new housing in Bristol. Looking at the designs I am excited to see that the gardens will remain open and become free to visit. As a local resident this will be a major draw for me and I am pleased that so much work has been done to retain this space as a biodiverse haven for wildlife. The buildings themselves look fine too. I've read several comments here bemoaning them but frankly I think that they look fun and functional. The main focus should be, in my opinion, on the gardens themselves - not the buildings and so creating a spectacle with the buildings was not the right direction to go. My only hope is that the final buildings are made from a material that fits in with the surrounding architecture in terms of it's colour - e.g. to match the light coloured stonework found in this part of the UK. I think that the zoo have done a brilliant job with these proposals and want to express that there are many in the local area that feel the same way. We understand the need for them to move up to Wild Place and wish them every success in the future.</p>	04-Jul-22
101.	<p>I fully object to this application. There are many safety issues in respect of vehicular conflicts with dropping and picking up children from neighbouring school. More housing means many more cars in this area causing environmental issues. The proposed buildings are not in keeping with this conservation area.</p>	04-Jul-22

102.	<p>Key issues, Loss of light. Height of proposed complex that will negatively impact on nearby buildings. The character of this area will be dramatically and negatively affected. Five years of building work will cause immense disturbance and pollution to nearby surrounding areas. My family and I live in a basement flat on Northcote road. To have this complex built on our doorstep will impact our lives negatively in practical and emotional ways. Our kitchen which is our main living/working area looks out on to a well tended courtyard and above that is Northcote road. We do not have a huge amount of light but we do have some open sky. This proposed complex will dramatically change our view of that open sky to one of concrete blocks. Our courtyard is used throughout the spring and summer months as an extension of our living space. This proposal would mean being overlooked by looming blocks and the loss of light would almost certainly affect what is now a mini eco system of plant life and habitats to countless insects. I cordially invite anyone from the planning committee to join me for a cup of tea or glass of wine in my courtyard to see for themselves the impact that these proposed buildings would have. My son's bedroom is the ground floor of the building which looks directly onto the pavement of Northcote road. Partial shutters keep this room private but with enough light. The proposed buildings would overlook his room and are so high it would mean an almost complete exclusion of day light and take away his privacy. Many people live in Clifton because of the atmosphere that beautiful Victorian and Georgian houses create. More often than not this means apartment living with all the minor inconveniences that come with converted flats. Building this amount of new blocks in the middle of a conservation area full of victorian villas and houses shows a disappointing lack of regard for the character of Clifton. Five years of building work on this scale would create huge amounts of pollution for residents, the natural environment and more especially, children. Cement is one of the worst pollutants in the world in terms of health and the environment. This is a terrible legacy for the zoo to leave behind.</p>	04-Jul-22
103.		05-Jul-22
104.		05-Jul-22

105.	<p>It is acknowledged that the re-use and re-development of a facility that was originally developed and evolved over many years for a specific use is challenging. However, that does not mean that the scheme as proposed is acceptable. There is significant concern with the proposed quantum and scale of development, the poor quality of the architecture, the site layout and the adverse harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of this part of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings. This is a homogeneous scheme that does not respond to the architectural character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area, which is predominantly large detached and semi-detached villas alongside imposing educational buildings situated within a verdant landscape and tree-lined avenues. The scale of development within the southern end of the site would be over intensive with a consequential poor relationship with the adjacent School and its listed buildings. The north building at 6 storeys is an unrelenting monolithic block that does not respond to the character and appearance of the area. The relationship between the existing listed buildings and the scale and location of proposed development is extremely poor, in particular, the Bear Pit would be overly dominated by new development. There are concerns with the impact on retained green infrastructure. Particularly with regard to the buildability of the quantum of development whilst retaining the specified trees. There are significant questions over the long term maintenance of the proposed public space. The gardens are a locally listed heritage asset. The Grand Terrace is a defining feature of the gardens and is not worthy of being used as a deliveries and service route. The circular road to access houses needs to be rethought. There is concern that there will be insufficient car parking provision, which will result in the reality of extensive areas of on street parking throughout the site. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would neither sustain nor enhance the significance of relevant heritage assets including the Conservation Area and listed buildings within and without the site. It would provide insufficient substantial public benefit to outweigh the substantial harm caused by the impact of such a poor scheme on the relevant heritage assets. It is not considered that this scale of development can be justified in a heritage context. Moreover, it accords with neither the relevant Local Plan heritage policies nor the requirements of the NPPF and cannot be supported.</p>	05-Jul-22
106.	<p>An interesting historically important site kept futureproofed with sustainability and accessibility in mind enabling a world leading zoo to thrive and survive aiding conservation and education.</p>	05-Jul-22

107.	<p>I wish to lodge in the strongest terms my objections to the proposed development of the Zoo and its large gardens. The proposals will transform this unique and tranquil area, which is close to so many historical and attractive buildings into a mundane, dreary and unappealing neighbourhood so similar to other developments throughout the country. The area of Clifton has been designated a Conservation Area precisely for that reason - to protect it from developments like the one being proposed, so that it can remain unique. The continuance of Clifton as an area of architectural beauty is at a grave risk of being ruined after a long period in which local residents, and with the support of the town planners had taken steps to preserve its existence. The scale of the buildings as well as the modern style will dominate and instantly spoil the entire area and will especially dominate the properties in Northcote Road, College Road and Guthrie Road and the architectural beauty of the buildings of Clifton College. The building of houses within the zoo gardens will be detrimental to the open feeling that the gardens currently enjoy. Development, if any, should be restricted to the conversion and conservation of existing buildings in order to preserve the character of the gardens. Furthermore, the 'planting' of a densely populated area will inevitably lead to even more pressure for residents, the staff of Clifton College and the staff and patients at the nearby Pembroke Road surgery in competing for parking spaces with the residents and visitors to the new development. The parking situation will only be exacerbated with the development of the Zoo's West Car Park which is also being overdeveloped. The College uses the area outside the Zoo in Guthrie Road for coaches on a daily basis to transport students to their sports grounds. Presumably this will no longer be possible if the development proceeds.</p>	05-Jul-22
108.	<p>I live in Clifton and am a Zoo shareholder. From 2000 to 2005 I was chairman of the trustees of Bristol Zoo. I support the Zoo's proposal to redevelop it's Clifton site to include residential units, in order to facilitate the Zoo's transfer to a much larger site at the Hollywood Tower Estate, which borders Junction 17 of the M5 motorway.</p>	05-Jul-22
109.	<p>This would heavily impact the safety of the children of Clifton College.</p>	05-Jul-22
110.	<p>My objections to the planning application 22/02737/F are in relation to the impact on Clifton College and Local residents: Highways safety concerns, in particular concerns in relation to the potential for vehicular conflicts with school drop offs/pick ups and with the movement of children along Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue; Concerns around the potential for overlooking into the school grounds and buildings; Impacts on the setting of school buildings which comprise important heritage assets as well as impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; Any daylight/sunlight impacts on school buildings; Concerns around how construction would be managed and any impacts this may have on the operation of the school.</p>	05-Jul-22

111.	<p>I note that most of the support for this application comes from those who do not live within close proximity of the Zoo, and are therefore not directly affected by these proposals. As a resident of Northcote Road, I am one of very few residents whose immediate living environment will be changed for the worse should the development go ahead as proposed. Living on the ground and lower ground / basement floors, the light entering my property and the general visual amenity will be badly compromised by buildings (E2 and E3). These two disproportionately large and close blocks represent a very small proportion of the total scheme, which the Zoo and its architects could have easily adjusted - and could still - to avoid blighting the homes of us neighbours in Northcote Road. These would be new, oversized constructions looming over the street and our properties, and changing the character of the only length of Northcote Road which is currently open and 'airy' and which houses residents. The lego-brick, squared-off, monolithic design of these blocks, the lack of detail and finesse in their appearance, the overwhelming impression of blank, flat, monotonous facades with dead-eyed windows - all of this would completely alter the feel and atmosphere of what is at present a neighbourhood with architectural interest and variety and character on a human scale, and with natural greenery visible from outside the Zoo. Such a precious, unique site in this beautiful, highly valued and high-profile area of Bristol and the South West should be able to be enhanced, not degraded, by any new development. Since the second World War, too many poor quality, shoddily designed, crassly ill-suited and inappropriately located buildings have gone up in Clifton, as in so many parts of Bristol. There were perhaps understandable reasons for some of them, but there are no good reasons to contemplate the imposition of crude and unimaginative architecture, in this day and age and in a location where housing commands such premium prices, and when the Zoo's management promised faithfully to leave local residents, and indeed all Bristolians, a worthy legacy. What is proposed would, unaltered, certainly not offer that.</p>	06-Jul-22
112.		06-Jul-22
113.	<p>The revised plans have done nothing to improve the overall hideous size and appearance of this proposed development. The huge blocks of flats on the perimeter of the site are just not in keeping with the conservation area that the zoo has been part of. No consideration has been given to the affect these blocks of flats will have on existing adjacent properties . My original objection of the 6th July 2022 still stands.</p>	06-Jul-22

114.	I am objecting to the proposed redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens for the following reasons 1 An unacceptable number of over 200 residential units in a relatively small site putting strain on local service provision 2 Rediculously high apartment blocks on all of the zoo site boundaries affecting the character of the conservation area and both light and privacy issues to properties adjacent to the zoo site 3 Insufficient parking provision on the site for the number of dwellings which will affect the neighbourhood despite the zoo's assurances 4 The planned loss of a number of mature tree specimens which despite new planting will take 50 plus years to replace 5 Increased background noise from the planned extensive use of heat pumps 6 The zoo says it cares so much for the environment and the animals in it . What about the humans that have to live with the environment that they leave as their legacy ?!	06-Jul-22
115.	This sounds a wonderful plan for Clifton. It will add much needed housing and benefit for local people. I support this application in every way. The Zoo will continue at the Wild Place project and will be a bigger and better Zoo for Bristol	06-Jul-22
116.	Long term economical affects of replacing culture with residences means a temporary gain for property owners at the cost of future generations who inherit what is left of local industry. Local communities will become even more divided, closing locations that open conversations is a sure fire way to create more anxiety and hostilities. This furthermore removes safety and independence from your kids. Their development and reliance on you and your time driving them to these places will stifle their intrigue and willing to challenge themselves. The more cars you introduce into cities the more isolated those walking the streets feel. To summaries - you will temporarily increase the wealth of property owners at the cost of your children's future, their ability to take control and believe in their abilities. The gardens should revisit their price plan - free to enter model with additional transactions/subscriptions/season passes being available with green workshops. "In Britain, any piece of land left undisturbed will first be colonised by small plants, then shrubs and then trees. After a hundred or so years, it will become mature broadleaf woodland - and, having reached that steady state, will remain that way for ever - a state known as "climax vegetation". 'Why is Britain so bad at planning cities?' - The Guardian, David Rudlin 2019	06-Jul-22

117.	<p>Blank, uninteresting, monotonous, crude, oversized, over-tall, incongruous, insensitive, inappropriate: all of these terms describe much of what is proposed in this application, specifically the blocks (the word is sadly apposite) of flats running around the major part of the perimeter of the development. As a resident of Northcote Road, I am being asked to accept a significant reduction in the light entering my home, which consists of the lowers floors of a house; moreover, the general visual amenity of the road and the immediate neighbourhood will be severely compromised. What is proposed will have the feel of a gated development, one that looks inwards and presents a grim, blank face to its immediate neighbours. The perimeter blocks are far too high, too many and too crude in design to represent anything close to the worthy legacy promised by the Zoo management. The greenery currently visible from outside the Zoo will be almost totally obscured by the blocks. The only reason the walled enclosure of the Zoo as it is at present is not oppressive is that trees and some interesting buildings can be seen from outside over wall that are not too high. These blocks will impose a grossly different feel and impression to close residents, locals and visitors alike. Surely, in such a unique, high-profile, iconic site Bristol can create something better.</p>	06-Jul-22
118.	<p>Whilst i appreciate that the site needs to be developed, i am extremely concerned over the proposed height of the development running alongside Northcote Road. It will mean that my flat will loo directly at a newly developed dwelling and this will not only impede on my privacy, it will also impact on the overall value of the property. The proposal for over 200 dwellings is likely to cause an increase in traffic to the area and, this is already quite saturated. I have concerns that the small, local road infrastructure will not be able to cope with such an increase. I would like the Council to consider reducing the height of the proposed dwellings that overlook Northcote road and also moving them further away from the edge of the proposed development. This will enable a greater level of privacy for all concerned and also a better proliferation of natural light for the residents of Northcote Road, some who live in basement dwellings and where natural light is scarce. Thank you</p>	06-Jul-22

119.	<p>Dear Development Management Team, We would like to put forward the following objections to the current planning proposals for the Bristol Zoo Site. We believe that in its current form it will have a significantly detrimental effect on the neighbourhood and the local area, which is an established conservation area. We live in a basement flat on Northcote road, directly opposite the East wall of the Zoo. Being in a basement flat we have limited natural light, especially past midday. The current proposal of building a 5-storey block (E3) as close as possible to the boundary wall and a 4-storey block (E2) directly opposite our flat will completely change the quiet, neighbourhood feel of the already narrow road. It also means that we will receive more than 20% less light in the winter months, with the daylight and sunlight report stating VSC values as low as 0.72 of our former levels; well below the BRE guidelines. Our privacy will also be affected as we will be directly overlooked by balconies and windows in our street-facing bedroom. When less than a quarter of the perimeter of the site lies opposite residential properties, we ask why it is necessary to build to such heights in these areas; it will have a significant impact on your nearest neighbours' quality of life and is incongruous with the existing architecture. Parking is already limited on Northcote road and it is regularly used by parents picking up and dropping off their children from Clifton college, the School and the nursery at all times of the day. The suggested proposals (see drawing 3392 09B) will remove more than 50m of available parking spaces which are already at a premium in the area. The use of Northcote Road as a primary vehicular route of access throughout construction and onwards makes me concerned for the safety of the many pedestrians, including school children who regularly use Northcote and the surrounding roads to travel between school buildings. The aforementioned building heights on the periphery of the site also raise safety concerns about overlooking residential school buildings. Whilst we recognise the need for new housing in Clifton and Bristol and welcome the retention of the bristol zoo gardens as a publicly accessible site, this proposal only offers 20% affordable housing and will negatively affect the quality of life of existing residents. We ask for more consideration to be shown to the welfare of residents, the school and the existing architecture. Yours sincerely, Dr J Hendry and Miss H White</p>	06-Jul-22
120.	<p>We are writing to state a full objection to the plans proposed by the Zoo, for redevelopment of the site to include excessively tall and unsympathetic residential units around the perimeter. As previous residents of 5 Northcote Road, we feel very strongly that the proposals would severely and negatively impact the current residents and the historical character of this Conservation Area, irrevocably. The plans show an absolute disregard for the Zoo's neighbours and to this area of Clifton as a whole. If the Zoo were to leave such a deplorable legacy, it would be sad indeed.</p>	06-Jul-22

121.	<p>I am objecting again to the proposed development as it contravenes the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy Policy BCS22 by failing to 'safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance', namely the site of Bristol Zoo Gardens. The modifications to this Application are minor and are clearly contrary to BCS 22. The proposed development is over intense, unsympathetic to the period and style of the adjacent buildings and negatively impacts them. It will adversely affect this part of the Clifton Conservation Area and the setting of its listed buildings, views shared by Bristol City Council's Conservation Advisory Panel. The National Planning Policy Framework states that heritage assets should be sustained and enhanced and that 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation' (para 199). It continues that 'local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance.'(para 206). This proposed development does not ensure this or meet these criteria. There is a shortage of affordable housing in Bristol and it is very disappointing that the provision in this scheme will be reduced by half so that the work can start more quickly and a greater number of non-social housing residents can cover the ongoing costs of the long-term maintenance of the site. This appears to be a back handed way of reducing the affordable housing provision which obviously does not generate the level of income that the other units might do. This approach is both short sighted and short-termist. The issues caused by traffic from the 196 proposed units will severely impact the area around the site. It is naïve to expect that residents will not have cars and those numbers are likely to be higher than the numbers suggested by Bristol City Council's calculations. The area already has traffic issues at school drop off and pick up times. It is also an area that is frequented by school children throughout the day. The amount of traffic that this development will produce will lead to it being unsafe for school children (4-18 yrs olds) to circulate during the day. The views of Northcote Road as submitted on 13 January are very deceptive. They present Northcote Road, with the proposed development, as light and airy. The road is not like that now even on a bright, sunny day. The views also omit to show the southern end of Northcote Road with the extreme height and massing of building E3. The views presented by the developer are misleading and misrepresentative and do not clearly show the effects of the height and scale of the proposed development. Building E3's height and location has not changed. It remains domineering and overbearing. Its scale and height dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road (see doc. BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1) including no 1 and no 2 Northcote road, both tall, substantial Victorian houses. Building E3 is significantly taller (8m measured to the eaves) than these and will block more light from Northcote Road due to E3's extreme height. The overall massing and scale of the proposed buildings on Northcote Road need to be reduced to ensure more light reaches Northcote Road and for reasons of safeguarding as they look directly onto the school and a number of its boarding houses. I strongly object to the proposed development in its current form and ask that it is rejected by the Planning Committee.</p>	06-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

122.	<p>The revised proposals have minimal changes. The interior of the flats has been amended, but little change has been made to the heights and massing of the buildings. This is a particular issue for Northcote Road and Guthrie Road where five to six storey buildings are proposed where currently the buildings are three to four storeys high. The development does not reflect the existing architecture or the historic nature of the site and area. The number of dwellings across the site will also have a significant impact on the amount of traffic in the area and on road safety, both during the construction phase and thereafter. Whilst I understand that this is an opportunity for the Zoo to safeguard its long-term future, it is very disappointing that the proposals are less than sympathetic to their surrounds and that little consideration has been given to innovative and thoughtful design and how it can sit well within a Conservation Area. I therefore strongly oppose this development for the reasons listed above and in my original objection of 6 July 2022.</p>	06-Jul-22
123.	<p>I am objecting to these proposals as a parent for the following reasons: 1. Road Safety. I have serious concerns about road safety as the scheme is in close proximity to a large school consisting of both day and boarding pupils. The pupils are obliged to move around their campus to access different classrooms, sports fields etc. and the proposed scheme will cause an increased level of traffic, both during the construction phase and afterwards. This will jeopardise the safety of children moving around their school site. The entrances proposed for Guthrie Road and Northcote Road will have a particular impact as they are two of the main areas where parents pick up and drop off children. At peak times, there are already traffic jams, poor parking and bad driving and this will only be exacerbated by an increased number of cars. Entrances here are likely to significantly increase the risk of accidents to school children. 2. Parking. The scheme proposes 201 dwellings with 120 car parking spaces. This will not be enough parking spaces. While it is desirable and necessary to reduce car use, the reality is that most households have at least one vehicle. Where are these extra vehicles going to park? Again, the impact of this is increased traffic on the roads around the Zoo looking for parking spaces and once again, there will be an increased risk to children's safety. 3. Design. The design of the buildings is poor and lacks harmony in relation to its site. The surrounding Conservation area and the buildings adjoining the site consist of detached houses and imposing, listed school buildings broken only by trees and green spaces. These bear no relation to the proposed scheme which does not sit comfortably in this context. The buildings are too tall, overbearing and constitute a solid mass with no redeeming features. Inspiration seems to have been Stalinist Russia with a few plants added, perhaps to soften the corners, or to allude to the listed gardens that once occupied the site. The scheme does not reflect or relate to the pink sandstone of the neighbouring buildings, nor does it relate to the materials and colours of the Zoo's perimeter wall. Its sits in ugly contrast with its surrounds and will be an eyesore that is likely to date quickly. The new buildings are concentrated around the perimeter of the Zoo's site causing neighbouring houses, school playgrounds and boarding houses to be completely overlooked. In some instances, the new buildings are taller than the existing houses and the school being overlooked is a safeguarding issue. Will all the windows overlooking the school have opaque or frosted glass? This scheme is an opportunity to develop an historic and much-loved Bristol site. It is an opportunity to come up with innovative and thoughtful design, showcasing how a contemporary development can enhance a site bound by Conservation Area</p>	06-Jul-22

	<p>regulations. This scheme fails on all counts. It is pedestrian, lacklustre and is missing the vision and thoughtful consideration given to the historical context and site surroundings in local developments, such as the ss Great Britain and Wapping Wharf.</p>	
--	---	--

124.	<p>Bristol Zoological Gardens are hallowed ground in this city. They have an intangible magic that you feel when you move around them. Trees and flowers, gardens astonishingly mature, verdant and lush. And wildlife. Exotic wildlife. You're in the middle of Bristol. You're also in Eden. If the Zoo's current proposal gets planning permission and goes ahead, the iconic herbaceous border will become someone's multi-million pound private home and garden in around 5 years time. And until then, this unique slice of paradise, 186 years of historic fabric, woven into the heart of the city, will be a building site. And afterwards, it will never be the same again. A phenomenal juxtaposition of natural and urban, of people and wildlife; Bristol Zoological Gardens are unique. Bristol Zoological Gardens are a jewel in the crown of this city. They are 186 years of the natural world, history and collective memories contained within a 12 acre site in the heart of a city. Once they are sold off to a private developer to be turned into housing, they are gone for ever and not coming back. Why This Shouldn't Happen The corporate message being pushed very hard by the Zoo's management and supporters for their proposals are; "Much Needed Housing" If more homes are so necessary in Clifton and Bristol, why not start building on the Downs, our city parks, Ashton Court or Blaise Castle as well? Surely we can all agree that some places are just too important and valuable - in a strictly uneconomic sense - to be turned into housing estates? 'Affordable' housing 'Affordable' is a relative term. This site will be a luxury housing development when you do the maths and the 'affordable' housing will undoubtedly still prove to be well out of reach for most first-time buyers. Free Public Access To The Gardens If you look at the Zoo's plans, only about 20% of the site will be available to the public and approximately 42.5% of the existing trees will be removed as will the herbaceous border. If the Zoo's plans go ahead then the site will be owned by the developer and the 'free' public gardens will be paid for by an 'Estate Service Charge', paid for by residents. Whether it is in 5, 10, or 20 years time, it seems inevitable that residents will tire of their substantial service charge paying for the upkeep of public gardens and ultimately, they will close to the public. When asked directly, the Zoo can offer no guarantee that the gardens will stay open to the public in the long term. The Zoo says with a smooth sale, it envisages the gardens being closed for approximately 5 years. Taking into account potential and long planning delays - we could be looking at the site being closed for up to 10 years with much of that time it being a building site. 38% increase in the biodiversity of the site This assertion has been strongly challenged by the Bristol Tree forum who say; - An unworkable version of the metric for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) has been used (BNG 3.0) for calculating Urban tree habitat. BNG 3.1 fixes this and should be used instead. This shows that the trees growing on the site account for over 70% of its biodiversity. - The applicant's proposals will result in a net 22% loss of biodiversity rather than the 38.6% gain they have stated. When you look at the disparity between the public rhetoric and the detail, one can only draw the conclusion that the Zoo are trying to shoehorn their proposal through planning and are intentionally obfuscating the full details from the wider public. Accessibility If you currently want to visit the Zoo and live in Bristol, it is very easy to walk, cycle, get the bus or scoot. And if you live outside of Bristol, a train to Temple Meads and then the No. 8 bus up to Clifton is also very straightforward. The reality is that Cribbs Causeway is relatively inaccessible and not especially inviting if you live in the city and especially if don't have a car, which is widely encouraged in this day and age. Next to no one will be walking to Cribbs Causeway and very few will be cycling or scooting. Whatever the Zoo may hope, there is no question that the vast majority of people who will visit the Cribbs Causeway site - as they do now - will arrive by car. (Look at The Mall</p>	06-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

	<p>where almost all visitors arrive by car). This seems entirely at odds with the Zoo's target to become carbon neutral by 2035. Beyond Economics Bristol Zoo's presence in the heart of Bristol, genuinely means something to the people of this city. You can put a £40m price on the value of the site, but you can't put a price on giving many more generations of young people the proximity to wildlife in the heart of their own city. Conclusion I believe that if the Zoo chose now at this late stage - which it has not done so far - to meaningfully engage with the enthusiasm and goodwill of members, visitors, the wider public, the history, the memories, the possibility for change, the potential for restructure and development, for new investment, what its presence in the heart of the city means to people, it seems extremely likely that they would conclude that they cannot afford, not to keep Bristol Zoo open. Although the Zoo's management and trustees may be concerned that changing course at this late stage would appear weak and no doubt be rather inconvenient, I believe it would show great strength of character and history would remember and thank them.</p>	
125.	<p>I have placed several objections to these plans over the previous months. To my mind mismanagement of the Zoo's aims top my list, followed by inappropriate financial greed, inappropriate architectural dreams, and inappropriate hectoring of those involved with the outcome of traffic planning, amongst others. To those who have taken issue with Clifton College for fighting the planning application I ask; isn't taking care of No. 1 exactly what the Zoo are doing? Bristol Zoo Gardens are approximately 30 years older than the original Clifton College buildings. If Clifton College Chapel, and perhaps other buildings on the campus, is designated as a Grade 2 building by English Heritage could it not be feasible for Bristol Zoo Gardens to become part of English Heritage, Landmark Trust or National Trust to preserve what has been known for generations?</p>	07-Jul-22

126.	<p>I object most strongly to these proposals. Could I be thinking, possibly, that greed, misappropriation, misjudgement are involved? The artists' impressions of how the Bristol Zoo Gardens will look when completed are just an idealised utopia. Don't be seduced- in practice, the realities will be very different. Will the Conservation Hub actually include details of the surrounding conservation area outside the Zoo gardens? I think not. In theory there will be two kinds of people who will live in what is proposed- this who are able to afford what is on offer, and those who are unable to do so. There will be resentment between those who can and those who cannot. I have been unable to come to terms with the 40% of 'Affordable Housing' in this setting, therefore, for those who, like me, are not sure what this means, I recommend two pieces of reading. One is the entry posted on the 15th. July named 'Housing Enabling' and the other on the internet by The Bureau of Investigative Journalism on 'Affordable Housing'. There are approximately 20,000 names on the Bristol City Council's and surrounding areas waiting for 'Social Housing'. In the 1980s Margaret Thatcher's Government introduced the 'Right to Buy' for those in long term tenancy agreements, and some 2,000,000 Council owned properties became privately owned at a heavily subsidised Government rate. Less than 5% have been replaced by new builds. So why has Boris Johnson stated publicly that he intends to extend the scheme? Council/Social housing has always been, and will continue to be, a badly needed source of housing, especially as the population increases at an exponential rate. But, please, not in the Zoo's new build, even though inclusion of 'Affordable Housing' is compulsory. Therefore the whole scheme should be stopped in its tracks with immediate effect. No trees should be felled or damaged in whatever happens in the Zoo Gardens. The gardens themselves that will be open to the public will be a magnet for those aimless individuals who sit around drinking alcohol and leave their discarded containers for others to dispose of. The plans include a grand plan to save the Bear Pit and the Raptor Aviary. These are wild creatures that need to roam. I do hope that the Polar Bear Corner will not be saved. To see the Polar Bears in their confined quarters rocking their heads from side to side as a result of their madness was pitiful. They were shot, as I recall. I would like to see local billionaires offering a substantial collective amount to the present Zoological Society so that The Wild Place Project can go ahead but to leave the present Zoo Gardens and Car park without the shameful blocks of flats and new builds. Surely, in this day and age, an agreement along these lines could be mobilised? The present planning application is a disgrace and needs a radical rethink. It is not fit for purpose.</p>	07-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

127.	<p>Should one drive from Cribbs Causeway, past Westbury on Trym and up Falcondale Road onto Westbury Road, there appears before one's eyes beautifully constructed buildings in what is a familiar red stone. At White Tree roundabout the Downs open up to the right whilst on the left are the buildings that used to be St. Christopher's School. That view continues until Spire Hospital at the top of Blackboy Hill. The houses there are just the frontispiece for Henleaze, Redland and Cotham, mostly in the locally quarried red stone. Turning right at the top of Blackboy Hill takes one onto Downs Road, and the commencement of more beautiful red stoned houses down Pembroke Road, (the only exception being called euphemistically 'Paddy's Wigwam'), and then The Avenue with Clifton College Prep School in red stone. And the The Zoo. Approaching Bristol from the Long Ashton Bypass one has the splendid view of the Crescents overlooking the river and harbour. Along the Portway there are no houses as such until one turns right up Bridge Valley road. At the top, on the right, is Canynge Road which leads into Clifton, but on the right there is a building called The Mansion House, and a substantial row of houses that, again leads to Clifton. What a splendid sight those red houses are. And then the Zoo. I have been familiar with what I have described for seventy odd years. I am dismayed to find the plans for the 'refurbishment' of Bristol Zoo gardens are not in keeping with what I have described, but more of mass habitation out of kilter with the conservation area surrounding it. The tall blocks on the perimeter of the zoo, with animals depicted, will be an eyesore, and once winter arrives with lights on in the windows and the heat pumps operating, they will appear more like a cruise ship at sea. So, with that in mind, I suggest that the planners insist on funnels being included in the plans and the whole being called, 'SS Clifton Encore'.</p>	07-Jul-22
128.		07-Jul-22

129.	<p>As a near neighbour of Bristol Zoo Gardens, I have been affected negatively and relentlessly by every stage of the development proposals. Our contact with the "zoo committee", both through Zoom and at gatherings, has been politely restrained, always cordial, but frustratingly fruitless. The suggestions that my neighbours and I have raised with "the committee" have only been addressed marginally with the most minor tweaks here and there, the overall modifications to our requests being superficial and barely perceptible. The big picture remains much the same as it always has, with structures of 4, 5, and 6 storeys looming high and at close range. 1. The key complaint is the excessive size, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed development in close proximity to our homes as well as dominating this Conservation Area. Besides dwarfing our residences, the immediate area will suffer as the surrounding suburban roads are reduced to shadowy canyons - and the shadows will be undeniable. The considerable pedestrian 'traffic' on the pavements, especially for younger pupils, will no longer enjoy full daylight in the shrouded route - nor will visitors to the proposed park within. 'High Rises' will smother this neighbourhood beyond recognition. 2. Computer generated images produced by the zoo are comical in content, verging as an insult to our intelligence and our familiarity with these perimeter roads. Mature trees appearing immediately inside the zoo wall do not presently exist, nor would they reach such a stage for another 50 years. Furthermore, given their proximity to the projected buildings, there is no way in which they could survive and provide a shield to buffer the current residences. 3. The modernist monolithic architecture would be more appropriate in an entirely different setting or cityscape, not in a residential Conservation Area consisting of listed buildings and handsome Victorian homes whilst also abutting the classic setting of a prominent school and its impressive campus. Sight lines will have clearly been violated in multiple locations. From street level, gone are the glimpses of trees and the abundant daylight. Equally so, gone are a large proportion of mature trees within the 12 acres, all of which enrich the healthy well-being of this area. The artists' impressions take great liberties in distorting reality of the scene. 4. The towering height of these overbearing Blocks of Flats would adversely affect and diminish the daylight, directly and indirectly, onto properties, pavements and roads, as has been confirmed by the professional light studies which were commissioned by my neighbours. Apart from reduced daylight, the present outlook from these properties will be obliterated by apartment blocks directly opposite and at close range to our homes. Nowhere else in Clifton can be said to afford such an opportunity for prying eyes across narrow roads on such a grand scale. 5. Public 'benefit of access' to the proposed site is insignificant compared with the free public access provided by the nearby spacious Clifton Downs which have no overlooking monotonous houses, but feature trees, space and open skies. Who would choose to visit an artificially created enclave, surrounded by blocks of flat and in the proximity of other visitors, yet with The Downs so nearby? Bristol Zoological Gardens would leave a lasting legacy to this community if the emphasis remained on its splendid gardens. The proposals include the decimation of a majority of its mature trees. This development is alien to the character of this site as part of a Conservation Area as well as being a Historic and Community Asset. If all of these are violated by a brutalist style housing development on such a grand scale, little praise can be offered for the zoo's proclaimed intent for conservation. Detailed and persuasive arguments were submitted by Humphrey's & Co on February 6th, which I recommend and to which I defer. To conclude, the major fear of these proposals is the ghastly height, size, scale, scope and proximity of buildings which, in no way, blend with the local community. If approval is given, they will prove to be an</p>	07-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

	appalling intrusion to the immediate neighbourhood and to the character of Clifton as a Conservation Area.	
--	--	--

130.	<p>There was a time when Bristol Zoological Gardens elicited warm praise and loyal appreciation from Bristol residents, as well as from far afield - roadside directional signs attest to that. Alas - No more. The stunning oasis of calm, so conveniently situated within the community, will be severely diminished as an inspiring social and learning venue, surrounded on all sides by towering structures of massed humanity - hardly a conducive setting for enjoying a day out in "natural" beauty. I'll take the Downs and Ashton Court any day. The relentless lines of vast perimeter flats fail to reflect this Conservation Area. Local homes near the site, as well as a very large school, will be overlooked from all angles by their close proximity. Balcony potted plants and quirky animal murals will not disguise the boxed brutalist style of these monoliths which in no way enhance the area or preserve the character. A Clifton Carbuncle sums it up accurately. Anything which is constructed must correspond in height, scale, shape, form and proportion to existing buildings in the vicinity, and there are a significant number of listed and locally listed buildings on the doorstep, whether residential or within the College. The proposed designs fail to reflect these imposing architectural styles, even worse with such an abrupt clash at close range.</p> <p>The Roads: These will suffer from traffic overload and pressure for parking, especially with the elimination of road space due to the proposed access points for vehicles and pedestrians. Considering the City of Bristol's commitment to traffic reduction and elimination, this is a recipe for further pollution and mayhem, exacerbated by the daily school run. Pupils of all ages traversing the roads to lessons will face increased jeopardy for safety. Northcote Road: Consider the narrow one-way thoroughfare with a single pavement, where residents will be overlooked by 4 and 5 storey structures. A similar fate awaits the school for its many teaching buildings, playground, library and boarding houses. Tall buildings, lining one side, will smother the outlook as has been cited in light surveys. Elsewhere in Clifton, where buildings of such height exist, they aren't directly opposite or nearly so close to each other, or so near the pavement. Light Surveys: I defer to my neighbours who have found, through professionals, that BRE guidelines will have been breached, although it's blatantly obvious that the reductions will be considerable, especially for those at lower elevations. Winter light, especially, will simply be eclipsed to an intolerable degree. Those with lofty views, although receiving more daylight, will still be confronted with a walled expanse from most angles. The plan itself: There is no clear indication in the published plans of how the proposals will actually LOOK from key views. An artist's impression is not good enough with such a watered down, softened appearance intended to look more appealing. Landscape in the Zoo site: I refer to the detailed BTF analysis for a number of shocking statistics, regardless of the replanting scheme. Depressing is the projected net loss in biodiversity of 22%, in contrast to the Zoo's projection of a net gain of 38% Even more depressing is the planned loss of a third of the mature trees. The present Zoo, uniquely, is a masterpiece of GARDENS, as is proudly proclaimed in its name. Plans for the development of communal public parkland cannot possibly keep or maintain such a paradise that has been created over the decades. This alone will be a huge loss, even at ground elevation. Infrastructure in the Community: 200 dwellings would suggest a population surge of twice that number. Can the public services manage that, bearing in mind the need for medical appointments and other services? The total number of dwellings in this area has grown gradually, but a surge would be detrimental in this environ. Pollution: Much has been said about the environmental benefits of this project, but the pollution generated in the area during construction will be undeniable and permeating. This will not be a case of "Wait till the dust settles." The cement pollution alone, during construction, has</p>	07-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

	<p>been proven to affect those, especially with respiratory conditions -- and seriously so, lasting for life. In a similar vein, the mental health of pupils and residents will surely take a knock, just as it is during these deliberations. And finally: It is obvious that I strongly object to the proposals on many counts. Most immediately is the sheer size and scope of the plans regarding structure, height, style and the volume of housing. As has been stated by others, the original founders of the Zoo would be saddened and shocked to know that a housing estate is on the cards. The plans are completely out of character with the surrounding Conservation Area and come not even close to enhancing or improving it. Housing is not the appropriate answer for the Zoo's legacy. But - if it must be so, a far smaller scale should be the ultimate aim.</p>	
--	--	--

131.	<p>I am a Bristol resident living close to the zoo (zoo member too). I am most concerned about this proposed development and strongly object to the plans presented. There seem to be a number of issues that have not been considered properly. This development neighbours a school (i am a parent of school children in this vicinity), and in fact children circulate the area from a number of nearby schools as well, both in the morning and afternoon. The amount of traffic, parking and access considerations seem to have been overlooked in the context of safety for nearby residents and also school children and parents dropping children off to school. There are many children in this area, particularly along Guthrie road, the Avenue, College Road and Northcote road where all the school building are. This feels like an extremely dangerous development as regards the safeguarding and safety of children. By necessity, children have to travel between buildings or for pick-ups and drop-offs, and for the older children, they will be unaccompanied by adults so are at huge risk of a road accident or other more horrific risks, particularly in the winter when it is dark. The school is co-ed so there will also be potentially vulnerable pupils walking on the pavements and crossing roads in large numbers, as well as individuals late at night. There are many evening functions and boarding houses in the area leaving students particularly at risk. I would strongly object to the plans on that basis alone. In addition to that however, and again with the safeguarding of children playing in school playgrounds, or walking between classrooms, these unsightly and far-too tall buildings being proposed present a real risk for those children. These children will be overlooked and could easily be targeted or abused. There is already an issue with poor lighting in the area from a safety perspective, but the large buildings will further block sunlight and create more danger. Apart from the final design failing to take these issues into consideration, the proposed designs also fail to take into consideration the character and historic importance of the architecture in the area. Bristol Planning & conservation go to great lengths to uphold the historic characteristics of Bristols building heritage & local areas. The proposed development is grossly non compliant with this approach & in my opinion is being driven to maximise financial return for the charity / beneficiaries, rather than the community & Bristol heritage. This proposed development will be in a conservation area too. Given the lack of consideration in the aspect and overall plans, I would also be very concerned that the actual construction process itself has been equally poorly considered. The building works will take some years, which will mean construction taking place throughout the schooling year and in particular through the periods of public exams. Having come from a few years of Covid where children have been massively disadvantaged, the building work disruption would again be detrimental to the children's wellbeing and education. Given these will be the particularly difficult years when results are re-normalised, this will be bring even greater stress and further disadvantage to the futures of hundreds of students in the schools in the area. The lives / wellbeing of Bristol future generations once again seems to have been neglected by the developers. So on the basis of these concerns outlined, I would like to record a strong objection to the plans as presented. Best Regards Kirsty Jephcott</p>	07-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

132.	<p>We object on the following grounds. 1. Whilst the stepping of the Clifton Down Block is to be welcomed, the 6 level height at the Northcote road end is too great. It may fit a giraffe graphic but as the Clifton Down elevation shows, it is too dominating. Reducing that level to 5 and stepping down accordingly would be a great improvement. 2. We remain unconvinced by the parking provision. The planning documents suggest that as residents would know when they purchased that there would be no allocated parking, there will be no problem. We think this is unrealistic and residents will struggle to find on street parking in competition with residents from the West Car Park development. 3. We feel that the planning for both the Gardens and the West Car Park should be considered together to ensure design harmony and a coordinated approach to issues such as parking. Tony and Jenny Dugdale</p>	07-Jul-22
133.	<p>I work at Clifton College Prep School and have a number of concerns with the proposed re-development of the zoo. The proposed buildings will overlook our school and playground and will pose a safeguarding risk. In addition, the entry and egress of cars to the proposed buildings will have a direct impact on the safety of our pupils as they are dropped off and collected from Northcote Road and Guthrie Road. This would be particularly dangerous during the construction periods of the buildings. Clifton currently has a good mix of old and new buildings, but those proposed do not match with the environs of the College and the Downs. I am not against modern architecture but these do seem excessive in height and design and as such, I object wholeheartedly to the proposed plans.</p>	07-Jul-22
134.	<p>Dear Sir/ Madam, I wish to object to the above planning application but do not want to provide my home address. My objection is as follows: The proposed plans are not in keeping with the local amenities and would negatively impact neighbouring school children . The proposal presents a safeguarding and safety risk to children at Clifton College for three reasons: first, the height and proximity of the proposed apartment blocks means that children will be in view of residents as they are learning in the teaching building, 8 Northcote road; second, the proposed accommodation is a threat to safety due to increased road traffic; and third, the sense of wellbeing suggested by the central park and lake is diminished by the overbearing, invasive outer development. It is important to note that some children may have court protection orders due to challenging family contexts. Counselling and teaching directly opposite the development would be negatively impacted upon both during construction and thereafter. The proposed outer development needs to be reduced in height, so as to avoid intrusion to education and safety of children.</p> <p>-- Regards, Dr Caroline McGrath</p>	08-Jul-22

135.	I fully support Bristol Zoological Societies plans. As an Environmental Organisation they are consolidating their work of conservation and education and using their resources wisely. They are responding to the challenges of climate change and loss of biodiversity. They are considering the care of their animals, the plot of land they are vacating, and the people living in Clifton. It is a challenging balance to make. I think they are proposing a good compromise which I hope will offer an example of good eco housing, mixed with public access to a well loved historic site. I wish them well.	08-Jul-22
136.	I am very concerned about the proposals to develop the main Zoo site. My concerns are linked to the additional proposal to develop the former Zoo car park in 62 dwellings (as quashed by the High Court on 14th June 2022). In light of the density of the housing proposed and the knock on effect on roads, road safety and social infrastructure, I believe the schemes cannot be looked at separately. Road impact: 201 houses are proposed on the site, with an extra 62 proposed over the road at the Zoo's second proposed housing . The latest census information from Bristol City Council (2011) showed average car ownership is 1.04 cars per household. Other estimates suggest this has risen to 1.39 in the south west over the last 10 years. The impact on the junction with College Road and the Downs will be detrimental to road safety, air quality and traffic flow. The overflow on parking and the excess of delivery vans to the properties throughout the day has not been properly considered. In addition I am concerned for the road safety of children at Clifton College with all the increased traffic. I also object to the fifth oldest zoo in the world dating back to 1835 being turned into a very unimaginative housing development. Surely Bristol City Council is capable of leaving a better legacy to the city? The 'Our World Bristol' plan looked much more exciting and visionary and a far better legacy for Bristol. I appreciate the Zoo site needs to change but I object strongly to the plans as they stand.	08-Jul-22
137.	I should like to express my support for this application. Bristol zoo has presented proposals that fit well with the local area. This is not intensive housing, but instead the plans retain the open aspect of the existing gardens, protect the historic buildings and maintain the public space for the use of the entire community. The zoo has been one of the city's greatest assets during its time in Clifton and the current proposals will help to ensure a smooth transfer of the zoo to a more appropriate location where it can continue to stimulate the local economy as one of the largest visitor attractions in the West Country, while contributing to the conservation of our natural world. There will no doubt be some opposition, it would be impossible to develop a 12 acre urban site without stimulating various responses, but these look to me like a proportionate set of proposals that provide a sensitive approach to the ecology and the context of the site. I wish them well.	09-Jul-22

138.	<p>Dear Sir I would like to object in the strongest possible terms to the plans recently released for the development of The Zoo Gardens of Clifton. Application number: 22/02737/F I have lived and worked in Clifton for much of the last fifty years and have always enjoyed both the relative tranquillity and the architectural magnificence around me. As such, I can only view the proposed plans for the Zoo Gardens with both horror and dismay. I am sure that many have already articulated the concerns about the impact that that many people and that many cars moving into such a small area will have, but for me just as important is the damage it will do to the aesthetics and character of the place. Clifton has always been a jewel in the crown of Bristol and admired far and wide, both within the UK and, as I have found on my travels, further afield as well. It is the part of the city that people who have visited here generally remember well and wax lyrical about in their recollections of the city as a whole - and that surely makes it a key aspect of our legacy. A legacy which you as custodians should be protecting, rather than compromising. I have seen the once beautiful towns surrounding the metropolis of London, places like Dorking and Leatherhead, reduced to customised and characterless imitations of each other, and fear that that is what could well be in store for Clifton. There are areas of outstanding natural beauty which are now protected for the future by law. Surely Clifton as a whole, and the Gardens in particular warrant the same. Generations of citizens have enjoyed this oasis of green and calm and, especially at this time of crisis and concern, about global warming, about such things as the pandemic, surely we owe the future generations the opportunity to enjoy it in the same way. Filling it with huge numbers of new residents and ringing it with buildings that will dwarf the surroundings is not the way forward. It is instead a cul de sac that will ruin a place that so many treasure and love - and accelerate the remorseless march of concrete and metal across our landscapes. We can do better than that - and definitely should. The Gardens are very special, both to Clifton and to Bristol, and create a diversity and a pleasure that your plans would go a long way to eliminating. It is time to think again and to choose a different path. Yours sincerely Nigel Siddall</p>	11-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

139.	<p>Whilst commending the preservation of listed buildings, I find the unimaginative proposals for the rest of the site overbearing, without consideration for the conservation area and failing to consider fully the negative impact on neighbouring residents, their lives and the environment. Specifically, I object to the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. overdevelopment of the site: there are too many dwellings crammed around the perimeter, giving the appearance of post war communist blocks. 2. the height of the proposed apartment blocks: residents in Northcote Road, as well as the school, will lose their privacy and suffer considerable loss of light because of the proximity and height of the buildings opposite which is unacceptable. The apartment blocks, particularly the one opposite the Downs will dominate the area, permanently changing the skyline of mature trees and elegant buildings to an ugly grey mass. 3. lack of sensitivity to the conservation area: the proposed new buildings are by both size and design oppressive and without interest. They are neither sympathetic to the many historic buildings in the vicinity nor do they compliment them by innovative design. The visual impact will cause irreversible harm to the conservation area. 4. insufficient consideration for nature and the environment: the loss of trees and potential damage to others during the building process is unacceptable, effecting nature and bird life in particular. Also there is little thought about the negative impact of the construction process and long term traffic and parking to the gardens. 5. inadequate parking provision and regard for traffic flow. The lack of parking is likely to lead to residents parking on, and damaging the garden verges of the circular road. Residents cars, delivery and service vehicles will cause congestion, particularly in Guthrie and Northcote Road which are both narrow giving rise to safety concerns for residents and especially the children of Clifton College. 	11-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

140.	<p>The issues caused by traffic from the 196 proposed units will severely impact the area around the site. It is naïve to expect that residents will not have cars and those numbers are likely to be higher than the numbers suggested by Bristol City Council's calculations. The area already has traffic issues at school drop off and pick up times. It is also an area that is frequented by school children throughout the day. The amount of traffic that this development will produce will lead to it being unsafe for school children (4-18 yrs olds) to circulate during the day. The views of Northcote Road as submitted on 13 January are very deceptive. They present Northcote Road, with the proposed development, as light and airy. The road is not like that now even on a bright, sunny day. The views also omit to show the southern end of Northcote Road with the extreme height and massing of building E3. The views presented by the developer are misleading and misrepresentative and do not clearly show the effects of the height and scale of the proposed development. Building E3's height and location has not changed. It remains domineering and overbearing. Its scale and height dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road (see doc. BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1) including no 1 and no 2 Northcote road, both tall, substantial Victorian houses. Building E3 is significantly taller (8m measured to the eaves) than these and will block more light from Northcote Road due to E3's extreme height. The overall massing and scale of the proposed buildings on Northcote Road need to be reduced to ensure more light reaches Northcote Road and for reasons of safeguarding as they look directly onto the school and a number of its boarding houses. I strongly object to the proposed development it is all too high and out of keeping for the conservation area and historical buildings are lost.</p>	11-Jul-22
141.	<p>We OBJECT to the above planning application for the following reasons - Out of keeping with the conservation area - Over developed and way too high buildings - Overlooks the boarding houses and playgrounds of Clifton College so is a safety hazard and completely unacceptable. - Congestion of an extra 200 residents in the roads already very congested, there are not enough parking spaces provided within the development and the surrounding roads are already congested enough. - Extra traffic is a safety issues to both Clifton College and Clifton High School - Demand on services, hospitals and doctors in the area are already oversubscribed - Schools in the area are already oversubscribed - The strutures proposed are too tall and cover the whole perimeter of the existing zoo, a block of grey is incredibly ugly and out of keeping for this area of outstanding beauty with Durdham Downs. - 4-6 storey buildings proposed, a 6 storey building on the northern boundary by the Downs is completely unacceptable for local historic buildings and architecture and completely out of keeping. - The plans drawn up are deceptive and shown green space in the middle, however the whole perimeter is surrounded with a mass of 4-6 storey buildings looking into Clifton College and surrounding houses gardens, bedrooms etc</p>	11-Jul-22

142.	<p>The proposed redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens is completely out of keeping for the conservation area of Clifton. The modern blocks of flats above the perimeter walls tower above the street and gardens. These monolithic blocks are entirely incongruent with our area in design, scale, mass and form. They will overwhelm the gardens and obliterate street views of the sky, mature trees and the glimpses of historic buildings that characterise Clifton. A construction project on this scale in a conservation area will completely detract from the desirability and preservation and enhancement of the character of the area. The scale and design may be suitable in a city centre, but is surely inappropriate for our conversation area and looks like something more suitable for Disneyland with hideous balconies with stencils of animals and a humongous 6 storey high green brick giraffe on the side of a building. We were led to believe that the sale of the Zoo Gardens was to pay for new enclosures at Wild Place, but this does not seem to be the case as only the Gorillas and one species of lemur are being relocated! The rest have been shipped off to other zoos, this was not the impression we were given when the Zoo needed to maximise the value of this site. The Zoo is retaining some communal garden space, but it is expected that over 150 mature trees will be removed for this hideous proposed development along with the historic ornamental garden. The towering blocks of flats around the perimeter will not make the communal garden space desirable. The proposed housing development on the north side along Clifton Down and the east side Northcote Road show a building of almost 300 metres of monolithic, uninterrupted block of flats up to 6 storeys high, towering over the existing high perimeter wall and dominating the neighbouring historic buildings. On the north side along Clifton Down from the historic zoo entrance is 150 metres of monolithic, uninterrupted blocks of flats rising to 6 storeys high, some 60ft taller than existing high perimeter walls. Along Guthrie Road near Clifton College's historical buildings the scale is once again overwhelming and completely out of keeping for an area like Clifton in a conservation area. It has to be opposed until a more moderate low level development (3 storeys high max) is proposed that is in keeping with the conservation area and not in some cheap brick with giraffes on the side which is completely out of character with the bath stone and other quarried stone already seen so much in the surrounding roads.</p>	11-Jul-22
143.	<p>I have placed several objections to these plans over the previous months. To my mind mismanagement of the Zoo's aims top my list, followed by inappropriate financial greed, inappropriate architectural dreams, and inappropriate hectoring of those involved with the outcome of traffic planning, amongst others. To those who have taken issue with Clifton College for fighting the planning application I ask; isn't taking care of No. 1 exactly what the Zoo are doing? Bristol Zoo Gardens are approximately 30 years older than the original Clifton College buildings. If Clifton College Chapel, and perhaps other buildings on the campus, is designated as a Grade 2 building by English Heritage could it not be feasible for Bristol Zoo Gardens to become part of English Heritage, Landmark Trust or National Trust to preserve what has been known for generations?</p>	12-Jul-22

144.	<p>I object most strongly to these proposals. Could I be thinking, possibly, that greed, misappropriation, misjudgement are involved? The artists' impressions of how the Bristol Zoo Gardens will look when completed are just an idealised utopia. Don't be seduced- in practice, the realities will be very different. Will the Conservation Hub actually include details of the surrounding conservation area outside the Zoo gardens? I think not. In theory there will be two kinds of people who will live in what is proposed- this who are able to afford what is on offer, and those who are unable to do so. There will be resentment between those who can and those who cannot. I have been unable to come to terms with the 40% of 'Affordable Housing' in this setting, therefore, for those who, like me, are not sure what this means, I recommend two pieces of reading. One is the entry posted on the 15th. July named 'Housing Enabling' and the other on the internet by The Bureau of Investigative Journalism on 'Affordable Housing'. There are approximately 20,000 names on the Bristol City Council's and surrounding areas waiting for 'Social Housing'. In the 1980s Margaret Thatcher's Government introduced the 'Right to Buy' for those in long term tenancy agreements, and some 2,000,000 Council owned properties became privately owned at a heavily subsidised Government rate. Less than 5% have been replaced by new builds. So why has Boris Johnson stated publicly that he intends to extend the scheme? Council/Social housing has always been, and will continue to be, a badly needed source of housing, especially as the population increases at an exponential rate. But, please, not in the Zoo's new build, even though inclusion of 'Affordable Housing' is compulsory. Therefore the whole scheme should be stopped in its tracks with immediate effect. No trees should be felled or damaged in whatever happens in the Zoo Gardens. The gardens themselves that will be open to the public will be a magnet for those aimless individuals who sit around drinking alcohol and leave their discarded containers for others to dispose of. The plans include a grand plan to save the Bear Pit and the Raptor Aviary. These are wild creatures that need to roam. I do hope that the Polar Bear Corner will not be saved. To see the Polar Bears in their confined quarters rocking their heads from side to side as a result of their madness was pitiful. They were shot, as I recall. I would like to see local billionaires offering a substantial collective amount to the present Zoological Society so that The Wild Place Project can go ahead but to leave the present Zoo Gardens and Car park without the shameful blocks of flats and new builds. Surely, in this day and age, an agreement along these lines could be mobilised? The present planning application is a disgrace and needs a radical rethink. It is not fit for purpose.</p>	12-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

145.	<p>Should one drive from Cribbs Causeway, past Westbury on Trym and up Falcondale Road onto Westbury Road, there appears before one's eyes beautifully constructed buildings in what is a familiar red stone. At White Tree roundabout the Downs open up to the right whilst on the left are the buildings that used to be St. Christopher's School. That view continues until Spire Hospital at the top of Blackboy Hill. The houses there are just the frontispiece for Henleaze, Redland and Cotham, mostly in the locally quarried red stone. Turning right at the top of Blackboy Hill takes one onto Downs Road, and the commencement of more beautiful red stoned houses down Pembroke Road, (the only exception being called euphemistically 'Paddy's Wigwam'), and then The Avenue with Clifton College Prep School in red stone. And the The Zoo. Approaching Bristol from the Long Ashton Bypass one has the splendid view of the Crescents overlooking the river and harbour. Along the Portway there are no houses as such until one turns right up Bridge Valley road. At the top, on the right, is Canynge Road which leads into Clifton, but on the right there is a building called The Mansion House, and a substantial row of houses that, again leads to Clifton. What a splendid sight those red houses are. And then the Zoo. I have been familiar with what I have described for seventy odd years. I am dismayed to find the plans for the 'refurbishment' of Bristol Zoo gardens are not in keeping with what I have described, but more of mass habitation out of kilter with the conservation area surrounding it. The tall blocks on the perimeter of the zoo, with animals depicted, will be an eyesore, and once winter arrives with lights on in the windows and the heat pumps operating, they will appear more like a cruise ship at sea. So, with that in mind, I suggest that the planners insist on funnels being included in the plans and the whole being called, 'SS Clifton Encore'.</p>	12-Jul-22
146.		12-Jul-22
147.	<p>I objected before the revised plans. I object again as the changes from the original plans are minimal. The proposed buildings are still too high, too imposing. They will completely change the character of the area, which is a conservation area by the way. The original issues still remain. With these plans, there will be added traffic, more parking problems, added air pollution in the area.</p>	12-Jul-22

148.	<p>I accept that the Zoo animals will have more space at the Wild Place project. However, it is a big shame that we cannot be more imaginative about the use of the site and have to turn it into a strange housing estate. In effect, the plan is to have a few premium houses within the actual grounds of the zoo surrounded by very tall blocks of flats. These blocks of flats will seem very incongruous in the neighbourhood and will be towering over current neighbouring buildings, blocking their natural light and views and creating more traffic and parking concerns. Indeed, the plan provide some parking, but don't take into consideration the extra visitors to the new lodgers, which will add to the parking problems. The idea of keeping the gardens open to the general public is a good gesture, but in effect, the general public won't be travelling to the area just to walk through these gardens and in time, these will only be to the benefit of the people living there. Also these new flats will probably be overlooking the adjacent school's playgrounds and classrooms, which could be a safeguarding issue for the school. My main concern is the height of these buildings and their design which will make them stand out in the area and not be in keeping.</p>	12-Jul-22
149.	<p>I am concerned about the general increase in road use around the area. In spite of a proposed pedestrian crossing, the extra traffic that will result from the new housing, and also the construction traffic in what would be a lengthy development, will be a danger. The high numbers of pupils, at Clifton High School and in particular Clifton College in the immediate vicinity pose a significant risk of road traffic accidents. There have been near misses in the past and by increasing traffic flow, this simply raises the chance of a fatality or life changing injury. Whilst there is allocated parking on the designs, there will inevitably be extra cars parked on the street, which will add to congestion and danger during drop-offs and pick-ups. The height of the buildings will also reduce the light along Northcote Road and Guthrie Road, as well as meaning that the apartments will be overlooking a school playground and classrooms, as well as blocking views and light for residents in these roads too.</p>	12-Jul-22
150.	<p>Dear Sirs I would like to raise the following concerns: Highways safety concerns, in particular concerns in relation to the potential for vehicular conflicts with school drop offs/pick ups and with the movement of children along Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue; ¿ Concerns around the potential for overlooking into the school grounds and buildings; ¿ Impacts on the setting of school buildings which comprise important heritage assets as well as impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; ¿ Any daylight/sunlight impacts on school buildings; ¿ Concerns around how construction would be managed and any impacts this may have on the operation of the school.</p>	12-Jul-22
151.	<p>Potential safeguarding for high rise flats overlooking school grounds Conflict with school traffic Conflict with main traffic as is already caused by access to the zoo Very important heritage site and buildings will dramatically change the landscape</p>	12-Jul-22

152.	<p>As a zoo member for 17 years I can understand why the zoo wants to redevelop the site and am not against the principle of redeveloping the site. However, I am also a parent of a child at Clifton College and am therefore very familiar with the vehicular access issues of the roads immediately surrounding the zoo. I have read the access documents, Highways Agency report, and the transport statement. It is true that compared to current traffic levels generated at the site from its existing three car parks (assuming we include the Ladies Mile temporary car park), that traffic generated at the site proposed will probably be lower. However, it is disingenuous to therefore conclude that the proposed vehicular access to the site is acceptable. Currently most vehicle access to the BZG site is from Clifton Down into the existing car park at the front of the zoo and closest to the visitor entrance. As proposed there will be no vehicular access to the site from Clifton Down. The next most busy vehicular access is to the Ladies Mile car park (albeit only on certain days of the year). Again this will not be in use in relation to the site. The only current vehicular access that will also be in use in the new site is College Road - as there is currently an overflow car park here. As proposed, vehicular access to the site will primarily use roads which are not currently used by visitors to the BZG site. This is a change at the micro level despite what the planning application states re the overall levels of traffic in the vicinity to the existing site. It is completely inappropriate for access to the site to either be from Guthrie Road or Northcote Road. Northcote road is a particularly narrow one-way road with a very tight bend, which will deliver cars to The Avenue. Both Northcote Road and The Avenue are surrounded by Clifton College buildings which children have to cross continuously throughout the day. They are already busy enough with existing traffic and it would be unsafe to add any more traffic. Guthrie Road is also already very busy and is not wide enough for two cars to pass for most of its length. Adding any more traffic would make the safety for school children even worse than currently as again there is a need to cross the road continuously to access the spread out school buildings. The existing access for buses for sports transport to the school's sports ground in Failand and trips would also be significantly affected. Overall I think the traffic access needs to be revised and the only acceptable vehicular access to the site should be from Clifton Down. If this is not possible because the zoo does not own the land that would enable this, then the zoo needs to rethink its intentions. This is before we consider overlooking, impact on heritage assets, and how construction will be managed given the access points proposed. All of which are reasons to object in their own right.</p>	12-Jul-22
153.	<p>Dear sir/madam, The idea of the zoo turn into residential will be DISASTER. it will be clogged with car park problem, congestion etc., it would be good to preserve and make the Zoo for more environmentally friendly. It will only profit the company who make the building/housing. It will affect our community, the school - Clifton College. Please do not give permission to build into a commercial or property development.</p>	12-Jul-22

154.	<p>This space should remain as an area of natural beauty for general public enjoyment. An alternative plan ought to be implemented without the creation of further dwellings in the relevant area. The addition of peripheral housing will detract greatly from accessibility of the remaining gardens, irreversibly diminish the historic nature of the preexisting buildings, all while increasing the population density of the area and causing significant additional burden on the surrounding infrastructure. Clifton is already densely populated and this planning application will worsen the living conditions of all, including new residents within any complex. Converting an important national public asset (in public, charitable hands) into a housing development is very far from the stated objective of BZS/BZG "protecting the legacy of Bristol Zoo Gardens". The Charity Commission ought to be invited to comment on the conversion of critical charity assets so inseparable from the charitable objectives of BZS/BZG.</p>	12-Jul-22
155.	<p>Whilst I understand the need for the site to be developed the design of the proposed residential buildings are ugly and totally out of keeping with their surrounding properties. Please ensure a more appropriate design is used.</p>	12-Jul-22
156.	<p>Dear Sir, I am writing in support of the above planning application and thoroughly approve of all of the changes made in Savill's cover letter, Planning Statement and supporting documents. Yours faithfully Miriam Hare (Mrs)</p>	12-Jul-22
157.	<p>I think the planned proposal responds sensitively to its setting. I approve of its sustainability proposals, and as someone whose ancestor, Francis Adams, sold the land to the Zoo in the first place, I like the way that some of the historical buildings including the Aquarium are being conserved. I particularly approve of the public access to the gardens in the daytime and of delivering 200 high quality eco friendly new homes for Bristol.</p>	12-Jul-22

158.	<p>22/02737/F Bristol Zoo Gardens Guthrie Road Bristol BS8 3HA Redevelopment of site to include 201 residential units (Class C3), the provision of community floorspace (Class E, F1 and F2), and open space with associated landscaping, play space, parking, accesses (pedestrian, cycle and vehicular), infrastructure, works to listed buildings, and selective demolition of buildings. Principle of redevelopment The Zoo Gardens are designated as public open space in the development plan and on reflection the Society is not convinced by the current plans to partially develop the site for housing whilst retaining open space as publicly accessible gardens. We think that the proposal is neither fish nor fowl. It would be better either being kept as open space or redeveloped for housing. The Society questions who will wish to visit the site when it is surrounded and dominated by private housing. The special character of the existing Gardens will be further eroded with vehicles accessing an area where no vehicles have previously been permitted, both passing through the open space and parking there on a permanent basis. The verdant nature of the area will inevitably be completely transformed. In addition, there will be the challenge of maintaining such a significant area of open space, presumably paid for by service charges on future residents. There will be inevitable pressure to create a gated community at some point in the future. The Zoo Gardens currently provide an oasis of calm that has been enjoyed by Bristolians for generations. We consider that they are of such special environmental and historical importance that they should be retained as a fully accessible public asset. Detailed response Nevertheless, if the development in something like its current housing plus open space form is accepted, we have the following comments. In our response to the earlier consultation we welcomed the principles published to guide the future of the Bristol Zoo site. The Society has considered whether the proposals match the aspiration of these principles. In particular, the aim to "create an inspiring and sustainable development that celebrates the site's natural and built heritage. We will create space for communities to thrive and the wider public to enjoy - a legacy to make us and Bristol proud." The retention of open space for future public access (even if used less than if it was completely open space), and the reuse of historic buildings, are positive proposals. The proposed Conservation Hub is welcome. However, in the Society's view the current proposals fall short of the stated aspirations in a number of ways. Aspects of the proposals also cut across adopted development plan policies, in particular DM17 in the Bristol Local Plan - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies which states, "Development on part, or all, of an Important Open Space as designated on the Policies Map will not be permitted unless the development is ancillary to the open space use." The Society has reservations over the heights of several of the proposed residential blocks and considers that further detailed assessment will be required. The Society also has reservations about the quality of the architecture, and notes that others have also expressed the view that this site deserves building design proposals which make a much more positive contribution to the appearance of the Conservation Area and to the setting of Listed Buildings. This particular issue remains a critical aspect when making an overall assessment of the case to change the main use of the site. The Society is disappointed by the lack of ambition with respect to the eco credentials of the project, particularly with such a high level of car provision in such an accessible location. Height of buildings The Society has significant reservations about the heights of several of the proposed residential blocks and considers that further detailed assessment will be required. These reservations concern the impact of the heights of the perimeter blocks on the wider conservation area and on the internal character of the gardens themselves. The latter concern also applies to the town</p>	12-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

	<p>houses arcing around the lake, albeit to a lesser extent. Further assessment is required with respect to the proposed residential blocks to the north and northeast. At 7 storeys the corner block may well have adverse impacts both on the general appearance of the Conservation Area and on the specific amenities of neighbouring properties. Whilst the heights on the northern edge reduce gradually from 6, 5 and 4 storeys there is a need to carefully assess their visual impact. The Society is not convinced that the planning application demonstrates the potential impact of the proposed buildings by means of verified views. It has proved difficult to identify which views are being demonstrated and to assess in detail the potential future impact, particularly on neighbouring residents. Clifton Conservation Hub The Society welcomes the proposal to repurpose the iconic entrance building to provide for a range of conservation related activities. This seems an appropriate future for this historic part of the site. Vehicle access, circulation, and parking The Society is disappointed by the lack of ambition with respect to future car ownership and parking. Surely this well-located site has the potential to become an exemplar for a car-free development. The developers' own plan showing "resident routes to key local facilities" provides very real evidence that key local facilities are all within easy walking distance. The need to provide circulation routes and undercroft parking areas makes the development much more invasive in terms of its impacts on the gardens than would be necessary with a car-free scheme. Details are required to demonstrate how the proposed vehicle access off Northcote Road will actually operate in practice. The Guthrie Road access exists and is more straightforward in terms of future operation. Retention of public access As noted above, there is clearly a challenge in retaining public access to the open spaces when they will be bounded by private residential areas. The juxtaposition of private and public outside areas will need very careful design and planning to ensure satisfying experiences for all parties. There is lack of clarity about the future of the water body - is it really to be utilised for wind surfing and boating or for more conservation related purposes? As the illustrations demonstrate, and notwithstanding the efforts made to avoid significant incursions into the gardens, the Society fears that much of the essential character of the gardens will be lost. This is because of the likely visual dominance of the apartment blocks and the resulting sense of overbearing the gardens. Currently the gardens offer oases of tranquillity and privacy from urban bustle, with a minimal sense of intrusion from the outside world. There is a very real risk these will be lost, in part because of the dominance of the proposed buildings but also because of the manner in which the service roads dissect the site and will bring vehicular movement deep into the gardens. It is absolutely fundamental that if the BZS truly want to deliver a legacy consistent with the principles it published, then it should commit to binding any future developer to the proposals.</p>	
159.	I fully support preservation and propose enhancing the existing historical Zoo; and wholeheartedly oppose the redevelopment plans.	12-Jul-22
160.	This is a terrible and unimaginative use of the space and I strongly object. We do not need more houses and instead need a peaceful space that the existing community can enjoy. More housing will only add to increased population and traffic in an already heavily populated area.	12-Jul-22
161.		13-Jul-22

162.	I am a parent of a child who boards at Clifton College in a house directly opposite this house. I do not want under any circumstances people living in these 201 houses looking into my sons dormitory or indeed whilst he is in lessons. Any person, potential sex offender, secret paedophile can buy or rent one of these properties. It is disgusting of the Zoo to propose this. The site should be kept as an environmental learning centre for ALL children in BCC area. The Zoo cares for animals - why not children?. Surely there is a safeguarding issue here?	13-Jul-22
163.	I fully support this proposal, which will add much needed smaller housing units to Clifton. It's particularly welcome that there will be free access to the gardens for all (not the case now). I have complete confidence that the Zoo will have carefully considered all viable options and that the proposed scheme, when finished, will be of benefit to the neighbourhood and local residents.	13-Jul-22
164.	The updated plans remain wholly inappropriate in an area of conservation. The proximity to the school, the Downs and a Resedential neighbourhood has not been considered in proposing a huge block of flats that are an eyesore. I'm not opposed to development but I can see no sensitivity demonstrated here. Strongly oppose	13-Jul-22
165.	I have not seen any part of the revised plan which considers the impact on the neighbourhood, surrounding schools, traffic and conservation area.	13-Jul-22
166.	I fully object to the proposed plans as they stand for the following reasons: Major concern over the height of the new buildings. They will limit light to the surrounding homes, school and frankly make no sense in a conservation area. Furthermore, the school grounds and buildings will be overlooked. Whilst I appreciate the need for homes - this is a completely inappropriate site. Due to size of the plot 200 homes requires a 'high rise' modern type build, will increase traffic (in an already busy area), reduce air quality, create major safety issues for the neighbourhood and 2 large schools and destroy the feel of the conservation area. Why does it have to be 200 homes - I fail to see the rationale for this number in this particular area. The overall management of the build in an area with constant flow of school traffic and children is a major concern. The area already suffers from unsafe drivers. I can't see a construction management plan. Whilst it would be wonderful to see this historic site continue to benefit Bristol - this current plan appears to benefit the pockets of the developers at the detriment of those who actually reside in Bristol.	13-Jul-22
167.	I object most strongly. The plan to build so many blocks so close to the boundary and with buildings so high is preposterous as it will upset the local residents of College Road and Northcote Road as well the students and staff of Clifton College whose privacy will be invaded. The noise disruption should also be considered and the air pollution that would ensue with so many extra vehicles would be undesirable. The interior area of the site looks delightful so would it be possible to develop this idea further by constructing more houses there?	13-Jul-22

168.	When I first saw the proposal I uttered the words of John McEnroe: "You can't be serious!". Even a child would spot the failings of this proposal. Too high, too many and far too ugly. This is a wonderful opportunity to develop probably the best building site in the UK and what is being proposed is shameful. The City of Bristol deserves better than to allow greed to offset conservation of the aesthetic of its architecture. I note that many of those in support don't live anywhere near the site and this should be borne in mind when the planning decision is made.	13-Jul-22
169.	I support this application. Although I am sad to see the Zoo go from its existing site, I think the the proposed use of the land is very much in keeping with the area and will provide amenities for the community for years to come. I note that not only are there plans for public use of the gardens, but also mixed tenure housing to bring balanced communities to one of the most affluent parts of Bristol, building on its legacy as a city where opportunities created by the great city are shared.	13-Jul-22
170.	The parking is already difficult here in Clifton, and the shops and cafes have sufficient trade. Princess Victoria Street - narrowed as it now is - has now become over-cluttered. An increase in numbers of cars, bikes and e-scooters would not improve the area.	13-Jul-22
171.	The proposed development is completely inappropriate in this location between the Downs and Clifton College School. It will be very detrimental to the heritage aspects linked to multiple buildings in the immediate vicinity which is a Conservation Area. It is hard to see how the safety risk and nuisance from the number of additional and heavy traffic movements both during construction and once complete can be adequately mitigated - if you consider the construction of Crossrail as an example; although the main construction works had a very good safety record, 4 members of the public were killed, in separate accidents by construction lorries associated with the project - this is a risk that cannot be ignored particularly bearing in mind the proximity of a major school.	13-Jul-22
172.		14-Jul-22
173.	The size of the proposed development is totally out of keeping with the local area and impacts negatively on the Clifton conservation area. The proposed felling of over 40% of trees on site does not conform to conservation guidelines. The site will unsafely mix a huge increase in traffic on the site with pedestrians and there is no guarantee that the site will remain open to public pedestrian access in the long term. This reduces an open space amenity and increases pollution and built up areas. Whilst the site proposes to have affordable housing, it is unlikely to be in high enough numbers to meet housing needs, instead providing high net worth individuals with luxury premises at the expenses of demolishing or converting historic buildings of community and cultural value. Change the use of the site by all means but do not grant permission to developers motivated by profit with no thought to a valuable community resource and open space.	14-Jul-22

174.	<p>I am concerned about the scale and number of the additional residential buildings that seem totally out of keeping for a conservation area. This large construction project that will bring significant heavy goods vehicles and plant machinery during construction will have a detrimental effect on local traffic, increase pollution and could compromise schoolchildren's safety in Guthrie Rd and College Rd. If and when completed, this scheme will bring with it too many additional residents' vehicles for the inadequate parking proposed for the development. A spurious assumption that residents probably won't have vehicles would not I'm sure hold water. These additional vehicles will invariably park in the local residential roads that are already choked with cars especially during University term times when we are inundated with student vehicles that rarely move. The proposal that will bring yet more vehicles to Clifton without providing any additional parking is surely counter to BCC's environmental and transport policies and certainly impacts on residents such as ourselves who do not have off road parking. It appears obvious that high density, high price housing planned to enrich the developers is driving a proposal that will add little to the local community, will increase road traffic and pollution whilst removing an historic and aesthetically appropriate visitor attraction. I totally understand the Zoo's need and wish to move and understand that something must use the valuable space they vacate. The alternative proposal floated for a future environmental visitor attraction seems to have many merits. But I object totally to the proposal for high density scheme that does not consider the impact on the local community as currently configured.</p>	14-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

175.	<p>I write as a former pupil of Clifton College who is still connected to it and also as a part-time local resident. I wish to object to the proposals. The Zoo has enjoyed and earned a fine reputation locally, nationally and internationally since the 1830s. It has had a very good relationship with the College and other neighbours for at least 160 years. If these proposals go through, its legacy will be seen very differently.</p> <p>Specifically, the addition of 200 dwellings on this site will greatly increase the flow of traffic, particularly larger and service vehicles, through College Road, Guthrie Road and Northcote Road. All of these are used throughout the school term by pupils - some of them very young - as they travel within the wider College campus.</p> <p>Northcote Road is particularly vulnerable, being a narrow one-way, residential street often already filled with parking and is used by large numbers of young pupils. The anticipated significant increase in the volume and nature of traffic has to create a real risk for the pupils of the College (and those who supervise them) and other neighbours. The proposal includes buildings of 5, 6 and 7 storeys and these will overlook many neighbours. There have to be specific safeguarding risks in the current proposals, particularly relating to the children of the College (and other children living locally) in these circumstances. It is highly pertinent that this will include children boarding in the College on a full-time basis. Many very local neighbours will be significantly impacted by the reduction in sunlight. The surrounding area will be significantly impacted by these proposals in terms of the loss of historic views, whether that is from within Clifton Village or from the Downs. The proposed development is within a Conservation Area and in what has been described as "the finest suburb in England". The planning authorities should be seeking to maintain that reputation. This does not mean not allowing the site to be developed or sanctioning only a pastiche development. What it does mean is that any development should be modern, proportionate and sympathetic to the surrounding area. This proposal is none of those things and the Zoo will leave the site it has enjoyed for almost 2 centuries with a regrettable legacy and its fine reputation diminished and with the planning authority creating a precedent for development it may also regret.</p>	15-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

176.	<p>15 July 2022 Bristol Zoological Gardens Redevelopment 22/02737/F Letter of Objection Dear Mr Bunt Speaking as Bristol resident for most of my adult life, a large part of which was spent in Clifton, I strongly object to the shocking proposals for the development of the Zoo following its impending departure. The Zoo has always been a vital part of the community as well as for the entire City of Bristol as well as an attraction for the whole of the Southwest of England and Wales. For it to be replaced by such a massive housing development of such proportions is too horrible to fathom. Although aerial projections show pleasing parkland and a smattering of reasonable sized houses, the perimeter of the Zoo site is nothing but relentless barricades of high-rise flats which are a horrifying addition to the neighbourhood, whether viewed from within or from the surrounding roads, residences and the school. The whole concept is absolutely abhorrent, especially within the Conservation Area. The architecture alone does not reflect this part of Bristol in the least. I gather that 200 homes are envisioned. The result of such a plan guarantees the arrival of at least 400 new residents and the strain on infrastructure for matters more than increased traffic and parking mayhem. Our experience when living in this area always involved the challenge of street parking, but there was always greater ease when school was not in session. But now - the problems will be more constant with many more permanent residents. My greatest objection, however, regards the monstrous perimeter structures - their height, size, volume, architecture and complete lack of a sympathetic blend with the Clifton Conservation Area. Having not been to previous consultations, it is hard to comprehend that something like this has been allowed to progress to this stage. As stated, I strongly object to the proposals on all counts, but particularly for the scope of this appalling project. Yours sincerely Mary Isaac</p>	15-Jul-22
177.	We would like to object strongly to the proposed plans for the development of the zoo - for the reasons outlined so succinctly by the Tobacco Factory. They would forever change the nature of a very special area.	16-Jul-22
178.	We would like to object again to the proposed development at Bristol Zoo which would undoubtedly make life difficult for Clifton College. The buildings overpower all those nearby and the parking provision appears totally inadequate. Moreover, the strain on local services such as doctors' surgeries would be excessive.	16-Jul-22
179.	We would like to object to the proposed development at Bristol Zoo. The intended buildings at the edge of the site are totally out of keeping with the surrounding late nineteenth century architecture, in building materials, design and scale. This is particularly undesirable in a conservation area. Moreover, it is surely unrealistic to think that private houses within the site will mix with play areas and paths for cyclists travelling at speed. Such density of housing would set a dangerous precedent for future development in Clifton. We would also deplore the felling of any trees at the site. Jon and Pat Millington	16-Jul-22

180.	This is an abomination! The design is totally out of keeping with what is a very beautiful and historic part of the City. The principle of housing on the site of the zoo is not in question, but the design is dreadful and should be completely re-thought.	17-Jul-22
181.		17-Jul-22
182.	<p>I have loved visiting the zoo since I was a little girl, as did my parents and grandparents. There are fond stories from each generation of my family and I look forward to visiting the new site at Wildspace and starting more memories there in due course. While I grew up on the outskirts of the city I now live and work in Clifton, it is my home. I am sincerely disappointed with these plans. I am perhaps biased - I fell in love with the Our world Bristol idea being supported by the Eden Project and backed by local businesses to create the Worlds First Virtual Reality Zoo and Gardens. These plans have my backing as true vision for the future and cementing a Bristol Zoo legacy while increasing the gardens size. My two criticisms: out of character designs for the area and the loss of nearly 45% of the 381 trees. But putting my perhaps bias aside I do have concerns for these plans the architecture doesn't fit in with surrounding buildings. The neighbouring houses are dominantly Georgian and Victorian structures, while the building designs here are modern and the character in my opinion would be lost. If you are building in such a historic area there needs to be more sympathetic to the neighbouring designs. The gardens have been lovingly planted and looked after for 180 + years, they have been planted like the Westonbirt Arboretum - they are meant to be viewed together and were landscaped purposely for the backdrop of the zoo. The loss of nearly 45% of the trees is unacceptable in a modern city like Bristol during an acknowledged Climate crisis. There is 381 trees in the Bristol Zoo gardens and nearly 45% of the trees would be felled with these designs and the remaining trees would be put at risk due to their root systems likely being damaged during the construction phase that it is likely the loss would be far greater than 45%. The loss of biodiversity and canopy cover would be felt and noticed for residents. It is estimated there would be a biodiversity net loss of 22% by the Bristol Tree Forum rather than the net gain of 36% they are proposing. I question some of their maths in the application, which doesn't add up and call for an independent calculation. These gardens have been a part of the city since 1836 and they have been lovingly maintained by the zoo - the trees in the zoo gardens are noted nationally (champion trees from the gardens are included on the national register) and internationally recognised too and should not be felled or put at risk. This is not the legacy the zoo should leave behind in its home of over 180 years - it has a responsibility to practice what they preach. Losing this many trees will negatively affect the tree canopy cover in the area. While the Clifton ward has one of the best tree canopy covers in Bristol, it is still under the recommended tree canopy cover for a healthy city of 30%. We need to be prioritising existing mature trees while planting new ones, mature trees have larger canopy cover than newly planted trees. (Replacing a 100 year old tree with new sapling will not cover the loss of habitat, biodiversity or canopy cover and thus carbon intake.) Also there is no tree planting sites remaining in Clifton or Clifton Down - the area would lose this canopy cover and trees altogether. The Zoo charity has a responsibility to Bristol residents and neighbours to provide best value, this is not exclusive to price from property developers but best decision to seal their legacy and to leave behind something worthwhile. I have read both the Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society response and the Bristol Tree Forum's response and am concerned with the zoos current application. The trees should be awarded TPO's and protected, the plans need to be re-thought out so 90% of the trees are retained.</p>	17-Jul-22

183.	<p>Actually very disappointed with these designs. I understand the zoo wants to make a hefty profit from property developers but as someone who has been their neighbour for a significant number of years I feel they are letting us down. I have read comments made by the Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society, Bristol Tree Forum, Historic England, CAP and a number of local people within Bristol boundary. Most comments are in favour for the relocation of the zoo, while it is a much beloved part of our city the need for bigger enclosures so the animals have a better quality of life has been much needed for a long time. However, most comments are not in favour of these designs and plans. They lack imagination and do not fit in to the conservation area it is in. The designs are disappointing and will soon become an eye sore within the Georgian and Victorian community it is surrounded by. As many residents already struggle with parking and deliveries things will only get worse. It feels Bristol is a leader for the environment, we were the green capitol in 2015, we led cities in the UK to acknowledge the Climate crisis, Greta Thunberg gave a speech to the masses here just before the lockdowns. Why with a disappearing tree canopy across our city are we entertaining plans that do not respect our beliefs and mature and ancient trees. Nearly 45 % trees look to be felled under these plans, yet the actual number will be much higher - many roots will be destroyed or damaged in construction and their root protection acts won't be upheld. The transplant of several trees idea is a lovely idea but the success rate of trees being moved is low but won't be seen for several years. It is likely out of the hundreds of trees it is likely 70% + trees will be felled or die. It is outrageous the area will lose so much biodiversity, mature and ancient tree canopy cover and the designs to be destroyed and not replaced in the area - as there are no available tree planting pits in the Clifton, Clifton Down wards on the Bristol City Council website. Marvin Rees, councillor for property development should be disappointed for these plans. I reject these proposals. I welcome new plans with a better understanding for the area and more respect for the nature and the gardens they want to be built on.</p>	17-Jul-22
184.	<p>I have placed several objections to these plans over the previous months. To my mind mismanagement of the Zoo's aims top my list, followed by inappropriate financial greed, inappropriate architectural dreams, and inappropriate hectoring of those involved with the outcome of traffic planning, amongst others. To those who have taken issue with Clifton College for fighting the planning application I ask; isn't taking care of No. 1 exactly what the Zoo are doing? Bristol Zoo Gardens are approximately 30 years older than the original Clifton College buildings. If Clifton College Chapel, and perhaps other buildings on the campus, is designated as a Grade 2 building by English Heritage could it not be feasible for Bristol Zoo Gardens to become part of English Heritage, Landmark Trust or National Trust to preserve what has been known for generations?</p>	18-Jul-22

185.	<p>Should one drive from Cribbs Causeway, past Westbury on Trym and up Falcondale Road onto Westbury Road, there appears before one's eyes beautifully constructed buildings in what is a familiar red stone. At White Tree roundabout the Downs open up to the right whilst on the left are the buildings that used to be St. Christopher's School. That view continues until Spire Hospital at the top of Blackboy Hill. The houses there are just the frontispiece for Henleaze, Redland and Cotham, mostly in the locally quarried red stone. Turning right at the top of Blackboy Hill takes one onto Downs Road, and the commencement of more beautiful red stoned houses down Pembroke Road, (the only exception being called euphemistically 'Paddy's Wigwam'), and then The Avenue with Clifton College Prep School in red stone. And the The Zoo. Approaching Bristol from the Long Ashton Bypass one has the splendid view of the Crescents overlooking the river and harbour. Along the Portway there are no houses as such until one turns right up Bridge Valley road. At the top, on the right, is Canynge Road which leads into Clifton, but on the right there is a building called The Mansion House, and a substantial row of houses that, again leads to Clifton. What a splendid sight those red houses are. And then the Zoo. I have been familiar with what I have described for seventy odd years. I am dismayed to find the plans for the 'refurbishment' of Bristol Zoo gardens are not in keeping with what I have described, but more of mass habitation out of kilter with the conservation area surrounding it. The tall blocks on the perimeter of the zoo, with animals depicted, will be an eyesore, and once winter arrives with lights on in the windows and the heat pumps operating, they will appear more like a cruise ship at sea. So, with that in mind, I suggest that the planners insist on funnels being included in the plans and the whole being called, 'SS Clifton Encore'.</p>	18-Jul-22
186.		18-Jul-22

187.	<p>I object most strongly to these proposals. Could I be thinking, possibly, that greed, misappropriation, misjudgement are involved? The artists' impressions of how the Bristol Zoo Gardens will look when completed are just an idealised utopia. Don't be seduced- in practice, the realities will be very different. Will the Conservation Hub actually include details of the surrounding conservation area outside the Zoo gardens? I think not. In theory there will be two kinds of people who will live in what is proposed- this who are able to afford what is on offer, and those who are unable to do so. There will be resentment between those who can and those who cannot. I have been unable to come to terms with the 40% of 'Affordable Housing' in this setting, therefore, for those who, like me, are not sure what this means, I recommend two pieces of reading. One is the entry posted on the 15th. July named 'Housing Enabling' and the other on the internet by The Bureau of Investigative Journalism on 'Affordable Housing'. There are approximately 20,000 names on the Bristol City Council's and surrounding areas waiting for 'Social Housing'. In the 1980s Margaret Thatcher's Government introduced the 'Right to Buy' for those in long term tenancy agreements, and some 2,000,000 Council owned properties became privately owned at a heavily subsidised Government rate. Less than 5% have been replaced by new builds. So why has Boris Johnson stated publicly that he intends to extend the scheme? Council/Social housing has always been, and will continue to be, a badly needed source of housing, especially as the population increases at an exponential rate. But, please, not in the Zoo's new build, even though inclusion of 'Affordable Housing' is compulsory. Therefore the whole scheme should be stopped in its tracks with immediate effect. No trees should be felled or damaged in whatever happens in the Zoo Gardens. The gardens themselves that will be open to the public will be a magnet for those aimless individuals who sit around drinking alcohol and leave their discarded containers for others to dispose of. The plans include a grand plan to save the Bear Pit and the Raptor Aviary. These are wild creatures that need to roam. I do hope that the Polar Bear Corner will not be saved. To see the Polar Bears in their confined quarters rocking their heads from side to side as a result of their madness was pitiful. They were shot, as I recall. I would like to see local billionaires offering a substantial collective amount to the present Zoological Society so that The Wild Place Project can go ahead but to leave the present Zoo Gardens and Car park without the shameful blocks of flats and new builds. Surely, in this day and age, an agreement along these lines could be mobilised? The present planning application is a disgrace and needs a radical rethink. It is not fit for purpose.</p>	18-Jul-22
188.		18-Jul-22

189.	<p>At first sight the plans would appear to have some positives - providing a range of housing, keeping the gardens as a community resource, as well as preserving historic zoo buildings. There are many admirable box ticks - eco friendly credentials in spades, a conservation hub, disabled parking, play areas, exhibition and meeting spaces. Get past the idealised artist's impressions, however, and a different story emerges. The surrounding conservation area, which includes the many listed buildings on the Clifton College campus, is famous for the harmoniousness of its architectural style and proportions. I am reluctant to use the now overworked 'iconic' but the view of the College as you walk up College Road, alongside The Close and towards the Chapel can only be described thus. Imagine passing the Memorial Arch and being confronted with this proposed abomination. The planners seem keen to preserve or repurpose the historic structures in the zoo and some of these existing buildings will no doubt become very desirable homes, though why anyone would want to preserve structures such as the Bear Pit and the Birds of Prey Aviary, where beautiful birds and creatures lived a life of monotony and misery eludes me. Unfortunately the architects seem to have gone out of their way to provide the most incongruous design possible when it comes to the apartment blocks around the perimeter. They can only be described as an eyesore in the context of their surroundings. No amount of animal murals, cascading greenery and elephant bunting will disguise this. I am sure the new designs have architectural merit in many settings but please, not here. Apart from the lack of aesthetic appeal the blocks are far too tall and their close proximity to other buildings will have a negative impact on the daylight and privacy of local residents and the students working and living at Clifton College. The desire to keep large areas of the site as communal gardens is laudable, but the ambitious plans for landscaping and planting will require a large team of gardeners and groundsmen to maintain. Will the residents in affordable housing be willing or even able to contribute to this? The number of spaces allotted for parking - 100 - is totally inadequate for 200 residences in an area which already struggles for space. Twelve acres is a comparatively small area for this project and I believe it is too much of a compromise to provide this density of housing alongside the planned areas of open space. I strongly object to these proposals.</p>	18-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

190.	<p>The Bristol Zoo site has been a marvellous resource for the residents of the whole of Bristol and a wide surrounding area for a very long time. I believe it should be preserved and maintained as a Botanical Garden which it has been up until now. The surrounding prison-like walls should be demolished - they are no longer needed to protect citizens from ferocious wild animals. The area can be opened up for free access on a permanent basis for Bristol residents at least. It is very likely that residents in the surrounding areas would be willing to contribute by subscription to maintain this as a free service for everyone. The model in my mind is that of the very old and spectacular Botanical Gardens in Durban, South Africa. I do not think that present plans will lead to this site being freely open to the public for very long because those who have paid considerable sums for the larger accommodations will inevitably want to exclude the public after some time and I do not know how effective any safeguards would be to prevent this. Affordable housing is a praiseworthy concept which I would support. In fact, it would be better to set aside an area on the periphery of the site for modest but well designed affordable housing only, perhaps available to key workers for rent (otherwise modest purchased houses would be passed on at immodest prices after a while). This might require the financial and administrative input of Bristol City Council and I don't know how they would regard this. The present building plans are, as usual, completely out of character for this part of Bristol. The buildings are too tall and too monolithic. Whatever else is decided, far prettier buildings are needed to fit in with local character. The ground floor parking under the proposed new buildings is inexpressibly ugly and inappropriate in these times. Vehicle parking should only be available to staff maintaining the gardens. There has never been parking on the zoo site and it should not start now. There is a very good adjacent public bus service. Like the Cribbs Causeway development which is not in Bristol, the new Wild Place Project zoo site is outside Bristol and no benefits, financial or reputational, accrue to Bristol. Let us at least make a new and spectacular Botanical Garden a credit to Bristol.</p>	18-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

191.	<p>The Bristol Zoo site has been a marvellous resource for the residents of the whole of Bristol and a wide surrounding area for a very long time. I believe it should be preserved and maintained as a Botanical Garden which it has been up until now. The surrounding prison-like walls should be demolished - they are no longer needed to protect citizens from ferocious wild animals. The area can be opened up for free access on a permanent basis for Bristol residents at least. It is very likely that residents in the surrounding areas would be willing to contribute by subscription to maintain this as a free service for everyone, and I certainly would. The model in my mind is that of the very old and spectacular Botanical Gardens in Durban, South Africa. I do not think that present plans will lead to this site being freely open to the public for very long because those who have paid considerable sums for the larger accommodations will inevitably want to exclude the public after some time and I doubt the efficacy of any safeguards to prevent this. Affordable housing is a praiseworthy concept which I would support. In fact, it would be better to set aside an area on the periphery of the site for modest but well designed affordable housing only, perhaps available to key workers for rent (otherwise modest purchased houses would be passed on at immodest prices after a while). The present building plans are, as usual, completely out of character for the heritage of historic Bristol. The buildings are too tall and too monolithic. Whatever else is decided, far prettier buildings are needed to fit in with local character. The ground floor parking under the proposed new buildings is inexpressibly ugly and inappropriate in these times. Vehicle parking should only be available to staff maintaining the gardens. There has never been parking on the zoo site and it should not start now. There is a very good adjacent public bus service. Like the Cribbs Causeway development which is not in Bristol, the new Wild Place Project zoo site is outside Bristol and no benefits, financial or reputational, accrue to Bristol. Let us at least make a new and spectacular Botanical Garden a credit to Bristol.</p>	18-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

192.	<p>I'm writing to object to the proposal of the redevelopment of the Bristol Zoo grounds as set out in 22/02737/F. As a parent of several children that attend Clifton College I have the following concerns: 1. Highways & child safety concerns, in particular concerns in relation to the potential for vehicular conflicts with school drop offs/pick ups and with the movement of children along Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue. I am concerned around the increased risk to child safety during pick up/ drop off from schools, and during the movement between buildings during the school day. This includes during proposed construction. As a former Chair of Governors of another Bristol school, who's son was hit by a car coming home from school I wrote to the Council requesting revisions to road safety - this was ignored - and regrettably, a few years later a pupil was killed by a vehicle meters from where my son had been hit. 2. Concerns around the potential for overlooking into the school grounds and buildings- as a society we have a duty of care to protect children, and the current proposals do not allow such protection with the overlooking of school grounds enabling increased risk of predatory advances, photographs and targeting of specific children. 3. The development will have a significant impact on the setting of school buildings which comprise important heritage assets as well as impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This devalues the heritage of the school and surrounding area. 4. The current proposals will have a negative impact on daylight/sunlight on school buildings which directly effects the learning of pupils, and in particular those that suffer from Seasonal Affective Disorder, and other mental health conditions. 5. I have serious concerns around how construction would be managed and the significant impact this may have on the operation of the school during this period, which is likely to be extensive.</p>	18-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

193.	<p>Objecting to a monstrous overdevelopment in a conservation area adjoining a school. The proposal seeks to triple the elevations of some of the existing buildings to then overlook school playgrounds, walkways and classrooms. Clifton College and buildings were designed by a legendary architect in Charles Hansom. The Zoo was also constructed in a sympathetic style to reflect the Clifton community and heritage. This proposal is not in keeping with any proportionality or sympathy for the existing neighbourhood and would ruin the nature of the area. In addition to the concerns for local school children, this proposal seeks to create the most densely populated area within Clifton which is renowned for being a historical setting without being encumbered by high rise blocks for which there is not sufficient road space to support. It is deeply inappropriate to position high rise housing with balconies overlooking school children and these plans have not taken into account these effects. Privacy will be completely compromised and adding so many residences with so many vehicles will deteriorate the safety and tranquility of the area for generations of school children to come.</p> <p>1. Highways & child safety concerns, in particular concerns in relation to the potential for vehicular conflicts with school drop offs/pick ups and with the movement of children along Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue. I am concerned around the increased risk to child safety during pick up/ drop off from schools, caused by the excess traffic that this overly dense proposed housing area would create</p> <p>2. Concerns around the potential for overlooking into the school grounds and buildings- as a society we have a duty of care to protect children, and the current proposals do not allow such protection with the overlooking of school grounds enabling increased risk of predatory advances, photographs and targeting of specific children. The proposed plans totally subvert the existing harmony in which the school exists.</p> <p>3. The development will have a significant impact on the setting of school buildings which comprise important heritage assets as well as impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This devalues the heritage of the school and surrounding area.</p> <p>4. The current proposals will have a negative impact on daylight/sunlight on school buildings which directly effects the learning of pupils, and in particular those that suffer from Seasonal Affective Disorder, and other mental health conditions.</p> <p>5. I have serious concerns around how construction would be managed and the significant impact this may have on the operation of the school during this period, which is likely to be extensive.</p> <p>- Dust is a major concern as many young children, mine included, suffer from Asthma and the resulting dust will be a major health concern for the young children attending school and playing sport outside.</p> <p>- Noise is a huge distraction for students at study and the gargantuan structures being proposed will require heavy digging & noisy construction with heavy equipment. We object strongly to this application and request that it be modified into a more appropriate scheme.</p>	19-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

194.	<p>Objecting to a monstrous overdevelopment in a conservation area adjoining a school. The proposal seeks to triple the elevations of some of the existing buildings to then overlook school playgrounds, walkways and classrooms. Clifton College and buildings were designed by a legendary architect in Charles Hansom. The Zoo was also constructed in a sympathetic style to reflect the Clifton community and heritage. This proposal is not in keeping with any proportionality or sympathy for the existing neighbourhood and would ruin the nature of the area. In addition to the concerns for local school children, this proposal seeks to create the most densely populated area within Clifton which is renowned for being a historical setting without being encumbered by high rise blocks for which there is not sufficient road space to support. It is deeply inappropriate to position high rise housing with balconies overlooking school children and these plans have not taken into account these effects. Privacy will be completely compromised and adding so many residences with so many vehicles will deteriorate the safety and tranquility of the area for generations of school children to come.</p> <p>1. Highways & child safety concerns, in particular concerns in relation to the potential for vehicular conflicts with school drop offs/pick ups and with the movement of children along Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue. I am concerned around the increased risk to child safety during pick up/ drop off from schools, caused by the excess traffic that this overly dense proposed housing area would create</p> <p>2. Concerns around the potential for overlooking into the school grounds and buildings- as a society we have a duty of care to protect children, and the current proposals do not allow such protection with the overlooking of school grounds enabling increased risk of predatory advances, photographs and targeting of specific children. The proposed plans totally subvert the existing harmony in which the school exists.</p> <p>3. The development will have a significant impact on the setting of school buildings which comprise important heritage assets as well as impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This devalues the heritage of the school and surrounding area.</p> <p>4. The current proposals will have a negative impact on daylight/sunlight on school buildings which directly effects the learning of pupils, and in particular those that suffer from Seasonal Affective Disorder, and other mental health conditions.</p> <p>5. I have serious concerns around how construction would be managed and the significant impact this may have on the operation of the school during this period, which is likely to be extensive.</p> <p>- Dust is a major concern as many young children, mine included, suffer from Asthma and the resulting dust will be a major health concern for the young children attending school and playing sport outside.</p> <p>- Noise is a huge distraction for students at study and the gargantuan structures being proposed will require heavy digging & noisy construction with heavy equipment. We object strongly to this application and request that it be modified into a more appropriate scheme.</p>	19-Jul-22
------	---	-----------

195.	<p>I am worried with the current plans about the damage to the biodiversity of the area. The Root Protection Act also would be broken by this property development as the trees are mature in the zoo and would be unduly damaged/ killed by the building foundations. During a period where Bristol is leading the march on environmental issues (such as the recent Clean Air Zone) why are we destroying local vegetation in order to build properties not even in keeping with the local area. Clifton, Bristol is also known for its beauty and classical architecture. This development looks generic and quite frankly ugly, this would destroy part of the character of the area and would lead to a loss in appeal for tourism and new residents looking to join the area. I am also concerned about the affect this development would have to the wider area. Residents who already live in the surrounding area already have difficulty parking and accepting deliveries. There are not enough parking spaces in the new plan which would lead to even more traffic issues in the surrounding areas.</p>	19-Jul-22
196.	<p>The zoo is looking to maximise the value of its land sale and to leave us with a terrible legacy. The council's job should be to protect the interests of its citizens - but as has been seen with the zoo's other application for the west car park it seems to side with the interests of developers. The zoo's development plans for the west car park have only been halted through the dogged work of a number of local residents - I am guessing that same group will challenge any approval given for this application of the main site. We are being asked to accept a high density, high rise development that will despoil a beautiful environment. Who, other than the zoo and its developers, could possibly think that was a good idea? The bitter pill is being sweetened with some greenwash about the development and some public access to the gardens - that seems a terrible deal to me. I hope the council roundly reject these plans and force the zoo into radically changing their strategy.</p>	19-Jul-22
197.	<p>The proposed plans are not sympathetic to the existing gardens, the other properties in the vicinity. There is absolutely no thought involved to make it a beautiful space - the blocks of apartments around the perimeter are too high and frankly hideous in design. If you were going to go modern at least use lots of reflective glass and perhaps wood and dark metals to give it some elements of the existing site. And keep the elevations low in keeping with surrounding property. It's another example of greed over what's actually appropriate. I no longer live in Clifton but the Zoo was part of my life and it would be such a shame to change it into some towering monolithic complex with some pretty bits in the middle. I strongly suggest a rethink, I can't imagine any neighbouring residents are at all happy about it</p>	20-Jul-22

198.	The proposed plans are not sympathetic to the existing gardens, the other properties in the vicinity. There is absolutely no thought involved to make it a beautiful space - the blocks of apartments around the perimeter are too high and frankly hideous in design. If you were going to go modern at least use lots of reflective glass and perhaps wood and dark metals to give it some elements of the existing site. And keep the elevations low in keeping with surrounding property. It's another example of greed over what's actually appropriate. I no longer live in Clifton but the Zoo was part of my life and it would be such a shame to change it into some towering monolithic complex with some pretty bits in the middle. I strongly suggest a rethink, I can't imagine any neighbouring residents are at all happy about it	20-Jul-22
199.	I object to the this planning application as it will increase the density in an already overpopulated area. It will have an adverse effect on air quality, infrastructure, increase traffic and noise. The surrounding area is already in trouble: potholes, filthy roads, blocked drains and broken street lighting. KEEP THIS SITE AS A LEARNING CENTRE FOR BRISTOL'S CHILDREN.	20-Jul-22
200.	I fully support this application. The plans are well thought-out and provide a much needed stock of sustainable and low cost housing in the area. While it is undoubtedly sad to lose Bristol Zoo Gardens, the new scheme will provide a hugely valuable and biodiverse community area that can still be enjoyed by the public (and for free!). The historical and heritage-rich buildings will be preserved, and there will still be a conservation presence in terms of the new Clifton Conservation Hub. The current site of Bristol Zoo Gardens is highly dilapidated and needs an unsustainable level of funding to maintain it. The proposed plans offer the only sustainable way forward. 'NIMBY' objections hold little weight in this context as they are short-sighted and acknowledge the decline of the site (owing to insufficient visitors and investment)	20-Jul-22
201.	Whilst some internal aspects of the existing zoological grounds appear to be "preserved" under these plans, the negative impact of the development Far Far outweigh these few sympathetic elements. Apart from the enormous disruption the actual construction works will have on the neighbouring citizens, school pupils & staff, wildlife and visitors that support this community, once completed, it is clearly evident that ongoing everyday life for these groups will be detrimentally affected by the project as it is currently proposed. The impact on local traffic, for example, with pollution and safety concerns amongst other considerations, will be excessive in comparison to the area expected to cope with such a huge increase in volume. The immediate neighbourhood and wider Clifton community is a conservation area that is the council's responsibility to protect. Whilst we should be open minded to how buildings and towns need to evolve to support people and the environment, these proposals do not present benefits in either respect apart from pure number of "housing". And the volume of this is far too excessive for the local infrastructure to cope with. Additionally, the outlooks that will be created are not nearly sympathetic enough for a conservation area.	20-Jul-22

202.	The local infrastructure can not possibly support this development without major disruption to traffic, safety and pollution. The overdevelopment of this site is contrary to the principles of this conservation area The project is not sympathetic to the zoo's heritage or the Clifton community	20-Jul-22
203.	The housing is too dense and not in keeping with houses in the area. They are too close to the adjacent roads and too high. The development is not suitable for the general public to be able to use the facilities.	20-Jul-22
204.	Clifton has a housing style of architecture that its residents and visitors admire. The proposed housing on this site makes no attempt to blend in with our traditional buildings. The "boxy" elevations are, I consider, quite ugly. As they have car parking at ground level they are one floor higher than necessary. The higher buildings on Northcote Road and Guthrie Road will dominate these roads. The proposed public access comments by the developer sounds good but I cannot imagine the residents making these visitors welcome. Will there be any facilities for these visitors? Will there be any visitors wanting to visit with their picnic baskets and barbecues and sit on the lawns? Too many of the existing trees are being removed. I visited a new housing development in Bath a few years ago and there were virtually no parking places included on the site. Residents were expected to use public transport, taxis or car hire. Why are there over 100 car spaces being included in this scheme? Bristol has a real car transport problem. Why allow more cars into the City? Other uses for this site should be considered. They may not be as profitable for the Zoo but may benefit the residents of Bristol more.	20-Jul-22
205.	Dear planning committee, I write to support the planning application of the Bristol Zoological Society to redevelop the Bristol Zoo Gardens into a residential and community asset park. I support this development because: > It will provide high-quality housing in direct proximity to the green spaces of the Downs and existing public transport links, at a time when Bristol needs them so much, without trimming Bristol's green belt, attracting new residents and families to this part of the city. > The proposed plan will open access to the wonders of the gardens for free to residents and neighbors, I can't wait to visit it regularly. > The historic entrance of the site seems to be protected in the plan and this will leave a landmark of the old zoo on-site. If this entrance building becomes a cafe and a community space as it is planned, it will be an amazing space to socialize and rest which is really needed near the Downs nature reserve (we have been waiting for toilets to be built for ages) > The proceeds of the development will give the Bristol Zoological Society the resources needed to build a new Bristol Zoo, 10 times bigger with a new campus in Cribbs Causeway delivering a new world-leading visitor attraction with major benefit for the region and its economy. I hope you will allow this to happen. I would not understand if you would stop this project led by an internationally acclaimed charity focused on animal conservation. Thanks in advance for your consideration.	20-Jul-22

206.	The proposed plans are not sympathetic to the existing gardens, the other properties in the vicinity. There is absolutely no thought involved to make it a beautiful space - the blocks of apartments around the perimeter are too high and frankly hideous in design. If you were going to go modern at least use lots of reflective glass and perhaps wood and dark metals to give it some elements of the existing site. And keep the elevations low in keeping with surrounding property. It's another example of greed over what's actually appropriate. I no longer live in Clifton but the Zoo was part of my life and it would be such a shame to change it into some towering monolithic complex with some pretty bits in the middle. I strongly suggest a rethink, I can't imagine any neighbouring residents are at all happy about it	20-Jul-22
207.	The proposed plans are not sympathetic to the existing gardens, the other properties in the vicinity. There is absolutely no thought involved to make it a beautiful space - the blocks of apartments around the perimeter are too high and frankly hideous in design. If you were going to go modern at least use lots of reflective glass and perhaps wood and dark metals to give it some elements of the existing site. And keep the elevations low in keeping with surrounding property. It's another example of greed over what's actually appropriate. I no longer live in Clifton but the Zoo was part of my life and it would be such a shame to change it into some towering monolithic complex with some pretty bits in the middle. I strongly suggest a rethink, I can't imagine any neighbouring residents are at all happy about it	20-Jul-22
208.		21-Jul-22
209.		21-Jul-22

210.	<p>Morning Matthew, I hope you are well. We understand from Sinead McKendry of Savills that they have issued a clarification additional to our Objection dated January 2023, grateful if you could note our clients position in this light: 1) In our objection dated January 2023, we note that "A Visually Verified Montage (VVM) view has been provided from across the College playing fields (The Close), from the base of the Cricket Pavilion. However, this only demonstrates the outline of the proposed South Buildings along Guthrie Road with a height of 3 to 4 storeys and not the larger scale development that sits at a higher level, namely the proposed perimeter apartments that make up the North Buildings with a maximum height of 6 storeys or the East Buildings which range in height from 3 to 5 storeys." Our concern with the VVM is not simply the location it is taken from but rather what it does/does not show in terms of detail, notably we do not think it shows the full impact of the taller buildings on the BZG site on the College's Main Campus. As such our objection still stands. 2) In regard to Location we state the following in our objection dated January 2023, "Additionally, the proposed view included within the VVM is neither taken from the protected Local View (LC24) which runs from the south-west corner of the College's Grounds or the identified Long View (L25) as identified in the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CACA) Important views and Landmark Buildings Map. Long views are long distance views across the City to key features or landmark buildings. In this instance Long View L25 stretches from the grounds of Clifton College northwards across the College and BZG site, both of which are identified within the CACA as Landmarks of City-wide importance. As a consequence of this the College consider the VVM does not accurately reflect those protected views, as identified in the CACA, and request an updated VVM which accurately reflects the impact of the proposals at the BZG site on Local View LC24 and Long View L25." The College did last year request that a VVM be taken from the School Grounds, however, this should not have discounted VVM's from the two identified CACA protected views, but rather added to these to ensure that a robust approach is taken to all views across the Conservation Area. Whilst the College's priority is to ensure that the College itself is duly considered in the Planning Process, as reflected in the attached email correspondence, this does not change the Policy position on protected views which are clear on where these are located and it is felt should have also been drawn from to provide comprehensive coverage across the entirety of Colleges main campus (in line with the CACA identified views). As such we consider our concerns to still be relevant and recommend that Historic England are asked to confirm that they are content with no VVMs of these protected views, in their assessment of the overall proposals. Additional to the above I would appreciate if you could confirm that the planning application is still on track for a decision on 15th March 2023 at Planning Committee or if the date has been pushed back in light of the additional commentary received. Kind regards, Beth Elisabeth Pywell MRTPI Senior Planner CBRE Planning and Development</p>	21-Jul-22
211.	<p>I vehemently object to the proposed plans for the housing that will be built in place of Bristol Zoo. We live around the corner, on Apsley road. My son goes to Clifton College and I believe there is a strong case for the height of the proposed flats which would overlook the school grounds to be a huge safe guarding issue. One which I am very uncomfortable about. I am amazed it has even been suggested due to it being in a conservation area, and I would be appalled if the plans were agreed. Some of the proposed changes to the space I support, such as the gardens, and playground, which are respectful to the conservation area we live in. Thank you.</p>	21-Jul-22

212.	<p>I am writing to you concerning the proposed development of the Zoo gardens in Clifton and would like to make the following objections: 1. Highways safety concerns, in particular, concerns in relation to the potential for vehicular conflicts with school drop-offs/pick-ups and with the movement of Clifton College children along Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue. 2. Concerns around the potential for overlooking into Clifton school grounds and buildings. 3. Safeguarding issues for Clifton College pupils. 4. Daylight/sunlight impacts on Clifton College school buildings. 5. Impacts on the setting of Clifton College school buildings which comprise important heritage assets as well as impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; 6. Concerns around how construction would be managed and any impacts this may have on the operation of the schools in the local area, in particular the close neighbouring school, Clifton College. 1. Highways safety concerns, in particular, concerns in relation to the potential for vehicular conflicts with school drop-offs/pick-ups and with the movement of children along Guthrie Road, Northcote Road, College Road and The Avenue. There are two large schools close to the zoo, Clifton High and Clifton College, which already create considerable congestion to the area at school dropping off and pick-up times. There is already an unacceptable amount of illegal parking, occasional drive blocking and 'frustrated driving' and the situation would become much worse. There is no mention of the soon-to-be ongoing development in the Zoo West car park off College Road. So, it is not just the 200 households as described in the Zoo gardens but the two developments together and considerably more households will add considerably more pressure on traffic congestion including parking. The area will become too densely populated and will lead to even more pressure for residents, the staff of Clifton College, Clifton High and the staff and patients at the nearby Pembroke Road surgery, who will all be competing for parking spaces with the residents and visitors to the new development. The area will be overdeveloped, especially with the development of the Zoo's West Car Park. There is little provision for residents' and guests' parking within the planned development. There would be more households than allocated parking spaces. I object to the amount of traffic that will be generated around the local roads of the site by this volume of housing plus that of the West Car Park site. The increased volume of traffic will not only be detrimental to the air quality but will also cause a considerable safety concern for a large number of school children on foot walking to all the schools in the area. Bristol council would be showing a complete disregard for the safety of children if they proceed at this scale. This excess traffic is of concern for the safety of the pupils of Clifton College and Clifton High and Christchurch C of E Primary school. In particular, Clifton College pupils, who spend a lot of time each day walking between buildings in this area. The density of the development is too great to maintain public safety around this site. Clifton College also uses the area outside the Zoo in Guthrie Road for coaches on a daily basis to transport students to their sports grounds. How will this be possible if the development proceeds? There also seems to be no provision for social services (carers etc) attending to the elderly and others. 2. Concerns around the potential for overlooking Clifton school grounds and buildings. 3. Safeguarding issues for Clifton College pupils. 4. Daylight/sunlight impacts on Clifton College school buildings. 5. Impacts on the setting of Clifton College school buildings which comprise important heritage assets as well as impacts on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area; The proposed design plans will mean that Clifton College grounds and buildings will be overlooked. There are safeguarding issues for children playing in school playgrounds, looking into classrooms or walking between facilities on the large campus. These children will be overlooked and have</p>	21-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

	<p>the potential to be targeted or abused. This development does not consider the safeguarding and safety of children attending the schools close to the site. Children are often walking around the campus site of Clifton College, they will be unaccompanied by adults so are at risk of a road accident, particularly in the winter when it is dark. Clifton College is a co-ed boarding school there will be young pupils walking on the pavements and crossing roads in large numbers, as well as individuals late at night. There are many evening functions and boarding houses in the immediate area leaving students, particularly at risk. The proposed height of the developments is unacceptable to Clifton College and to the residents of Northcote Road, and College Road, with an increased lack of sunlight. I object to the design of the perimeter buildings. The surrounding roads will feel like dark alleyways. The scale and impact of the losses of daylight and sunlight for most of the neighbourhood adjacent to the Zoo have been significantly under-represented in the plans. The report provided by the Zoo's daylight and sunlight surveyors appears to include errors and omissions in the presentation of its data. The scale, height and proximity have resulted in numerous breaches of BRE planning guidelines for reductions in daylight and sunlight within the proposal adversely affecting many of the directly neighbouring properties, residents and children. The proposal to build 5 story buildings alongside Northcote road will significantly alter the character and charm. How is this possible in a conservation area? The area of Clifton has been designated a Conservation Area to protect it from developments like the one being proposed, so that it can remain unique. The proposed 5 & 6-story modern style buildings will dwarf the scale of current buildings and will dominate, as well as significantly harming the visual environment and the architectural beauty of the buildings of Clifton College. The architectural design does not take into account the surrounding historical buildings. The proposal does not take into consideration the close neighbours or show any regard for the functioning of Clifton College which is in such close proximity to the development. It will significantly reduce the sense of spaciousness and deprive people of the views of the sky, sunlight and views of mature trees as they live work and play in the neighbourhood. 6. Concerns around how construction would be managed and any impacts this may have on the operation of the schools in the local area, in particular the close neighbouring school, Clifton College. Given the lack of consideration in the aspect and overall plans, I would also be very concerned that the actual construction process itself has been equally poorly considered. The building works alone, which will take several years, will have a severe impact on the surrounding local schools. With construction likely taking place throughout the school year and in particular through the periods of public exams, it will bring disruption, increase traffic and a lot of noise. This will heavily disrupt the safe running of the school and affect the education and examinations of hundreds of students. This following several years of Covid disruption which these students have already suffered. We cannot support a development that will heavily disrupt the education and examinations of hundreds of students, during particularly difficult years when results are re-normalised. This does not seem to have been considered by these developers. Finally, I object to the view of the site from the Downs with 6-storey tall buildings built up to the boundary wall. The frontage should be no more than the current two-storey height. I don't believe the original garden will be welcoming to the public. The layout of the site, with overly tall buildings around its perimeter, and narrow gated access will make it seem private. There is no similarity to the amenity of the current zoo gardens. There will be a loss of many mature tree species There does not seem any guarantee that once the development is completed that public access will be maintained to the</p>	
--	--	--

	gardens in the long term. On the basis of all these concerns, I would like to record a strong objection to the plans as presented.	
213.	Absolute disgrace. The zoo (and anyone else associated with this proposal) should be ashamed of these plans - clearly out to maximise profit with no consideration for anyone else. This should never be allowed to happen and if the City planning department lets anything like this through they should be ashamed too. It is totally out of keeping for the area, destroying a beautiful place in a conservation area with dreadful edifices which don't fit in. It is not wanted and not needed, totally unfair on the local residents, and the safety and safeguarding concerns of the development and the tall buildings overlooking a school is significant.	22-Jul-22

214.	<p>This is a dreadful proposal in so many ways. It would mean too many people living on what is a relatively small site. This in turn will generate much unwanted traffic on already busy surrounding roads. The perimeter building designs are hideous and far too large, completely out of character for the area and far too imposing for the residents adjacent to the site. There is no consideration for the site's neighbours, in terms of traffic flow and also there would be major disruption during construction. Apartments overlooking a school lead to safeguarding concerns, as well as concerns of road safety & pollution. In the proposal, the gardens are to be kept for the public, but why would 'the public' visit such a confined ugly site, which would be effectively a private housing estate. Also the removal of several trees etc. is not showing much protection for this side of the proposal and the surrounding buildings would detract from them anyway. For an organisation so committed to the environment and ecological issues, this is an embarrassing proposal which disregards these values for the surrounding area. It just looks like a planning application looking at profiteering rather than considering any impact on the surroundings and is irresponsible. Even if this is refused and a smaller design is resubmitted, it would still be an inappropriate proposal for the regeneration of the site.</p>	22-Jul-22
215.	<p>So many new documents added but I would suggest deliberately uploaded separately so that people don't have the time to go through each in detail. What is obvious though is that the plan is still to build 4/5 stories overlooking the Pre Prep and Prep schools and that residents of this new development would be able to spend all day looking at children should they wish which is very concerning. There is no comment in the plans and multiple other docs to address the safeguarding concerns of parents of Clifton College Pupils and the Developments proposed height will be an eyesore in amongst the Older period buildings. This looks like a plan out of the 70's where anything goes and are we so desperate for housing that all rules go out the window. To summarise: 1. Why shouldn't children attending Clifton College have the right to feel safe? 2. Why is it ok to build something so out of place with the area? Cannot believe this has even reached this stage but then we are talking about a Labour run Council!</p>	22-Jul-22
216.	<p>My Son goes to school at Clifton College and I have a interest in the area as my family live in Stoke Bishop and lots of our friends live very close to this proposed development. These plans are terrible and very short sighted and greedy. The dwellings planned will make the local area look hideous and the security and privacy of pupils of Clifton College have been completely overlooked in the pursuit of money.</p>	22-Jul-22
217.	<p>Who thought up these plans? Terrible idea to have 5/6 story buildings overlooking a school full of children. Children should go to school feeling safe, not visible to anyone who lives in floor 4 upwards at all times. This is just pure greed. Not to mention the impact on local infrastructure and traffic surrounding the school.</p>	22-Jul-22

218.	Having seen the plans displayed I believe the proposed development will provide much needed housing in Clifton and also create a beautiful park for the use of Clifton residents, who at present can only appreciate the grounds of Bristol Zoo if they are visitors. Modern housing designed with the environment in mind from the start is a great upgrade on much of Clifton housing, which tends to be much older and almost certainly energy inefficient compared to modern buildings.	22-Jul-22
219.	Whilst I think this will be the very best use of this area, I also think that the number of parking spaces MUST be adequate for the number of residential units being built. I feel Guthrie road should be upgraded even if this means taking a bit of the downs and that the type of housing should be affordable, not just for very well off people from the Clifton area but also for ordinary folk or even to house some of the homeless.	23-Jul-22
220.	Private housing build type along some perimeters of the Zoo appears to be featureless in design and lack sympathetic character as was to be expected. Would like to have seen the use of pitched roofs also. Richard Coles BSG ex-employee/current volunteer	23-Jul-22
221.		25-Jul-22
222.	I personally think that it is terrible that fellow parents and the College have mounted such a petty organised assault on the zoo's plans. From all of the information that I have been able to find it would appear that the plans put forward are robust and I for one fully support them in their enterprising efforts to build more houses whilst keeping their beautiful gardens open into the future.	25-Jul-22
223.	This application ensures that the land will still be accessible to the general public to enjoy and will create welcoming community spaces and play areas.	25-Jul-22

224.	<p>I have loved visiting the zoo since I was a little girl, as did my parents and grandparents. There are fond stories from each generation of my family and I look forward to visiting the new site at Wildspace and starting more memories there in due course. While I grew up on the outskirts of the city I now live and work in Clifton, it is my home. I am sincerely disappointed with these plans. I am perhaps biased - I fell in love with the Our world Bristol idea being supported by the Eden Project and backed by local businesses to create the Worlds First Virtual Reality Zoo and Gardens. These plans have my backing as true vision for the future and cementing a Bristol Zoo legacy while increasing the gardens size. My two criticisms: out of character designs for the area and the loss of nearly 45% of the 381 trees. But putting my perhaps bias aside I do have concerns for these plans the architecture doesn't fit in with surrounding buildings. The neighbouring houses are dominantly Georgian and Victorian structures, while the building designs here are modern and the character in my opinion would be lost. If you are building in such a historic area there needs to be more sympathetic to the neighbouring designs. The gardens have been lovingly planted and looked after for 180 + years, they have been planted like the Westonbirt Arboretum - they are meant to be viewed together and were landscaped purposely for the backdrop of the zoo. The loss of nearly 45% of the trees is unacceptable in a modern city like Bristol during an acknowledged Climate crisis. There is 381 trees in the Bristol Zoo gardens and nearly 45% of the trees would be felled with these designs and the remaining trees would be put at risk due to their root systems likely being damaged during the construction phase that it is likely the loss would be far greater than 45%. The loss of biodiversity and canopy cover would be felt and noticed for residents. It is estimated there would be a biodiversity net loss of 22% by the Bristol Tree Forum rather than the net gain of 36% they are proposing. I question some of their maths in the application, which doesn't add up and call for an independent calculation. These gardens have been a part of the city since 1836 and they have been lovingly maintained by the zoo - the trees in the zoo gardens are noted nationally (champion trees from the gardens are included on the national register) and internationally recognised too and should not be felled or put at risk. This is not the legacy the zoo should leave behind in its home of over 180 years - it has a responsibility to practice what they preach. Losing this many trees will negatively affect the tree canopy cover in the area. While the Clifton ward has one of the best tree canopy covers in Bristol, it is still under the recommended tree canopy cover for a healthy city of 30%. We need to be prioritising existing mature trees while planting new ones, mature trees have larger canopy cover than newly planted trees. (Replacing a 100 year old tree with new sapling will not cover the loss of habitat, biodiversity or canopy cover and thus carbon intake.) Also there is no tree planting sites remaining in Clifton or Clifton Down - the area would lose this canopy cover and trees altogether. The Zoo charity has a responsibility to Bristol residents and neighbours to provide best value, this is not exclusive to price from property developers but best decision to seal their legacy and to leave behind something worthwhile. I have read both the Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society response and the Bristol Tree Forum's response and am concerned with the zoos current application. The trees should be awarded TPO's and protected, the plans need to be re-thought out so 90% of the trees are retained.</p>	26-Jul-22
------	--	-----------

225.	<p>Actually very disappointed with these designs. I understand the zoo wants to make a hefty profit from property developers but as someone who has been their neighbour for a significant number of years I feel they are letting us down. I have read comments made by the Clifton and Hotwells Improvement Society, Bristol Tree Forum, Historic England, CAP and a number of local people within Bristol boundary. Most comments are in favour for the relocation of the zoo, while it is a much beloved part of our city the need for bigger enclosures so the animals have a better quality of life has been much needed for a long time. However, most comments are not in favour of these designs and plans. They lack imagination and do not fit in to the conservation area it is in. The designs are disappointing and will soon become an eye sore within the Georgian and Victorian community it is surrounded by. As many residents already struggle with parking and deliveries things will only get worse. It feels Bristol is a leader for the environment, we were the green capitol in 2015, we led cities in the UK to acknowledge the Climate crisis, Greta Thunberg gave a speech to the masses here just before the lockdowns. Why with a disappearing tree canopy across our city are we entertaining plans that do not respect our beliefs and mature and ancient trees. Nearly 45 % trees look to be felled under these plans, yet the actual number will be much higher - many roots will be destroyed or damaged in construction and their root protection acts won't be upheld. The transplant of several trees idea is a lovely idea but the success rate of trees being moved is low but won't be seen for several years. It is likely out of the hundreds of trees it is likely 70% + trees will be felled or die. It is outrageous the area will lose so much biodiversity, mature and ancient tree canopy cover and the designs to be destroyed and not replaced in the area - as there are no available tree planting pits in the Clifton, Clifton Down wards on the Bristol City Council website. Marvin Rees, councillor for property development should be disappointed for these plans. I reject these proposals. I welcome new plans with a better understanding for the area and more respect for the nature and the gardens they want to be built on.</p>	26-Jul-22
226.	<p>Objection - full Reasons for objection: 1. Harm to the overall historic interest and significance of the site 2. Loss of the Communal Value The plans do not address the need for more local and accessible green spaces (to address the increasing mental and physical health issues). The plans do not preserve all the mature trees and shrubs (valuable assets to address climate change issues). 3. Does not reflect the dilution of UK Government's housing targets. The proposal (for a housing development) does not reflect the relaxation in the UK Government's housing plan - aka 'dilution of the housing targets' (6/12/2022). This UK government decision to be more flexible / realistic with housing targets has been made specifically to protect key sites in areas of historic interest (e.g. Clifton), which the Government has now realised are at risk of inappropriate housing developments. 4. Squandering of a public space The proposal (for a housing development) does not reflect the concerns that 'some public spaces are being squandered' (Michael Gove, MP, (27/12/2022)</p>	26-Jul-22

227.	<p>Objection - full Any potential housing development on the former Bristol Zoo Gardens and West Car park site is totally inappropriate usage of this unique green site with it's cultural and historical significance, in a conservation area. In the 1960's Bristol Zoo was apparently very fortunate to be gifted a very large part of the former Hollywood Estate (164 acres), (now developed as Bristol Zoo's 'Wild Place'). Generosity of this kind is highly commendable. The Zoo Trustees should consider echoing this historic generosity, together with the support given to the Zoo by Bristol's citizens over the last 186 years, by gifting the whole site (Zoo Gardens and Zoo West Car Park) to the 'Citizens of Bristol for ever in perpetuity', - effectively as an extension to the Clifton and Durham Downs. Gifting the whole site to the Citizens of Bristol is something that the former Zoo and all Bristol citizens would be proud of for centuries. (The Zoo Trustees would make a significant 'profit' as a result of such a generous gift, as the on-going maintenance of the grounds and existing structures, would immediately cease.)</p>	26-Jul-22
228.	<p>Objection A) The Bristol Zoo Gardens and the adjacent (Bristol Zoo) West Car Park individual planning applications (22/02737/F and 21/01999/F) should be withdrawn and only reconsidered as a single site. The combined site has significant historic interest, a large number of mature trees, superb gardens, a large percentage of green space and historic walls. B) Treating the Bristol Zoo Gardens and Bristol Zoo West Car Park as potential housing development site(s) is totally inappropriate use of the historic site(s). This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for Bristol City to actively demonstrate a commitment to the ever increasing need for more green spaces for the mental health, physical health and well-being of citizens. The Downs (the green space, adjacent to the Zoo) has seen an unprecedented increase in usage in recent years. This is an opportunity for the City of Bristol (together with the Downs Committee, Merchant Venturers, Bristol University, etc.) to invest in the long-term future of Bristol citizens, by expanding the Downs green space, thereby making the ex-Zoo sites accessible to all citizens 'for ever hereafter' (i.e. consider protecting the Zoo site along the same basis as the Downs is protected). A precedent has already been set, as the Zoo's North Car Park site, has apparently already been reclaimed by the Downs.</p>	26-Jul-22

229.	I work at Clifton College and with over 200 new homes opposite the school traffic and parking will become a major problem. College road, the Avenue and Guthrie road will have queuing traffic, especially at school drop off/pick up times. On street parking will be reduced if the public wish to park and go to the zoo gardens and café. The site is over developed and the planned new houses are not in keeping with the surrounding houses most of which date from the time on or after the school was built in 1862. There will be overlooking from the new houses into school buildings and this raises safeguarding concerns. Pupils walk on all of the roads around school going to and from lessons and there will be road safety concerns with increased traffic from the new site. Many trees will be lost during the demolition process and the green public space in the centre will end up being taken over by the residents as people will not want to visit gardens in the middle of a housing estate. During the building process there will be inevitable noise and disruption to the school and all local residents.	29-Jul-22
230.	I work at Clifton College and with over 200 new homes opposite the school traffic and parking will become a major problem. College road, the Avenue and Guthrie road will have queuing traffic, especially at school drop off/pick up times. On street parking will be reduced if the public wish to park and go to the zoo gardens and café. The site is over developed and the planned new houses are not in keeping with the surrounding houses most of which date from the time on or after the school was built in 1862. There will be overlooking from the new houses into school buildings and this raises safeguarding concerns. Pupils walk on all of the roads around school going to and from lessons and there will be road safety concerns with increased traffic from the new site. Many trees will be lost during the demolition process and the green public space in the centre will end up being taken over by the residents as people will not want to visit gardens in the middle of a housing estate. During the building process there will be inevitable noise and disruption to the school and all local residents.	29-Jul-22
231.	I work at Clifton College and with over 200 new homes opposite the school traffic and parking will become a major problem. College road, the Avenue and Guthrie road will have queuing traffic, especially at school drop off/pick up times. On street parking will be reduced if the public wish to park and go to the zoo gardens and café. The site is over developed and the planned new houses are not in keeping with the surrounding houses most of which date from the time on or after the school was built in 1862. There will be overlooking from the new houses into school buildings and this raises safeguarding concerns. Pupils walk on all of the roads around school going to and from lessons and there will be road safety concerns with increased traffic from the new site. Many trees will be lost during the demolition process and the green public space in the centre will end up being taken over by the residents as people will not want to visit gardens in the middle of a housing estate. During the building process there will be inevitable noise and disruption to the school and all local residents.	29-Jul-22

232.	<p>I work at Clifton College and with over 200 new homes opposite the school traffic and parking will become a major problem. College road, the Avenue and Guthrie road will have queuing traffic, especially at school drop off/pick up times. On street parking will be reduced if the public wish to park and go to the zoo gardens and café. The site is over developed and the planned new houses are not in keeping with the surrounding houses most of which date from the time on or after the school was built in 1862. There will be overlooking from the new houses into school buildings and this raises safeguarding concerns. Pupils walk on all of the roads around school going to and from lessons and there will be road safety concerns with increased traffic from the new site. Many trees will be lost during the demolition process and the green public space in the centre will end up being taken over by the residents as people will not want to visit gardens in the middle of a housing estate. During the building process there will be inevitable noise and disruption to the school and all local residents.</p>	29-Jul-22
233.	<p>I write concerning the planning application above re the proposed development of the Bristol Zoo site. I moved to Bristol in 1981 and was fortunate enough to be a master at Clifton College. A post I stayed in for 34 years. The Zoo was an integral part of the College and was enjoyed by many college students, masters/mistresses alike. I understand that the Zoo would want to capitalise on the sale, but the proposed design seems to want to cram as many people in as possible. The buildings are far too high and not in keeping with the surrounding properties. Along with people come cars and pressure on amenities. Doctors, dentists and parking. It is the aesthetics in design which need to be addressed and to be realistic about what the area could feasibly tolerate in a population hike. It is for these reasons that I most strongly object to the planning application cited above.</p>	01-Aug-22
234.	<p>I am a local architect and consider this to be a good design in very many respects except for one, and that is the height of the perimeter flats along the lower half of Northcote Road and along Guthrie Road. As is clear from page 68 of the Design and Access Statement, the proposed blocks of flats in these locations are between about 4m and 6m higher than the existing buildings across the street from them. There is no good reason why we should accept that this represents good urban design. Put very simply, the flats in question would fit their immediate environment better by being 1 storey lower. The general height of buildings in those areas, when so clearly consistent and long established, should be respected and conformed to. Higher opposite the Downs works fine, but not where I have identified in this objection. It is no justification to point to the overall density of the proposals being in line or even below expectations or targets generally accepted for this type of development, because to reduce overall density merely reduces land value and there are good design reasons, well articulated by the designers, why more of the site is not built on. So, in short, I hope the planners will focus on this aspect of the design and agree with my objection, and I hope that this scheme, so good in so many other respects, can be amended, approved and built without too much fuss and too much delay.</p>	01-Aug-22

235.	The proposals for Bristol Zoo will spoil the open feel and make it look like a prison. The buildings are ugly and will not enhance this lovely piece of natural area. If these residences are built there will be congestion all around this area. It is busy enough now but this will lead to an enhancement of traffic which will then build up further into Clifton. I am totally against this proposal.	03-Aug-22
236.	These proposals (a) are wholly unsympathetic, unsuitable and incongruent in scale, mass, form and design for a unique Conservation Area; (b) would overwhelm the proposed community garden and all the surrounding buildings. Note the professionally produced visualisations which have been commissioned by local residents. (c) are contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the statutory obligation to ensure that proposed development preserves or enhances the character of the Conservation Area; (d) will never attract people from across Bristol. (Who would want to come and see gardens in the middle of an upmarket housing estate?); (e) come nowhere near satisfying the requirements of sustainable design; and (f) present insuperable safeguarding and, because of the traffic they will generate, serious Health and Safety problems for the children of the adjoining school; They would do enormous damage done to the Conservation Area. They represent a thoroughly inappropriate legacy for the Zoo to leave after 186 years, particularly bearing in mind alternative options for the use of the site. A luxury housing estate some six stories high may, financially, be the best option for the Zoo but it would represent a disaster for the City of Bristol. It would allow the Zoo to sell the Gardens to a property developer for an estimated £40 million when it could easily adopt one of the alternative options that are available and which would enable the site to be developed in a sustainable manner and one which respects the integrity of the Conservation Area. The Committee is under no obligation to support an organisation which is in any event abandoning the City and has transformed itself from a conservation charity into, frankly, a greedy developer. The Zoo routinely claims made that the site will provide 'desperately needed housing' but this idea is risible. It is housing at the lower end of the scale that is needed in Bristol while the apartments proposed at the Zoo will be sold as luxury flats. The current design includes '20% affordable housing.' This is, most definitely, not social housing - but 80% of market rent and well out of range for key workers. If this scheme is approved there will be substituted for the iconic gardens of which the people of Bristol are rightly proud a series of ghastly, unimaginative tower blocks which will forever represent an ugly blot on the landscape. Future generations will wonder how this can possibly have been allowed. ;	05-Aug-22

237.	<p>I object most strongly to this application. I do so for the following reasons: 1. Design. The Heritage Statement submitted in support of the application makes the following claim: 'the introduction of bespoke, bold architecture into this historically separate and different site will have negligible impact to [sic] the setting of the listed buildings of Clifton College, nor to its locally-listed buildings along Guthrie, College and Northcote Roads.' Nothing could be further from the truth. The shoe-horning of 5 and 6 storey perimeter blocks of flats of monolithic design lacking in any finesse is wholly out of keeping with the robust rhythm of weighty Victorian villas, constructed predominantly from dressed rubble and Bath stone detailing, that are the feature of the surrounding buildings. The proposals fail to take any account of the height, scale, massing, shape, form or proportion of the existing buildings, skylines and roofscapes. They cannot conceivably be said to satisfy the test of preserving or enhancing the character of the Conservation Area. 2. Daylight and sunlight. The overwhelming design of the tower blocks will impact significantly on the daylight and sunlight of the surrounding buildings. I support the objections of the residents of Northcote Road and Clifton College. 3. Traffic. The scheme involves the creation of 201 residential units. This will result in a significant increase in traffic with consequential effects on pedestrian safety and substantial pressure on on-street parking. The concerns of Clifton College and of the residents in Northcote Road are entirely justified. 4. Embodied carbon. The design means that the embodied carbon and greenhouse gas emissions (that is the energy generated and greenhouse gas emitted, associated with the materials and construction process) will be far above what is recommended. Giving consent to this proposal would be wholly inconsistent with the Council's declaration of a climate emergency. 5. Charitable status. The Zoo trustees are on record as saying that they have a responsibility to achieve maximum PRICE for the land. That is wholly wrong. Their responsibility is to achieve best VALUE in accordance with their charitable purposes which include a responsibility for environmental concerns - a matter which has been pointed out to them on numerous occasions and consistently ignored.</p>	05-Aug-22
238.	All the new properties should have covered balconies. Surely we learnt that during the pandemic, and makes them feel so much more airy, accessible, environmental (plants), communal and practical. Could envisage buying one of the new properties, as this is potentially a lovely development, but only if with a balcony (or terrace if ground floor).	07-Aug-22
239.	just make all the apartments with a covered balcony/terrace - so much better for enjoyment of the outdoors	07-Aug-22
240.	support it if they all have covered balconies, would make it lovely.	07-Aug-22
241.	buildings could be more attractive - more glass, more balconies	07-Aug-22
242.	Looks like a fabulous idea. However I would propose 2 things: Firstly that almost all the properties have a covered balcony - so much nicer to live in and environmentally sound - covered to provide an outside space even in inclement weather. Secondly - consider stone/brickwork as used in the Redland Girls School development (Bath stone?) Which looks lovely and in keeping with the area. Some indication of likely prices of resulting properties would be interesting please.	07-Aug-22

243.	<p>To confirm my objection to current proposals as follows:- Concept: It's unfair to argue this project must be approved/ accepted on the basis its a requirement of a hard to argue mission statement "Saving Wildlife Together" It's unlikely to find anyone in Bristol & further afield that wouldn't support saving wildlife Design: A huge scale, bulky 5 & 6 storey project encircling & overwhelming historic gardens & retained buildings isn't sympathetic Images illustrate a project that appears more to do with a time-share apartment, hotel/ center parc development Proposals fail to grasp the beauty & timeless architecture of a Clifton & Hotwells context - streets, squares & terraces that have informed many urban design projects across the world. Furthermore glib giraffe & elephant graphics on blank gable facades are a legacy in the Conservation Area that won't stand the test of time A design that reflects the scale, materials, architecture & urban streetscape of Clifton & Hotwells would be easier to understand & support Environmental: The immediate site area is a vehicle gridlock - especially mornings & afternoons & it's hard to comprehend how a proposal to create over 200 properties won't exacerbate the problem The drawings, as presented, are difficult to understand/ grasp in terms of vehicular access, egress & parking It appears the scheme relies on an extensive shared inner "ring-road" for traffic circulation although images don't illustrate any vehicles or day to day site/ context reality (?) An easy to follow study needs to be undertaken so existing & proposed residents understand the noise impact of heat pumps, vehicles (including motorbikes & performance cars) under-croft car-parks, public events & open access space within a walled, 5/ 6 storey building setting Given the impact of climate change it would be helpful to understand how pv panel/ green roofs are to be maintained on a practical level for example will high level access arrangements & perimeter details grow as the scheme evolves (?) Conclusion: After 185 years the zoo has decided to leave Clifton & their decision isn't unreasonable However, it's more than reasonable for Clifton & Hotwells to have a project that isn't based on a flawed nostalgic philosophy & inappropriate design model</p>	07-Aug-22
244.	<p>Please note that the Zoo site is in a conservation area with many notable listed buildings nearby. It is a heritage site of importance and distinction: Problems: 1. 2001 homes is too many on a site of this size 2. Parking for 100 cars is insufficient 3.The modern design is inappropriate and unimaginative 4. The buildings are too high and will dominate the area 5.Important trees will be lost 6. When the Zoo closes First Bus may well reroute the No 8 bus so there is no stop near the Zoo site I strongly object to the current proposed plans</p>	07-Aug-22

245.	<p>Re: Objection to Bristol Zoo Society's planning application to turn its Clifton site into a housing estate 22/02737/F I was very sad to see the proposal to turn Bristol Zoo into a housing estate. I write in objection to this planning application as someone who has grown up, lived and worked in Bristol, enjoyed the zoo as a child and has taken my own family there regularly in more recent years. I am also a scientist, author and broadcaster, and I have been Patron of Twycross Zoo in the West Midlands for more than a decade, so I have very good insights into the challenges - and opportunities - facing zoos in the 21st century. It is important to be very clear about what is at stake here, and what the proposal contained in the planning application really means. It means the loss of a huge cultural asset for Clifton and Bristol more widely. At a time when we should be promoting sustainable travel and green spaces, and building our cities accordingly, it means the loss of a place in the city that could be easily walked and cycled to. It means the loss of a place where people could learn about biodiversity and conservation. And ultimately, it means the selling off of a much loved attraction in Bristol in order to bankroll the expansion of another attraction in South Gloucestershire. The proposal includes 201 new homes, in five- and six-storey blocks of brick-built flats - taller than anything around them, and completely unsympathetic to the surrounding architecture - and parking for 124 cars. Many mature trees will be felled to make way for more concrete and tarmac. Is this what Clifton really needs, rather than a place where families could come to learn about nature, and enjoy green space? The application somewhat fancifully suggests that the public will still be able to enjoy the fragment of the botanical gardens that is left. But who will really feel welcome walking in between those tall flats into what will surely feel like a private garden (and will probably become one once new residents become dissatisfied with this sharing of space)? This is an important change of use for a green and educational space in the city of Bristol. The planning decision will be important not just for this site, but for what it signals about Bristol itself - a city which prides itself on its green credentials and green spaces, and its educational and cultural assets. The planning decision about this proposal to turn Bristol's zoological and botanical gardens into a housing estate must, of course, be considered completely separately from the funding requirements for the Wild Place attraction in South Gloucestershire. Professor Alice Roberts North Somerset</p>	09-Aug-22
246.	<p>I cannot see a significant difference between the revised and original plans, which I have already objected to. These plans are for an up market housing estate with few units large enough to accommodate families. There are already plenty of similar sized apartments in Clifton available to buy or rent. The design of the blocks is totally out of character with the surrounding conservation area. It is unlikely that the gardens, which will initially be available for public use, will remain so in the future. Many trees will be cut down. The herbaceous border within the zoo gardens, will be bulldozed, in spite of it being award winning and also, over the years, has had the ashes of loved ones scattered on its soil, with the zoo's permission. The twenty per cent of affordable units will still be too expensive for key workers, at eighty percent of their market price. Some wealthy developer will gain from these plans, not the people of Bristol.</p>	10-Aug-22

247.	<p>I object to the proposed plan because: The proposed medium rise buildings are out of character with the surrounding area. 'Affordable ' and 'for social rent' are not defined in the plans. Few houses, as opposed to flats, are planned. Those that are, will no doubt be astronomically expensive as houses in Clifton always are. This debunks the claim that the zoo sale will provide, admittedly, much needed housing ie houses, not flats, in Bristol. There are already plenty of flats available for private rent in Clifton , at similar prices to other parts of the city. Only some of the accommodation that is planned will have access to on road or off road parking. Although the bus service has improved, this means that the accommodation is less likely to be suitable for families. The proposal that the residents' service charges will fund the upkeep of the public garden is unsustainable in the long, or even medium term . Only a small proportion of the beautiful and historic gardens are to be retained, presumably the lawn and other easy to maintain areas. Instead of planning permission for an inner city, densely populated housing estate , the council should have bought or helped to buy the site to keep the gardens, accessible to the public for a small annual fee. Alternatively a body, such as English Heritage it the National Trust could have taken over the gardens.</p>	10-Aug-22
248.	<p>Dear Development Management Team Re: Bristol Zoo Gardens - Application 22/0737/F - Objection to Bristol Zoo Planning As a deeply concerned resident of 6 Northcote Rd and unofficial "Chair of the Northcote Rd Residents Association" I object to the above application on several grounds. I am not an expert but have tried to read and understand the 200 documents provided as best I can and their implications. If I have unwittingly misinterpreted anything I hope allowance will be made for this. I also hope there will be plenty more time to get independent expert advice and for more genuine dialogue and consideration to be given before any decisions are made. Key General Objections and Comments: 1. The sheer scale, length, height and form of the proposed perimeter residential blocks as it currently stands will significantly damage rather than preserve or enhance the character of this beautiful, historic Clifton Conservation Area in general, beyond the Zoo Gardens. It will dominate and intrude into the local neighbourhood in the adjacent streets. It will significantly reduce the sense of spaciousness and residential and visual amenity that is currently a feature of this area. It will significantly deprive people of the views of sky, sunlight and the glimpses of mature trees as they live work and play (the children in Clifton College) in the neighbourhood. 2. These same characteristics of scale, height and proximity have resulted in numerous breaches of BRE planning guidelines for reductions in daylight and sunlight within the proposal adversely affecting many of the directly neighbouring properties, residents and children. This is already causing many people significant stress and worry about a real deterioration in their living and home working environments. The scale and impact of the losses of daylight and sunlight for most of the neighbourhood adjacent to the Zoo has been significantly under-represented. The report provided by the Zoo's daylight and sunlight surveyors appears to include many significant errors and numerous omissions in the presentation of its data. However, if this scheme were approved, based on the data presented and contained within the reports it appears there will be significantly darker and gloomier winters for much of the neighbourhood and almost all of the adjacent residents. This is contrary to impressions implied by the surveyors' written conclusions. In an environment when we are increasingly understanding the importance of mental health and wellbeing</p>	14-Aug-22

	<p>for adults and children and we are aware of the vital importance of daylight and sunlight, surely we should not be choosing to breach BRE guidance in such an important aspect merely to aid additional profit for the few. 3. The scheme does not appear to be as environmentally positive as implied which is extremely disappointing for a proposal from the Zoo. 4. The suggestion that a few access entrances will make the gardens a wonderful unique community asset that many people beyond the neighbours will visit, seems overplayed in an area where the magnificent Clifton Downs are adjacent. 5. Although the scheme clearly satisfies the planning requirements for social housing there would seem to be very little social benefit that a 20% price reduction on price and 30% reduction on rents in c.40 Clifton properties (built over several years) which command almost twice the price of other properties in many other parts of the city. Thus, this development should not be considered as a major social benefit nor a reason to build an unnecessary large numbers of homes to maximise the profits for the Zoo if it is to the immediate and permanent detriment of the local community and the historic character of the conservation area. This is especially true when there are so many more and better located brownfield sites elsewhere that can build higher quantities of more affordable housing. 6. Even if permission were given for a reduced scale of lower level housing to a more environmentally suitable scale (perhaps 50%) one questions whether this really is the best use of such an absolutely unique heritage 12 acres site. No matter how nicely it is dressed up, the greater likelihood is that this proposed development will simply become a pleasant, affluent housing estate with some nice gardens and a nod to social housing. It will not really do anything to help the less well off and most needy, nor will it contribute anything substantial to the housing shortage. It will perhaps provide c.60 new homes per year, (12 "affordable") with the first phase completed in 3-4 years' time. Neither will it provide much of significant benefit to remaining non-Clifton Bristol residents. Overall, the development seems much more likely to leave a permanent, unwanted and "visible legacy of darkness" for its neighbours depriving them of far more pleasure and amenity in the short and long term than it will ever return. Without being a planning expert but just by walking around the perimeter it is fairly easy to imagine that many of these problems and most of these objections might be resolved - quite simply, by reducing the existing heights of all the blocks of flats by two storeys around the entire perimeter. Of course, this would limit the potential profit from this particular development and this particular site. However, this profit can only be realised and is only significantly increased by the agreement for change of usage to allow the development of high value housing. This is why we very much hope and are relying on Bristol City Council to make the right long term decision for both Clifton and Bristol. Its role is not to maximise profit for developers. If it does make the right decision then it can help ensure the Zoo and its trustees do leave a legacy they can be proud of rather than a "dark legacy of resentment" to the Clifton Community in which the Zoo has resided for over 150 years. If this current application were approved the latter legacy would seem to be the more likely outcome. The Northcote residents have been very frustrated, disappointed and distressed that the zoo planning team have pursued this planning application with such apparent disregard for the clearly expressed concerns and constructive suggestions made during consultations with their neighbours. The Zoo team have produced a number of impressive professional documents in support of their proposal. However, these appear to provide a rather flattering gloss over the plan's defects and its limitations and impacts. The zoo has repeatedly made it clear to us that the planning application has been submitted with the intention of extracting</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the maximum potential value for the site, albeit within a significant number of constraints due to the special and unique historic characteristics of this site. This proposed plan demonstrates that intent very clearly. More Specific Detailed Objections and Comments: Breaches in BRE guidance for Daylight and Sunlight: Devla Patman Redler report The Zoo team's Savills surveyor has admitted that these surveys are something of a "dark art" so I thought I would look at these closely upon the advice of a professional planning consultant. It was pointed out that surveyors are unlikely to produce reports for their clients which suggest that the proposed scheme's viability is threatened as a result of breaches in the BRE guidance on light reductions. Disturbingly, there appear to be a significant number of clear errors and even large numbers of omissions in at least some of their tables of source data provided in their appendices. By using N/A in certain rows of their appendices they have omitted to show and include many dozens of windows that that experience adverse effects of greater than 20% reduction for the Vertical Sky Component and 20% reduction in the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours. Each of these 20% reductions in light represents a breach of BRE guidance. I estimate there are many dozens of errors and possibly hundreds of omissions. This has resulted in significantly incorrect percentages being quoted and I have not found the report to be impartially or fairly representative. All the errors and omissions seem to be in the favour of the development despite the many breaches of the BRE guidance with subsequent widespread negative impacts on much of the neighbourhood. 6 Northcote Rd For example, at 6 Northcote Rd, First Floor where we live, the summary table only shows a reduction in VSC of greater than 20% on 1 window rather than for the 3 windows that the data clearly implies - if the calculations had been completed correctly. These 3 windows represent 100% of our most important living space as they are our prime living and working space 16 hours/day in a post Covid working from home environment. As far as we can envisage, we will actually lose almost all sight of the sky from the room and simply be looking from all parts of the room and beyond at a plain brick wall just 21 metres away. This wall will tower several metres above our windows and the skyline on this floor. This brick wall "feature/view" will intrude into and throughout all the key living spaces in our flat even including the kitchen. The data would also appear to indicate that we may lose more than 20% of our Annual Probable Sunlight from especially in the winter months when sunlight is scarce. However, this data is not highlighted in the report. The impact of such developments on our lives and wellbeing would be massively detrimental, especially as one of us is prone to SAD in winter. We don't really understand the NSL calculations so we can't comment usefully except to say that in light of the data and the presentation of what we have seen so far in this report we are deeply concerned and very distrustful. Elsewhere: Across the report we note numerous VSC errors and omissions: Table 10.2 6 Northcote Rd should indicate that 5 out of 17 windows (29.4%) have more than 20% reductions in VSC (failures) rather than 3 out of 17 failures (18%) as reported. Note this equates to a significant 63.3% error in favour of the proposal. 5 Northcote Rd indicates only 1 window out of 11 has more than 20% reductions in VSC (9%) when the data shows 4 failures (36.3%) 4 Northcote Rd indicates 1 out 11 windows (9%) fail when there are actually 3 failures(27.3%) 3 Northcote Rd indicates 4 out of 14 windows fail (28%) when there are actually 7 failures(50%) 2 Northcote Rd indicates 7 out of 15 windows (47%) when there are actually 8 failures(53%) 1 Northcote Rd indicates 8 out of 15 windows (53%) fail when there are actually 10 failures(71%) Pooles House indicates 17 out of 71 windows (24%) fail when there are actually 23 failures(32%) Everything appears to have been significantly (mis)represented in favour of the development - I have</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>estimated 71 errors and as many of these houses are split into flats the percentage impacts of these losses can be very significant for different households. Annual Probable Sunlight Hours As far as I can see the tables in the appendix are full of N/A's which do not generally show the percentage sunlight reductions nor do they show the calculations for the amount of APSH lost across hundreds of windows Pt. 4.15 states: o Sunlight will be adversely affected if there are 0.8 times former sunlight hours during either period o The reduction in sunlight will over the whole year will be greater than 4% APSH Pt. 10. states: If the overall annual loss is greater than 4% of APSH, the room may appear, colder and less cheerful and pleasant. However, for the data provided for the Northcote Rd residential properties it would appear that over 95% of the windows will get a reduction in APSH greater than 4%. Over 90% of windows will get reductions of over 20% light in the winter months, some from existing low levels of light, especially the lower floor flats. This is a significant adverse impact for very many people which has not been highlighted in the surveyors' report The level of both errors and omissions in this report would appear to significantly undermine the accuracy and validity of the numbers quoted and potentially, the conclusions about the adverse impacts of this development. If the same level of omissions or errors is true across the whole report, across all the properties it appears to massively underplay the impacts of the loss of daylight and sunlight on the direct neighbouring communities to the Zoo's perimeter. The Townscape and Visual Assessment The proposed development is in a wonderful, unique and historic conservation area where the guidance states that: See Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, section 72, paragraph (1) 72General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions. (1)In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any [F1functions under or by virtue of] any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Much has been done within the inevitable constraints of the site itself within the walls to preserve the main beautiful features as far as possible - given the desire to build hundreds of housing units! Unfortunately, this has resulted in the housing being pushed to the perimeter wall. Here, it is clear that in many cases the net effect is the opposite of preserving or enhancing the conservation area within which the Zoo sits. The biggest problem seems to be the sheer scale, length height and form of the structures in such close proximity to the neighbouring residents and streets. While some of the structures might work in some places as small infills in a district, this entire development is on a very different scale. i) There is almost 600 metres of a continuous modern blocks flats which is entirely out of character with the conservation area. The combination of height, continuity and proximity to the wall especially on the narrower streets such as Northcote Rd will overpower and dominate the neighbourhood like nothing else in Clifton. While the properties are claimed to enhance the sense of a "walled garden", the fact they tower 50 - 60 feet above the wall in many places creates more of a sense of a "walled city or fortress". Some have called it Stalinesque. In general, 2-4metre walls with a one or two storey storey structure previously behind them (not always solid but see through) now have 4 or 5 storey buildings proposed - rising up to 60 feet higher than before. ii) The flat roofs do not complement the pitched roofs of the Clifton roofscape but obscure them in places. In some cases, they also bring the tops of the buildings closer to the street and their neighbours creating a more domineering impact. iii) The height and proximity to the streets and other properties obscures the sky, plus key glimpses of mature trees and the historic buildings such as Clifton College which are so much part of the character of this</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>historic neighbourhood. This is especially true on the South end of Northcote Rd where residents live and work and children study and play and walk to and from classes. It also clearly applies to views from Guthrie Rd. iv) The level of loss of sky and sunlight loss in winter for the hundreds of people who walk along Northcote Rd every day and live or work or play in many of these neighbouring properties will be substantial. It will create even longer darker winters that will surely be to the detriment of the hundreds of people affected, just when we are all at our most vulnerable. It is noticeable that the proposal is very sparse on images at street level. These would give a much better sense of what the potential impact of the proposed development would be. Many pictures are plans, aerial photos or simply, rather flattering sketches. A walk around the perimeter looking up easily shows the difference. Mostly, it is very hard to see how the proposal can be said to be "preserving the character" let alone "enhancing it". Elsewhere in Clifton, where buildings of comparable heights exist they are rarely directly opposite, so close to each other or so close to the pavements or thoroughfares. They are either at least 28 - 35 metres away from each other and set back from the pavements or they have many "look throughs". These elements help sustain and create a sense of spaciousness and sky that characterise the neighbourhood. The report summary Pt. 8.9 clearly states that the development will "increase the effect of urban closure," "provide increased visual closure of the local street views" and "substantial adverse effects" for "private residential properties on Northcote Rd." Apart from the improvements of replacing some low quality buildings at the top of Northcote Rd, the only beneficial effects acknowledged in the report appear to be the few glimpsed views into the site through the proposed new access points. At best, these "positive" effects have been acknowledged as slight. The larger number of adverse effects in the report are either judged as moderate or substantial. The photos 37 -47 in the appendix provided in support of this judgment regarding the level of adverse effects experienced really do not give any accurate sense or feeling of the adverse impacts of this development - which are a lot more powerful than implied. The report suggests the adverse impact for Northcote Rd is moderate. Maybe this is partly because it states that this is a "strongly urban environment". However, despite some urban features especially at the North end this categorisation does not seem so true at the South end where the Victorian terraces and residential buildings are. Photo 42 does show that the lower end of Northcote Rd feels more suburban rather than urban as described in the report. This photo also shows that at least 30% of the mature greenery viewed from this location would be obscured by the proposed development - which is obviously an adverse impact. Clifton is a spacious suburb and the high levels of sky and visibility and mature trees visible throughout. These characteristics help it retain this spacious feeling even when more urban features are occasionally present. The increased height of the buildings and greatly increased sense of closure along Northcote Rd especially at the southern end of Northcote Rd will completely destroy this sense of suburban spaciousness. The report does however acknowledge the severe adverse impact and high sensitivity of the scheme for the residents of Northcote Rd at the South end. This makes it all the more surprising and disappointing that the proposal was not adapted in this respect, especially given the constructive suggestions made by the residents during the consultations for some appropriate height reductions and cut throughs. These were ignored, much to our considerable distress and frustration. Environmental Concerns I am not an environmental expert but how likely is it really that several years of building works and demolition, uprooting over 100 mature trees, introducing 200 new homes, 400 new permanent residents plus 100+ cars is actually going to</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>support or enhance the environment? I see the Tree Forum in a public comment has suggested that the Zoo's claim of an improvement in its sustainability is wrong and that there will indeed be a significant deterioration. I do not understand how such a unique 12 acres site, relatively undisturbed/stable for so long with so many mature and unique trees and vegetation habitats can be considered appropriate to redevelop in this way on this scale for so little housing and social benefit</p> <p>Conclusions It is understandable that the trustees of the Zoo and their team of experts may feel they need to put in as strong a plan as possible so that they can maximise the potential profit for the site and so that feel confident that they are not at risk of being sued for not fulfilling their fiduciary duties. However, the scale of this scheme proposed and the apparent disregard of almost all the valid major concerns expressed by the neighbourhood during consultations has been enormously disappointing and distressing. The omission of helpful images at ground level which could have been produced plus the volumes of omissions and errors in data presented need to be rectified and clearly presented and made available for all to see and understand. For a site of this size the detrimental impacts need to be better explained and understood. I believe the Council might consider an independent review or new reports for these items. If this current proposed scheme were approved, I believe the Zoo's legacy would be far from what it desires. While doing very little to address the crisis of affordable housing, the proposal currently risks leaving an embittered darkened neighbourhood permanently diminished in many of its unique and precious qualities, surrounding quite a posh housing estate. The profit from approving the change of usage and this scheme would clearly benefit the zoo and the developers by millions of pounds. However, it would be at the direct expense of Clifton which would suffer years of massive disruption as the site was transformed for such a large project plus longer term enduring negative impacts of something that so clearly fails to preserve and enhance the character of the area in many important respects. Surely, if housing has to be approved, at the very least a much "lower rise" solution is required. This would benefit the internal zoo site residents as well as the entire neighbourhood. Alternatively, could the zoo and the Council give something like the OurWorld proposal a better consideration for a more fitting and suitable legacy for the benefit of the whole of Bristol? If this change of usage and the scale of this residential development were to be allowed by Bristol City Council now, this could be a massive, opportunity lost for this historic unique site, forever. This would appear to be for the sake of a few expensive dwellings benefiting a few hundred mostly quite privileged and affluent people, plus some profit for the property developers and some extra "windfall" millions which are desired but not actually required by the Zoo - which is a charitable trust. All of this would be at the expense of Clifton, its unique and outstandingly beautiful neighbourhood and conservation area and of no significant benefit to the remainder of Bristol. We all understand the reason for the loss of the Zoo which is a very sad loss for the city and the neighbourhood. It has brought much life and vitality and happy memories to so many for over hundred years and will be greatly missed. Surely, we all deserve something more fitting in its memory, than a large, overbearing, "rather posh housing estate".</p>	
--	--	--

249.	<p>Dear Matthew As you are the Case Officer for the above, I am writing to ask for your advice and help regarding a number of matters concerning the Bristol Zoo Planning Application Ref. 22/02737/F and in particular, I have questions regarding the processes likely to be involved from now. I am a resident of 6 Northcote Rd and Chair of the Northcote Rd Residents Association. You will have seen various objections, concerns and fears expressed from different Northcote Rd residents, who are almost certainly the Zoo's residential neighbours potentially most adversely affected by the proposed development. This was acknowledged in the townscape assessment and to us personally, by the Zoo planning team. Our Primary Concerns Our concerns have been primarily based on the potentially overpowering, overbearing, overshadowing and intrusive impacts of the immediately adjacent proposed blocks of flats planned so high and so close to us all. In our particular part of the neighbourhood at the bottom end of Northcote Rd, the incongruence of the design and its scale and potential adverse impacts on the townscape in an historic conservation area plus the significant losses of daylight and sunlight, really are much larger than the planning application and some of its supporting documents imply. There is nowhere in this part of Clifton where such large-scale block of continuous modern housing development exists directly opposite other housing in such close proximity. We have been particularly concerned by the quality, limitations and implications of two documents supplied in the application: 1. The daylight and sunlight survey: acknowledged privately as a "dark art" by Geraint Jones the Savills surveyor, this was full of inaccuracies, with dozens of omissions and seemed utterly misrepresentative of the effects of the development. Some more but not complete detail about the levels of omissions and inaccuracy is contained in my personal, previously submitted objection. 2. The townscape and visual impact assessment: where the suggestion that this was all an urban rather than suburban landscape (only really true for some parts of the wall) and a few select photos in the appendix gave no impression at all of the impacts of the scale of this development in reality as experienced at ground level. For example, appendix photo 45 seems to imply that two mature trees and a significant amount of sky will not be obscured by the 5 storeys intended block, which they surely will be. Indeed, the overall planning application is very light in demonstrating this real ground and street level visual impact - using just a couple of highly selective sketches. This seems surprising for the most major development in Clifton for decades where surely everyone should be getting a much fuller and proper representation of the proposed outcome. Given the huge negative impact of these current planning designs on what I believe you call the "residential and visual amenities" of the residents of Northcote Rd, we are all very worried that decisions are now going to be made based on what we believe to be either inaccurate, substandard, biased or misrepresentative documents. And, although we know that loss of private views and property price losses are of no relevance to planning decisions, for some of us the potential adverse impacts in the current proposal are genuinely heart breaking. If implemented, they would seriously diminish the quality of our lives and our living. This would be true if we stay or if we leave after having incurred the costs of moving and the devaluations of our properties Our Questions We are exceptionally keen to know that the planning process will allow our concerns and our alternative viewpoints and/or documents to be properly considered. This is especially so given the undoubted potential scale of damage to our mental and financial wellbeing from these current plans. However, we freely admit we do not know how best to ensure this can happen. Are you able to advise us please? We have become increasingly worried partly because of what everyone feels has been a "sham tick box neighbourhood consultation" process by</p>	14-Aug-22
------	---	-----------

	<p>the Zoo's team and partly because some of the documents commissioned by them seem biased and misrepresentative - perhaps unsurprisingly. In their clear pursuit for maximum profit, the Zoo planning team repeatedly seem to have shown almost complete disregard for the concerns expressed by neighbours on all sides of the Zoo including the West Car Park and Clifton College. If possible, we would like to know the following please: i) What is the process from here on in and where or how do we at Northcote Rd get our concerns properly explored? ii) What happens on the Monday 12th September determination date/what is the process? iii) What is likely to happen or could happen after this date? iv) Is there anything we could do privately in advance that would help/or we could do afterwards? v) Will there be another independent light survey commissioned? vi) Will there be a requirement to model ground level and street views of the development from inside and outside the zoo? Will they be independent? If so, who will pay for them? vii) Would it make sense for the neighbours to commission some of these services and if so, by when would they now be needed? Could we be given access to some of the Zoo's team data/models already built to help do this? viii) Would it be helpful to submit some more illustrative pictures and corrected photographs of the visual impact at ground and street level even if not terribly sophisticated? Would it be helpful to submit these with some constructive suggestions? ix) Would it be possible for you or a representative of the Planning Committee to meet briefly with us and literally see things from our points of view? And if so, when? (A late afternoon as the sun drops is quite illuminating!) In our experience, once people have seen the current heights of the proposed development in relation to the existing trees and buildings on Northcote Rd a short 5 minutes' walk is sufficient to reasonably visualise how (shockingly) overbearing the impact would be. This is all due to the combination of the proposed building heights and their proximity to the street. It is immediately obvious that huge amounts of sky and practically all glimpses of mature trees and of the historic buildings, plus almost all the late afternoon sunshine will be obliterated. It is these characteristics that give this part of the neighbourhood its character and keep it feeling suburban and spacious, despite some low-level urban features being present. Once these features or characteristics are lost, the Northcote Rd area becomes much more urban, more enclosed and quite a lot darker for much of the afternoon and early evening. Some of these elements were slightly acknowledged but in a very understated way in the townscape assessment.. In our personal instance at 6 Northcote Rd, the proposed outlook changes from looking at broad skies and trees stretching almost a mile away to simply looking at a 50ft -60 ft high brick wall just 66 feet away, with barely a glimpse of sky from any window - intruding and dominating all our key living and working spaces. To visualise this potential change is truly shocking and deeply dispiriting. It is a genuinely distressing experience I now have many times each day, every day since the planning application was submitted - after the last consultation we were all shocked by the absence of any fundamental changes. I would really welcome an opportunity for you to visit us so that you can so simply and easily visualise all this. The adverse impact here at this end of Northcote Rd is evidently many times worse and much more instantly visible than that of the West Car Park. Yet, if there were a meaningful conversation with the neighbours we feel these particular concerns might be reasonably addressed with some reductions in heights and scale or increases in distance in the right places. The Northcote Rd residents are not inherently opposed to plans for housing. However, we have become very upset by the Zoo's approach which has come across as feigning interest, feigning sincerity and feigning concern. They have proposed a scheme with almost complete disregard for</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>our clearly expressed key concerns and constructive suggestions and which is directly and very evidently at the significant expense of our own mental and financial wellbeing. The current application clearly seeks to maximise their profit with complete disregard and at huge direct emotional and financial costs to their direct neighbours. (They can only get an extra million pounds because we, collectively, lose a million pounds so to speak!). While we appreciate both the Zoo's needs for money and Bristol's needs for housing it is surely not the responsibility of the Council to maximise the profits for the Zoo, to the clear disadvantage of the existing neighbouring community. The legacy the Zoo's team are proposing to leave Clifton after 186 years does not currently appear to be either an inspiring or a happy one for its erstwhile neighbours. We are now very much hoping and relying on the Planning Committee to help address this matter fairly - obviously, with full regard to planning law and planning guidelines. We understand there are many stakeholders and demands including present housing needs and Zoo trustees to be taken into account. As the Northcote Rd residents who are directly adjacent, we have been acknowledged as the most adversely affected of the residential neighbours. We simply cannot see how the current plans for our neighbourhood can reasonably be argued to preserve and enhance the neighbourhood's character. More detailed examination and understanding of the significant reductions in daylight and sunlight plus the obliteration of almost all views of historic buildings and trees from within the terrace and at street level show the development would significantly damage the neighbourhood's character for us all and massively diminish the quality of very many more lives at our end of the development than it will ever enhance. We would like to be reassured we will be given a proper and fair chance of proper representation regarding our expressed concerns and we would very much like to understand how best we might achieve it. Any advice you can give will be greatly appreciated. Please do forgive the length of this letter. I know things are slow in August but given the pending September 12th determination date I would greatly appreciate your prompt acknowledgment of your receipt of this and welcome your response and advice as soon as possible, please. Many thanks and best regards</p>	
250.	<p>Please think about the potential for harm that development of this site will cause - the major objection I would raise relates to the buildings proposed - the sense of scale is overbearing. The monolithic appearance is completely detrimental to an area of such stunning historic architecture, and whilst I am a fan of combining old with new architecture, this is not sympathetic or appropriate - the Zoo site holds significant heritage value for Bristol - the huge loss of Communal Value to the people of this city and further loss of valuable, precious green urban space and public amenity is permanently diminished - the harm to listed buildings, that however sympathetically they are converted, they will no longer be accessed by the public and will have their community purpose lost and their use permanently altered. - has the Zoo's justification for abandoning the site been proven? or are they using the pandemic lull as a for a revamped plan to one single site (that was gifted to them) and opportunistically cashing in? - please don't overlook the fact that it is listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space - with grave concern that half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. This site is so special, make a decision that enables it to stay that way. Change is inevitable, but it should be better change, for the good of the wider Bristol and regional society it serves - spaces like this are too precious.</p>	17-Aug-22

251.	<p>With the confirmed departure of the Bristol Zoological Society ('the Society') in Clifton, there is need to consider change of use of the zoo site as it holds such significance both in terms of heritage and its position in a conservation area, adjacent to Clifton College School and a range of significant historical buildings. This is the largest building scheme in Clifton for many decades (perhaps ever), and must be very carefully planned and orchestrated. This application saddens me as it appears the line between need and greed has become blurred. The Society will not be the ones commissioning or managing the build, and all safeguards must be thought through by planning, ahead of any proposal being passed. - loss of light or privacy - the scale of the proposal will overlook Northcote Road properties (in particular) and limit their light, and privacy. At most, any buildings on that perimeter should not stand taller than those existing buildings in Northcote Road - overshadowing - the adjacent Northcote and College Roads are very narrow, with resident parking bays or double lines - roads that the height and overscaled apartment blocks along the perimeter walls would dominate at a scale disproportionate to all adjacent conservation area buildings - highway safety - there is no detail about a street lighting plan, nor how this will impact the locality. The plan denotes seven new entrances, four of which will allow vehicular access, which will impact the surrounding streets which are already crowded with school vehicles at any time of day (mini buses, maintenance vehicles, delivery vehicles and full size coaches) plus parents at drop off and pick up times in numerous cars. - traffic and parking issues - whilst the Society have been making efforts to explain their proposal through production of printed materials distributed through letterboxes in the neighbourhood, the literature is misleading, as it fails to illustrate any cars (bar one parked under an awning), but depicts children playing and families picnic-ing, ambling or in a learning space. The gardens look lovely, but the reality is this is a housing development for 201 homes. Cars will need to access the suggested 120 spaces provided in 'undercroft' or 'covered parking' but this is not denoted in any illustrations, giving a false representation of the planned 'other-worldliness' atmosphere. Guthrie Road and the surrounding streets encompass the 'hub' of the Clifton College school campus. The existing traffic for school drop off and pick up times is already unmanageable, despite efforts by the school to encourage the 'if you care, park elsewhere' mantra and are unable to restrain parking on yellow lines, yellow zigzags, and road corners. The proposal suggests an increase in pedestrians in the area, who will be in jeopardy with the subsequent congestion generated by a housing scheme of this scale. The Society propose that residents of the site will be less likely to need a car, but on what grounds do they know that? The lack of parking spaces will create spill out into surrounding roads directly or indirectly - perhaps through visitors to the 'free' gardens - amenity - the concept of amenity suggests that a building project would be considered attractive and agreeable, adding pleasantness to a surrounding area. The design to date illustrates overdevelopment of six storey structures which will dominate surrounding homes and detract light, limit privacy and possibly present safeguarding issues for the adjacent school buildings and play areas - wildlife - 44 trees to be relocated in a limited landscape? Where is the plan for these trees? Trees are not just what is illustrated on the surface by trunk, branches and foliage - they have established and interlinked root systems - whilst on the surface it looks like the trees are accounted for, and the significant ones will be left in place, what about their roots? There is little detail, if any, about the affect the installation of utilities, drainage and water management which all require deep digging and excavation will have significant impact on the roots. The gloss of the leaflet sounds reassuring, but the tree report from the tree</p>	17-Aug-22
------	---	-----------

	<p>experts shows more concern that must be factored into this decision. - historic buildings - this is the most significant project of scale in Clifton ever to be proposed, and must be in keeping with the architectural assets of the locality. The scale and design of the proposal jars with neighbouring historic buildings - conservation - the Society holds conservation amongst it's key objectives, but this proposal does not fully integrate the context of building conservation for all the elements, only in the existing buildings e.g. Clifton Pavilion and the Giraffe House - design - the standout flaw of this application is the scale of overdevelopment around the perimeter - appearance of the development - the glossy illustrations are misleading for many people who will take a leaflet at face value and believe the Society will deliver the application on based on those illustrations. The reality, sadly, is more likely to be that the Society will be long gone, having sold the site and secured the funding needed for the Wild Place Project site. As members of the proposed Management Board of the 'gardens' they will have no influence or say on the build project I object to this planning application, and hope that one evolves that is of better scale and is more fitting in local scale and conservation interpretation. As the Society's brochure says 'it is important we leave a legacy we can be proud of in this beautiful part of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area'. Well then, do just that, not this.</p>	
252.	<p>As a major conservation zoo in the UK and one which has undergone major capital development across the last decade including complex planning applications we welcome and fully support the plans for Bristol Zoo Gardens. It is clear that the society have thought long and hard about the application to not only provide housing in a popular and beautiful area of Bristol but to ensure the legacy of Bristol Zoo Gardens remains and providing an inclusive space for residents and visitors to enjoy. Retaining such an important site to the people of Bristol and Clifton is of huge importance and the team at the zoo have put this front and centre in their thinking from day one. As chairman of the British and Irish Association of Zoos and Aquariums and CEO of Chester Zoo, I applaud the careful consideration the zoo team have taken in the project and would recommend it for approval.</p>	18-Aug-22

253.	<p>The BZG planning committee have made very detailed and considered changes to the original development proposal. It remains a much needed source of new housing in Bristol whilst preserving the heritage of the zoo site. It will add very well designed new housing to a very constrained housing stock in Bristol. I remain shocked at how selfish very affluent local residents and parents/members of an elite private school can be in carpet bagging this planning portal with objections to this extremely reasonable proposal. If this was so important to keep things as is these same people should have actually found a way to financially support the zoo to keep the site. Appeals were made and met with deaf ears at that time hence the BZG site being proposed. As it is, the BZG team are taking a very considered approach to the design which is above and beyond what a standard private developer should do: the site is being made accessible to the public and for free (this was not the case before when the zoo was open); they are providing a mix of housing for more affluent residents whilst also providing a significant percentage of affordable homes; there is real preservation of garden and iconic parts of zoo architecture. With the amended application the BZG has made amendments to reduce some multi-family housing due to the aforementioned objections. I personally do not think these changes were needed, but they did make them thus demonstrating the BZGs real commitment to acknowledging and responding to criticism as reasonably possible. In terms of the overall site, I remain fully supportive - we desperately need more homes in Bristol, and especially need more homes in central areas of Bristol. To really fight climate change at a council level we should be improving density so people can walk/cycle instead of commute to workplaces. Building densely supports business by increasing their market too. Building more homes helps increase the supply of housing and helps gradually deal with the homeless situation. These are not disputed facts. I hope the bad faith objections of NIMBYs in Clifton do not overwhelm reason when it comes to this application. Also it is worth emphasising, people in Bristol who own very expensive homes have a personal financial interest in keeping the housing stock limited at this end of the market - it inflates the value of their homes accordingly. Many of the objections appear to be obfuscating their true intent. Frankly if a detailed, well considered application like this does not meet an acceptable standard, what would? Inaction will lead to an empty undeveloped site, or some parking - that is not a good use of space. (I am not even acknowledging the what can only politely described as 'eccentric' proposal to build a VR zoo in a massive hangar building that has been astroturfed as a supposedly reasonable alternative). Finally, this whole process highlights the unfair nature of the state of planning permission in the UK. Who comments on these applications, and whose voices are unheard? Do comments on this application reflect the sentiment for the wider community? Do random comments from pressure groups reflect democracy or justice? I hope when the council considers these objections or comments in support of the application these questions are also considered carefully. I hope my comment does not appear intemperate but as a millennial medical doctor in the NHS and also researcher at the University I have struggled with the housing market in Bristol, and despite my profession being relatively well paid. I think the council should work for everyone rather than those sections of society who happened to buy housing 20-30 years ago when the average mortgage was 3-5 times an average yearly salary as opposed to the 10-20x it stands now.</p>	31-Aug-22
------	--	-----------

254.	<p>I remain supportive of this development. The housing proposals are simply beautiful and give the public access to a lovely garden for free. I do not sympathise or empathise with the reflexively negative commenters objecting to this proposal. As far as I can tell these people would only be happy if nothing ever changed, if no new people ever moved into Bristol, and they could maintain a static city. I implore the council to ignore the objections from people who are simply resistant to any change - they will never be pleased by any proposal. If it were up to them their own houses would never have been built in the first place as they would have objected to any building without a thatched roof. Modern buildings with timber frame construction are brilliant, long lived, and have a much lower environmental footprint. They allow for modern energy efficiency standards to be met and they can be built quickly. Bristol is a growing and vibrant city. Trying to block people being able to get new homes here is simply an injustice and is leading to increasing problems of housing insecurity in the aggregate. Consigning people who want new homes to only buying in the suburbs on brownfield sites is not fair and also not going to allow the city to meet climate targets. We need more density to promote alternative transport modes such as cycling, walking (not to mention fee paying customers to support more bus routes) which lessens the climate impact of people who would otherwise be spread further and more inclined to drive. Bristol Council should be embracing this fortunate position it finds itself in as a popular city for people to move by enabling more housing development at density. In time this will significantly support plans for e.g. a Bristol metro by providing the customers that will use it. I also think the arguments re "not enough affordable housing" should be ignored - the site needs to be commercially viable to support the new Zoo site, and also 20% of ~150 homes is a lot of new affordable housing that would not be available if this site is not built. International data from cities in New Zealand and Canada has demonstrated the clear correlation of easing housing development through e.g. permitting reform/planning rules promoting density, and reducing the rate of house price growth. This should not have to be explained but if you increase supply to meet demand, price falls. People understand this with daily purchases but seem to think housing is a special case. Notably in Harlem, New York City, USA recently a housing development of a large apartment block was opposed through similar arguments of "insufficient affordable housing" - the site is now being continued to use for its current purpose, a truck (lorry) stop. These objections are what I class as bad faith objections. Often such objections are made simply to prevent any new building and are not truly concerned with provision of affordable housing. Finally, I feel this site should not have any barriers to increasing density or implementing the full vision of its design. The architect has designed a truly beautiful site and it would be a shame to allow these NIMBYs who seem to be organising an undemocratic astroturf campaign against the development to win with their regressive arguments. These objectors just want to maintain their property values at the expense of the rest. The losers of such an outcome are the people of Bristol.</p>	31-Aug-22
------	--	-----------

255.	<p>It is not surprising a new housing development on a much loved zoo site attracts strong feelings. Notably when it came to finding means to support the zoo to stay open at this site with funding from this same public, that did not materialise. Bristol needs new housing. This is a large area of land being redeveloped with careful consideration to provide this very much unmet need. It is heartening to see a mixture of new housing including the provision of some affordable housing as well. The objections from the nearby private school and parents of pupils from this school strike me as incredibly unjustified and unfair. We should not be giving undue weight to the already very privileged to pull the ladder up from others in society (in this cases through maintaining the status quo of insufficient housing stock in Bristol). Finally, the following is not likely to be a popular opinion, and overall I remain supportive of this application, however I think more rather than less housing should be planned and provided. I do not think it is particularly good land use or equitable for the wider community that large tracts of this development are dedicated to public space. It would be better for this to be used instead to site more housing but I also understand that often people like having areas of green space next to them. It is worth considering that the zoo site is right next to the very large green space of the downs however.</p>	31-Aug-22
256.	<p>As a local resident I am concerned about the effect of the residential development of the Zoo Site. Clifton as a whole is already running low on space for existing households. In particular the issue of parking for cars. 201 extra households will invariably mean a significant increase in the number of cars. Either 201 parking spaces (an undesirable idea) will need to be provided or residents will end up parking their cars in surrounding streets which are already very full. The aesthetic of the area also must be considered. There are several examples of unsympathetic development throughout the Conservation Area already. It is of course impractical to demolish them. The Zoo site should not become another of these unsympathetic developments. The aesthetic of the area is integral to what makes Clifton a unique part of Bristol. The style of many of the proposed buildings do not fit the style of other residential properties in the area. I am also concerned that some of the building are too tall. Many of the buildings in the surrounding area are harmonious in height. The number of stories ought to be reconsidered to fit in better with the surrounding buildings. As I understand it Clifton College have pointed out their own concerns with the development. The majority of the surrounding area is in fact boarding houses and school buildings. Not that you would really know as the College buildings on the whole blend in almost seamlessly with the residential area. If the College is able to provide boarding facilities for its many students without impacting the aesthetic of the area, why should Bristol Zoological Society not be held to the same standard? As mentioned the surrounding area has many young students living and studying 24/7 almost year round. The plans for redevelopment of the site seem unconcerned about the welfare and safety of these students. Proposed buildings overlooking school buildings and play areas is an undeniable safeguarding concern. The increased traffic in the area caused by the redevelopment is likely to increase the already present risk of traffic accidents involving students. In summary I feel that the redevelopment of the Zoo site ought to be a heavily community focused project. The residential plans ought to be scaled back significantly and also radically redesigned to better suit the surround area. The redevelopment of such a historically important site should not be seen as a financial opportunity but a</p>	04-Sep-22

	<p>preservation project. BZS should be looking to leave the Clifton site on a high note after so many years of being a treasured part of the Clifton Community. If these plans go ahead they will instead be causing lasting damage to a community that supported them. Preserve the integrity of the local area and the history of the site.</p>	
--	---	--

257.	<p>The Bristol Zoo site has been a marvellous resource for the residents of the whole of Bristol and a wide surrounding area for a very long time. I believe it should be preserved and maintained as a Botanical Garden which it has been up until now. The surrounding prison-like walls should be demolished - they are no longer needed to protect citizens from ferocious wild animals. The area can be opened up for free access on a permanent basis for Bristol residents at least. It is very likely that residents in the surrounding areas would be willing to contribute by subscription to maintain this as a free service for everyone. The model in my mind is that of the very old and spectacular Botanical Gardens in Durban, South Africa. I do not think that present plans will lead to this site being freely open to the public for very long because those who have paid considerable sums for the larger accommodations will inevitably want to exclude the public after some time and I do not know how effective any safeguards would be to prevent this. Affordable housing is a praiseworthy concept which I would support. In fact, it would be better to set aside an area on the periphery of the site for modest but well designed affordable housing only, perhaps available to key workers for rent (otherwise modest purchased houses would be passed on at immodest prices after a while). This might require the financial and administrative input of Bristol City Council and I don't know how they would regard this. The present building plans are, as usual, completely out of character for this part of Bristol. The buildings are too tall and too monolithic. Whatever else is decided, far prettier buildings are needed to fit in with local character. The ground floor parking under the proposed new buildings is inexpressibly ugly and inappropriate in these times. Vehicle parking should only be available to staff maintaining the gardens. There has never been parking on the zoo site and it should not start now. There is a very good adjacent public bus service. Like the Cribbs Causeway development which is not in Bristol, the new Wild Place Project zoo site is outside Bristol and no benefits, financial or reputational, accrue to Bristol. Let us at least make a new and spectacular Botanical Garden a credit to Bristol.</p>	05-Sep-22
------	---	-----------

258.	<p>The Bristol Zoo site has been a marvellous resource for the residents of the whole of Bristol and a wide surrounding area for a very long time. I believe it should be preserved and maintained as a Botanical Garden which it has been up until now. The surrounding prison-like walls should be demolished - they are no longer needed to protect citizens from ferocious wild animals. The area can be opened up for free access on a permanent basis for Bristol residents at least. It is very likely that residents in the surrounding areas would be willing to contribute by subscription to maintain this as a free service for everyone, and I certainly would. The model in my mind is that of the very old and spectacular Botanical Gardens in Durban, South Africa. I do not think that present plans will lead to this site being freely open to the public for very long because those who have paid considerable sums for the larger accommodations will inevitably want to exclude the public after some time and I doubt the efficacy of any safeguards to prevent this. Affordable housing is a praiseworthy concept which I would support. In fact, it would be better to set aside an area on the periphery of the site for modest but well designed affordable housing only, perhaps available to key workers for rent (otherwise modest purchased houses would be passed on at immodest prices after a while). The present building plans are, as usual, completely out of character for the heritage of historic Bristol. The buildings are too tall and too monolithic. Whatever else is decided, far prettier buildings are needed to fit in with local character. The ground floor parking under the proposed new buildings is inexpressibly ugly and inappropriate in these times. Vehicle parking should only be available to staff maintaining the gardens. There has never been parking on the zoo site and it should not start now. There is a very good adjacent public bus service. Like the Cribbs Causeway development which is not in Bristol, the new Wild Place Project zoo site is outside Bristol and no benefits, financial or reputational, accrue to Bristol. Let us at least make a new and spectacular Botanical Garden a credit to Bristol.</p>	05-Sep-22
------	--	-----------

259.	<p>Comments: I would like to raise three further objections to those already raised:</p> <p>Economic Benefits The comment from the Council's Economic Development team - to the effect that "the Economic Benefits Assessment document represents a reasonable estimate of the potential economic benefits of the proposal" - cannot be taken seriously. The document is not balanced and does not follow - as the report claims - HM Treasury Green Book Guidance for reasons I have set out in my previous objection.</p> <p>Carbon Factors The Council's Sustainable City team have commented: "As SAP 2012 carbon factors were in use for Part L 2013 at the time of the initial submission, the use of these carbon factors has been continued for the revised statement (rather than Part L 2021). For the purpose of BCS14 calculations we consider this to be acceptable" The same applicant was recently awarded consent on the West car Park site. That application (21/01999/F) was submitted long before this application (22/02737/F). In a September 2022 revision to the Energy and Sustainability Statement accompanying the application 21/01999/F, the applicant's consultants, Hydrock, updated the carbon factors used in the calculation of the residual CO2 savings from the proposal from Part L 2013 to Part L 2021. the comment from the Sustainable Cities team seems to indicate that the Council would find it acceptable under the newer application to make use of the older carbon factors. The Council's position should be considered in the light of the rather obvious point that it cannot be for the applicant to pick and choose the carbon factors which suit its purpose of seeking to demonstrate compliance with extant policy, still less, for the Council to consent to the wishes of the applicant when it is clear that the basis for the calculation has changed. To put this another way, the Council is sanctioning an approach to the calculation of carbon savings from renewable electricity generation which have not been reflected in the carbon intensity of generation for more than ten years. It is obviously out of date. It is incredibly disappointing to see a Council that has declared a climate emergency seeking to ease the path of an application based on endorsing the use of carbon factors that are completely divorced from prevailing reality. This view is unacceptable and must be changed.</p> <p>Affordable Housing As regards affordable housing, the Applicant's Planning Statement (from Savills, October 2022) states: "Application Policy BCS17 state that affordable housing will be required in residential developments of 15 or more dwellings. A minimum of 40% provision is sought in Inner West Bristol, subject to viability, although the Affordable Housing Practice Note (April 2018) allows a 20% provision subject to meeting the required criteria. The tenure, size and type of affordable units will reflect identified needs, site suitability and economic viability". Currently, the Council is likely to exceed targets it set for building new homes, but will fail to meet its target for affordable homes. The approach in the Affordable Housing Practice Note (AHPN) seemed inconsistent with a sincere attempt to deliver the required number of affordable homes. The AHPN does not form part of the statutory development plan. New policies cannot be set out in the Affordable Homes Practice Note, so the Core Strategy policies would remain the locally relevant ones. BCS17 in the Core Strategy states: Affordable housing will be required in residential developments of 15 dwellings or more. The following percentage targets will be sought through negotiation: - 40% in North West, Inner West and Inner East Bristol; - 30% in all other locations It would be extremely difficult, in the circumstances, to argue that 20% affordable homes is the outcome that would have resulted under the extant policy BCS17. If that is not the case, then it would be reasonable to argue that the AHPN had materially influenced the policy in ways that it cannot do. There is a general understanding (it is a matter of public record) that the applicant seeks to sell the land to generate revenue in support of its objectives.</p>	25-Oct-22
------	--	-----------

	<p>It is not the role of the Council's planning function, or the development control committee, to facilitate the achievement of a higher value for land than might otherwise be the case. In the context, therefore, and recognizing that there is likely to be sufficient residual value in the land value to justify a higher proportion of affordable homes, then if consent were given to the proposal, it would be difficult to argue that the AHPN had not given rise to a material change in the application of the extant policy on affordable homes, BCS17. The 20% affordable homes offered by the applicant a) is inadequate, and b) has been arrived at in a manner that is inconsistent with the application of BCS17.</p>	
--	--	--

260.	<p>The Planning Statement from Savills makes much of the context in which the application is made, in particular, the situation that Bristol, Clifton & West of England Zoological Society (BCWEZS) finds itself in. It also makes much of the economic impacts, as well as the supposedly sustainable nature of the proposal. Background The economic plight of the Zoological Gardens site is significantly of BCWEZS's own making. The publicly available Annual Report and Financial Statements for BCWEZS, made up for the year ending December 2019, reported on the 2020-2025 Strategic Plan. Included in the Plan were: - "Capital investment at both Bristol Zoo gardens and Wild Place Project"; and - "...a clear long-term vision and masterplans for both Bristol Zoo Gardens and Wild Place Project. Bristol Zoo Gardens transformed by the time of its bicentenary in 2036. Wild Place will continue to grow into an even greater wildlife adventure, while Bristol Zoo gardens will place a greater value on visitors' interactions with and understanding of individual animals. The Report and Financial Statements in the same document then reported that the closure of both sites as a result of the coronavirus pandemic was impacting on this strategy. It noted: Following the Coronavirus pandemic and the financial implications arising from the closure of both sites from 21 March to 19 June 2020 for Wild Place Project and 14 July for Bristol Zoo gardens, the Trustees will be reconsidering this strategy and the Society's ability to raise the capital needed to implement the planned major capital development projects. It will take time for the longer term implications for the Society to be more fully understood and the impact on its future longer term strategy. This will be the main objective for 2020 alongside the continued focus on ensuring both sites operate safely for our employees, visitors and animals and the implementation of cost saving initiatives. Note the wording here - reconsideration of the strategy was supposedly to follow, and not precede, the pandemic. The reported financial performance for the year was not at all suggestive of impending financial meltdown, though alarm bells were being sounded, as would have been prudent in the circumstances. The Report contains a Report of the Trustees, which was approved by the Board of Trustees, and signed off by its Chair on 24 September 2020. The accounts were signed off by the accountants on the 6th of October by the auditor acting on behalf of BCWEZS. Nonetheless, around two months after the Trustees Report report was signed off, at the end of November 2020, the Zoo reported that it was closing the Clifton site altogether, relocating to the Wild Place Project site in South Gloucestershire. Bristol Post reported: The new Bristol Zoo will offer spacious, modern facilities, significant growth in conservation and education work and a ground-breaking, innovative visitor experience, said a Bristol Zoological Society spokesperson. [...] The plans have been announced after the second lockdown forced Bristol Zoo Gardens and Wild Place Project to close, after months of closure during the peak spring and summer months. Although BCWEZS has been keen to draw links between the closure of the Clifton site and the pandemic, there is more than a suggestion that this has provided a somewhat convenient way for BCWEZS to give a decision that had been considered for some time a softer landing. This is because the visitor numbers at the Zoo site in recent years appear to have been negatively affected by the growth in visitor numbers at Wild Place Project, which BCWEZS also owns. Although what was written in the Annual Report and Financial Statements for the year ending end of 2019 gave no clear hint of this, as the Planning Statement for the West Car Park notes: A formal submission for pre-application request was made to Bristol City Council in March 2020. The proposed development submitted for pre-application comment related to a scheme for 78 dwellings (no affordable housing provision and a proposed density of 153 dph) and the buildings proposed ranged from 2-4.5 storey</p>	25-Oct-22
------	--	-----------

	<p>plus semi basement parking. It is clear, therefore, that well before the Report and Financial Statements for year ending 2019 were signed off, and in advance of the first lock-down linked to the Covid-19 pandemic, BCWEZS was exploring the option of developing the West Car Park. It is not entirely clear, therefore, that plans were not already afoot to sell the Clifton site well before the effects of the pandemic became known. Chris Booy, Vice Chair of Trustees, in his written statement regarding the Zoo's application on the West Car Park, noted: In late 2020, Trustees of Bristol Zoological Society voted unanimously to relocate Bristol Zoo to the Wild Place Project site. [...] This decision followed an extensive process to explore a number of options, as well as taking independent professional advice. It seems clear that preparatory work to inform the decision had been underway for some time. It is a little surprising that the Trustees Report remained silent regarding the preparatory work ongoing, including the pre-application submission to Bristol City Council. The Charity Commission's Guidance on preparing a trustees' annual report indicates: If your charity's income is more than £500,000 you also need to: - explain your strategy for meeting its charitable purposes - list any significant activities you undertook as part of this strategy - give details of what your charity achieved in carrying out these activities to meet its purposes The omission, in the Report, of any mention of the pre-application submission, or other work underway at the time, is an omission in the Trustees' explanation of their Strategy. In a video purporting to explain its decision, the CEO, Justin Morris, reports that there has been a 'significant decline over many years' in visitor numbers. The evolution in visitor numbers at the Clifton site has, between 2008 and 2019 (we have excepted the 2020 year for fairly obvious reasons) exhibited a downward trend overall. This is true for both total visitor numbers and paying visitors. The former exhibits a compound rate of decline of less than 1% per annum, the latter, a slightly higher compound rate of 1.4% (see Figure 1). Figure 1: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2019, Zoo Gardens Site Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements Neither of these rates seems 'precipitous', though equally, that they were happening would have been risen to consider additional forms of income generation and / or a change in the nature of the visitor experience, as mentioned in the Report and Financial Statements. The picture is rather different, though, if one looks only at the period before the Wild Place Project was up and running. In the period from 2008-2013 (2014 was the first full year where WPP was in operation), there is no obvious downward trend in visitor numbers at all (see Figure 2). There is no clear increase either (there is, possibly, for the paying visitors). Figure 2: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2013, Zoo Gardens Site Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements The main period of decline in visitor numbers at the Clifton site coincides with the opening of WPP, and the increasing number of visitors choosing to visit there over time. This must have been foreseeable: a competing (even if run by the same entity) attraction of a similar nature to an existing one would be expected to draw some visitors away from the existing attraction. Indeed, as WPP visitors have steadily increased, it might be considered somewhat surprising that visitor numbers at the Clifton site held up as well as they did (see Figure 3). Figure 3: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2019, Zoo Gardens Site and WPP Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements If BCWEZS wanted to maintain visitors at the Clifton site, establishing a competing attraction was a strange way of seeking to achieve that. Since 2013, total visitor numbers at the Zoo site have held up rather better than the number of paying visitors at the Clifton site: whilst the former have</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>declined by 1.3%p.a. in the period up to, and including, 2019, the latter have fallen by 2.6% p.a. over the same period. In Chris Booy's statement referenced above, he noted that the decision was linked to operating losses in recent years, coinciding with the opening of WPP: The decision to relocate after 185 years of memories was not taken lightly, but after making an operating loss in four of the last six years, we had to move forward to safeguard the future of the Society. It might be considered, therefore, that decisions of the Zoological Society's own making have been at least partially responsible for its worsening financial performance. There was also a statement made to the effect that the relocation to WPP would enable 'millions more people to enjoy the magic'. The 2035 vision for the zoo sets out a target regarding visitors. By 2035, the aim is to: 'Engage and connect with more than 800,000 visitors and members per annum.' In 2019, across the Clifton site and WPP, there were 830,000 visitors (see Figure 3), or more than the target for WPP to achieve by 2035. The implication is that by 2035, the main effect of a strategy that achieves the 800,000 targets will have been a net transfer of the half a million or so visitors at the Clifton site to WPP. The potential environmental consequences of each scenario are explored below. The suggestion that the new zoo site will have, in the words of the Chair of the Trustees, Charlotte Moar, 'conservation and sustainability at its heart' is questionable. Indeed, BCWEZS's strategy looks like the antithesis of what an entity concerned with wildlife would do, recognizing that - as BCWEZS well knows - one of the major threats (if not the major threat) to species extinction comes from climate change (see below). Although this preamble may seem of limited relevance, it does need to be recognized that Development Management Policy DM31 (see further below) requires that: Where a proposal would affect the significance of a heritage asset, including a locally listed heritage asset, or its wider historic setting, the applicant will be expected to: i. Demonstrate that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; Given that BCWEZS's decision have been responsible for the drop off in visitor numbers at the Clifton site, then it might have been expected to take 'all reasonable efforts' to sustain the existing use (including, presumably, by closing WPP, or by rationalizing the use of each site according to suitability for key species). The application has not demonstrated that this has been done. Economic Benefits If applicants make claims for their proposal that are obviously unfounded, it is important that these are highlighted. The report by Savills - 'Economic Benefits Assessment' - is blatantly lopsided as an exercise in economic assessment, whilst also being riddled with errors and judgements of a questionable nature. Officers and Councillors are at risk of being seriously misled by this report. The report claims that: The assessment of economic benefits follows guidance from the Homes and Communities Agency Additionality Guide (HCA, 2014) and HM Treasury's Green Book (2020). This report does not, though, follow the HM Treasury's Green Book: if it can be said to have done so, it does so selectively and in a uniquely biased manner. The Treasury's Green Book would have required external costs and benefits to have been included in any assessment. These are genuinely public costs and benefits and might have a central role in determining whether the harm to heritage assets is justified. Because no attempt has been made to identify any external costs (because the assessment fails to respect the guidance it claims to have followed), it could not reliably be determined whether the harm to heritage assets was justified. Without a proper appraisal of these matters, attaching monetary values as per the HM Treasury Green Book Guidance (including Supplementary Guidance), the Council cannot possibly determine whether the harm to heritage assets is justified. Nonetheless, we should</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>explore the claims made further. The assessment suggests the reference case for the assessment is as follows: The reference case for this assessment is the site in a vacant state once the Bristol Zoo moves to its new home. We can compare this with the words in the Addendum to the Transport Statement from Peter Evans Partnership related to the same application: Bristol Zoo Gardens closed to members of the public in September 2022, after the submission of the planning application. However the zoo use remains the permitted use for the site. Therefore consideration of this use and the associated traffic generation in the baseline position as set out in the Transport Statement for the scheme remains appropriate. The Planning Statement sets out a range of benefits which are attributed to the application. 5.75. What is abundantly clear is that, while the nature of the movements may be different as the site moves from being a tourist attraction to a residential/community use, overall there will be a significant reduction in movements associated with the proposals (DM23 states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions). 5.76. It is also relevant to note that it is understood that in excess of 85.5% of visitors to the zoo currently travel by private motor car, while the application proposals not only seek to reduce total movements, but also to encourage alternative modes of transport. [...] 5.82. Residents will not be eligible for residents parking permits and so, in comparison with the existing tourist use where there would be significant use of the pay and display on-street parking, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in parking demand on surrounding streets. It is clear from the above that all the transport impacts are assessed against a baseline of the Zoo operating as an open visitor attraction, whilst the economic assessment assumes a baseline where the site is vacant. If the site was to be treated as an operating visitor attraction for the purposes of assessing transport impacts, why would the economic assessment take a completely different baseline as the basis for the assessment? It doesn't really matter which one believes is more relevant - given the site is, de facto, not open for business, then it seems difficult to sustain the fiction that it is still occupied. Either the claimed transport benefits are not as they are, or the claimed economic benefits are not as they are. The applicant is guilty of choosing multiple different baselines to suit whatever case it is seeking to make in a given document. A clear view is required on how assessment should proceed. Is it the Transport Statement or the Economic Assessment which is wrong? The approach to appraising the impact of the proposal is clearly not consistent across the application. Claimed Additional Homes The social and economic benefits of the site include a suggestion that the 196 additional homes are to be included as a social and economic benefit. There are relevant questions to be considered as to whether these homes are genuinely 'additional'. The Planning Statement is clear enough on the need for new dwellings due to a 'shortfall': BCC published its Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment 2020 to 2025 in June 2021, which confirms that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. It confirms that the council only has a 3.7 years supply of housing land. The statement also confirmed that BCC is failing to deliver sufficient homes against the Housing Delivery Test, at 72% of the delivery requirement. The administrative area of Bristol is, therefore, in need of significant new residential dwellings to address the shortfall The claim that the homes which are proposed will be additional raises questions regarding the counterfactual. If there is a shortfall against existing policy requirements, then it become more difficult to argue the 'additionality' case. Can it be argued that these houses are additional to what would otherwise be supplied when a) there is a shortfall against targets, and b) where growth in construction activity is limited by a shortage in</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>availability of labour? If the homes were not developed here, the shortfall might, after all, equally be met elsewhere, though ultimately, the pace of delivery of dwellings may be constrained by the availability of suitably skilled labour.</p> <p>Employment Claims In respect of employment, the Assessment claims: The proposed development would generate more jobs, economic activity and revenues to the local government than the reference case which is the vacant site once the Bristol Zoo moves to its new home. The economic benefits include 125 on and off-site construction jobs during the 3-year construction period for residents of Bristol; 54 on-site jobs during operation (including people working from their home)</p> <p>Proposals such as this will not generate new 'jobs' in construction. The employment market across the UK is currently tight, and it is especially tight in construction. The Construction Skills Network suggests that there will be an additional quarter of a million workers required between now and 2026 (it is not entirely clear where they are expected to come from). The likely impact of this proposal is to contribute to overall construction activity, the pace of delivery of which may be constrained by the availability of sufficient workers with the relevant skills. The net effect of the proposal is likely to be, at the margin, to slow down the pace of delivery of everything else. The figures for the on-site jobs are even less defensible than those for the construction sector. The Assessment states: Once operational, the proposed development could generate up to 54 on-site full time equivalent (FTE) jobs upon completion based on the employment densities for each use class within the proposed development, including 41 homeworkers.⁵ The estimate for the numbers of homeworkers who will reside on-site is based on the ONS estimates of homeworkers as a percentage of working age residents in the South West⁶ and applying that on the household level. What this is identifying is - based on ONS estimates - how many of the residents at the site might be home workers. In order for it to be correct to claim the site might 'generate' these homeworking jobs, it would also have to generate the people. These are people who do not spontaneously emerge once the site is built: they do already exist. Nor does the development spontaneously create (anywhere) opportunities for homeworkers at the site. To attribute these jobs to the site is not credible. There may be some employment attributable to the development in terms of staff at the café, office and community hub, but one also needs to consider the relevant counterfactual. There might be some additional spend (relative to what would have occurred anyway) but much (not all) of it is likely to be 'displacement' of spend that would have occurred elsewhere. All this assumes that the appropriate counterfactual is a vacant site - if one took the view adopted in the Transport Assessment - that the baseline is a still functioning Zoo, then even on the methodologically flawed grounds that the employment claims are made, the change at the site would look very different. In summary, the claimed employment generation is unsound. New Expenditure Similar comments can be made regarding 'new expenditure' by residents. The assessment makes the following assumptions: To estimate the additional expenditure from new residents, we take the average household expenditure for convenience goods, comparison goods and food and beverages as detailed in Table 2.6. We multiply the expenditure by the respective retention rates to estimate how much of this expenditure is retained in Bristol City's retail and restaurant units. We then multiply the result by the 196 additional households in the proposed development. This calculation gives an estimate of the weekly residential expenditure which is then multiplied by 52 to estimate the yearly expenditure. We estimate that the expenditure that would be retained in the local authority area to be approximately £1.5m per annum. The residents will not be 'new people' (other</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>than any new-born children). They already exist somewhere, and they spend money. Correctly considered, the expenditure is likely to imply displacement of expenditure that would have occurred elsewhere (unless the occupants already live nearby, in which case, their expenditure patterns may be similar). It would be difficult to justify, however, attributing any additionality to this spend. Some incremental uplift might be attributable to the café simply because of its proximity to residents. This assumes, of course, that the appropriate counterfactual is a vacant site - if one took the view adopted in the Transport Assessment - that the baseline is a still functioning Zoo, then even on the methodologically flawed grounds that the 'spend' claims are made, the change at the site would look very different. The Assessment goes even further than this: 2.5.3. This additional expenditure is expected to support additional jobs in retail and food and beverage. Using average turnover per employee in these sectors we estimate that this will support 13 jobs for residents of Bristol, which are accounted for in the multiplier effect outlined in Table 2.5 above. 2.5.4. Additionally, expenditure from new residents living at the Proposed Development would support employment in local shops and businesses in Bristol City. Again, it is very difficult to justify a view that the jobs supported would be 'additional'. The point at para 2.5.4. seems to be double counting the effect described in 2.5.3., which itself is not genuinely additional. GVA The Gross Value Added (GVA) calculations are effectively run off the employment assumptions discussed above: Gross Value Added (GVA) is an indicator of wealth creation by measuring economic activity associated with the operations in the development proposal. This section outlines the estimated GVA benefits which would be generated compared to the reference case. We have based our estimates based on GVA generated per worker in the South West region⁷ and the number of operational jobs created by each use type presented in Table 2.3. The proposed development scheme is estimated to generate £1.6m per annum. Given the questionable basis for the employment figures claimed in the report, then it follows that the claimed GVA figures are also unsound. There are other reasons, though, why the GVA figures are unlikely to be attributable to this site. This may seem counter-intuitive, but it comes back to the question of the relevant counterfactual: if this scheme were not given the go-ahead, would the same level of GVA be generated from construction across the year? If the labour market were not so constrained, then it might be possible to claim the GVA as 'additional', especially in conditions where the consenting process for housing was such that rates of build were in excess of what was required by Government (there was clear scope to argue that the development was 'additional', in the sense of being above levels required by Government policy). Neither is true in this case. Construction-related GVA will not be affected by what in the UK context is a relatively small scheme. Tax Revenues as Economic Benefits The Savills Assessment goes on to describe how the proposals could lead to the generation of additional public sector revenue. It is rather odd to see taxes and other transfers included as 'economic benefits'. Council Tax revenue is not 'an economic benefit': it arises as a transfer of income from private households to the Council. The same is true of Business Rates, except that the entity paying is a business, transferring funds to (at least for the majority of them) Bristol City Council. The payment of CIL is also a transfer. The New Homes Bonus is a transfer of funds from central government to local government. Where do Savills imagine the New Homes Bonus payments come from? Does the revenue materialize from thin air? HM Treasury's Green Book notes: 6.7 Transfers of resources between people (e.g. gifts, taxes, grants, subsidies or social security payments) should be excluded from the overall estimate of Net Present Social Value</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>(NPSV). Transfers pass purchasing power from one person to another and do not involve the consumption of resources. Transfers benefit the recipient and are a cost to the donor and therefore do not make society as a whole better or worse off. Only under quite specific circumstances should taxes be included as a benefit. The Assessment makes no such case. It presents all forms of what are, for the most part, forms of charge or tax as 'economic benefits'. Understanding the economic consequences of these transfers would require additional analysis of, for example, the deadweight loss implied by the imposition of the relevant taxes / charges. In reality, the extraordinarily marginal nature of these in the macroeconomic context is such that they would not tend to have any meaningful impact on the framework of taxation and spending that government would implement as a means to achieve its overarching fiscal objectives. Summary There is little in the Assessment of Economic Benefits that stands up to close scrutiny. The Assessment is lopsided in the extreme. It fails to follow Green Book principles in that none of the externalities associated with building out the proposal are considered. There may also be affects on asset values for neighbours that the assessment overlooks. These would not be public disbenefits, but private ones. Nonetheless, they are a reflection of the affect of the site on the amenity of the existing property owners. Transport First of all, it seems clear that - as per the above - the baseline for the Transport Assessment is no longer the relevant one. It is not clear what the BCWEZS would do in the absence of the application being granted consent but given that there appears to be no 'Plan B', then it would be strange to assume that the baseline for the assessment is a state of affairs which no longer prevails. The attempt, in the Addendum to the Transport Statement, to reassert that the appropriate baseline for the assessment is 'the zoo use' because this 'remains the permitted use for the site' belongs in the realms of magic realism. If BCWEZS has based its strategy on a presumption that one or other, or both, planning consents would be granted (irrespective of the nature of the application made), then to the reasons for presuming such an outcome deserve scrutiny, especially if they effectively imply a fettering of the discretion of officers and Councillors to arrive at a rational decision, achieved in a lawful manner. Nonetheless, the claims in the original assessment that, for example, the design of the scheme reflects an assessment that 'in this location it would not be necessary to own a car' and that the scheme provides 'infrastructure and promotion measures ... to encourage non private car travel' cannot be taken seriously: there are 118 car parking spaces proposed. As regards collectively owned vehicles, the Transport Statement notes: 'A car club space and car is proposed as part of the scheme.' That is suggestive of a scheme that does only the bare minimum. The supposed benefits of this car club space are overblown: Whilst provision of a car club vehicle still enables car travel the availability of this vehicle would reduce the need for residents to own their own private car, which in turn is a sustainable benefit to the scheme. This is also a benefit to the wider Clifton area as would enable local residents to use the shared vehicle instead of owning their own car. The aim for this vehicle to be electric brings environmental benefits. In other words, it's not even guaranteed to have the car as electric. The Planning Statement from Savills notes: 5.75. What is abundantly clear is that, while the nature of the movements may be different as the site moves from being a tourist attraction to a residential/community use, overall there will be a significant reduction in movements associated with the proposals (DM23 states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions). 5.76. It is also relevant to note that it is understood that in excess of 85.5% of visitors to the zoo currently travel by private motor car, while the application proposals not only seek to reduce total movements, but also to</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>encourage alternative modes of transport. [...] 5.82. Residents will not be eligible for residents parking permits and so, in comparison with the existing tourist use where there would be significant use of the pay and display on-street parking, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in parking demand on surrounding streets. One could be forgiven for thinking that the two consultants' reports are discussing a completely different scheme, other than in the respect that they both assume - erroneously - that the effect of the proposal on traffic should be considered as if the Zoo was still open. The applicants may pretend all they wish that the Zoo hasn't closed, but it already has, and that decision was of the applicant's own making. The appropriate baseline for this assessment is a non-functioning Zoo, with no visitors, and no visitor traffic, not a state of affairs that has now passed, and for which there are - apparently - no clear plans to return to. But why, if the location is so 'sustainable' (what does it even mean for 'a location' to be 'sustainable?'), were 'in excess of 85.5% of visitors' to the Zoo, when it was still open, travelling by car? Why does the Transport Assessment assume that the behaviour of the would-be residents will be so different in the face of similar travel options? The reality is that the Transport Statement does not really envisage car-free travel, and is not expecting much by way of this in future. Indeed, notwithstanding the 118 car parking spaces, the Transport Assessment is happy to consider the potential for this number being exceeded. It includes a thoroughly unconvincing plan for what it appears to anticipate will be pressure for additional car parking: However BCC confirmed early in the pre-application process that residents of the BZG site would not be able to apply for on-street parking permits. This removes the potential impact of overspill parking from occurring on a daily basis, as pay and display parking locally is time limited. Therefore when residents move into the site they would be aware of whether they have space to park a vehicle or not. The level of car parking proposed is therefore designed on this basis. MfS [Manual for Streets] identifies at section 8 that lower car parking provision can be successful when adequate on-street parking controls are present, which is the case at the BZG site. Ineligibility for on-street parking permits would be made clear though any sales and marketing agent. With allocated car parking proposed this provides residents with a clear understanding as to whether their property is car free or not. The internal streets around the site would be managed by a management company to make sure that no parking takes place outside of the marked parking bays. The presumption is that there would be controls feeding into habits, but as the above extracts indicate, parking restrictions locally are time-limited. Those using cars for travel into work would, therefore, compete for spaces outside the hours of time-restricted parking. Since the Statement mainly considers impacts relative to 'peak time' traffic, it is unclear whether the Statement has properly considered the possibility that would-be residents may simply take a chance on out-of-restricted hours spaces being available. Contrary to what is stated, therefore, it seems likely that there could be intense competition for local parking spaces in the hours outside the restrictions - the exact same hours when visitors to the Zoo would not have been seeking to park their vehicles. All o</p>	
261.		25-Oct-22

262.	<p>I find it difficult to believe that this application is considered to be complete given the lack of evidence on, notably, the environment / energy side. I have made these views known to relevant officers, but in the absence of a response to most recent questions, I note the following: The absence of an integration of a commitment to reduce embodied carbon in the design (both in terms of materials and the completely inappropriate scale) is not aligned with National planning Policy Framework, notably para 134 and the associated Guidelines. It is inconsistent with even the existing Net Zero Strategy, and not in line with stated policy in this respect. The Council has the ability through existing policies, notably BCS13, BCS14 and BCS15, to reflect the requirements of the NPPF in respect of design quality in its decisions. Given that the design fails in respect of embodied carbon / energy, then it should be refused. In respect of other matters, the 'Economic Benefits' assessment is completely lopsided. It claims to follow guidance on additionality from the now abolished HCA, making highly subjective decisions regarding the magnitude of these benefits. It also claims to follow guidance on appraisal from the Treasury Green Book. If it does so at all, it does so only in the most impartial and lopsided manner. No professional economist ought to render such a document on the basis that it captures the economic benefits. It is of concern that the comment from 'economic development' simply asks for further elaboration of these benefits without highlighting any of the very obvious deficiencies and shortcomings of the presentation. Whether or not the document concerned should carry any weight at all in a development control decision is moot, in any case, yet since the Committee and officers have tended to reference these in decision making, possibly considering this (rightly or wrongly) as part of the balance they must weigh up, then it seems entirely appropriate to indicate that the benefits assessment is, literally, Cyclopic in its outlook, focusing only on 'positive' benefits without weighing up - as per Treasury Green Book - the wider impacts of the development. These include, but are not limited to, environmental impacts, none of which have been considered in the assessment of benefits. In the expectation of further information and revision, these comments are not as detailed as they will be on receipt of a revised proposal.</p>	25-Oct-22
------	---	-----------

263.	<p>There is much to be welcomed in this proposal, and it is clear that the provision of a public open space and the construction of additional housing is an appropriate use for this much-valued site. However, having read through the documentation I am left with two major concerns: The first centres on the quality of the design of the proposed residential buildings and their scale. The impression I get from the plans is that three of the four sides of the site will be dominated by monolithic slab-sided blocks that tower over the surrounding buildings, rather than enhancing them, and do not fit in with the character of the conservation area. Why is it not possible to design buildings that are sympathetic to those around them, and why is it necessary to seek to build five/six-storey blocks when those in the rest of the area do not rise above three storeys? I urge planners not to accept second-rate design and not to allow over-development, and accordingly to reject the current designs and insist on lower buildings. The second arises from the issue of public access. I applaud the proposals with regard to the open space in the centre of the development. However, I believe that there are insufficient safeguards to guarantee public access in perpetuity and that there is inadequate financial provision for ensuring that the gardens are properly maintained in the long term. Any permission granted must be contingent on an appropriate sum of money being set aside to provide for the maintenance of the site and for a suitably robust management structure being put in place to oversee its maintenance.</p>	01-Nov-22
264.	<p>Whilst being broadly in favour of this site being used for a mixture of private/social housing and public access and welcoming many of the proposals for the open areas, I continue to be concerned about two aspects that these revised proposals fail to address: I remain of the opinion that the design of the flats surrounding the site is not in keeping with neighbouring properties in the conservation area and that they are too tall to fit in comfortably. No attempt has been made to design them to harmonise with local building styles and it is imperative that such an important and sensitive site should benefit from more sympathetic and appropriate new construction. The proposals for managing the open areas still fail to provide adequate safeguards for ensuring public access in perpetuity. The proposed funding model means that residents will have a strong incentive for restricting access - this could be mitigated by establishing a trust fund at the outset for maintenance of the grounds using funding provided as a condition of granting planning permission. Without adequate funding the gardens and buildings will soon deteriorate.</p>	01-Nov-22

265.	<p>Hello planning department, I've just gone through the visuals of the planned build of our former zoo. I'm incredibly disappointed at the proposed development and hope you see the sense of reviewing what has been laid out. I pity the poor local neighbours who will be overshadowed by the far to high proposed buildings as well as this development bringing nothing in keeping to this area, we're not far off of it looking like a soviet block built prison. There are far to many house/flats/etc in these proposed plans and to me the whole development really stinks of commercial greed (which I guess is nothing new in what we've all witnessed these past years) by developers. Why can't this be a low level green development with more affordable units and more of the existing park space available to all to enjoy? The visuals show nothing to engage in the conservation area that the zoo sits in. You haven't addressed the massive increase in vehicles (from number of proposed dwellings, I'd predict an extra 300+ vehicles) in this area further clogging the narrow roads that surround the zoo and given local residents a further headache in being able to park 'near' their residence. When will we learn that instead of potentially destroying a local beauty spot (yes it could be changed into a walled garden or virtual zoo) we line the pockets of the developers who really don't give a damn about what they do as long as a profit is made. We live in very sad times and I hope you see sense to reject the proposed plans and plan better in keeping with this historic area and have a development that is environmentally less damaging. Yours in hope, Bill Brown.</p>	01-Nov-22
266.	<p>Having read the proposals I cannot agree to the scale of the development. I do appreciate that the Zoo requires a goodly sum for their site but the proposal by the developer maximises every aspect of the site and the surrounding streetscapes. The canyon-like streets that are created by the development are totally unacceptable and totally against the cocept of the Conservation area that was set up to guard Clifton against developments like this. I am totally opposed to this proposal.</p>	03-Nov-22
267.	<p>Having just seen some modelled visuals of the Zoo's proposed housing development, to say I am shocked would be an understatement. The flats are ugly concrete blocks, at least two stories too tall, which totally dominate the surrounding streets and existing houses. Not only do they have no architectural subtlety or interest in themselves, but there has been no attempt at blending in with the surrounding Victorian buildings. It's bad enough that the Zoo has gone, but to put in its place such hideous constructions is an insult to the local residents, and indeed the whole City of Bristol. The Zoo was something that made me proud to be a Bristolian, but this proposed development is an embarrassment. For a City that prides itself on its creative talent and heritage, it shows no innovation or intelligence in design and quite how anyone could even propose such a scheme in the first place is beyond my understanding. If planning permission is granted it will be an incredible missed opportunity to create something beautiful for the future on a site of such historic importance, and will be yet another example of Bristol City Council getting things so very wrong.</p>	03-Nov-22

268.	Very ugly and not in keeping with the beauty of Clifton and the Downs.	04-Nov-22
269.	I am a local parent and have frequented the zoo often. I use and love the area. The redevelopment is ugly and uncalled for. It brings More people more traffic. More pollution. It is obscenely too high, aesthetic pollution. It excludes the public from a space that was meant for the public. We should treasure our historic sites, buildings and open spaces not just see them as profiteering opportunities by offices, shops and dwellings on them. There are so many ugly office, industrial sites to redevelop. Just because it is in Clifton the profit margins for developers, owners and council must be huge. Quality of life is important. I object this redevopment.	04-Nov-22
270.	The height of the proposed structures is far too high. There are just too many flats squashed in. It will look very ugly. As must be obvious to all, this proposal has nothing to do with protecting the heritage of the site. It is all to do with maximising revenues.	05-Nov-22
271.	The plans, especially the housing stock proposed, are not in keeping with the street scene and the conservation area. The housing is too high and as such will both obscure light and affect trees. The area has already suffered from traffic pollution and additional cars parked or coming into the housing will place a heavier burden on the area in terms of traffic crowding and pollution. The roads around the site are small and mainly reduced to single flow traffic which can already be prone to bottle necks. The area is already becoming overpopulated due to many local residences in BS8 being converted in to HMOs for students . The site has a long history of being a public amenity as a gardens and should continue as a public amenity, or at the very least be primarily a public amenity with some low rise housing on the place of existing buildings.	05-Nov-22

Second consultation phase

7th November 2022 – 15th January 2023

STANCE	COMMENTS	DATE RECEIVED
272. S	All the new properties should have covered balconies. Surely we learnt that during the pandemic, and makes them feel so much more airy, accessible, environmental (plants), communal and practical. Could envisage buying one of the new properties, as this is potentially a lovely development, but only if with a balcony (or terrace if ground floor).	07-Nov-22
273. S	just make all the apartments with a covered balcony/terrace - so much better for enjoyment of the outdoors	07-Nov-22
274. S	support it if they all have covered balconies, would make it lovely.	07-Nov-22
275. S	buildings could be more attractive - more glass, more balconies	07-Nov-22
276. S	Looks like a fabulous idea. However I would propose 2 things: Firstly that almost all the properties have a covered balcony - so much nicer to live in and environmentally sound - covered to provide an outside space even in inclement weather. Secondly - consider stone/brickwork as used in the Redland Girls School development (Bath stone?) Which looks lovely and in keeping with the area. Some indication of likely prices of resulting properties would be interesting please.	07-Nov-22
277. O	My original objections are unchanged by the revised proposals. The proposed development is in a Conservation Area The design of the houses is totally out of keeping with the Victorian houses in the neighbourhood and indeed most of Clifton. What's more they are high, much higher than most of the perimeter of the existing site so will stand out very prominently. I don't object to new houses being built but it is a Conservation Area and therefore the design should be in keeping with the surroundings and the heritage of Clifton.	07-Nov-22
278. O	Through the enormous mass of documents revising the plans, I couldn't see anything addressing the awful external nature of the proposed development. The proposals are still totally out of keeping with the visual appearance of the local area and would be a blot on the landscape. Any development must fit in with the rich architectural character of this part of Clifton - the proposals have total disregard for the fact this is a Conservation Area.	07-Nov-22
279. O	Received a letter from the Zoo and the pictures on the first page showing a park area all look great. I looked at the next page and see 6 story buildings are being proposed. 6 stories is far too high and out of keeping with the general nature of Clifton. Any new build should be no higher than the typical Victorian properties in Clifton and designed in a style far closer to the other Victorian buildings in the area - not modern high rise blocks of flats. These are visually out of character with Clifton.	07-Nov-22

280. S	<p>The BZG planning committee have made very detailed and considered changes to the original development proposal. It remains a much needed source of new housing in Bristol whilst preserving the heritage of the zoo site. It will add very well designed new housing to a very constrained housing stock in Bristol. I remain shocked at how selfish very affluent local residents and parents/members of an elite private school can be in carpet bagging this planning portal with objections to this extremely reasonable proposal. If this was so important to keep things as is these same people should have actually found a way to financially support the zoo to keep the site. Appeals were made and met with deaf ears at that time hence the BZG site being proposed. As it is, the BZG team are taking a very considered approach to the design which is above and beyond what a standard private developer should do: the site is being made accessible to the public and for free (this was not the case before when the zoo was open); they are providing a mix of housing for more affluent residents whilst also providing a significant percentage of affordable homes; there is real preservation of garden and iconic parts of zoo architecture. With the amended application the BZG has made amendments to reduce some multi-family housing due to the aforementioned objections. I personally do not think these changes were needed, but they did make them thus demonstrating the BZGs real commitment to acknowledging and responding to criticism as reasonably possible. In terms of the overall site, I remain fully supportive - we desperately need more homes in Bristol, and especially need more homes in central areas of Bristol. To really fight climate change at a council level we should be improving density so people can walk/cycle instead of commute to workplaces. Building densely supports business by increasing their market too. Building more homes helps increase the supply of housing and helps gradually deal with the homeless situation. These are not disputed facts. I hope the bad faith objections of NIMBYs in Clifton do not overwhelm reason when it comes to this application. Also it is worth emphasising, people in Bristol who own very expensive homes have a personal financial interest in keeping the housing stock limited at this end of the market - it inflates the value of their homes accordingly. Many of the objections appear to be obfuscating their true intent. Frankly if a detailed, well considered application like this does not meet an acceptable standard, what would? Inaction will lead to an empty undeveloped site, or some parking - that is not a good use of space. (I am not even acknowledging the what can only politely described as 'eccentric' proposal to build a VR zoo in a massive hangar building that has been astroturfed as a supposedly reasonable alternative). Finally, this whole process highlights the unfair nature of the state of planning permission in the UK. Who comments on these applications, and whose voices are unheard? Do comments on this application reflect the sentiment for the wider community? Do random comments from pressure groups reflect democracy or justice? I hope when the council considers these objections or comments in support of the application these questions are also considered carefully. I hope my comment does not appear intemperate but as a millennial medical doctor in the NHS and also researcher at the University I have struggled with the housing market in Bristol, and despite my profession being relatively well paid. I think the council should work for everyone rather than those sections of society who happened to buy housing 20-30 years ago when the average mortgage was 3-5 times an average yearly salary as opposed to the 10-20x it stands now.</p>	07-Nov-22
--------	--	-----------

281. S	<p>I remain supportive of this development. The housing proposals are simply beautiful and give the public access to a lovely garden for free. I do not sympathise or empathise with the reflexively negative commenters objecting to this proposal. As far as I can tell these people would only be happy if nothing ever changed, if no new people ever moved into Bristol, and they could maintain a static city. I implore the council to ignore the objections from people who are simply resistant to any change - they will never be pleased by any proposal. If it were up to them their own houses would never have been built in the first place as they would have objected to any building without a thatched roof. Modern buildings with timber frame construction are brilliant, long lived, and have a much lower environmental footprint. They allow for modern energy efficiency standards to be met and they can be built quickly. Bristol is a growing and vibrant city. Trying to block people being able to get new homes here is simply an injustice and is leading to increasing problems of housing insecurity in the aggregate. Consigning people who want new homes to only buying in the suburbs on brownfield sites is not fair and also not going to allow the city to meet climate targets. We need more density to promote alternative transport modes such as cycling, walking (not to mention fee paying customers to support more bus routes) which lessens the climate impact of people who would otherwise be spread further and more inclined to drive. Bristol Council should be embracing this fortunate position it finds itself in as a popular city for people to move by enabling more housing development at density. In time this will significantly support plans for e.g. a Bristol metro by providing the customers that will use it. I also think the arguments re "not enough affordable housing" should be ignored - the site needs to be commercially viable to support the new Zoo site, and also 20% of ~150 homes is a lot of new affordable housing that would not be available if this site is not built. International data from cities in New Zealand and Canada has demonstrated the clear correlation of easing housing development through e.g. permitting reform/planning rules promoting density, and reducing the rate of house price growth. This should not have to be explained but if you increase supply to meet demand, price falls. People understand this with daily purchases but seem to think housing is a special case. Notably in Harlem, New York City, USA recently a housing development of a large apartment block was opposed through similar arguments of "insufficient affordable housing" - the site is now being continued to use for its current purpose, a truck (lorry) stop. These objections are what I class as bad faith objections. Often such objections are made simply to prevent any new building and are not truly concerned with provision of affordable housing. Finally, I feel this site should not have any barriers to increasing density or implementing the full vision of its design. The architect has designed a truly beautiful site and it would be a shame to allow these NIMBYs who seem to be organising an undemocratic astroturf campaign against the development to win with their regressive arguments. These objectors just want to maintain their property values at the expense of the rest. The losers of such an outcome are the people of Bristol.</p>	07-Nov-22
--------	--	-----------

282.	S	It is not surprising a new housing development on a much loved zoo site attracts strong feelings. Notably when it came to finding means to support the zoo to stay open at this site with funding from this same public, that did not materialise. Bristol needs new housing. This is a large area of land being redeveloped with careful consideration to provide this very much unmet need. It is heartening to see a mixture of new housing including the provision of some affordable housing as well. The objections from the nearby private school and parents of pupils from this school strike me as incredibly unjustified and unfair. We should not be giving undue weight to the already very privileged to pull the ladder up from others in society (in this cases through maintaining the status quo of insufficient housing stock in Bristol). Finally, the following is not likely to be a popular opinion, and overall I remain supportive of this application, however I think more rather than less housing should be planned and provided. I do not think it is particularly good land use or equitable for the wider community that large tracts of this development are dedicated to public space. It would be better for this to be used instead to site more housing but I also understand that often people like having areas of green space next to them. It is worth considering that the zoo site is right next to the very large green space of the downs however.	07-Nov-22
283.	O	I have lived in Bristol all my life and Bristol zoo has a big significant's in my life it is a major land mark for Bristol. I remember Alfred the gorilla. The elephants Christine and one other that children could ride on. Polar bears and many other magnificent creatures, I think if we need to move the zoo to build houses on is very sad when there is many areas in and around Bristol we could build houses on. I also understand the new zoo the wild place is impressive but we need to save are zoo in Clifton not just for now but for Bristol Heritage. And for many generations to come.	07-Nov-22
284.	O	I really cannot quite believe what I see regarding the proposals for the zoo site . Completely overbearing,out of character, inappropriate buildings proposed , how dare there be such a over development of the site where once stood low bearing and old buildings were . No doubt large mature trees will be taken down . No , that must NOT happen .	07-Nov-22
285.	O	I strongly object to the proposed development of Bristol Zoo gardens; the proposed buildings,size and architecture would be completely out of character and completely spoil the experience and appearance of the historic buildings adjacent and in the area. Clifton is a suburb of great importance both for residents and Bristol dwellers and tourists who come for the beauty and open nature of the area, this would be a great own goal and well as an act of desecration.	07-Nov-22
286.	O	I object strongly to these plans for housing that have been submitted regarding the site at the Zoo.	07-Nov-22
287.	O	I wish to object strongly to the proposed Plan to change the Zoo Gardens into a housing development. This area comprises many special trees and is a wonderful green area for everyone to enjoy in the future. The area is a national treasure and should be secured for the future. Yours faithfully Sonya Clifton	07-Nov-22

288.	O	The site of such a cherished zoo needs to be honoured with special care and consideration, not turned into yet another generic housing development with no identity. The proposed development is too close to the school, it will overcrowd the local homes and there won't be enough parking. We need to use the land in a respectful way that preserves green space, protects ecosystems and wildlife and pays homage to Bristol Zoo.	07-Nov-22
289.	O	It is a terrible shame that the zoo had to close but it appears there wasn't enough money or interest to keep it going. The historic site should be made into a park and community/ education site for the people of Bristol to enjoy. Businesses can provide food entertainment and other sorts and leisure facilities so the council receives rate payment and the city becomes a bigger attraction. It will do nothing for the long term benefit of the city to build more flats and houses which will no doubt hand a large amount of cash into the bank accounts of a few developers. Save the zoo site for the people of Bristol	07-Nov-22
290.	O	I think the city of Bristol should decide what the best use of this iconic, historic and quasi-public site could be for the benefit of everyone and not just maximising the Zoo's profit margin. For example, Bristol Zoo carrying on but in a modified form, a 'Bristol Kew Gardens', Our World Bristol's proposal for an augmented reality zoo or another type of visitor attraction. The Zoo's planning proposal is advocating for the loss of at least a third of the trees across the gardens. The Zoo's own website describes their gardens as "one of the UK's most important collections of plants" and "170 years of nurture and gardening artistry." The iconic herbaceous border pictured above will be bulldozed and become someone's multi-million pound home. How can the Zoo - a conservation charity dedicated to fighting climate change - justify destroying any of these gardens - against the backdrop of Bristol being a Green Capital and the current climate crisis? Only a fraction of the site will be available to the public. The Zoo offers no guarantee that the gardens will stay open to the public in the long term. There are many other solutions and options that the Zoo could explore and pursue if they would listen and engage. If it was proposed that London, Dublin or Berlin Zoo were to be sold off for private housing there would no doubt be significant public outrage. Bristol is not a capital city but the principal remains the same. The Zoo's desire to bankroll their new attraction in South Gloucestershire is a completely separate issue from the sale and future use of this site.	08-Nov-22
291.	O	Bristol claims to be a green city yet is willing to destroy one of the most diverse gardens it has. Removing nearly 46.5% of the current unique trees that the historic Bristol zoo contains. Why not convert this area into a Bristol Kew Gardens equivalent? Let's drive more tourism rather than creating more exclusive tower blocks that will damage the environment. Let's keep the zoo's history and maintain it as exciting place for people to visit across the generations.	08-Nov-22

292.	O	The objections raised so far are mostly not just NIMBY neighbours. Most people do not object in principle to the development of the zoo gardens to provide housing. Many of the local residents are not living in multimillion pound properties, but flats and apartments in sensitively converted older buildings, and some (mostly compatible) modern multi occupancy buildings. It is in the interest of all people in Bristol , not just those fortunate enough to live in Clifton, to maintain an attractive environment, with open green space and well designed buildings. This development raises concerns about the density of residence, and the height of the residential buildings proposed. This is particularly an issue in Northcote Road and Guthrie Road. Three stories would be preferable to 5 and 6, and more compatible with the surrounding environment. The buildings along Clifton Down are more acceptable, as they will be set back behind the existing mature trees. We need to have a more spacious environment, less dwellings packed in to a small area, and less high rise dominating the development. As other commentators have stated, there must be a secure way of sustaining the gardens for public access with a high standard of maintenance guaranteed for the future.	08-Nov-22
293.	O	The zoo has been very effective in public consultation and discussion at their series of meetings, and some of the suggestions and ideas expressed by local people have been taken into consideration. Overall the plan has shown some sensitivity to effects on the Clifton environment and the presentation of enhanced gardens with free public access is to be commended. I regret the fact that once again the zoo and Bristol City have decided to crowd as much accommodation into this space as possible, greatly increasing the density of population in this restricted area. The buildings, while having some sensitivity in design , are again taller than are suitable for this site. Four stories would create much less visual impact than the planned six.	08-Nov-22
294.	O	I have previously commented on the plans to redevelop Bristol Zoo for residential purposes and whilst I was broadly supportive to these proposals, I was very disappointed with the unpleasant visual aspects of the proposed design. As a long-standing local resident is a matter of great concern that the unsightly eyesore which constitutes this design has not been significantly modified in the latest proposals. Indeed, it is hard to discern what changes have been made and good design cannot be replaced by the meaningless spin set out in the Design Guide. Therefore, I must continue to express my disgust at the unsympathetic nature of these proposals which are wholly out of keeping with the surrounding historic area. I must also emphasis that successful design does not stop at the site boundary but must produce a development which fits into the local environment comfortably. The current proposals fail on these grounds and so should not be allowed to proceed unmodified. Moreover, permitting this ill-fitting development to proceed, will set an unhealthy precedent for the future and could easily lead to a rash of similarity ill-conceived development proposals in the Clifton district which will destroy the ambience of the local area. Hence, the applicant should think again and devise something more keeping with the situation of the site.	08-Nov-22

295.	O	I am disappointed to note that the latest proposal are very little changed from their predecessors meaning that the chance to create a feature which enhances the locale is being lost. It is difficult to see why the promoters are continuing to believe that grey is a sensible colour for such a prominent development as it more suited to bunkers, machine-gun nests, multi-storey car parks, gasworks and other such utilitarian structures. Indeed, its hard to believe that anyone who has spent any time at all in Bristol has noticed that it rains a fair bit and so the use of warmer colours is highly desirable. In short the local residents are the people who will have to live with this development and their opinion on its appearance deserves to take precedence over imported architects. Regards Paul Johnson	08-Nov-22
296.	O	Whilst I consider that it is a shame that Bristol Zoo feels it must move from its historic and easily accessible site in Clifton to a much more remote and unsustainable location adjacent the M4 motorway as this seems rather contrary to its ecological and conservation objectives, I broadly welcome these proposals. This is because I believe that a carefully designed residential development is the best alternative use of this site. I also consider that it is laudable that the applicants seek to maximise the number of dwellings present and at the same time preserve its gardens. Likewise, I welcome the potential to reduce fly-parking arising from the removal of the Zoo. Nevertheless, I have many concerns about these proposals as they stand. My primary concern is that the buildings are too tall and will overshadow the adjoining properties and dominate this part of Bristol. Thus even a casual visit to the area in which the Zoo is situated will indicate that with the exception of the prominent landmarks provided by several church towers, the Cathedral Spire and the tower of Clifton College, the buildings surrounding this site are of a relatively uniform 3 or 4 storey height. This is true not only of the immediately adjacent area, but of most of the Clifton and Clifton Down areas. As this is not true of the current proposals and I fear the that will visually dominate this area unacceptably. I consider this to be particular problem in respect of Clifton College where it seems that the range of historic buildings adjacent to Guthrie Road will dominated by the new buildings and this will ruin the College's setting by creating an unwelcome intrusion into its backdrop from the south. Whilst placing the taller buildings on the northern site of the site where the ground rises would seem to be sensible, those on the other sides must not be allowed to overshadow the existing buildings on Guthrie, Northcote and College Roads. The current proposals fail in this respect. Likewise, a casual visit to the area in which the Zoo site is located will indicate that most of the building are constructed in the warm colours provided by red sandstone and creamy limestone walls. However, the current proposals seem to be finished in a rather drab cold colour more befitting of a 1970s multi-storey municipal car park than this location and they will do little to enhance its appearance. I notice that the brochure I have receive makes a play of the fact that this development will sit 'sympathetically within the walled gardens' already on the site. To be successful this development must also be sympathetic to the area outside this wall and in this respect, I consider that it fails dramatically. So more need to be done to harmonise this development with its wider surroundings and not just eth former zoo site itself. Consequently, whilst I would not wish to see a pastiche of the surrounding Victorian architecture, I feel a design more in keeping with its neighbourhood in terms of height and colouration could readily be devised. Hence, I feel it rather smacks of something	08-Nov-22

		<p>being parachuted in from outside with little thought for its neighbours and needs to be significantly changed. I also consider that Guthrie Road is very busy with Clifton College pupils in term times and so steps must be taken to maximise their safety during the construction of this development. This could best be achieved by the implementation of a Construction Management Plan. As I note that no such document is provided in support of this application, I would suggest that it is necessary to devise one forthwith. This strategy must be based on the premiss that works access to the site is obtained only from Clifton Down Road and the large vehicle are not routed through the surrounding residential areas. Overall, therefore, whilst this proposal has much to commend it, I feel that it has a number of fairly obvious shortcomings which must be addressed before it is approved. Under these circumstances I must object to it. Paul Johnson Town and Transport planner</p>	
297.	O	<p>The updated plans remain wholly inappropriate in an area of conservation. The proximity to the school, the Downs and a Residential neighbourhood has not been considered in proposing a huge block of flats that are an eyesore. I'm not opposed to development but I can see no sensitivity demonstrated here. Strongly oppose</p>	08-Nov-22
298.	O	<p>I have not seen any part of the revised plan which considers the impact on the neighbourhood, surrounding schools, traffic and conservation area.</p>	08-Nov-22

299.	O	<p>I fully object to the proposed plans as they stand for the following reasons:</p> <p>Major concern over the height of the new buildings. They will limit light to the surrounding homes, school and frankly make no sense in a conservation area. Furthermore, the school grounds and buildings will be overlooked. Whilst I appreciate the need for homes - this is a completely inappropriate site. Due to size of the plot 200 homes requires a 'high rise' modern type build, will increase traffic (in an already busy area), reduce air quality, create major safety issues for the neighbourhood and 2 large schools and destroy the feel of the conservation area. Why does it have to be 200 homes - I fail to see the rationale for this number in this particular area. The overall management of the build in an area with constant flow of school traffic and children is a major concern. The area already suffers from unsafe drivers. I can't see a construction management plan. Whilst it would be wonderful to see this historic site continue to benefit Bristol - this current plan appears to benefit the pockets of the developers at the detriment of those who actually reside in Bristol.</p>	08-Nov-22
300.	O	<p>Whilst being broadly in favour of this site being used for a mixture of private/social housing and public access and welcoming many of the proposals for the open areas, I continue to be concerned about two aspects that these revised proposals fail to address: I remain of the opinion that the design of the flats surrounding the site is not in keeping with neighbouring properties in the conservation area and that they are too tall to fit in comfortably. No attempt has been made to design them to harmonise with local building styles and it is imperative that such an important and sensitive site should benefit from more sympathetic and appropriate new construction. The proposals for managing the open areas still fail to provide adequate safeguards for ensuring public access in perpetuity. The proposed funding model means that residents will have a strong incentive for restricting access - this could be mitigated by establishing a trust fund at the outset for maintenance of the grounds using funding provided as a condition of granting planning permission. Without adequate funding the gardens and buildings will soon deteriorate.</p>	08-Nov-22

301.	O	<p>There is much to be welcomed in this proposal, and it is clear that the provision of a public open space and the construction of additional housing is an appropriate use for this much-valued site. However, having read through the documentation I am left with two major concerns: The first centres on the quality of the design of the proposed residential buildings and their scale. The impression I get from the plans is that three of the four sides of the site will be dominated by monolithic slab-sided blocks that tower over the surrounding buildings, rather than enhancing them, and do not fit in with the character of the conservation area. Why is it not possible to design buildings that are sympathetic to those around them, and why is it necessary to seek to build five/six-storey blocks when those in the rest of the area do not rise above three storeys? I urge planners not to accept second-rate design and not to allow over-development, and accordingly to reject the current designs and insist on lower buildings. The second arises from the issue of public access. I applaud the proposals with regard to the open space in the centre of the development. However, I believe that there are insufficient safeguards to guarantee public access in perpetuity and that there is inadequate financial provision for ensuring that the gardens are properly maintained in the long term. Any permission granted must be contingent on an appropriate sum of money being set aside to provide for the maintenance of the site and for a suitably robust management structure being put in place to oversee its maintenance.</p>	08-Nov-22
302.	O	<p>I note that there is no guarantee of perpetual public access to the gardens. Indeed, access gates with keypads, such as are proposed for the pedestrian gate on the boundary alongside Clifton Down Road, are definitely not 'open access'. Whilst the site is currently gated, there is no reason for this to be perpetuated. To create a ghetto, albeit one with wealthy residents seems undesirable. The revised proposals do not address the concerns raised by myself among others to the original high density and physical height of the block of flats, N1 etc. . Amendments to the layout within the blocks are immaterial when the block itself is the problem.</p>	09-Nov-22
303.	O	<p>Whilst it seems inevitable that the Zoo site will be used for building it is still important that the area be used for the benefit of as many and diverse individuals as possible. This includes access as an open space and housing provision for people of limited means or with disability. It seems sad that the committee in charge of housing development should be willing to accept a 20% provision of such accommodation in return for a guarantee of the work being commenced quickly (short term benefit) whereas the full 40% legal requirement would be of major long term benefit. The original much vaunted open access to the site and provision for its long term maintenance now seems at risk. The suggestion that ongoing costs of this should be borne by the residents (apart from those in social housing) and this necessitates the maximum number of residents and the minimum of those in social housing is a spurious way of reducing the % of social housing. I would suggest that there should be a sum of money put in trust by the developers for the grounds maintenance from the outset.</p>	09-Nov-22

304.	O	The density of the proposed housing, in particular high rise Block N, is too great for the area. The character of Clifton Down Road is of individual buildings the majority of which were originally designed as single family dwellings although I accept that some are now subdivided into flats. A monolithic high structure would adversely impinge on the area and should be avoided. The existing boundary wall currently conceals the buildings within the zoo grounds, that should remain its purpose.	09-Nov-22
305.	O	The proposed housing development is totally inappropriate for this conservation area. - It is too high on all sides of the site and blocks light and openness. - It is too dense, extensive and flat/block-like, looking more like a fortress - the design is really poor quality. - The appearance is not in keeping with the Victorian and other houses in the area. - It causes the loss of mature trees that provide oxygenation, habitat for birds and other fauna - It causes the loss and destruction of world- renowned herbaceous borders that mean the loss of flora and fauna - There is no protection for public access to the whole area, in perpetuity. - The density of the building will require extensive parking on site. There is insufficient street parking already so there is no space for the cars of additional residents. Nobody can reasonably believe that the home buyers will not have cars that need parking. The area has already suffered from traffic pollution and additional cars parked or coming into the housing will place a heavier burden on the area in terms of traffic crowding and pollution. The roads around the site are small and mainly reduced to single flow traffic which can already be prone to bottle necks. This will pose a danger to children at the adjacent school. Overall, the scale, density and height of the development is wrong for the area and the impacts beyond just the building have not been considered. The site has a long history of being a public amenity as gardens and should continue as a public amenity, or at the very least be primarily a public amenity with some low rise housing on the place of existing buildings. I believe that there are insufficient safeguards to guarantee public access in perpetuity and that there is inadequate financial provision for ensuring that the gardens are properly maintained in the long term.	09-Nov-22

306.	O	<p>As a resident of Northcote Road, I wrote in July 2022 and then again in November 2022 to outline some of my objections to Bristol Zoo's proposals for building large residential buildings on the main Zoo site. Since then our Northcote Road Residents' Association has received the final report from the professional organisation which we commissioned to carry out a light survey - outlining the light issues which would affect all eight of the houses in our road - caused by the planned building of the blocks of flats in such a very close proximity to our houses. You are most likely aware that the Zoo planners do accept that the houses in Northcote Road would be the most seriously affected by the new buildings so I hope that you will be making special note of the objections brought forward by Northcote Road residents. It is clear that the enormous height and form of the proposed buildings will have a more overbearing impact than I had anticipated. Despite some assurances given to us during several Zoom meetings with the planners, no significant adjustments have been made from the original plans - our suggestions have been disregarded. It is now clear that the proposed buildings will totally change the environment of all the dwellings here. Top floors will lose their views completely. The main living room in my flat, which I have long claimed to have one of the best views in Bristol, will lose this view completely as well as a significant amount of sunlight during the day. Flats and floors lower down within all six houses in Northcote Road will lose much more daylight of course. All of us living in this road are likely to experience a feeling of being enclosed by these buildings. I am not objecting to the principle of new housing being built on the main Zoo site (though I am very much more in sympathy with the "Save Bristol Zoo Gardens" campaign) - it is principally the height of the buildings proposed all round the perimeter which I object to. I should add that the actual loss of light and views to our homes has only become clear when I looked at the new visualisations that the Northcote Road Residents Association have commissioned. The Zoo's published images for what Northcote Road would look like are seriously misleading. In general, it is clear that more and more people living in Clifton, as they find out about the Zoo's plans, are realising that that the proposed flats would be totally unsympathetic and out of character with being placed in a Conservation Area. I urge you to reject these plans.</p>	10-Nov-22
------	---	---	-----------

307. O	<p>I wrote on July 4th 2022 to object strongly to Bristol Zoo's proposals for building large residential buildings on the main Zoo site. I write as a resident of Northcote Road, immediately adjacent to some of the enormous blocks of flats being proposed. Since my last letter, revised proposals have been submitted by the Zoo. My original criticisms remain but I would like to make some additional comments. The Zoo has made the most minor and cosmetic of adjustments to their plans and these revised plans just do not address (at all) the concerns raised by myself and my neighbours. The plans for high density and totally inappropriately tall blocks of flats remain and the proposed development is quite clearly totally inappropriate for this conservation area. The visualisations commissioned by one of my neighbours show clearly the completely overwhelming impact the buildings will have. It is no exaggeration to say that they will have a devastating impact on the totality of the local environment - and not just where I live in Northcote Road. The massive block housing developments proposed - very close to the adjacent roads (some of which are very narrow) - are totally out of character with the environment of this part of Clifton. A few particular points arising out of comments made recently on the planning website (Summary of Design Changes and Revised Documents): - The planners have stated that the buildings opposite Clifton College are "in keeping with the local character". Having lived and worked within the buildings of Clifton College for 34 years, I assert that this statement is very wide of the mark. - I dispute the statement that "a traffic analysis demonstrates that the proposed development would generate less traffic than the average daily traffic associated with Bristol Zoo and would cause a reduction in local on-street parking". I have observed local traffic and parking in the area (Northcote, Guthrie and College Roads) for over 40 years (at all times of day) and, knowing the number of units of accommodation proposed and about the limited amount of parking which will be provided on site, I cannot accept this statement. - It is also stated that the noise during the construction phase is not being considered as part of the Noise Impact Assessment. I would suggest that it is vital that consideration of the noise impact during construction should be included as this will be of huge importance to local residents over a period of, I estimate, 5 years of clearing the site and construction of new buildings. The noise and general impact of such a large construction site - in very close proximity to many living spaces - is likely to be enormous and, I predict, is very likely to have a seriously adverse effect on the mental wellbeing of local residents, myself included. Finally, I would like to express great concern about the future of the Zoo's Education Centre (next to the Clifton College Music School). This was a new build just a few years ago and, as I have seen myself, it is a "state of the art" building able to be used for all kinds of educational purposes. As I walk past it each day, I can see that it is, thankfully, still being used. However, the proposed building plans have one of the large residential blocks in the place where the education centre now sits. This obviously means that the Education Centre will be demolished. This is nothing short of criminal - to destroy such a new and useful facility; a terrible waste of resources. I know that the Zoo plans to build a new Education facility at The Wild Place but this will cost a great deal of money and, being much further from the centre of Bristol, make it more difficult and costly for students to reach. This - and the elimination of the wonderful herbaceous border - are just two examples of the needless destruction that will take place if the Zoo's plans are allowed to go ahead. I urge you to reject these plans</p>	10-Nov-22
--------	---	-----------

308.	O		10-Nov-22
309.	O	<p>My original objection is pasted below and I see little in the revised planning proposals that counters any of the points previously made by me or other objectors. Savills have proffered a reduction in the number of residential units from 201 to 196 and a tacit acknowledgement that the space within its footprint would soon become ghettoised, necessitating the imposition of opening hours for the gardens. That does not translate into the returning of this part of our city's landscape to the people of Bristol. In short, the revisions comprise slightly fewer ugly boxes crowbarred into a wholly flawed concept. Original Objection: The developer's ability to put housing on this site obviously provides its motivation for pressing forward with this development and the funding to relocate the zoo. But the plans are wholly inadequate for several reasons: 1) Unhampered public access to this space which surrounded by high walls and the proposed housing will create an unsafe ghettoised space, especially after dark 2) The proposed new buildings are utilitarian, almost comedically Stalinesque, over-storeyed, and will self-evidently prove, if they are built, to be an utter eyesore talked about for years afterwards as the Clifton Carbuncle. What ever possessed the architects, planners or others to proffer such a build? 3) There is inadequate provision of social housing and first homes 4) The plan encourages car usage contrary to the sustainability policies put in place by Bristol City Council. 5) More imaginative schemes, even ones focused on creating a social/community space, and one that has a wider geographical, i.e., regional, draw would be infinitely preferable to this proposed plan. There is other less expensive derelict and unused land in the City that would be far more adequate and provide better affordable housing. The leaflet pushed through Clifton letterboxes recently is insulting. The implied choice to be made is a false one. One can support both good development and conservation action; one need not come at the expense of the other.</p>	10-Nov-22

310.	O	<p>The developer's ability to put housing on this site obviously provides its motivation for pressing forward with this development and the funding to relocate the zoo. But the plans are wholly inadequate for several reasons: 1) Unhampered public access to this space which surrounded by high walls and the proposed housing will create an unsafe ghettoised space, especially after dark 2) The proposed new buildings are utilitarian, almost comedically Stalinesque, over-storeyed, and will self-evidently prove, if they are built, to be an utter eyesore talked about for years afterwards as the Clifton Carbuncle. What ever possessed the architects, planners or others to proffer such a build? 3) There is inadequate provision of social housing and first homes 4) The plan encourages car usage contrary to the sustainability policies put in place by Bristol City Council. 5) More imaginative schemes, even ones focused on creating a social/community space, and one that has a wider geographical, i.e., regional, draw would be infinitely preferable to this proposed plan. There is other less expensive derelict and unused land in the City that would be far more adequate and provide better affordable housing. The leaflet pushed through Clifton letterboxes recently is insulting. The implied choice to be made is a false one. One can support both good development and conservation action; one need not come at the expense of the other.</p>	10-Nov-22
------	---	---	-----------

311.	O	<p>Having read the updated design documents there are no material changes to alter such an inappropriate development for the site, in particular the over sized "blocks" of flats, so there is still some obvious areas where significant changes and improvements must be made. Key issues; - Height of development not in keeping with surrounding buildings & conservation area - Loss of a unique amenity for the whole of Bristol in a unique and irreplaceable site/area - New buildings because of significant height increase will overlook into school areas - New buildings because of significant height increase will mean loss of light to existing properties - Negative visual impact on existing buildings close by of significant architectural appeal - Road safety and traffic impact on what are already congested small city streets (all of which surrounding the site are in effect single track), with significant pedestrian use by school children - Allowance of public traffic/cars onto the site for the first time in its history seems wholly inappropriate - Limited access to the site/gardens for the public Bristol & the Zoo should be leaving a far better legacy on a site that has sustained them for 200 years - the current scheme's approach appears to be simply squeeze as many units on the site that they can get away with, rather than leaving a legacy that is appropriate for both Bristol, Clifton and the Zoo. Whilst I understand and support the need for more new homes especially affordable in our city, adding 201 homes is very minor. Also I note 80% of the properties proposed do not need to be "affordable" so I'm sure will some be the most expensive properties in Bristol in terms of price per square foot - therefore I believe this scheme in its current form is wholly inappropriate and I hope will be refused until a scheme is proposed that befits this wonderful site and our city. We will only get one chance at getting this development right so please reject this scheme in its current form!</p>	10-Nov-22
------	---	---	-----------

312.	O	<p>Having read the design documents as well as comments made by others, there are some obvious areas where significant changes and improvements must be made. Key issues; - Height of development not in keeping with surrounding buildings & conservation area - Loss of a unique amenity for the whole of Bristol in a unique and irreplaceable site/area - New buildings because of significant height increase will overlook into school areas - New buildings because of significant height increase will mean loss of light to existing properties - Negative visual impact on existing buildings close by of significant architectural appeal - Road safety and traffic impact on what are already congested small city streets (all of which surrounding the site are in effect single track), with significant pedestrian use by school children - Allowance of public traffic/cars onto the site for the first time in its history seems wholly inappropriate Bristol & the Zoo should be leaving a far better legacy on a site that has sustained them for 200 years - the current scheme's approach appears to be simply squeeze as many units on the site that they can get away with, rather than leaving a legacy that is appropriate for both Bristol, Clifton and the Zoo. Whilst I understand and support the need for more new homes especially affordable in our city, adding 201 homes is very minor. Also I note 80% of the properties proposed do not need to be "affordable" so I'm sure will some be the most expensive properties in Bristol in terms of price per square foot - therefore I believe this scheme in its current form is wholly inappropriate and I hope will be refused until a scheme is proposed that befits this wonderful site and our city. We will only get one chance at getting this development right so please reject this scheme in its current form!</p>	10-Nov-22
313.	O	<p>The revised Biodiversity Metric 3.0 calculation is in a file type that not available to everyone who might be interested and should be substituted with the information in the generally used .pdf file type. This important environmental document is presented in the superceded Biodiversity Net Gain Metric 3.0. This version had flaws in the way certain entries were used in the calculation which skewed the results to give a misleading result. These flaws were responsible for giving a results that were unrealistically optimistic. Biodiversity Net Gain Metric 3.1 is now the current version with this problem rectified and has been available for about a year. It is the version that is incorporated in the forth coming Environment Act 2020 legislation. A city that declared an Ecological Emergency in 2020 could be expected to use the currently available standards as a minimum. Perhaps the City Planning Department should require this and other all applicants to use the current version for Biodiversity Net Gain calculations.</p>	10-Nov-22
314.	O	<p>The removal of a number of historic buildings and trees are concerning for the area. building new homes but not providing parking is not a good thing. I am all for development but the loss of things that make Clifton and Bristol so good, is sad. I suggest that this goes back to the board so it can be revised in better keeping with the area and is more supportive.</p>	14-Nov-22

315.	S	I believe this application meets all the necessary planning guidelines/policies and would deliver much needed additional housing into Clifton, including affordable homes. it is also a very attractive development and allows the central historic gardens to be open to the public for free. The development of the site will allow the Zoo to continue its development of a new Bristol Zoo at its Wild Place site together with its ongoing conservation and education work, which would benefit everyone living in the Bristol area and beyond.	15-Nov-22
316.	S	My family are lifetime supporters of the Zoo. This planning permission will facilitate the development of a New state of the art Zoo. This development of the existing Clifton site will bring much needed houses, allow Public access to the beautiful gardens, and provide a new cafe and meeting space in the iconic entrance building. This development must be good for Bristol as a whole.	15-Nov-22
317.	O		21-Nov-22
318.	O	I am objecting again to the proposed development as it contravenes the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy Policy BCS22 by failing to 'safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance', namely the site of Bristol Zoo Gardens. The modifications to this Application are minor and are clearly contrary to BCS 22. The proposed development is over intense, unsympathetic to the period and style of the adjacent buildings and negatively impacts them. It will adversely affect this part of the Clifton Conservation Area and the setting of its listed buildings, views shared by Bristol City Council's Conservation Advisory Panel. The National Planning Policy Framework states that heritage assets should be sustained and enhanced and that 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation' (para 199). It continues that 'local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance.'(para 206). This proposed development does not ensure this or meet these criteria. There is a shortage of affordable housing in Bristol and it is very disappointing that the provision in this scheme will be reduced by half so that the work can start more quickly and a greater number of non-social housing residents can cover the ongoing costs of the long-term maintenance of the site. This appears to be a back handed way of reducing the affordable housing provision which obviously does not generate the level of income that the other units might do. This approach is both short sighted and short-termist. The issues caused by traffic from the 196 proposed units will severely impact the area around the site. It is naïve to expect that residents will not have cars and those numbers are likely to be higher than the numbers suggested by Bristol City Council's calculations. The area already has traffic issues at school drop off and pick up times. It is also an area that is frequented by school children throughout the day. The amount of traffic that this development will produce will lead to it being unsafe for school children (4-18 yrs olds) to circulate during the day. The views of Northcote Road as submitted on 13 January are very deceptive. They present Northcote Road, with the proposed development, as light and airy. The road is not like that now even on a bright, sunny day. The views also omit to show the southern end of Northcote Road with the extreme height and massing of building E3. The views presented by the developer are misleading and misrepresentative and do not clearly show	22-Nov-22

		<p>the effects of the height and scale of the proposed development. Building E3's height and location has not changed. It remains domineering and overbearing. Its scale and height dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road (see doc. BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1) including no 1 and no 2 Northcote road, both tall, substantial Victorian houses. Building E3 is significantly taller (8m measured to the eaves) than these and will block more light from Northcote Road due to E3's extreme height. The overall massing and scale of the proposed buildings on Northcote Road need to be reduced to ensure more light reaches Northcote Road and for reasons of safeguarding as they look directly onto the school and a number of its boarding houses. I strongly object to the proposed development in its current form and ask that it is rejected by the Planning Committee.</p>	
319.	O	<p>The revised proposals have minimal changes. The interior of the flats has been amended, but little change has been made to the heights and massing of the buildings. This is a particular issue for Northcote Road and Guthrie Road where five to six storey buildings are proposed where currently the buildings are three to four storeys high. The development does not reflect the existing architecture or the historic nature of the site and area. The number of dwellings across the site will also have a significant impact on the amount of traffic in the area and on road safety, both during the construction phase and thereafter. Whilst I understand that this is an opportunity for the Zoo to safeguard its long-term future, it is very disappointing that the proposals are less than sympathetic to their surrounds and that little consideration has been given to innovative and thoughtful design and how it can sit well within a Conservation Area. I therefore strongly oppose this development for the reasons listed above and in my original objection of 6 July 2022.</p>	22-Nov-22

320.	O	<p>I am objecting to these proposals as a parent for the following reasons: 1. Road Safety. I have serious concerns about road safety as the scheme is in close proximity to a large school consisting of both day and boarding pupils. The pupils are obliged to move around their campus to access different classrooms, sports fields etc. and the proposed scheme will cause an increased level of traffic, both during the construction phase and afterwards. This will jeopardise the safety of children moving around their school site. The entrances proposed for Guthrie Road and Northcote Road will have a particular impact as they are two of the main areas where parents pick up and drop off children. At peak times, there are already traffic jams, poor parking and bad driving and this will only be exacerbated by an increased number of cars. Entrances here are likely to significantly increase the risk of accidents to school children. 2. Parking. The scheme proposes 201 dwellings with 120 car parking spaces. This will not be enough parking spaces. While it is desirable and necessary to reduce car use, the reality is that most households have at least one vehicle. Where are these extra vehicles going to park? Again, the impact of this is increased traffic on the roads around the Zoo looking for parking spaces and once again, there will be an increased risk to children's safety. 3. Design. The design of the buildings is poor and lacks harmony in relation to its site. The surrounding Conservation area and the buildings adjoining the site consist of detached houses and imposing, listed school buildings broken only by trees and green spaces. These bear no relation to the proposed scheme which does not sit comfortably in this context. The buildings are too tall, overbearing and constitute a solid mass with no redeeming features. Inspiration seems to have been Stalinist Russia with a few plants added, perhaps to soften the corners, or to allude to the listed gardens that once occupied the site. The scheme does not reflect or relate to the pink sandstone of the neighbouring buildings, nor does it relate to the materials and colours of the Zoo's perimeter wall. Its sits in ugly contrast with its surrounds and will be an eyesore that is likely to date quickly. The new buildings are concentrated around the perimeter of the Zoo's site causing neighbouring houses, school playgrounds and boarding houses to be completely overlooked. In some instances, the new buildings are taller than the existing houses and the school being overlooked is a safeguarding issue. Will all the windows overlooking the school have opaque or frosted glass? This scheme is an opportunity to develop an historic and much-loved Bristol site. It is an opportunity to come up with innovative and thoughtful design, showcasing how a contemporary development can enhance a site bound by Conservation Area regulations. This scheme fails on all counts. It is pedestrian, lacklustre and is missing the vision and thoughtful consideration given to the historical context and site surroundings in local developments, such as the ss Great Britain and Wapping Wharf.</p>	22-Nov-22
321.	S	<p>Dear Sir, I am writing in support of the above planning application and thoroughly approve of all of the changes made in Savill's cover letter, Planning Statement and supporting documents. Yours faithfully Miriam Hare (Mrs)</p>	23-Nov-22

322.	S	I think the planned proposal responds sensitively to its setting. I approve of its sustainability proposals, and as someone whose ancestor, Francis Adams, sold the land to the Zoo in the first place, I like the way that some of the historical buildings including the Aquarium are being conserved. I particularly approve of the public access to the gardens in the daytime and of delivering 200 high quality eco friendly new homes for Bristol.	23-Nov-22
323.	O		24-Nov-22
324.	O	It is acknowledged that the re-use and re-development of a facility that was originally developed and evolved over many years for a specific use is challenging. However, that does not mean that the scheme as proposed is acceptable. There is significant concern with the proposed quantum and scale of development, the poor quality of the architecture, the site layout and the adverse harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of this part of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings. This is a homogeneous scheme that does not respond to the architectural character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area, which is predominantly large detached and semi-detached villas alongside imposing educational buildings situated within a verdant landscape and tree-lined avenues. The scale of development within the southern end of the site would be over intensive with a consequential poor relationship with the adjacent School and its listed buildings. The north building at 6 storeys is an unrelenting monolithic block that does not respond to the character and appearance of the area. The relationship between the existing listed buildings and the scale and location of proposed development is extremely poor, in particular, the Bear Pit would be overly dominated by new development. There are concerns with the impact on retained green infrastructure. Particularly with regard to the buildability of the quantum of development whilst retaining the specified trees. There are significant questions over the long term maintenance of the proposed public space. The gardens are a locally listed heritage asset. The Grand Terrace is a defining feature of the gardens and is not worthy of being used as a deliveries and service route. The circular road to access houses needs to be rethought. There is concern that there will be insufficient car parking provision, which will result in the reality of extensive areas of on street parking throughout the site. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal would neither sustain nor enhance the significance of relevant heritage assets including the Conservation Area and listed buildings within and without the site. It would provide insufficient substantial public benefit to outweigh the substantial harm caused by the impact of such a poor scheme on the relevant heritage assets. It is not considered that this scale of development can be justified in a heritage context. Moreover, it accords with neither the relevant Local Plan heritage policies nor the requirements of the NPPF and cannot be supported.	24-Nov-22

325.	O	<p>The issues caused by traffic from the 196 proposed units will severely impact the area around the site. It is naïve to expect that residents will not have cars and those numbers are likely to be higher than the numbers suggested by Bristol City Council's calculations. The area already has traffic issues at school drop off and pick up times. It is also an area that is frequented by school children throughout the day. The amount of traffic that this development will produce will lead to it being unsafe for school children (4-18 yrs olds) to circulate during the day. The views of Northcote Road as submitted on 13 January are very deceptive. They present Northcote Road, with the proposed development, as light and airy. The road is not like that now even on a bright, sunny day. The views also omit to show the southern end of Northcote Road with the extreme height and massing of building E3. The views presented by the developer are misleading and misrepresentative and do not clearly show the effects of the height and scale of the proposed development. Building E3's height and location has not changed. It remains domineering and overbearing. Its scale and height dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road (see doc. BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A- 2602-PL1) including no 1 and no 2 Northcote road, both tall, substantial Victorian houses. Building E3 is significantly taller (8m measured to the eaves) than these and will block more light from Northcote Road due to E3's extreme height. The overall massing and scale of the proposed buildings on Northcote Road need to be reduced to ensure more light reaches Northcote Road and for reasons of safeguarding as they look directly onto the school and a number of its boarding houses. I strongly object to the proposed development it is all too high and out of keeping for the conservation area and historical buildings are lost.</p>	28-Nov-22
------	---	---	-----------

326.	O	<p>The proposed redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens is completely out of keeping for the conservation area of Clifton. The modern blocks of flats above the perimeter walls tower above the street and gardens. These monolithic blocks are entirely incongruent with our area in design, scale, mass and form. They will overwhelm the gardens and obliterate street views of the sky, mature trees and the glimpses of historic buildings that characterise Clifton. A construction project on this scale in a conservation area will completely detract from the desirability and preservation and enhancement of the character of the area. The scale and design may be suitable in a city centre, but is surely inappropriate for our conversation area and looks like something more suitable for Disneyland with hideous balconies with stencils of animals and a humongous 6 storey high green brick giraffe on the side of a building. We were led to believe that the sale of the Zoo Gardens was to pay for new enclosures at Wild Place, but this does not seem to be the case as only the Gorillas and one species of lemur are being relocated! The rest have been shipped off to other zoos, this was not the impression we were given when the Zoo needed to maximise the value of this site. The Zoo is retaining some communal garden space, but it is expected that over 150 mature trees will be removed for this hideous proposed development along with the historic ornamental garden. The towering blocks of flats around the perimeter will not make the communal garden space desirable. The proposed housing development on the north side along Clifton Down and the east side Northcote Road show a building of almost 300 metres of monolithic, uninterrupted block of flats up to 6 storeys high, towering over the existing high perimeter wall and dominating the neighbouring historic buildings. On the north side along Clifton Down from the historic zoo entrance is 150 metres of monolithic, uninterrupted blocks of flats rising to 6 storeys high, some 60ft taller than existing high perimeter walls. Along Guthrie Road near Clifton College's historical buildings the scale is once again overwhelming and completely out of keeping for an area like Clifton in a conservation area. It has to be opposed until a more moderate low level development (3 storeys high max) is proposed that is in keeping with the conservation area and not in some cheap brick with giraffes on the side which is completely out of character with the bath stone and other quarried stone already seen so much in the surrounding roads.</p>	28-Nov-22
------	---	--	-----------

327.	O	<p>We OBJECT to the above planning application for the following reasons - Out of keeping with the conservation area - Over developed and way too high buildings - Overlooks the boarding houses and playgrounds of Clifton College so is a safety hazard and completely unacceptable. - Congestion of an extra 200 residents in the roads already very congested, there are not enough parking spaces provided within the development and the surrounding roads are already congested enough. - Extra traffic is a safety issues to both Clifton College and Clifton High School - Demand on services, hospitals and doctors in the area are already oversubscribed - Schools in the area are already oversubscribed - The strutures proposed are too tall and cover the whole perimeter of the existing zoo, a block of grey is incredibly ugly and out of keeping for this area of outstanding beauty with Durdham Downs. - 4-6 storey buildings proposed, a 6 storey building on the northern boundary by the Downs is completely unacceptable for local historic buildings and architecture and completely out of keeping. - The plans drawn up are deceptive and shown green space in the middle, however the whole perimeter is surrounded with a mass of 4-6 storey buildings looking into Clifton College and surrounding houses gardens, bedrooms etc</p>	28-Nov-22
328.	O	<p>The proposed planning application is completely inappropriate for a conservation area. The proposed buildings are way too big - they are very unsympathetic to the surrounding area and tower over the existing adjacent buildings. The proposal is hideously out of character with the surrounding conservation area and I strongly urge the council reject it.</p>	28-Nov-22

329.	O	<p>I strongly object to the proposals insofar as they relate to the southern end of Northcote Road in particular. There have been only minor changes to building E2 and no changes at all to building E3. Contrary to the impression given (for instance Penoyre & Prasad's answer to Q2 raised by Clifton College, as set out in Appendix 5 of the October 22 Planning Statement), building E3 has been set no further back than shown in the October 2021 consultation, nor has it been reduced in height. Building E3 itself dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road in scale and height, as is clearly shown in document BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1. What is not shown so clearly in that document is its height in relation to numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road, both substantial Victorian houses. Based on the proposals, building E3 would be over 8 metres taller (measured to the eaves) or 6.5 metres taller (measured to the ridge) than these houses, contributing strongly to the overbearing effect. I have previously raised a concern as to the adverse impact on the front gardens of numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road from overshadowing, particularly the loss of afternoon and evening sun. I do not believe that this has been addressed. The gap between buildings E2 and E3 is of limited benefit to those neighbours who are positioned further along Northcote Road, particularly towards the southern end, where the unrelenting mass of building E3 will dominate. The daylight and sunlight assessments show adverse impacts to several rooms in residential properties in Northcote Road, beyond BRE guidelines, with rather trite comments such as 'retained daylight levels are considered acceptable' or 'the neighbouring residential properties will generally remain with adequate levels of daylight and sunlight'. To whom they are considered acceptable is unclear, but it is certainly not the owners of the properties concerned. Nor does there appear to be any recognition that it is generally the principal reception rooms (those on the lower floors) that are worst affected, and where the loss of residential amenity will be most felt. To summarise, those residents towards the lower (southern) end of Northcote Road are particularly severely impacted by the proposals, largely because of the extreme height of building E3 and its proximity to neighbouring properties, but also because it is positioned in such a way that it will take away much of the afternoon and evening sun. Without a significant reduction in the scale of this building, I urge the planning committee to reject the proposals.</p>	28-Nov-22
------	---	---	-----------

330.	O	<p>I wish to reiterate my objections to the proposed development. I am extremely disappointed that, despite our having raised objections on numerous occasions throughout the consultation process, the applicants have made no changes of any significance to the proposed Building E3. This building is, quite simply, far too tall relative to existing neighbouring properties in Northcote Road. This is in a Conservation Area whose character should be preserved if the term is to mean anything at all. As it stands, building E3 would tower over neighbouring properties, dominating the outlook even from upper floors, and casting lower floors and front gardens (which currently enjoy a sunny outlook) into shadow for much of the day. The effect on those of us living in the area in terms of mental health and wellbeing would be devastating. Quite apart from the issue of height, the proposed buildings are not at all sympathetic to their surroundings: the overall design of the site, comprising high blocks placed around the perimeter, has the appearance of the worst sort of gated community, designed to keep people out rather than to contribute to the wider community. If the site is to be developed for housing, then please make it more sympathetic to its surroundings to avoid doing irreparable harm to buildings that have stood there since the Victorian era, as well as their residents. This could be done by reducing the height and massing of buildings and setting them further back from the perimeter.</p>	28-Nov-22
------	---	--	-----------

331.	O	<p>I strongly object to the proposals insofar as they relate to the southern end of Northcote Road in particular. Contrary to the impression given (for instance Penoyre & Prasad's answer to Q2 raised by Clifton College, as set out in Appendix 5 of the October 22 Planning Statement), building E3 has been set no further back than shown in the October 2021 consultation, nor has it been reduced in height. Building E3 itself dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road in scale and height, as is clearly shown in document BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1. What is not shown so clearly in that document is its height in relation to numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road, both substantial Victorian houses. Based on the proposals, building E3 would be over 8 metres taller (measured to the eaves) or 6.5 metres taller (measured to the ridge) than these houses, contributing strongly to the overbearing effect. I have previously raised a concern as to the adverse impact on the front gardens of numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road from overshadowing, particularly the loss of afternoon and evening sun. I do not believe that this has been adequately addressed. The gap between buildings E2 and E3 is of limited benefit to those neighbours who are positioned further along Northcote Road, particularly towards the southern end, where the unrelenting mass of building E3 will dominate. The daylight and sunlight assessments show adverse impacts to several rooms, beyond BRE guidelines, with the rather trite comments that the 'retained daylight levels are considered acceptable' or 'the neighbouring residential properties will generally remain with adequate levels of daylight and sunlight'. To whom they are considered acceptable is unclear, but it is certainly not the owners of the properties concerned. Nor does there appear to be any recognition that it is generally the principal reception rooms (those on the lower floors) that are worst affected, and where the loss of residential amenity will be most felt. Those residents towards the lower (southern) end of Northcote Road are particularly severely impacted by the proposals, largely because of the extreme height of building E3 and its proximity to neighbouring properties. Without a significant reduction in the scale of this building, I urge the planning committee to reject the proposals.</p>	28-Nov-22
------	---	---	-----------

332. O	<p>Any development in a conservation area should have to answer the basic question of whether or not it improves or, at a minimum, conserves the area in which it is sited. This proposal does neither and is quite clearly detrimental to the area in its scale, monolithic and repetitive nature and lack of public amenity. I have no doubt that it, or something very similar, will land on this site. But that represents multiple failures in three particular areas. Firstly, it is obviously an attempt by the site owners and developers to simply maximise profit at minimum effort to themselves with scant consideration for historic buildings and conservation factors other than as necessary to greenwash the proposal through the process. You set yourselves a low bar and barely crawled over it. Secondly, it is a failure of imagination and competence by the architects. Seven years of training to design that? Walk around Clifton, open your eyes and think for half an hour. It is hard to conceive a site in Western England which represent such an opportunity to design something wonderful and organic. It is equally hard to imagine anything which better fails to reach anywhere near that goal. Thirdly, it is a failure of the planning process to achieve the simple goal of improving and conserving this environment. I recommend a journey on the newly opened Elizabeth line stopping at every station along the way to have a look at what can be achieved. Then look back at this and ask yourselves why you have failed so badly. Thankfully talent and determination still exists in places. None of it appears to have been applied here. Local views will no doubt be ignored and you will build your totally average pile of steel, concrete and glass. Just don't expect anyone who lives here to be thankful for your efforts.</p>	29-Nov-22
333. O	<p>I think the city of Bristol should decide what the best use of this iconic, historic and quasi-public site could be for the benefit of everyone and not just maximising the Zoo's profit margin. For example, Bristol Zoo carrying on but in a modified form, a 'Bristol Kew Gardens', Our World Bristol's proposal for an augmented reality zoo or another type of visitor attraction. The Zoo's planning proposal is advocating for the loss of at least a third of the trees across the gardens. The Zoo's own website describes their gardens as "one of the UK's most important collections of plants" and "170 years of nurture and gardening artistry." The iconic herbaceous border pictured above will be bulldozed and become someone's multi-million pound home. How can the Zoo - a conservation charity dedicated to fighting climate change - justify destroying any of these gardens - against the backdrop of Bristol being a Green Capital and the current climate crisis? Only a fraction of the site will be available to the public. The Zoo offers no guarantee that the gardens will stay open to the public in the long term. There are many other solutions and options that the Zoo could explore and pursue if they would listen and engage. If it was proposed that London, Dublin or Berlin Zoo were to be sold off for private housing there would no doubt be significant public outrage. Bristol is not a capital city but the principal remains the same. The Zoo's desire to bankroll their new attraction in South Gloucestershire is a completely separate issue from the sale and future use of this site.</p>	29-Nov-22

334.	O	Bristol claims to be a green city yet is willing to destroy one of the most diverse gardens it has. Removing nearly 46.5% of the current unique trees that the historic Bristol zoo contains. Why not convert this area into a Bristol Kew Gardens equivalent? Let's drive more tourism rather than creating more exclusive tower blocks that will damage the environment. Let's keep the zoo's history and maintain it as an exciting place for people to visit across the generations.	29-Nov-22
335.	O	I object to the current proposal for the zoo site. It is completely out of character with and will destroy the conservation area. The current proposals appear to be based on maximum profit without any consideration for the environment, conservation or legacy. If an individual made an application to add any building of a similar sort to their residence or anywhere on their property in this area, it would be rejected immediately. Why do different planning rules apply to big business? I cannot believe that a proposal that is so incompatible in its design with and so opposite to the very essence of a conservation area has been allowed to be submitted after pre-application enquiries and advice and is in accordance with The Major Applications Protocol. I am unaware of any local support for the proposal. I understand that the site will be developed but would hope that a more imaginative design that preserves and enhances the historical conservation area for future generations could be developed.	29-Nov-22
336.	O	The revised plans have done nothing to improve the overall hideous size and appearance of this proposed development. The huge blocks of flats on the perimeter of the site are just not in keeping with the conservation area that the zoo has been part of. No consideration has been given to the effect these blocks of flats will have on existing adjacent properties. My original objection of the 6th July 2022 still stands.	30-Nov-22
337.	O	I am objecting to the proposed redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens for the following reasons 1 An unacceptable number of over 200 residential units in a relatively small site putting strain on local service provision 2 Ridiculously high apartment blocks on all of the zoo site boundaries affecting the character of the conservation area and both light and privacy issues to properties adjacent to the zoo site 3 Insufficient parking provision on the site for the number of dwellings which will affect the neighbourhood despite the zoo's assurances 4 The planned loss of a number of mature tree specimens which despite new planting will take 50 plus years to replace 5 Increased background noise from the planned extensive use of heat pumps 6 The zoo says it cares so much for the environment and the animals in it. What about the humans that have to live with the environment that they leave as their legacy ?!	30-Nov-22

338.	O	<p>I strongly object to the plans to build a luxury housing estate on the site of the Bristol Zoo Gardens. The gardens have been open to the public for 186 years. The queues of people visiting the Zoo before it closed demonstrates its significance to generations of people of Bristol. The historical and environmental damage this development will cause are not justified. The whole of the beautiful gardens and planting on this site should be preserved with its mature trees, historical herbaceous border, various ecosystems and the amazing biodiversity it offers (per the BZS website) for future generations to enjoy. Examination of the financial reports for the Zoo show that the Clifton site is financially viable. Losses have been generated by millions of pounds being spent on consultancy fees to facilitate the sale of the site. Although there were no visitors during lockdown, the Zoo received £2.5million in business continuation insurance. Indeed the Zoo generates far more money and visitors than the Wild Place. The Zoo has misled the public into believing that the sale of the Clifton site is necessary as the only option. This is not the case as the KPMG report they commissioned includes other possible courses of action - none of which were presented to their shareholders. The Clifton site is listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space. It should stay this way. There is much public goodwill and support to explore options that will keep this site as a public green space rather than a luxury gated housing estate "Saving Wildlife Together" is the motto of the Zoo. The Council should start by saving the wildlife and biodiversity of the Clifton site by saying No to the Planning Application.</p>	30-Nov-22
------	---	--	-----------

339.	O	<p>I strongly oppose the plans for the zoo gardens for the overbearing nature of the proposed blocks of flats that show no sympathy for the Clifton conservation area and the neighbouring buildings. lack of sympathy the design shows for this conservation area and its neighbouring buildings, the poor quality of the public park, loss of sunlight to neighbouring streets and the access issues around Guthrie Road. The proposed buildings give the appearance of a prison block and are totally unsuitable for a conservation area. The perimeter buildings are too overbearing, too large and extensive, too close to the perimeter and have no sympathy in scale or design to the neighbouring buildings. The new buildings completely overshadow and dominate the Zoo entrance building. The view of the site from the Downs will be a wall of modern buildings that remove the feeling of openness and visual amenity from the Downs where currently the buildings are well below the tree line. The main access point on Guthrie Road opposite the school is completely inappropriate for such a large site. This is a street with chicanes to slow traffic, which makes it hard for traffic to move along it. On top of that, the stretch of road next to the site entrance is used by the school to load and unload school buses several times each day- other streets being unsuitable for this purpose. If the main entrance is located on Guthrie Road, the number of dwellings on the site needs to be decreased significantly. The public park is hidden away within this gated community with controlled access. The wall of tall surrounding buildings will deprive the park of sunlight and make the area feel walled in. The access roads within the site represent further loss of green open space. The beautiful heritage gardens will be ripped up along with established trees. This is not conservation. The neighbouring streets will lose sunlight for much of the year as they will be overshadowed by the excessively tall, uninterrupted blocks of flats.</p>	30-Nov-22
------	---	---	-----------

340. O	<p>I strongly object to the plans for the Bristol Zoo Gardens. The layout of the site, with overly tall buildings around its perimeter, and narrow gated access makes it feel unwelcoming to the public. Much of the public garden space shown on the plans is actually access road and should not be classified as garden space especially as most of the car parking spaces are in the central part of the site. There is no similarity to the amenity of the current zoo gardens. There does not seem any guarantee that once the development is completed that public access will be maintained to the gardens in the long term. Such access is more assured if the public gardens form a solid area fronting onto Clifton Downs Road rather than lost within the gated community. I object to the loss of a visitor attraction that brings people into Clifton from outside Bristol. The community conservation centre is unlikely to have the equivalent economic value to the area and this negative impact has not been taken into account in the economic report. The public gardens have been dubbed down into an area surrounded by and crossed by access roads that are overlooked and shaded by excessively tall buildings around its perimeter and within it. I object to the amount of traffic that will be generated around the local roads of the site by this volume of housing plus that of the West Car Park site. No account seems to have been taken of parking needed by visitors to the residents of these sites. The loss of the car parks on Clifton Down Road is not mentioned. These visitors and the Clifton College drop off/pick up traffic will create substantial parking problems in the area with cars driving around looking for parking spaces, on top of all the additional traffic wanting to access the site. All this excess traffic is of a concern for the safety of the pupils of Clifton College who spend a lot of time each day walking between buildings in this area. The density of the development is too great to maintain public safety around this site. I object to the design of the perimeter buildings. These are all too tall, reducing the light into the public gardens substantially. The surrounding roads will feel like dark alleyways - especially College Road with blocks of flats situated close to the road on both sides. The architectural design bears no relation to the historical buildings that have been preserved nor to the surrounding buildings of Clifton conservation area. I object to the view of the site from the Downs with its 6 storey tall buildings built up to the boundary wall. The frontage should be no more than the current two storey height.</p>	30-Nov-22
341. O	<p>I oppose this proposal primarily on the basis of its complete failure to preserve or enhance the Clifton conservation area. - Failure of the architecture to respond properly to or integrate with the surrounding established character and context - Overbearing, over-intensive and unsympathetic scale of development - Unjustified and irreversible harm to listed buildings - Appearance of a gated community, even a prison complex behind high walls, completely the opposite of what Bristol considers as its general outlook on life - Public access not legally assured - Not allowed for in the statutory local plan - Failure to give "considerable weight" to a heritage asset - Therefore not in accordance with applicable conservation legislation - Clear danger of erosion of BCC's standards applicable to future conservation area planning proposals I support the BCC Conservation Advisory Panel's submission, and that of Historic England, who have commented that the closure of the zoo site will have a pronounced harmful impact on the significance of the site (and have not withdrawn this view while giving credit for some extremely minor revisions).</p>	30-Nov-22

342.	O	I have read the applicants' new replies to the planning officer and viewed most of the supporting documents. My chief objection remains, relating to the failure to abide by requirements of the conservation area status of the local area and resulting incongruous and overbearing design. The latest inputs on the conservation area and heritage appear to acknowledge harm and speak of "mitigation" rather than "enhancement". There are some arguments referring to "enhancement" but they are weak or even bogus, relying on the quality of the development and public access rather than the design or density of the development. The objections based on the scale and blockiness of the buildings are unmitigated by the very minor proposals to soften the outline and to limit overlooking. The proposal says there need be enough free market dwellings to contribute about £1300 each in estate service charge to fund the public realm aspects. But there could be many fewer dwellings, contributing less than this, if proper account were taken of using volunteer gardeners, surpluses from events, and voluntary public donations (compare with quantum of such funds collected by Clifton Suspension Bridge). The idea of the Clifton Conservation Hub is extremely welcome and could be very successful as well as a source of funding for the public realm. I ask the planners to take full account of the risk of blowing the whole concept of conservation area status out of the water, yielding an unmanageable precedent not only in Clifton but elsewhere. Among all the public comments I have noted only one recent one in support and as it is anonymous there must be doubt about the weight to give it.	30-Nov-22
343.	O	The current design and planning of the proposed development is not congruent with Clifton in design, scale, mass, and form. I utterly object this application.	01-Dec-22

344. O	<p>Comments: I would like to raise three further objections to those already raised:</p> <p>Economic Benefits The comment from the Council's Economic Development team - to the effect that "the Economic Benefits Assessment document represents a reasonable estimate of the potential economic benefits of the proposal" - cannot be taken seriously. The document is not balanced and does not follow - as the report claims - HM Treasury Green Book Guidance for reasons I have set out in my previous objection.</p> <p>Carbon Factors The Council's Sustainable City team have commented: "As SAP 2012 carbon factors were in use for Part L 2013 at the time of the initial submission, the use of these carbon factors has been continued for the revised statement (rather than Part L 2021). For the purpose of BCS14 calculations we consider this to be acceptable" The same applicant was recently awarded consent on the West car Park site. That application (21/01999/F) was submitted long before this application (22/02737/F). In a September 2022 revision to the Energy and Sustainability Statement accompanying the application 21/01999/F, the applicant's consultants, Hydrock, updated the carbon factors used in the calculation of the residual CO2 savings from the proposal from Pat L 2013 to Part L 2021. the comment from the Sustainable Cities team seems to indicate that the Council would find it acceptable under the newer application to make use of the older carbon factors. The Council's position should be considered in the light of the rather obvious point that it cannot be for the applicant to pick and choose the carbon factors which suit its purpose of seeking to demonstrate compliance with extant policy, still less, for the Council to consent to the wishes of the applicant when it is clear that the basis for the calculation has changed. To put this another way, the Council is sanctioning an approach to the calculation of carbon savings from renewable electricity generation which have not been reflected in the carbon intensity of generation for more than ten years. It is obviously out of date. It is incredibly disappointing to see a Council that has declared a climate emergency seeking to ease the path of an application based on endorsing the use of carbon factors that are completely divorced from prevailing reality. This view is unacceptable and must be changed.</p> <p>Affordable Housing As regards affordable housing, the Applicant's Planning Statement (from Savills, October 2022) states: "Application Policy BCS17 state that affordable housing will be required in residential developments of 15 or more dwellings. A minimum of 40% provision is sought in Inner West Bristol, subject to viability, although the Affordable Housing Practice Note (April 2018) allows a 20% provision subject to meeting the required criteria. The tenure, size and type of affordable units will reflect identified needs, site suitability and economic viability". Currently, the Council is likely to exceed targets it set for building new homes, but will fail to meet its target for affordable homes. The approach in the Affordable Housing Practice Note (AHPN) seemed inconsistent with a sincere attempt to deliver the required number of affordable homes. The AHPN does not form part of the statutory development plan. New policies cannot be set out in the Affordable Homes Practice Note, so the Core Strategy policies would remain the locally relevant ones. BCS17 in the Core Strategy states: Affordable housing will be required in residential developments of 15 dwellings or more. The following percentage targets will be sought through negotiation: - 40% in North West, Inner West and Inner East Bristol; - 30% in all other locations It would be extremely difficult, in the circumstances, to argue that 20% affordable homes is the outcome that would have resulted under the extant policy BCS17. If that is not the case, then it would be reasonable to argue that the AHPN had</p>	02-Dec-22
--------	--	-----------

	<p>materially influenced the policy in ways that it cannot do. There is a general understanding (it is a matter of public record) that the applicant seeks to sell the land to generate revenue in support of its objectives. It is not the role of the Council's planning function, or the development control committee, to facilitate the achievement of a higher value for land than might otherwise be the case. In the context, therefore, and recognizing that there is likely to be sufficient residual value in the land value to justify a higher proportion of affordable homes, then if consent were given to the proposal, it would be difficult to argue that the AHPN had not given rise to a material change in the application of the extant policy on affordable homes, BCS17. The 20% affordable homes offered by the applicant a) is inadequate, and b) has been arrived at in a manner that is inconsistent with the application of BCS17.</p>	
--	---	--

345.	O	<p>The Planning Statement from Savills makes much of the context in which the application is made, in particular, the situation that Bristol, Clifton & West of England Zoological Society (BCWEZS) finds itself in. It also makes much of the economic impacts, as well as the supposedly sustainable nature of the proposal. Background The economic plight of the Zoological Gardens site is significantly of BCWEZS's own making. The publicly available Annual Report and Financial Statements for BCWEZS, made up for the year ending December 2019, reported on the 2020-2025 Strategic Plan. Included in the Plan were: - "Capital investment at both Bristol Zoo gardens and Wild Place Project"; and - "...a clear long-term vision and masterplans for both Bristol Zoo Gardens and Wild Place Project. Bristol Zoo Gardens transformed by the time of its bicentenary in 2036. Wild Place will continue to grow into an even greater wildlife adventure, while Bristol Zoo gardens will place a greater value on visitors' interactions with and understanding of individual animals. The Report and Financial Statements in the same document then reported that the closure of both sites as a result of the coronavirus pandemic was impacting on this strategy. It noted: Following the Coronavirus pandemic and the financial implications arising from the closure of both sites from 21 March to 19 June 2020 for Wild Place Project and 14 July for Bristol Zoo gardens, the Trustees will be reconsidering this strategy and the Society's ability to raise the capital needed to implement the planned major capital development projects. It will take time for the longer term implications for the Society to be more fully understood and the impact on its future longer term strategy. This will be the main objective for 2020 alongside the continued focus on ensuring both sites operate safely for our employees, visitors and animals and the implementation of cost saving initiatives. Note the wording here - reconsideration of the strategy was supposedly to follow, and not precede, the pandemic. The reported financial performance for the year was not at all suggestive of impending financial meltdown, though alarm bells were being sounded, as would have been prudent in the circumstances. The Report contains a Report of the Trustees, which was approved by the Board of Trustees, and signed off by its Chair on 24 September 2020. The accounts were signed off by the accountants on the 6th of October by the auditor acting on behalf of BCWEZS. Nonetheless, around two months after the Trustees Report report was signed off, at the end of November 2020, the Zoo reported that it was closing the Clifton site altogether, relocating to the Wild Place Project site in South Gloucestershire. Bristol Post reported: The new Bristol Zoo will offer spacious, modern facilities, significant growth in conservation and education work and a ground-breaking, innovative visitor experience, said a Bristol Zoological Society spokesperson. [...] The plans have been announced after the second lockdown forced Bristol Zoo Gardens and Wild Place Project to close, after months of closure during the peak spring and summer months. Although BCWEZS has been keen to draw links between the closure of the Clifton site and the pandemic, there is more than a suggestion that this has provided a somewhat convenient way for BCWEZS to give a decision that had been considered for some time a softer landing. This is because the visitor numbers at the Zoo site in recent years appear to have been negatively affected by the growth in visitor numbers at Wild Place Project, which BCWEZS also owns. Although what was written in the Annual Report and Financial Statements for the year ending end of 2019 gave no clear hint of this, as the Planning Statement for the West Car Park notes: A formal submission for pre-application request was made to Bristol City Council in March 2020. The proposed development submitted for pre-application</p>	02-Dec-22
------	---	---	-----------

	<p>comment related to a scheme for 78 dwellings (no affordable housing provision and a proposed density of 153 dph) and the buildings proposed ranged from 2-4.5 storey plus semi basement parking. It is clear, therefore, that well before the Report and Financial Statements for year ending 2019 were signed off, and in advance of the first lock-down linked to the Covid-19 pandemic, BCWEZS was exploring the option of developing the West Car Park. It is not entirely clear, therefore, that plans were not already afoot to sell the Clifton site well before the effects of the pandemic became known. Chris Booy, Vice Chair of Trustees, in his written statement regarding the Zoo's application on the West Car Park, noted: In late 2020, Trustees of Bristol Zoological Society voted unanimously to relocate Bristol Zoo to the Wild Place Project site. [...] This decision followed an extensive process to explore a number of options, as well as taking independent professional advice. It seems clear that preparatory work to inform the decision had been underway for some time. It is a little surprising that the Trustees Report remained silent regarding the preparatory work ongoing, including the pre-application submission to Bristol City Council. The Charity Commission's Guidance on preparing a trustees' annual report indicates: If your charity's income is more than £500,000 you also need to: - explain your strategy for meeting its charitable purposes - list any significant activities you undertook as part of this strategy - give details of what your charity achieved in carrying out these activities to meet its purposes The omission, in the Report, of any mention of the pre-application submission, or other work underway at the time, is an omission in the Trustees' explanation of their Strategy. In a video purporting to explain its decision, the CEO, Justin Morris, reports that there has been a 'significant decline over many years' in visitor numbers. The evolution in visitor numbers at the Clifton site has, between 2008 and 2019 (we have excepted the 2020 year for fairly obvious reasons) exhibited a downward trend overall. This is true for both total visitor numbers and paying visitors. The former exhibits a compound rate of decline of less than 1% per annum, the latter, a slightly higher compound rate of 1.4% (see Figure 1). Figure 1: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2019, Zoo Gardens Site Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements Neither of these rates seems 'precipitous', though equally, that they were happening would have been risen to consider additional forms of income generation and / or a change in the nature of the visitor experience, as mentioned in the Report and Financial Statements. The picture is rather different, though, if one looks only at the period before the Wild Place Project was up and running. In the period from 2008-2013 (2014 was the first full year where WPP was in operation), there is no obvious downward trend in visitor numbers at all (see Figure 2). There is no clear increase either (there is, possibly, for the paying visitors). Figure 2: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2013, Zoo Gardens Site Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements The main period of decline in visitor numbers at the Clifton site coincides with the opening of WPP, and the increasing number of visitors choosing to visit there over time. This must have been foreseeable: a competing (even if run by the same entity) attraction of a similar nature to an existing one would be expected to draw some visitors away from the existing attraction. Indeed, as WPP visitors have steadily increased, it might be considered somewhat surprising that visitor numbers at the Clifton site held up as well as they did (see Figure 3). Figure 3: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2019, Zoo Gardens Site and WPP Source: all data are from previous</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements. If BCWEZS wanted to maintain visitors at the Clifton site, establishing a competing attraction was a strange way of seeking to achieve that. Since 2013, total visitor numbers at the Zoo site have held up rather better than the number of paying visitors at the Clifton site: whilst the former have declined by 1.3%p.a. in the period up to, and including, 2019, the latter have fallen by 2.6% p.a. over the same period. In Chris Booy's statement referenced above, he noted that the decision was linked to operating losses in recent years, coinciding with the opening of WPP: The decision to relocate after 185 years of memories was not taken lightly, but after making an operating loss in four of the last six years, we had to move forward to safeguard the future of the Society. It might be considered, therefore, that decisions of the Zoological Society's own making have been at least partially responsible for its worsening financial performance. There was also a statement made to the effect that the relocation to WPP would enable 'millions more people to enjoy the magic'. The 2035 vision for the zoo sets out a target regarding visitors. By 2035, the aim is to: 'Engage and connect with more than 800,000 visitors and members per annum.' In 2019, across the Clifton site and WPP, there were 830,000 visitors (see Figure 3), or more than the target for WPP to achieve by 2035. The implication is that by 2035, the main effect of a strategy that achieves the 800,000 targets will have been a net transfer of the half a million or so visitors at the Clifton site to WPP. The potential environmental consequences of each scenario are explored below. The suggestion that the new zoo site will have, in the words of the Chair of the Trustees, Charlotte Moar, 'conservation and sustainability at its heart' is questionable. Indeed, BCWEZS's strategy looks like the antithesis of what an entity concerned with wildlife would do, recognizing that - as BCWEZS well knows - one of the major threats (if not the major threat) to species extinction comes from climate change (see below). Although this preamble may seem of limited relevance, it does need to be recognized that Development Management Policy DM31 (see further below) requires that: Where a proposal would affect the significance of a heritage asset, including a locally listed heritage asset, or its wider historic setting, the applicant will be expected to: i. Demonstrate that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; Given that BCWEZS's decision have been responsible for the drop off in visitor numbers at the Clifton site, then it might have been expected to take 'all reasonable efforts' to sustain the existing use (including, presumably, by closing WPP, or by rationalizing the use of each site according to suitability for key species). The application has not demonstrated that this has been done.</p> <p>Economic Benefits If applicants make claims for their proposal that are obviously unfounded, it is important that these are highlighted. The report by Savills - 'Economic Benefits Assessment' - is blatantly lopsided as an exercise in economic assessment, whilst also being riddled with errors and judgements of a questionable nature. Officers and Councillors are at risk of being seriously misled by this report. The report claims that: The assessment of economic benefits follows guidance from the Homes and Communities Agency Additionality Guide (HCA, 2014) and HM Treasury's Green Book (2020). This report does not, though, follow the HM Treasury's Green Book: if it can be said to have done so, it does so selectively and in a uniquely biased manner. The Treasury's Green Book would have required external costs and benefits to have been included in any assessment. These are genuinely public costs and benefits</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>and might have a central role in determining whether the harm to heritage assets is justified. Because no attempt has been made to identify any external costs (because the assessment fails to respect the guidance it claims to have followed), it could not reliably be determined whether the harm to heritage assets was justified. Without a proper appraisal of these matters, attaching monetary values as per the HM Treasury Green Book Guidance (including Supplementary Guidance), the Council cannot possibly determine whether the harm to heritage assets is justified. Nonetheless, we should explore the claims made further. The assessment suggests the reference case for the assessment is as follows: The reference case for this assessment is the site in a vacant state once the Bristol Zoo moves to its new home. We can compare this with the words in the Addendum to the Transport Statement from Peter Evans Partnership related to the same application: Bristol Zoo Gardens closed to members of the public in September 2022, after the submission of the planning application. However the zoo use remains the permitted use for the site. Therefore consideration of this use and the associated traffic generation in the baseline position as set out in the Transport Statement for the scheme remains appropriate. The Planning Statement sets out a range of benefits which are attributed to the application. 5.75. What is abundantly clear is that, while the nature of the movements may be different as the site moves from being a tourist attraction to a residential/community use, overall there will be a significant reduction in movements associated with the proposals (DM23 states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions). 5.76. It is also relevant to note that it is understood that in excess of 85.5% of visitors to the zoo currently travel by private motor car, while the application proposals not only seek to reduce total movements, but also to encourage alternative modes of transport. [...] 5.82. Residents will not be eligible for residents parking permits and so, in comparison with the existing tourist use where there would be significant use of the pay and display on-street parking, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in parking demand on surrounding streets. It is clear from the above that all the transport impacts are assessed against a baseline of the Zoo operating as an open visitor attraction, whilst the economic assessment assumes a baseline where the site is vacant. If the site was to be treated as an operating visitor attraction for the purposes of assessing transport impacts, why would the economic assessment take a completely different baseline as the basis for the assessment? It doesn't really matter which one believes is more relevant - given the site is, de facto, not open for business, then it seems difficult to sustain the fiction that it is still occupied. Either the claimed transport benefits are not as they are, or the claimed economic benefits are not as they are. The applicant is guilty of choosing multiple different baselines to suit whatever case it is seeking to make in a given document. A clear view is required on how assessment should proceed. Is it the Transport Statement or the Economic Assessment which is wrong? The approach to appraising the impact of the proposal is clearly not consistent across the application. Claimed Additional Homes The social and economic benefits of the site include a suggestion that the 196 additional homes are to be included as a social and economic benefit. There are relevant questions to be considered as to whether these homes are genuinely 'additional'. The Planning Statement is clear enough on the need for new dwellings due to a 'shortfall': BCC published its Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment 2020 to 2025 in June 2021, which confirms that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>sites. It confirms that the council only has a 3.7 years supply of housing land. The statement also confirmed that BCC is failing to deliver sufficient homes against the Housing Delivery Test, at 72% of the delivery requirement. The administrative area of Bristol is, therefore, in need of significant new residential dwellings to address the shortfall. The claim that the homes which are proposed will be additional raises questions regarding the counterfactual. If there is a shortfall against existing policy requirements, then it becomes more difficult to argue the 'additionality' case. Can it be argued that these houses are additional to what would otherwise be supplied when a) there is a shortfall against targets, and b) where growth in construction activity is limited by a shortage in availability of labour? If the homes were not developed here, the shortfall might, after all, equally be met elsewhere, though ultimately, the pace of delivery of dwellings may be constrained by the availability of suitably skilled labour. Employment Claims In respect of employment, the Assessment claims: The proposed development would generate more jobs, economic activity and revenues to the local government than the reference case which is the vacant site once the Bristol Zoo moves to its new home. The economic benefits include 125 on and off-site construction jobs during the 3-year construction period for residents of Bristol; 54 on-site jobs during operation (including people working from their home). Proposals such as this will not generate new 'jobs' in construction. The employment market across the UK is currently tight, and it is especially tight in construction. The Construction Skills Network suggests that there will be an additional quarter of a million workers required between now and 2026 (it is not entirely clear where they are expected to come from). The likely impact of this proposal is to contribute to overall construction activity, the pace of delivery of which may be constrained by the availability of sufficient workers with the relevant skills. The net effect of the proposal is likely to be, at the margin, to slow down the pace of delivery of everything else. The figures for the on-site jobs are even less defensible than those for the construction sector. The Assessment states: Once operational, the proposed development could generate up to 54 on-site full time equivalent (FTE) jobs upon completion based on the employment densities for each use class within the proposed development, including 41 homeworkers.⁵ The estimate for the numbers of homeworkers who will reside on-site is based on the ONS estimates of homeworkers as a percentage of working age residents in the South West⁶ and applying that on the household level. What this is identifying is - based on ONS estimates - how many of the residents at the site might be home workers. In order for it to be correct to claim the site might 'generate' these homeworking jobs, it would also have to generate the people. These are people who do not spontaneously emerge once the site is built: they do already exist. Nor does the development spontaneously create (anywhere) opportunities for homeworkers at the site. To attribute these jobs to the site is not credible. There may be some employment attributable to the development in terms of staff at the café, office and community hub, but one also needs to consider the relevant counterfactual. There might be some additional spend (relative to what would have occurred anyway) but much (not all) of it is likely to be 'displacement' of spend that would have occurred elsewhere. All this assumes that the appropriate counterfactual is a vacant site - if one took the view adopted in the Transport Assessment - that the baseline is a still functioning Zoo, then even on the methodologically flawed grounds that the employment claims are made, the change at the site would look very different. In summary, the claimed</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>employment generation is unsound. New Expenditure Similar comments can be made regarding 'new expenditure' by residents. The assessment makes the following assumptions: To estimate the additional expenditure from new residents, we take the average household expenditure for convenience goods, comparison goods and food and beverages as detailed in Table 2.6. We multiply the expenditure by the respective retention rates to estimate how much of this expenditure is retained in Bristol City's retail and restaurant units. We then multiply the result by the 196 additional households in the proposed development. This calculation gives an estimate of the weekly residential expenditure which is then multiplied by 52 to estimate the yearly expenditure. We estimate that the expenditure that would be retained in the local authority area to be approximately £1.5m per annum. The residents will not be 'new people' (other than any new-born children). They already exist somewhere, and they spend money. Correctly considered, the expenditure is likely to imply displacement of expenditure that would have occurred elsewhere (unless the occupants already live nearby, in which case, their expenditure patterns may be similar). It would be difficult to justify, however, attributing any additionality to this spend. Some incremental uplift might be attributable to the café simply because of its proximity to residents. This assumes, of course, that the appropriate counterfactual is a vacant site - if one took the view adopted in the Transport Assessment - that the baseline is a still functioning Zoo, then even on the methodologically flawed grounds that the 'spend' claims are made, the change at the site would look very different. The Assessment goes even further than this: 2.5.3. This additional expenditure is expected to support additional jobs in retail and food and beverage. Using average turnover per employee in these sectors we estimate that this will support 13 jobs for residents of Bristol, which are accounted for in the multiplier effect outlined in Table 2.5 above.</p> <p>2.5.4. Additionally, expenditure from new residents living at the Proposed Development would support employment in local shops and businesses in Bristol City. Again, it is very difficult to justify a view that the jobs supported would be 'additional'. The point at para 2.5.4. seems to be double counting the effect described in 2.5.3., which itself is not genuinely additional. GVA The Gross Value Added (GVA) calculations are effectively run off the employment assumptions discussed above: Gross Value Added (GVA) is an indicator of wealth creation by measuring economic activity associated with the operations in the development proposal. This section outlines the estimated GVA benefits which would be generated compared to the reference case. We have based our estimates based on GVA generated per worker in the South West region⁷ and the number of operational jobs created by each use type presented in Table 2.3. The proposed development scheme is estimated to generate £1.6m per annum. Given the questionable basis for the employment figures claimed in the report, then it follows that the claimed GVA figures are also unsound. There are other reasons, though, why the GVA figures are unlikely to be attributable to this site. This may seem counter-intuitive, but it comes back to the question of the relevant counterfactual: if this scheme were not given the go-ahead, would the same level of GVA be generated from construction across the year? If the labour market were not so constrained, then it might be possible to claim the GVA as 'additional', especially in conditions where the consenting process for housing was such that rates of build were in excess of what was required by Government (there was clear scope to argue that the development was 'additional', in the sense of being above levels required by Government policy). Neither is true in</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>this case. Construction-related GVA will not be affected by what in the UK context is a relatively small scheme. Tax Revenues as Economic Benefits The Savills Assessment goes on to describe how the proposals could lead to the generation of additional public sector revenue. It is rather odd to see taxes and other transfers included as 'economic benefits'. Council Tax revenue is not 'an economic benefit': it arises as a transfer of income from private households to the Council. The same is true of Business Rates, except that the entity paying is a business, transferring funds to (at least for the majority of them) Bristol City Council. The payment of CIL is also a transfer. The New Homes Bonus is a transfer of funds from central government to local government. Where do Savills imagine the New Homes Bonus payments come from? Does the revenue materialize from thin air? HM Treasury's Green Book notes: 6.7 Transfers of resources between people (e.g. gifts, taxes, grants, subsidies or social security payments) should be excluded from the overall estimate of Net Present Social Value (NPSV). Transfers pass purchasing power from one person to another and do not involve the consumption of resources. Transfers benefit the recipient and are a cost to the donor and therefore do not make society as a whole better or worse off. Only under quite specific circumstances should taxes be included as a benefit. The Assessment makes no such case. It presents all forms of what are, for the most part, forms of charge or tax as 'economic benefits'. Understanding the economic consequences of these transfers would require additional analysis of, for example, the deadweight loss implied by the imposition of the relevant taxes / charges. In reality, the extraordinarily marginal nature of these in the macroeconomic context is such that they would not tend to have any meaningful impact on the framework of taxation and spending that government would implement as a means to achieve its overarching fiscal objectives.</p> <p>Summary There is little in the Assessment of Economic Benefits that stands up to close scrutiny. The Assessment is lopsided in the extreme. It fails to follow Green Book principles in that none of the externalities associated with building out the proposal are considered. There may also be affects on asset values for neighbours that the assessment overlooks. These would not be public disbenefits, but private ones. Nonetheless, they are a reflection of the affect of the site on the amenity of the existing property owners. Transport First of all, it seems clear that - as per the above - the baseline for the Transport Assessment is no longer the relevant one. It is not clear what the BCWEZS would do in the absence of the application being granted consent but given that there appears to be no 'Plan B', then it would be strange to assume that the baseline for the assessment is a state of affairs which no longer prevails. The attempt, in the Addendum to the Transport Statement, to reassert that the appropriate baseline for the assessment is 'the zoo use' because this 'remains the permitted use for the site' belongs in the realms of magic realism. If BCWEZS has based its strategy on a presumption that one or other, or both, planning consents would be granted (irrespective of the nature of the application made), then to the reasons for presuming such an outcome deserve scrutiny, especially if they effectively imply a fettering of the discretion of officers and Councillors to arrive at a rational decision, achieved in a lawful manner. Nonetheless, the claims in the original assessment that, for example, the design of the scheme reflects an assessment that 'in this location it would not be necessary to own a car' and that the scheme provides 'infrastructure and promotion measures ... to encourage non private car travel' cannot be taken seriously: there are 118 car parking spaces proposed. As regards collectively owned vehicles, the Transport</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Statement notes: 'A car club space and car is proposed as part of the scheme.' That is suggestive of a scheme that does only the bare minimum. The supposed benefits of this car club space are overblown: Whilst provision of a car club vehicle still enables car travel the availability of this vehicle would reduce the need for residents to own their own private car, which in turn is a sustainable benefit to the scheme. This is also a benefit to the wider Clifton area as would enable local residents to use the shared vehicle instead of owning their own car. The aim for this vehicle to be electric brings environmental benefits. In other words, it's not even guaranteed to have the car as electric. The Planning Statement from Savills notes: 5.75. What is abundantly clear is that, while the nature of the movements may be different as the site moves from being a tourist attraction to a residential/community use, overall there will be a significant reduction in movements associated with the proposals (DM23 states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions). 5.76. It is also relevant to note that it is understood that in excess of 85.5% of visitors to the zoo currently travel by private motor car, while the application proposals not only seek to reduce total movements, but also to encourage alternative modes of transport. [...] 5.82. Residents will not be eligible for residents parking permits and so, in comparison with the existing tourist use where there would be significant use of the pay and display on-street parking, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in parking demand on surrounding streets. One could be forgiven for thinking that the two consultants' reports are discussing a completely different scheme, other than in the respect that they both assume - erroneously - that the effect of the proposal on traffic should be considered as if the Zoo was still open. The applicants may pretend all they wish that the Zoo hasn't closed, but it already has, and that decision was of the applicant's own making. The appropriate baseline for this assessment is a non-functioning Zoo, with no visitors, and no visitor traffic, not a state of affairs that has now passed, and for which there are - apparently - no clear plans to return to. But why, if the location is so 'sustainable' (what does it even mean for 'a location' to be 'sustainable?'), were 'in excess of 85.5% of visitors' to the Zoo, when it was still open, travelling by car? Why does the Transport Assessment assume that the behaviour of the would-be residents will be so different in the face of similar travel options? The reality is that the Transport Statement does not really envisage car-free travel, and is not expecting much by way of this in future. Indeed, notwithstanding the 118 car parking spaces, the Transport Assessment is happy to consider the potential for this number being exceeded. It includes a thoroughly unconvincing plan for what it appears to anticipate will be pressure for additional car parking: However BCC confirmed early in the pre-application process that residents of the BZG site would not be able to apply for on-street parking permits. This removes the potential impact of overspill parking from occurring on a daily basis, as pay and display parking locally is time limited. Therefore when residents move into the site they would be aware of whether they have space to park a vehicle or not. The level of car parking proposed is therefore designed on this basis. MfS [Manual for Streets] identifies at section 8 that lower car parking provision can be successful when adequate on-street parking controls are present, which is the case at the BZG site. Ineligibility for on-street parking permits would be made clear though any sales and marketing agent. With allocated car parking proposed this provides residents with a clear understanding as to whether their property is car free or not. The internal streets around the site would be managed by a management company to make</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>sure that no parking takes place outside of the marked parking bays. The presumption is that there would be controls feeding into habits, but as the above extracts indicate, parking restrictions locally are time-limited. Those using cars for travel into work would, therefore, compete for spaces outside the hours of time-restricted parking. Since the Statement mainly considers impacts relative to 'peak time' traffic, it is unclear whether the Statement has properly considered the possibility that would-be residents may simply take a chance on out-of-restricted hours spaces being available. Contrary to what is stated, therefore, it seems likely that there could be intense competition for local parking spaces in the hours outside the restrictions - the exact same hours when visitors to the Zoo would not have been seeking to park their vehicles. All o</p>	
346. O		02-Dec-22

347. O	<p>I find it difficult to believe that this application is considered to be complete given the lack of evidence on, notably, the environment / energy side. I have made these views known to relevant officers, but in the absence of a response to most recent questions, I note the following: The absence of an integration of a commitment to reduce embodied carbon in the design (both in terms of materials and the completely inappropriate scale) is not aligned with National planning Policy Framework, notably para 134 and the associated Guidelines. It is inconsistent with even the existing Net Zero Strategy, and not in line with stated policy in this respect. The Council has the ability through existing policies, notably BCS13, BCS14 and BCS15, to reflect the requirements of the NPPF in respect of design quality in its decisions. Given that the design fails in respect of embodied carbon / energy, then it should be refused. In respect of other matters, the 'Economic Benefits' assessment is completely lopsided. It claims to follow guidance on additionality from the now abolished HCA, making highly subjective decisions regarding the magnitude of these benefits. It also claims to follow guidance on appraisal from the Treasury Green Book. If it does so at all, it does so only in the most impartial and lopsided manner. No professional economist ought to render such a document on the basis that it captures the economic benefits. It is of concern that the comment from 'economic development' simply asks for further elaboration of these benefits without highlighting any of the very obvious deficiencies and shortcomings of the presentation. Whether or not the document concerned should carry any weight at all in a development control decision is moot, in any case, yet since the Committee and officers have tended to reference these in decision making, possibly considering this (rightly or wrongly) as part of the balance they must weigh up, then it seems entirely appropriate to indicate that the benefits assessment is, literally, Cyclopic in its outlook, focusing only on 'positive' benefits without weighing up - as per Treasury Green Book - the wider impacts of the development. These include, but are not limited to, environmental impacts, none of which have been considered in the assessment of benefits. In the expectation of further information and revision, these comments are not as detailed as they will be on receipt of a revised proposal.</p>	02-Dec-22
--------	---	-----------

348.	O	<p>Comments: I would like to raise three further objections to those already raised:</p> <p>Economic Benefits The comment from the Council's Economic Development team - to the effect that "the Economic Benefits Assessment document represents a reasonable estimate of the potential economic benefits of the proposal" - cannot be taken seriously. The document is not balanced and does not follow - as the report claims - HM Treasury Green Book Guidance for reasons I have set out in my previous objection.</p> <p>Carbon Factors The Council's Sustainable City team have commented: "As SAP 2012 carbon factors were in use for Part L 2013 at the time of the initial submission, the use of these carbon factors has been continued for the revised statement (rather than Part L 2021). For the purpose of BCS14 calculations we consider this to be acceptable" The same applicant was recently awarded consent on the West car Park site. That application (21/01999/F) was submitted long before this application (22/02737/F). In a September 2022 revision to the Energy and Sustainability Statement accompanying the application 21/01999/F, the applicant's consultants, Hydrock, updated the carbon factors used in the calculation of the residual CO2 savings from the proposal from Pat L 2013 to Part L 2021. the comment from the Sustainable Cities team seems to indicate that the Council would find it acceptable under the newer application to make use of the older carbon factors. The Council's position should be considered in the light of the rather obvious point that it cannot be for the applicant to pick and choose the carbon factors which suit its purpose of seeking to demonstrate compliance with extant policy, still less, for the Council to consent to the wishes of the applicant when it is clear that the basis for the calculation has changed. To put this another way, the Council is sanctioning an approach to the calculation of carbon savings from renewable electricity generation which have not been reflected in the carbon intensity of generation for more than ten years. It is obviously out of date. It is incredibly disappointing to see a Council that has declared a climate emergency seeking to ease the path of an application based on endorsing the use of carbon factors that are completely divorced from prevailing reality. This view is unacceptable and must be changed.</p> <p>Affordable Housing As regards affordable housing, the Applicant's Planning Statement (from Savills, October 2022) states: "Application Policy BCS17 state that affordable housing will be required in residential developments of 15 or more dwellings. A minimum of 40% provision is sought in Inner West Bristol, subject to viability, although the Affordable Housing Practice Note (April 2018) allows a 20% provision subject to meeting the required criteria. The tenure, size and type of affordable units will reflect identified needs, site suitability and economic viability". Currently, the Council is likely to exceed targets it set for building new homes, but will fail to meet its target for affordable homes. The approach in the Affordable Housing Practice Note (AHPN) seemed inconsistent with a sincere attempt to deliver the required number of affordable homes. The AHPN does not form part of the statutory development plan. New policies cannot be set out in the Affordable Homes Practice Note, so the Core Strategy policies would remain the locally relevant ones. BCS17 in the Core Strategy states: Affordable housing will be required in residential developments of 15 dwellings or more. The following percentage targets will be sought through negotiation: - 40% in North West, Inner West and Inner East Bristol; - 30% in all other locations It would be extremely difficult, in the circumstances, to argue that 20% affordable homes is the outcome that would have resulted under the extant policy BCS17. If that is not the case, then it would be reasonable to argue that the AHPN had</p>	02-Dec-22
------	---	--	-----------

	<p>materially influenced the policy in ways that it cannot do. There is a general understanding (it is a matter of public record) that the applicant seeks to sell the land to generate revenue in support of its objectives. It is not the role of the Council's planning function, or the development control committee, to facilitate the achievement of a higher value for land than might otherwise be the case. In the context, therefore, and recognizing that there is likely to be sufficient residual value in the land value to justify a higher proportion of affordable homes, then if consent were given to the proposal, it would be difficult to argue that the AHPN had not given rise to a material change in the application of the extant policy on affordable homes, BCS17. The 20% affordable homes offered by the applicant a) is inadequate, and b) has been arrived at in a manner that is inconsistent with the application of BCS17.</p>	
--	---	--

349.	O	<p>The Planning Statement from Savills makes much of the context in which the application is made, in particular, the situation that Bristol, Clifton & West of England Zoological Society (BCWEZS) finds itself in. It also makes much of the economic impacts, as well as the supposedly sustainable nature of the proposal. Background The economic plight of the Zoological Gardens site is significantly of BCWEZS's own making. The publicly available Annual Report and Financial Statements for BCWEZS, made up for the year ending December 2019, reported on the 2020-2025 Strategic Plan. Included in the Plan were: - "Capital investment at both Bristol Zoo gardens and Wild Place Project"; and - "...a clear long-term vision and masterplans for both Bristol Zoo Gardens and Wild Place Project. Bristol Zoo Gardens transformed by the time of its bicentenary in 2036. Wild Place will continue to grow into an even greater wildlife adventure, while Bristol Zoo gardens will place a greater value on visitors' interactions with and understanding of individual animals. The Report and Financial Statements in the same document then reported that the closure of both sites as a result of the coronavirus pandemic was impacting on this strategy. It noted: Following the Coronavirus pandemic and the financial implications arising from the closure of both sites from 21 March to 19 June 2020 for Wild Place Project and 14 July for Bristol Zoo gardens, the Trustees will be reconsidering this strategy and the Society's ability to raise the capital needed to implement the planned major capital development projects. It will take time for the longer term implications for the Society to be more fully understood and the impact on its future longer term strategy. This will be the main objective for 2020 alongside the continued focus on ensuring both sites operate safely for our employees, visitors and animals and the implementation of cost saving initiatives. Note the wording here - reconsideration of the strategy was supposedly to follow, and not precede, the pandemic. The reported financial performance for the year was not at all suggestive of impending financial meltdown, though alarm bells were being sounded, as would have been prudent in the circumstances. The Report contains a Report of the Trustees, which was approved by the Board of Trustees, and signed off by its Chair on 24 September 2020. The accounts were signed off by the accountants on the 6th of October by the auditor acting on behalf of BCWEZS. Nonetheless, around two months after the Trustees Report report was signed off, at the end of November 2020, the Zoo reported that it was closing the Clifton site altogether, relocating to the Wild Place Project site in South Gloucestershire. Bristol Post reported: The new Bristol Zoo will offer spacious, modern facilities, significant growth in conservation and education work and a ground-breaking, innovative visitor experience, said a Bristol Zoological Society spokesperson. [...] The plans have been announced after the second lockdown forced Bristol Zoo Gardens and Wild Place Project to close, after months of closure during the peak spring and summer months. Although BCWEZS has been keen to draw links between the closure of the Clifton site and the pandemic, there is more than a suggestion that this has provided a somewhat convenient way for BCWEZS to give a decision that had been considered for some time a softer landing. This is because the visitor numbers at the Zoo site in recent years appear to have been negatively affected by the growth in visitor numbers at Wild Place Project, which BCWEZS also owns. Although what was written in the Annual Report and Financial Statements for the year ending end of 2019 gave no clear hint of this, as the Planning Statement for the West Car Park notes: A formal submission for pre-application request was made to Bristol City Council in March 2020. The proposed development submitted for pre-application</p>	02-Dec-22
------	---	---	-----------

	<p>comment related to a scheme for 78 dwellings (no affordable housing provision and a proposed density of 153 dph) and the buildings proposed ranged from 2-4.5 storey plus semi basement parking. It is clear, therefore, that well before the Report and Financial Statements for year ending 2019 were signed off, and in advance of the first lock-down linked to the Covid-19 pandemic, BCWEZS was exploring the option of developing the West Car Park. It is not entirely clear, therefore, that plans were not already afoot to sell the Clifton site well before the effects of the pandemic became known. Chris Booy, Vice Chair of Trustees, in his written statement regarding the Zoo's application on the West Car Park, noted: In late 2020, Trustees of Bristol Zoological Society voted unanimously to relocate Bristol Zoo to the Wild Place Project site. [...] This decision followed an extensive process to explore a number of options, as well as taking independent professional advice. It seems clear that preparatory work to inform the decision had been underway for some time. It is a little surprising that the Trustees Report remained silent regarding the preparatory work ongoing, including the pre-application submission to Bristol City Council. The Charity Commission's Guidance on preparing a trustees' annual report indicates: If your charity's income is more than £500,000 you also need to: - explain your strategy for meeting its charitable purposes - list any significant activities you undertook as part of this strategy - give details of what your charity achieved in carrying out these activities to meet its purposes The omission, in the Report, of any mention of the pre-application submission, or other work underway at the time, is an omission in the Trustees' explanation of their Strategy. In a video purporting to explain its decision, the CEO, Justin Morris, reports that there has been a 'significant decline over many years' in visitor numbers. The evolution in visitor numbers at the Clifton site has, between 2008 and 2019 (we have excepted the 2020 year for fairly obvious reasons) exhibited a downward trend overall. This is true for both total visitor numbers and paying visitors. The former exhibits a compound rate of decline of less than 1% per annum, the latter, a slightly higher compound rate of 1.4% (see Figure 1). Figure 1: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2019, Zoo Gardens Site Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements Neither of these rates seems 'precipitous', though equally, that they were happening would have been risen to consider additional forms of income generation and / or a change in the nature of the visitor experience, as mentioned in the Report and Financial Statements. The picture is rather different, though, if one looks only at the period before the Wild Place Project was up and running. In the period from 2008-2013 (2014 was the first full year where WPP was in operation), there is no obvious downward trend in visitor numbers at all (see Figure 2). There is no clear increase either (there is, possibly, for the paying visitors). Figure 2: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2013, Zoo Gardens Site Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements The main period of decline in visitor numbers at the Clifton site coincides with the opening of WPP, and the increasing number of visitors choosing to visit there over time. This must have been foreseeable: a competing (even if run by the same entity) attraction of a similar nature to an existing one would be expected to draw some visitors away from the existing attraction. Indeed, as WPP visitors have steadily increased, it might be considered somewhat surprising that visitor numbers at the Clifton site held up as well as they did (see Figure 3). Figure 3: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2019, Zoo Gardens Site and WPP Source: all data are from previous</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements. If BCWEZS wanted to maintain visitors at the Clifton site, establishing a competing attraction was a strange way of seeking to achieve that. Since 2013, total visitor numbers at the Zoo site have held up rather better than the number of paying visitors at the Clifton site: whilst the former have declined by 1.3%p.a. in the period up to, and including, 2019, the latter have fallen by 2.6% p.a. over the same period. In Chris Booy's statement referenced above, he noted that the decision was linked to operating losses in recent years, coinciding with the opening of WPP: The decision to relocate after 185 years of memories was not taken lightly, but after making an operating loss in four of the last six years, we had to move forward to safeguard the future of the Society. It might be considered, therefore, that decisions of the Zoological Society's own making have been at least partially responsible for its worsening financial performance. There was also a statement made to the effect that the relocation to WPP would enable 'millions more people to enjoy the magic'. The 2035 vision for the zoo sets out a target regarding visitors. By 2035, the aim is to: 'Engage and connect with more than 800,000 visitors and members per annum.' In 2019, across the Clifton site and WPP, there were 830,000 visitors (see Figure 3), or more than the target for WPP to achieve by 2035. The implication is that by 2035, the main effect of a strategy that achieves the 800,000 targets will have been a net transfer of the half a million or so visitors at the Clifton site to WPP. The potential environmental consequences of each scenario are explored below. The suggestion that the new zoo site will have, in the words of the Chair of the Trustees, Charlotte Moar, 'conservation and sustainability at its heart' is questionable. Indeed, BCWEZS's strategy looks like the antithesis of what an entity concerned with wildlife would do, recognizing that - as BCWEZS well knows - one of the major threats (if not the major threat) to species extinction comes from climate change (see below). Although this preamble may seem of limited relevance, it does need to be recognized that Development Management Policy DM31 (see further below) requires that: Where a proposal would affect the significance of a heritage asset, including a locally listed heritage asset, or its wider historic setting, the applicant will be expected to: i. Demonstrate that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; Given that BCWEZS's decision have been responsible for the drop off in visitor numbers at the Clifton site, then it might have been expected to take 'all reasonable efforts' to sustain the existing use (including, presumably, by closing WPP, or by rationalizing the use of each site according to suitability for key species). The application has not demonstrated that this has been done.</p> <p>Economic Benefits If applicants make claims for their proposal that are obviously unfounded, it is important that these are highlighted. The report by Savills - 'Economic Benefits Assessment' - is blatantly lopsided as an exercise in economic assessment, whilst also being riddled with errors and judgements of a questionable nature. Officers and Councillors are at risk of being seriously misled by this report. The report claims that: The assessment of economic benefits follows guidance from the Homes and Communities Agency Additionality Guide (HCA, 2014) and HM Treasury's Green Book (2020). This report does not, though, follow the HM Treasury's Green Book: if it can be said to have done so, it does so selectively and in a uniquely biased manner. The Treasury's Green Book would have required external costs and benefits to have been included in any assessment. These are genuinely public costs and benefits</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>and might have a central role in determining whether the harm to heritage assets is justified. Because no attempt has been made to identify any external costs (because the assessment fails to respect the guidance it claims to have followed), it could not reliably be determined whether the harm to heritage assets was justified. Without a proper appraisal of these matters, attaching monetary values as per the HM Treasury Green Book Guidance (including Supplementary Guidance), the Council cannot possibly determine whether the harm to heritage assets is justified. Nonetheless, we should explore the claims made further. The assessment suggests the reference case for the assessment is as follows: The reference case for this assessment is the site in a vacant state once the Bristol Zoo moves to its new home. We can compare this with the words in the Addendum to the Transport Statement from Peter Evans Partnership related to the same application: Bristol Zoo Gardens closed to members of the public in September 2022, after the submission of the planning application. However the zoo use remains the permitted use for the site. Therefore consideration of this use and the associated traffic generation in the baseline position as set out in the Transport Statement for the scheme remains appropriate. The Planning Statement sets out a range of benefits which are attributed to the application. 5.75. What is abundantly clear is that, while the nature of the movements may be different as the site moves from being a tourist attraction to a residential/community use, overall there will be a significant reduction in movements associated with the proposals (DM23 states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions). 5.76. It is also relevant to note that it is understood that in excess of 85.5% of visitors to the zoo currently travel by private motor car, while the application proposals not only seek to reduce total movements, but also to encourage alternative modes of transport. [...] 5.82. Residents will not be eligible for residents parking permits and so, in comparison with the existing tourist use where there would be significant use of the pay and display on-street parking, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in parking demand on surrounding streets. It is clear from the above that all the transport impacts are assessed against a baseline of the Zoo operating as an open visitor attraction, whilst the economic assessment assumes a baseline where the site is vacant. If the site was to be treated as an operating visitor attraction for the purposes of assessing transport impacts, why would the economic assessment take a completely different baseline as the basis for the assessment? It doesn't really matter which one believes is more relevant - given the site is, de facto, not open for business, then it seems difficult to sustain the fiction that it is still occupied. Either the claimed transport benefits are not as they are, or the claimed economic benefits are not as they are. The applicant is guilty of choosing multiple different baselines to suit whatever case it is seeking to make in a given document. A clear view is required on how assessment should proceed. Is it the Transport Statement or the Economic Assessment which is wrong? The approach to appraising the impact of the proposal is clearly not consistent across the application. Claimed Additional Homes The social and economic benefits of the site include a suggestion that the 196 additional homes are to be included as a social and economic benefit. There are relevant questions to be considered as to whether these homes are genuinely 'additional'. The Planning Statement is clear enough on the need for new dwellings due to a 'shortfall': BCC published its Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment 2020 to 2025 in June 2021, which confirms that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>sites. It confirms that the council only has a 3.7 years supply of housing land. The statement also confirmed that BCC is failing to deliver sufficient homes against the Housing Delivery Test, at 72% of the delivery requirement. The administrative area of Bristol is, therefore, in need of significant new residential dwellings to address the shortfall. The claim that the homes which are proposed will be additional raises questions regarding the counterfactual. If there is a shortfall against existing policy requirements, then it becomes more difficult to argue the 'additionality' case. Can it be argued that these houses are additional to what would otherwise be supplied when a) there is a shortfall against targets, and b) where growth in construction activity is limited by a shortage in availability of labour? If the homes were not developed here, the shortfall might, after all, equally be met elsewhere, though ultimately, the pace of delivery of dwellings may be constrained by the availability of suitably skilled labour. Employment Claims In respect of employment, the Assessment claims: The proposed development would generate more jobs, economic activity and revenues to the local government than the reference case which is the vacant site once the Bristol Zoo moves to its new home. The economic benefits include 125 on and off-site construction jobs during the 3-year construction period for residents of Bristol; 54 on-site jobs during operation (including people working from their home). Proposals such as this will not generate new 'jobs' in construction. The employment market across the UK is currently tight, and it is especially tight in construction. The Construction Skills Network suggests that there will be an additional quarter of a million workers required between now and 2026 (it is not entirely clear where they are expected to come from). The likely impact of this proposal is to contribute to overall construction activity, the pace of delivery of which may be constrained by the availability of sufficient workers with the relevant skills. The net effect of the proposal is likely to be, at the margin, to slow down the pace of delivery of everything else. The figures for the on-site jobs are even less defensible than those for the construction sector. The Assessment states: Once operational, the proposed development could generate up to 54 on-site full time equivalent (FTE) jobs upon completion based on the employment densities for each use class within the proposed development, including 41 homeworkers.⁵ The estimate for the numbers of homeworkers who will reside on-site is based on the ONS estimates of homeworkers as a percentage of working age residents in the South West⁶ and applying that on the household level. What this is identifying is - based on ONS estimates - how many of the residents at the site might be home workers. In order for it to be correct to claim the site might 'generate' these homeworking jobs, it would also have to generate the people. These are people who do not spontaneously emerge once the site is built: they do already exist. Nor does the development spontaneously create (anywhere) opportunities for homeworkers at the site. To attribute these jobs to the site is not credible. There may be some employment attributable to the development in terms of staff at the café, office and community hub, but one also needs to consider the relevant counterfactual. There might be some additional spend (relative to what would have occurred anyway) but much (not all) of it is likely to be 'displacement' of spend that would have occurred elsewhere. All this assumes that the appropriate counterfactual is a vacant site - if one took the view adopted in the Transport Assessment - that the baseline is a still functioning Zoo, then even on the methodologically flawed grounds that the employment claims are made, the change at the site would look very different. In summary, the claimed</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>employment generation is unsound. New Expenditure Similar comments can be made regarding 'new expenditure' by residents. The assessment makes the following assumptions: To estimate the additional expenditure from new residents, we take the average household expenditure for convenience goods, comparison goods and food and beverages as detailed in Table 2.6. We multiply the expenditure by the respective retention rates to estimate how much of this expenditure is retained in Bristol City's retail and restaurant units. We then multiply the result by the 196 additional households in the proposed development. This calculation gives an estimate of the weekly residential expenditure which is then multiplied by 52 to estimate the yearly expenditure. We estimate that the expenditure that would be retained in the local authority area to be approximately £1.5m per annum. The residents will not be 'new people' (other than any new-born children). They already exist somewhere, and they spend money. Correctly considered, the expenditure is likely to imply displacement of expenditure that would have occurred elsewhere (unless the occupants already live nearby, in which case, their expenditure patterns may be similar). It would be difficult to justify, however, attributing any additionality to this spend. Some incremental uplift might be attributable to the café simply because of its proximity to residents. This assumes, of course, that the appropriate counterfactual is a vacant site - if one took the view adopted in the Transport Assessment - that the baseline is a still functioning Zoo, then even on the methodologically flawed grounds that the 'spend' claims are made, the change at the site would look very different. The Assessment goes even further than this: 2.5.3. This additional expenditure is expected to support additional jobs in retail and food and beverage. Using average turnover per employee in these sectors we estimate that this will support 13 jobs for residents of Bristol, which are accounted for in the multiplier effect outlined in Table 2.5 above.</p> <p>2.5.4. Additionally, expenditure from new residents living at the Proposed Development would support employment in local shops and businesses in Bristol City. Again, it is very difficult to justify a view that the jobs supported would be 'additional'. The point at para 2.5.4. seems to be double counting the effect described in 2.5.3., which itself is not genuinely additional. GVA The Gross Value Added (GVA) calculations are effectively run off the employment assumptions discussed above: Gross Value Added (GVA) is an indicator of wealth creation by measuring economic activity associated with the operations in the development proposal. This section outlines the estimated GVA benefits which would be generated compared to the reference case. We have based our estimates based on GVA generated per worker in the South West region⁷ and the number of operational jobs created by each use type presented in Table 2.3. The proposed development scheme is estimated to generate £1.6m per annum. Given the questionable basis for the employment figures claimed in the report, then it follows that the claimed GVA figures are also unsound. There are other reasons, though, why the GVA figures are unlikely to be attributable to this site. This may seem counter-intuitive, but it comes back to the question of the relevant counterfactual: if this scheme were not given the go-ahead, would the same level of GVA be generated from construction across the year? If the labour market were not so constrained, then it might be possible to claim the GVA as 'additional', especially in conditions where the consenting process for housing was such that rates of build were in excess of what was required by Government (there was clear scope to argue that the development was 'additional', in the sense of being above levels required by Government policy). Neither is true in</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>this case. Construction-related GVA will not be affected by what in the UK context is a relatively small scheme. Tax Revenues as Economic Benefits The Savills Assessment goes on to describe how the proposals could lead to the generation of additional public sector revenue. It is rather odd to see taxes and other transfers included as 'economic benefits'. Council Tax revenue is not 'an economic benefit': it arises as a transfer of income from private households to the Council. The same is true of Business Rates, except that the entity paying is a business, transferring funds to (at least for the majority of them) Bristol City Council. The payment of CIL is also a transfer. The New Homes Bonus is a transfer of funds from central government to local government. Where do Savills imagine the New Homes Bonus payments come from? Does the revenue materialize from thin air? HM Treasury's Green Book notes: 6.7 Transfers of resources between people (e.g. gifts, taxes, grants, subsidies or social security payments) should be excluded from the overall estimate of Net Present Social Value (NPSV). Transfers pass purchasing power from one person to another and do not involve the consumption of resources. Transfers benefit the recipient and are a cost to the donor and therefore do not make society as a whole better or worse off. Only under quite specific circumstances should taxes be included as a benefit. The Assessment makes no such case. It presents all forms of what are, for the most part, forms of charge or tax as 'economic benefits'. Understanding the economic consequences of these transfers would require additional analysis of, for example, the deadweight loss implied by the imposition of the relevant taxes / charges. In reality, the extraordinarily marginal nature of these in the macroeconomic context is such that they would not tend to have any meaningful impact on the framework of taxation and spending that government would implement as a means to achieve its overarching fiscal objectives.</p> <p>Summary There is little in the Assessment of Economic Benefits that stands up to close scrutiny. The Assessment is lopsided in the extreme. It fails to follow Green Book principles in that none of the externalities associated with building out the proposal are considered. There may also be affects on asset values for neighbours that the assessment overlooks. These would not be public disbenefits, but private ones. Nonetheless, they are a reflection of the affect of the site on the amenity of the existing property owners. Transport First of all, it seems clear that - as per the above - the baseline for the Transport Assessment is no longer the relevant one. It is not clear what the BCWEZS would do in the absence of the application being granted consent but given that there appears to be no 'Plan B', then it would be strange to assume that the baseline for the assessment is a state of affairs which no longer prevails. The attempt, in the Addendum to the Transport Statement, to reassert that the appropriate baseline for the assessment is 'the zoo use' because this 'remains the permitted use for the site' belongs in the realms of magic realism. If BCWEZS has based its strategy on a presumption that one or other, or both, planning consents would be granted (irrespective of the nature of the application made), then to the reasons for presuming such an outcome deserve scrutiny, especially if they effectively imply a fettering of the discretion of officers and Councillors to arrive at a rational decision, achieved in a lawful manner. Nonetheless, the claims in the original assessment that, for example, the design of the scheme reflects an assessment that 'in this location it would not be necessary to own a car' and that the scheme provides 'infrastructure and promotion measures ... to encourage non private car travel' cannot be taken seriously: there are 118 car parking spaces proposed. As regards collectively owned vehicles, the Transport</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Statement notes: 'A car club space and car is proposed as part of the scheme.' That is suggestive of a scheme that does only the bare minimum. The supposed benefits of this car club space are overblown: Whilst provision of a car club vehicle still enables car travel the availability of this vehicle would reduce the need for residents to own their own private car, which in turn is a sustainable benefit to the scheme. This is also a benefit to the wider Clifton area as would enable local residents to use the shared vehicle instead of owning their own car. The aim for this vehicle to be electric brings environmental benefits. In other words, it's not even guaranteed to have the car as electric. The Planning Statement from Savills notes: 5.75. What is abundantly clear is that, while the nature of the movements may be different as the site moves from being a tourist attraction to a residential/community use, overall there will be a significant reduction in movements associated with the proposals (DM23 states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions). 5.76. It is also relevant to note that it is understood that in excess of 85.5% of visitors to the zoo currently travel by private motor car, while the application proposals not only seek to reduce total movements, but also to encourage alternative modes of transport. [...] 5.82. Residents will not be eligible for residents parking permits and so, in comparison with the existing tourist use where there would be significant use of the pay and display on-street parking, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in parking demand on surrounding streets. One could be forgiven for thinking that the two consultants' reports are discussing a completely different scheme, other than in the respect that they both assume - erroneously - that the effect of the proposal on traffic should be considered as if the Zoo was still open. The applicants may pretend all they wish that the Zoo hasn't closed, but it already has, and that decision was of the applicant's own making. The appropriate baseline for this assessment is a non-functioning Zoo, with no visitors, and no visitor traffic, not a state of affairs that has now passed, and for which there are - apparently - no clear plans to return to. But why, if the location is so 'sustainable' (what does it even mean for 'a location' to be 'sustainable'?), were 'in excess of 85.5% of visitors' to the Zoo, when it was still open, travelling by car? Why does the Transport Assessment assume that the behaviour of the would-be residents will be so different in the face of similar travel options? The reality is that the Transport Statement does not really envisage car-free travel, and is not expecting much by way of this in future. Indeed, notwithstanding the 118 car parking spaces, the Transport Assessment is happy to consider the potential for this number being exceeded. It includes a thoroughly unconvincing plan for what it appears to anticipate will be pressure for additional car parking: However BCC confirmed early in the pre-application process that residents of the BZG site would not be able to apply for on-street parking permits. This removes the potential impact of overspill parking from occurring on a daily basis, as pay and display parking locally is time limited. Therefore when residents move into the site they would be aware of whether they have space to park a vehicle or not. The level of car parking proposed is therefore designed on this basis. MfS [Manual for Streets] identifies at section 8 that lower car parking provision can be successful when adequate on-street parking controls are present, which is the case at the BZG site. Ineligibility for on-street parking permits would be made clear though any sales and marketing agent. With allocated car parking proposed this provides residents with a clear understanding as to whether their property is car free or not. The internal streets around the site would be managed by a management company to make</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>sure that no parking takes place outside of the marked parking bays. The presumption is that there would be controls feeding into habits, but as the above extracts indicate, parking restrictions locally are time-limited. Those using cars for travel into work would, therefore, compete for spaces outside the hours of time-restricted parking. Since the Statement mainly considers impacts relative to 'peak time' traffic, it is unclear whether the Statement has properly considered the possibility that would-be residents may simply take a chance on out-of-restricted hours spaces being available. Contrary to what is stated, therefore, it seems likely that there could be intense competition for local parking spaces in the hours outside the restrictions - the exact same hours when visitors to the Zoo would not have been seeking to park their vehicles. All o</p>	
350. O		02-Dec-22

351. O	<p>I find it difficult to believe that this application is considered to be complete given the lack of evidence on, notably, the environment / energy side. I have made these views known to relevant officers, but in the absence of a response to most recent questions, I note the following: The absence of an integration of a commitment to reduce embodied carbon in the design (both in terms of materials and the completely inappropriate scale) is not aligned with National planning Policy Framework, notably para 134 and the associated Guidelines. It is inconsistent with even the existing Net Zero Strategy, and not in line with stated policy in this respect. The Council has the ability through existing policies, notably BCS13, BCS14 and BCS15, to reflect the requirements of the NPPF in respect of design quality in its decisions. Given that the design fails in respect of embodied carbon / energy, then it should be refused. In respect of other matters, the 'Economic Benefits' assessment is completely lopsided. It claims to follow guidance on additionality from the now abolished HCA, making highly subjective decisions regarding the magnitude of these benefits. It also claims to follow guidance on appraisal from the Treasury Green Book. If it does so at all, it does so only in the most impartial and lopsided manner. No professional economist ought to render such a document on the basis that it captures the economic benefits. It is of concern that the comment from 'economic development' simply asks for further elaboration of these benefits without highlighting any of the very obvious deficiencies and shortcomings of the presentation. Whether or not the document concerned should carry any weight at all in a development control decision is moot, in any case, yet since the Committee and officers have tended to reference these in decision making, possibly considering this (rightly or wrongly) as part of the balance they must weigh up, then it seems entirely appropriate to indicate that the benefits assessment is, literally, Cyclopic in its outlook, focusing only on 'positive' benefits without weighing up - as per Treasury Green Book - the wider impacts of the development. These include, but are not limited to, environmental impacts, none of which have been considered in the assessment of benefits. In the expectation of further information and revision, these comments are not as detailed as they will be on receipt of a revised proposal.</p>	02-Dec-22
--------	---	-----------

352.	O	<p>To who it may concern, As a long time resident of the area the Bristol Zoo gardens holds a special place in my heart. I object to the proposed plans for this site on the following grounds: 1. The proposed buildings are far too large and completely out of character with the surrounding area. To solve this please reduce the gargantuan nature of the blocks by splitting them up and reducing their heights to be similar to that of the surrounding buildings. I believe the perimeter faces of the new buildings should be in the clifton vernacular style to limit the development looking disjointed from the surrounding areas. 2. The amount of destruction to the beautiful gardens and historic trees is far to great. Less large old trees should be cut down and more must be saved for future generations to enjoy. 3. There is no safeguarding that the gardens will remain open to the public in the future. This should be rectified by creating legal documentation denoting how the green spaces will be protected in the future for public use. 4. Much of the development seems to revolve around residents using cars, this is out of line with Bristol's will to go Green (BCAZ). Car parking spaces should be removed (Especially those on the surface.) this will free up more area for the park. Much greater importance and thought must be given on public transport links to the site. The current proposal is completely out of alignment with the values and wishes of the clifton community and greater Bristol wide goals. In its current form the plans are untenable. Please make the appropriate changes.</p>	02-Dec-22
353.	O	<p>I would like to object to the current plans to develop the zoo gardens. The buildings proposed do no fit in with the character of this suburb of Bristol. I believe that they are inappropriate in design, scale, mass and form and would adversely change the nature of this part of Clifton and the Downs. Additionally parking in the area, which is limited, would be badly affected. Please reconsider the application and, if housing must be built, then require that the style and scale of any new buildings match the existing surrounding Victorian properties and that adequate parking is provided with the new development.</p>	02-Dec-22

354.	O	I am extremely concerned about the irreversible damage to the unique historical and aesthetic character of this part of Clifton should this proposal be granted permission. This is one of the most distinctive parts of BS8 and has continued to attract visitors (not just to the Zoo) as a place to be and in which to walk. The proposed structures appear (at least from the plans submitted) to be out of character aesthetically with the surrounding area and the existing structures in the immediate vicinity. The buildings appear to be huge in scale and height in particular, appearing especially vast next to the historically important and unique Zoological society building that will remain. The scale and scope of the proposed buildings are totally out of keeping, in height, aesthetic appearance and design. There are a number of mature and distinctive trees that would be felled for the proposed development. There is no going back once they are destroyed and the proposed structures built in their place. The excessive number of residences within the proposed plan would also further exacerbate parking problems in the area. The preponderance of parking spaces (to the detriment of publicly accessed external spaces) seems to run counter to BCC's declared commitment to a more environmentally sustainable city plan. Three different elevations of this development detrimentally and radically affect the appearance and character of three highly visible and distinctive parts of our district and our city. I object on the above grounds. Please think again, Bristol Zoo developers and architects, and please try to come up with plans that are sympathetic to this distinctive and unique area- it is such an important part of this city's history and culture. Smaller and more aesthetically in-keeping plans are required. You can do so much better than this. We have to protect and nurture our special spaces. When they are gone, they are gone forever.	02-Dec-22
355.	O	Application no, 22/02737/F I am writing to object to the proposed development of the Bristol zoo site on the grounds that the area isn't suitable for housing. The buildings proposed are not in keeping with the area. Mr Alexander Bruce Resident of College Rd	02-Dec-22
356.	O	This proposal is entirely inappropriate for the area.	02-Dec-22

357.	O	<p>The following represents a slightly revised version of the comments originally posted on August 7th. CHIS strongly opposes these depressingly unimaginative and potentially destructive proposals which are entirely unacceptable. The scheme includes half a mile of modern blocks of Flats several storeys high adjacent to all the Zoo boundaries which will dominate and overpower the neighbouring streets. This is especially the case along the west perimeter which would face the monolithic block proposed for the West Car Park site, permanently altering the feel, landscape, treescape, and skyscape of the Conservation Area. The scheme takes little, if any, account of the heritage, character and sense of space that makes this historic neighbourhood special, if not unique. Despite strong concerns expressed during various public consultations, it has been the experience of residents that most of their concerns have either been dealt with only at the most basic or cosmetic level or just completely ignored. The following points summarise some of the most blatantly pernicious aspects of the proposals : 1. 196 dwellings represents a massively over-dense development of the site. 2. Given the provision of only 100 parking spaces the circular access drive is likely to be permanently littered with cars and so appear even less discreet than the plans suggest. 3. The potential impact on the Conservation Area is poorly considered. In particular, the impact on the surrounding listed buildings and gardens of a development so monolithic in its scale and massing has not been justified. Especially appalling in this respect is the block on the northern boundary, 4. The proposed terracing is not appropriate in this area. 5. The loss of trees will be compounded by the inevitable damage to the roof systems of many other trees by infrastructure work. We urge rejection of this highly damaging Application.</p>	04-Dec-22
358.	O	<p>The minor modifications recently made to this Application entirely fail to address the concerns of CHIS who consider it to be clearly contrary to BCS 22. It represents an over-intense and overbearing development which would, without reasonable justification, adversely affect the character of this part of the Clifton Conservation Area and the setting of its listed buildings. Our views are entirely in line with those of Bristol City Council's Conservation Advisory Panel of which CHIS is a member and whose letter of 20 November 2022 sets out in some detail the architectural poverty of the scheme and its detrimental impact on heritage assets.</p>	04-Dec-22

359.	O	<p>The Clifton & Hotwells Improvement Society strongly opposes these depressingly unimaginative and potentially destructive proposals which are entirely unacceptable in their current form. The scheme includes half a mile of modern blocks of Flats several storeys high adjacent to all the Zoo boundaries which will dominate and overpower the neighbouring streets. This is especially the case along the west perimeter which would face the monolithic block proposed for the West Car Park site, permanently altering the feel, landscape, treescape and skyline of the Conservation Area. The scheme takes little, if any, account of the heritage, character and sense of space that makes this historic neighbourhood special, if not unique. Despite strong concerns expressed during various public consultations, it has been the experience of residents that most of their concerns have either been dealt with only at the most basic or cosmetic level or just completely ignored. The following points summarise some of the most blatantly pernicious aspects of the proposals : 1. 201 dwellings represents a massively over-dense development of the site. 2. Given the provision of only 100 parking spaces the circular access drive is likely to be permanently littered with cars and so appear even less discreet than the plans suggest. 3. The potential impact on the Conservation Area is poorly considered. In particular, the impact on the surrounding listed buildings and gardens of a development so monolithic in its scale and massing has not been justified. Especially appalling in this respect is the six storey block on the northern boundary. 4. The proposed terracing is not appropriate in this area. 5. The loss of trees will be compounded by the inevitable damage to the root systems of many other trees by infrastructure work. We urge rejection of this highly damaging Application which, far from leaving a worthy legacy, would irrevocably damage one of the finest sites in Bristol.</p>	04-Dec-22
360.	O	<p>These proposals are an affront to the present Victorian feel of this part of Clifton - a conservation area. The overbearing size of the proposed tower blocks which will overshadow virtually all of the present buildings should not be allowed. 196 units of housing in modern block look and the destruction of over 45% of the trees inside the Botanical Garden can only be described as appalling. The original site dating, in the main from 1846, has been a delight for the best part of 200 years. Surely the best use of the site now is for a public park, to be enjoyed by and used by residents and visitors alike with leisure facilities commensurate with its use.</p>	04-Dec-22
361.	O	<p>I strongly object to this site being used for private dwellings. I view this site as a heritage site and should be used for the residents of Bristol and visitors.</p>	05-Dec-22

362.	O	I object to the proposed plan on the following basis: Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	06-Dec-22
363.	O	Scale and nature of proposed development not in keeping with historical use of the site as a public space benefitting the community. Also, major impact on traffic flow to an already busy area, and impact on rights of local residents for peaceful occupancy and enjoyment of their homes. Potential Impact on the adjacent college and the historic character of the area.	06-Dec-22
364.	O	The proposal is at odds with Bristol's ambition to be Carbon Zero city by creating an environment that will reduce green space, increase traffic and destroy what is a beautiful part of our city - it would never happen in Bath!	06-Dec-22
365.	O	object on multiple grounds - congestion, safe guarding (Young children at school in neighbouring buildings), health and Safety. This appears to be motivated by financial return rather than enhancing the community.	06-Dec-22
366.	O	Dear Sirs With regard to the proposed planning on the former Zoo site, I feel I have no choice but to object to the proposed plans I fully appreciate that we need more housing and that this site could be used for this , but why in a conservation area would such an ugly, overbearing and completely out place development be proposed ? I live in this area and I even have to get permission to maintain and cut my trees , yet you are seriously proposing this development , I am sorry but it simply does not sit and leaves many unanswered questions So much could be done with this site for it to provide dwellings but in keeping in an area we have all been made fully aware is Conservation and must be respected There is no Conservation considerations with these's plans How very sad that yet again large developers are allowed to destroy beautiful area's with ugly buildings , why are we destroy our heritage that we will never get back	07-Dec-22

367.	O	<p>Dear Sirs Although I thoroughly appreciate that we need more homes , I find it impossible to understand why on this beautiful historical site we would consider such a plan The infrastructure surrounding this site simply makes no sense ,the roads can't cope with the existing traffic , the doctors surgery cannot even offer existing patients appointments due to volume and where are the school places going to be found? I understood that bristol Council were very green and wanting us off the roads , as there are no local school places you are going to have parents needing to drive children to an available school , how is this environmentally friendly and working with the Councils policies , its a total contradiction to what the council are preaching to us Furthermore , the proposals so close to a school , where there are children walking around and crossing roads , how can you not even consider their safety fo all sorts of reasons , we have a duty of care to our children. This is a beautiful ancient site that we are going to desecrate with housing , surely the alternative plan for a virtual zoo is amazing , educational, forward thinking and firmly puts Bristol on the map as a city that really does care about the environment actions speak louder than words and the existing zoo can only benefit from this . It is so sad to see that no imagination is been given to this site , I despair for the future of our children and young people</p>	07-Dec-22
368.	O	<p>I strongly object to this planning application.As I understand it Clifton is a conservation area and as a result 'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of the area'. It seems to me that this proposed development are entirely out of keeping with the character of the area in design and sheer size. These large, characterless blocks will overwhelm the surrounding houses, gardens and streets, spoiling the look and feel of the area for residents, visitors and people simply driving through. I have lived in Clifton for twenty years and have always been pleased, and impressed, at the way recent buildings have blended in with the existing buildings. The Clifton College buildings along Guthrie Road are good examples. It seems to me hugely inappropriate that this planning application can be considered appropriate by the owners of the site, the developers or Bristol City Council.</p>	07-Dec-22
369.	O	<p>I cannot really see how the development of 196 luxury apartments can benefit Bristol and the Clifton community. This has nothing to do with the current housing crisis since no average Joe will be able to afford one of those. What is planned here seems to be an enormous soviet style block of flats that is totally in contrast with the style of the surrounding area. I find totally absurd especially considering the fact that we are not allowed to change not even our extremely inefficient windows, yet such a money making monstrosity can be build. On top of this I find completely hypocrite to pretend that the garden will be somehow saved and access made available to the public. I understand the economic push behind such a project, but please consider that once we open to the transformation of this conservation are there is no way back. I am not really sure why we want to turn Clifton into Wapping Wharf. PS the dream would have been to turn the zoo into a botanic garden like Kew Garden the whole Bristol community can enjoy</p>	07-Dec-22

370.	O	My reason for objecting to this planning application is that it is not the best option for the city of Bristol. If the proposed development goes ahead, the citizens of Bristol will lose a hugely important green space for which alternative uses more in keeping with the Zoo's charitable objectives have not been explored. There are sufficient flaws in the proposal for the planning application to be rejected on environmental grounds in keeping with planning law. The application should therefore be rejected and a better use found for this site originally intended as Zoological Gardens for the people of Bristol not a housing estate.	07-Dec-22
371.	O	Bristol Zoo is such an important part of our local and national heritage. It has also helped to lead the way with animal conservation and preservation. The gardens were beautifully maintained and the animals were often part of a world heritage breeding programme. It is appalling that this site is now under threat. The Mayor of Bristol, the members of his cabinet, and the members of parliament who serve the city, and all city councillors must clearly demonstrate that they really care for the heritage of this city, so that future generations can enjoy this iconic site.	07-Dec-22
372.	O	I object on the following grounds and others. - Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. - Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. - Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. - Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. - Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. - Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. - Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. - Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	08-Dec-22
373.	O	I am a retired Architect & live a couple of blocks away from the proposed development. The height & scale of the proposal are both unacceptable in a conservation area where planning regulations are very restrictive. The quality of the architecture is surprisingly poor & monotonous & shows no sensitivity to its surroundings. In my opinion, the whole scheme needs a complete re-think.	08-Dec-22

374.	O	This proposal which is the largest construction project based in Clifton for many decades takes no account of the area being a conservation area. The planning team have refused to disclose the models they have used to seek planning permission but it is clear that a housing development for 196 homes will consist of several hundred meters of modern block of flats which will abut the perimeter walls. That will neither enhance nor preserve the character of the area. In addition, the buildings will overwhelm the gardens and obscure night views of the sky, mature trees and the historic buildings that characterise Clifton. Clifton is a major tourist attraction, both the bridge but also the buildings and to lose that as a consequence is shortsighted. Once an eyesore is built it can never be removed. Those of us who live here have to abide by stringent planning rules to ensure then integrity and historical nature of the area. If this development is allowed, it makes a mockery of the planning laws we abide by. In addition, it seems that 150 mature trees, just under 50% will be destroyed together with the historic ornamental garden. If allowed to go ahead, this development will be an invasion not only for those of us who live in Clifton, but for the City of Bristol as a whole which will have lost a unique and beautiful space.	08-Dec-22
375.	O	The buildings on the boundaries of Guthrie Road, Northcote Road and A4176 are excessively tall. The elevations are very domineering with little in their design relating to properties in the surrounding area.	08-Dec-22
376.	O	The revised proposal still consists of excessively high blocks all around the site perimeter which are far taller and denser than any surrounding buildings. The design does not compliment or reflect local building styles. The number of mature trees that will either be removed or relocated is very concerning as is the proximity of building works very close to trees being retained.	08-Dec-22
377.	O	I object to the whole concept of this development which is to delete a key component of our rich and varied civic life to be replaced by private dwellings. With the whole planet in a crisis we desperately need local resources which are easily accessible and which are working towards a sustainable future and the enrichment of nature. This proposal is an affront to the people of Bristol, it is destroying something which very many of us have used and continue to value. It appears that the proposals have been railroaded through during the pandemic without any published documents about their value, or the options for maintaining a flourishing zoological garden on this site. This is not a private development. It is a valued public resource and I request that the Council commission a detailed inquiry into the whole matter before they allow this act of cultural vandalism to the institution, the buildings, the trees and the gardens all set in this conservation area.	09-Dec-22

378.	O	Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	09-Dec-22
379.	O	I have received a letter which says that this planning application will have blocks of flats up to 6 storeys high built along the perimeter of the zoo site and that 150 mature trees will be removed. If this is the case then I object to this development in this conservation area. I would like to be sent a copy of the plans so I can comment on the detailed plans please.	10-Dec-22

380.	O	<p>I fully support the comments below as put forward by save bristol zoo campaign. We desperately need exciting ways to enhance the lives of Bristolians to improve their wellbeing and overall mental health. Squeezing more houses into an already over crowded city will not achieve this. There have been great alternatives put forward, particularly the ground breaking virtual zoo concept, that would be such a great attraction for our city and bring much needed tourist income. Please think strategically and conserve this unique site - a site that deserves so much more than just more boring houses that will only benefit a few. Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.</p>	10-Dec-22
381.	O	<p>This is such a great opportunity wasted - we don't need more housing as much as we need stimulating activities for us all. The other non-housing related proposals offer so much more in terms of tourism, genuine sustainability during a climate emergency, and amenity to the whole of the Bristol population and beyond. We owe it to the legacy of Bristol Zoo to replace it with something innovative, fun, and engaging, supporting people's mental and physical health. There are plenty of other sites for housing that are better suited to such purposes. PLEASE save this precious and historic space and amenity for generations to come - something Bristol can be proud of. Thank you.</p>	10-Dec-22

382.	O	<p>As a resident of Bristol for 35 years, I find these plans to be completely contrary to what is best for the citizens of the city as a whole, its richness of experience and culture, and a grim, joyless prospect for what was until recently, a colourful beacon of Clifton and the city as a whole. I believe the negatives to be thus: Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.</p>	11-Dec-22
------	---	--	-----------

383. O	<p>I write to voice my strongest possible objection to the proposed change of use at Bristol Zoo Gardens. This asset belongs to my future grandchildren and to their children when I am long gone, to enjoy just as my father enjoyed the days of Alfred entertaining the crowd and the students who borrowed Alfred after him. The Zoo is a part of Bristol's identity and the city will be lesser without it. While I welcome an end to the caging of large animals, putting an end to this moral wrong should not result in the loss to the community of a public site which holds such enormous cultural and historical value to the city. There is enormous potential for commercial use located within a densely populated area. The clientele of young families is literally on the doorstep. What evidence is there for professional and independent consultation over alternatives to closure? Has there been any consumer survey completed to demonstrate that the larger animals were in fact the main attraction? If the larger animals were replaced with alternative exhibitions, with an educational and perhaps a conservation theme, reflecting the enormous wildlife heritage of BBC Bristol for example, would the business model not have worked? If businesses like Airhop, Par 59, The Wave can all make it work in out of town locations why on earth can the Zoo Gardens not run for a profit when it has the population on the doorstep? These types of attractions have lower running costs than cages lions and higher potential revenues. What efforts have been made to pursue this sort of plan? Where is the evidence that climbing walls in the Giraffe house, adventure playground in the monkey temple would not be viable? These are iconic buildings that belong to the city and should not be given over to executive housing. Furthermore, expecting families to travel out of the city to the new Wildspace site is a contradiction with environmental requirements to make less journeys and there will be a huge loss of green space and trees. This decision requires more public debate and consideration. Housing is not the answer here.</p>	11-Dec-22
384. O	<p>I oppose this proposal which fails to enhance the Clifton conservation area. - Proposed architecture is not sympathetic with the surrounding established character and context - It will cause unjustified and irreversible harm to listed buildings - There is no convincing argument that a better considered visitor attraction would not be successful in this site. It has heritage as a visitor attraction, existing infrastructure and the huge advantage of city centre location. If other visitor attractions like AirHop or The Wave can be successful then why not the Zoo Gardens? This needs a change of commercial direction and better management, not executive housing. - The proposal has the impression of exclusivity and a gated community, which is at odds with the culture of the city. - Public access to this public asset is not legally assured within the plan - Not allowed for in the statutory local plan - Failure to give "considerable weight" to a heritage asset Therefore not in accordance with applicable conservation legislation - Clear danger of erosion of BCC's standards applicable to future conservation area planning proposals I support the BCC Conservation Advisory Panel's submission, and that of Historic England, who have commented that the closure of the zoo site will have a pronounced harmful impact on the significance of the site</p>	11-Dec-22

385.	O	I was born, educated, and have lived all my long life within 10 miles of Bristol. It has been a huge privilege to enjoy all the special features that the city has to offer. Among those features the Zoological Gardens figured largely in my childhood, and in the childhood of my daughter and my grandchildren. My memories of Rosie the elephant and Alfred, the gorilla with attitude, go back to the 1940s, and I find it incomprehensible that closure should even be considered. There are arguments to be had about keeping large animals in captivity, but they are not significant factors in the present debate. The Zoo is a magnificent asset to the city which Bristol can ill afford to lose. Please think again!	11-Dec-22
386.	O	Absolute disgrace. The zoo (and anyone else associated with this proposal) should be ashamed of these plans - clearly out to maximise profit with no consideration for anyone else. This should never be allowed to happen and if the City planning department lets anything like this through they should be ashamed too. It is totally out of keeping for the area, destroying a beautiful place in a conservation area with dreadful edifices which don't fit in. It is not wanted and not needed, totally unfair on the local residents, and the safety and safeguarding concerns of the development and the tall buildings overlooking a school is significant.	12-Dec-22
387.	O	This is a dreadful proposal in so many ways. It would mean too many people living on what is a relatively small site. This in turn will generate much unwanted traffic on already busy surrounding roads. The perimeter building designs are hideous and far too large, completely out of character for the area and far too imposing for the residents adjacent to the site. There is no consideration for the site's neighbours, in terms of traffic flow and also there would be major disruption during construction. Apartments overlooking a school lead to safeguarding concerns, as well as concerns of road safety & pollution. In the proposal, the gardens are to be kept for the public, but why would 'the public' visit such a confined ugly site, which would be effectively a private housing estate. Also the removal of several trees etc. is not showing much protection for this side of the proposal and the surrounding buildings would detract from them anyway. For an organisation so committed to the environment and ecological issues, this is an embarrassing proposal which disregards these values for the surrounding area. It just looks like a planning application looking at profiteering rather than considering any impact on the surroundings and is irresponsible. Even if this is refused and a smaller design is resubmitted, it would still be an inappropriate proposal for the regeneration of the site.	12-Dec-22
388.	O	I've been visiting the zoo since I was a child (1998) and it holds many special memories for me, as I imagine it does for many. I think it would be such a disappointment to replace such a historic place with a housing estate! The area does NOT need more houses!!! I believe the space should be turned into something which respects the environment and the history of the place. It should be a space for people to enjoy, relax and just be away from all the stress of life - like it has been since 1836. Honestly, would be an absolute disgrace if it was replaced with a housing estate...	12-Dec-22

389.	O	I object to this application because it is so obviously out of keeping with the character of the rest of the neighbourhood. I also doubt that the infrastructure is there to support all the extra residents - roads are already busy in that area. Very disappointing that this is being proposed in this city. I live in Clifton although not an immediate neighbour.	12-Dec-22
390.	O	This development is not at all sympathetic to the character of the area which is unacceptable for a conservation area. Bristol zoo and its gardens were a beautiful green space and the scale and design of the proposal is at odds with preserving this historic site's character. Additionally, this will cause parking issues as it is unclear where residents would be able to park and Clifton parking is already very tight.	13-Dec-22
391.	O	I object to the planning application on the grounds that it will mean a loss of valuable communal and green space that has come to mean a great deal to the people of Bristol. The plan would require the felling of many of the trees at a time when we should be fighting for the planting of trees not their destruction. Many others are likely to be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. The Bristol Zoo Gardens are listed as a local Historic Park and Garden and are an important open space. If the space is turned over to apartments it will become inaccessible to others. Such intensive development is also likely to result in harm to listed buildings and the change in building density is a negative one. The buildings proposed are out of scale and unsympathetic to the surrounding buildings. They do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby and will form a huge continuous block along the road. Other alternative plans for this site need to be explored	13-Dec-22
392.	O	I objected before the revised plans. I object again as the changes from the original plans are minimal. The proposed buildings are still too high, too imposing. They will completely change the character of the area, which is a conservation area by the way. The original issues still remain. With these plans, there will be added traffic, more parking problems, added air pollution in the area.	14-Dec-22

393.	O	I accept that the Zoo animals will have more space at the Wild Place project. However, it is a big shame that we cannot be more imaginative about the use of the site and have to turn it into a strange housing estate. In effect, the plan is to have a few premium houses within the actual grounds of the zoo surrounded by very tall blocks of flats. These blocks of flats will seem very incongruous in the neighbourhood and will be towering over current neighbouring buildings, blocking their natural light and views and creating more traffic and parking concerns. Indeed, the plan provide some parking, but don't take into consideration the extra visitors to the new lodgers, which will add to the parking problems. The idea of keeping the gardens open to the general public is a good gesture, but in effect, the general public won't be travelling to the area just to walk through these gardens and in time, these will only be to the benefit of the people living there. Also these new flats will probably be overlooking the adjacent school's playgrounds and classrooms, which could be a safeguarding issue for the school. My main concern is the height of these buildings and their design which will make them stand out in the area and not be in keeping.	14-Dec-22
394.	O	This site must remain as a public resource, and definitely not given over to private investment. Disgusted that it is even being considered.	14-Dec-22
395.	O	The proposed development is aesthetically jarring. It is completely unsympathetic with the area, a conservation area. No attempt has been made to blend in with the area. It is hugely imposing and will completely change the appearance of the area. The proposal to build right up to the boundary without softening the structure with the use of planting around the boundaries is at total odds with the area. It is appalling that a key historic site in Bristol has been allowed to close without any thoughts on how it could be replaced with something that brings benefits to society in a similar way. Instead of removing planting and trees that help the environment. Bristol city council is happy to approve a development that has a huge negative environmental impact. Surely this is at odds with the councils aims and objectives. This could have been an opportunity to create a site that enhances the environment, that helps support learning about the environment, perhaps a similar project to the Eden project or Westonbirt arboretum, rather than another housing development of "luxury one and two bed flats". What a wasted opportunity, Bristol City council you should be ashamed!	16-Dec-22

396.	O	The proposed development is aesthetically jarring. It is completely unsympathetic with the area, a conservation area. No attempt has been made to blend in with the area. It is hugely imposing and will completely change the appearance of the area. The proposal to build right up to the boundary without softening the structure with the use of planting around the boundaries is at total odds with the area. It is appalling that a key historic site in Bristol has been allowed to close without any thoughts on how it could be replaced with something that brings benefits to society in a similar way. Instead of removing planting and trees that help the environment. Bristol city council is happy to approve a development that has a huge negative environmental impact. Surely this is at odds with the councils aims and objectives. This could have been an opportunity to create a site that enhances the environment, that helps support learning about the environment, perhaps a similar project to the Eden project or Westonbirt arboretum, rather than another housing development of "luxury one and two bed flats". What a wasted opportunity, Bristol City council you should be ashamed!	16-Dec-22
397.	O	This development will cause unjustified harm to the community. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. There is no need for more luxury housing in Bristol, this is a greedy money grabbing proposal that does not satisfy any needs for this city. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. It is shameful to see such a site in Bristol go from being a wonderful public attraction to more unaffordable housing in a city with a housing crisis. I firmly object to this proposal.	18-Dec-22
398.	O	This is so sad! the proposed development is monolithic and totally out of keeping with a historic and valuable part of Bristol. 6 stories of uninterrupted blocks of appartments will dominate the whole area downgrading neighboring historic buildings.I think overbearing is the most suitable word.. really destroying an area of great beauty. the cynicism of this development is also exemplified by their pretence that they are retaining the current fantastic communal garden space. How can the council- in these ecosensitive times, consider cutting down about 150 mature trees plus ornamental gardens leaving only a small enclosed space losing one of the really valuable open spaces in Bristol. t This is a total violation of the values I thought Bristol City council states it adheres too.I do hope you will see sense and turn down this appalling application that seems to pander to profit for a few and loss of facilities for many	18-Dec-22

399.	O	I used to visit Bristol zoo with my Dad as a child . It was one of the day trips in Bristol he would take me on. I can remember it vividly because it was such a happy time. Bristol Zoo is iconic to Bristol, a key feature of its culture and what makes Bristol Bristol. It is a location for inspiring, learning and memory making for all ages. To lose the zoo would be a huge loss to the cultural and communal value of Bristol. It is a historic and fundamental part of Bristol. I understand the need for housing, this is a pressing issue and a very serious one. However Housing that demolishes a site with value and purpose , a site that brings joy to children's faces and prioritises nature and diversity , should not be shut after 186 years to create a site to house a few in comparison to the infinite number of smiles on people's faces if the zoo stayed open. I wholeheartedly object the proposal. I am in favour of building new (AFFORDABLE) houses , however not on sites that already have value and purpose to the community of Bristol. It is a waste of resources , time , energy and a lack of understanding of what the people of Bristol need. Please reconsider this proposal.	18-Dec-22
400.	O	As a resident of the area, I have looked over the proposals. I was optimistic, as the public were to gain free access to the gardens, but the plans are disappointing. The style given to the accomodation does not come close to respecting or matching the architecture of its surroundings. The historic surroundings of this green space need to be taken into consideration. This seems to be over-development, in stark contrast to the environment that residents. The appeal of the gardens is greatly reduced if they are in the centre of a housing estate. I object to this proposal. The scale of building and architectural style are inappropriate. Please reconsider, and if building, build beautifully.	19-Dec-22
401.	O		20-Dec-22
402.	O		20-Dec-22
403.	O	The proposed development is on too big a scale and the design is totally out of keeping with the neighbourhood. If permitted it would have a completely adverse effect on the character of this conservation area and it would not be a fitting legacy for the Zoo. I also understand that many mature trees would be lost as part of this proposal: this is surely not appropriate particularly as the council has no funds for tree-planting with the consequence that Bristol residents have to sponsor trees to be planted. The city cannot afford to loose any trees.	20-Dec-22

404.	O	As residents of Clifton living approximately 200-300 metres from the zoo, my wife and I very strongly object to this proposed development. The plan submitted to the Council appears to entail the construction of hundreds of metres of uninterrupted and overbearing blocks of flats up to five or six storeys high in material and in an architectural style that are grotesquely out of keeping with the historic buildings in this part of Clifton. It seems that the project will also entail the felling of a large number of mature trees at a time when, for ecological reasons, we are coming to think we should in fact be planting more of them. The proposal cannot possibly be regarded as an enhancement of the character of what is a conservation area. On the contrary, it will manifestly detract from the appeal of the area and render the definition of it as a conservation area obsolete. Were the Council to permit this proposal to proceed, thus allowing buildings of quite incompatible appearance to stand next to one another, it would be difficult to imagine what justification there could be for continuing to require residents in nearby houses such as ours to obtain formal permission to change the external appearance of our properties in relatively minor ways.	20-Dec-22
405.	O		21-Dec-22
406.	O	Morning Matthew, I hope you are well. We understand from Sinead McKendry of Savills that they have issued a clarification additional to our Objection dated January 2023, grateful if you could note our clients position in this light: 1) In our objection dated January 2023, we note that "A Visually Verified Montage (VVM) view has been provided from across the College playing fields (The Close), from the base of the Cricket Pavilion. However, this only demonstrates the outline of the proposed South Buildings along Guthrie Road with a height of 3 to 4 storeys and not the larger scale development that sits at a higher level, namely the proposed perimeter apartments that make up the North Buildings with a maximum height of 6 storeys or the East Buildings which range in height from 3 to 5 storeys." Our concern with the VVM is not simply the location it is taken from but rather what it does/does not show in terms of detail, notably we do not think it shows the full impact of the taller buildings on the BZG site on the College's Main Campus. As such our objection still stands. 2) In regard to Location we state the following in our objection dated January 2023, "Additionally, the proposed view included within the VVM is neither taken from the protected Local View (LC24) which runs from the south-west corner of the College's Grounds or the identified Long View (L25) as identified in the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CACA) Important views and Landmark Buildings Map. Long views are long distance views across the City to key features or landmark buildings. In this instance Long View L25 stretches from the grounds of Clifton College northwards across the College and BZG site, both of which are identified within the CACA as Landmarks of City-wide importance. As a consequence of this the College consider the VVM does not accurately reflect those protected views, as identified in the CACA, and request an updated VVM which accurately reflects the impact of the proposals at the BZG site on Local View LC24 and Long View L25." The College did last year request that a VVM be taken from the School Grounds, however, this should not have discounted VVM's from the two identified CACA protected views, but rather added to these to ensure that a robust approach is taken to all views across the Conservation Area. Whilst the College's priority is to ensure that the	21-Dec-22

		<p>College itself is duly considered in the Planning Process, as reflected in the attached email correspondence, this does not change the Policy position on protected views which are clear on where these are located and it is felt should have also been drawn from to provide comprehensive coverage across the entirety of Colleges main campus (in line with the CACA identified views). As such we consider our concerns to still be relevant and recommend that Historic England are asked to confirm that they are content with no VVMs of these protected views, in their assessment of the overall proposals. Additional to the above I would appreciate if you could confirm that the planning application is still on track for a decision on 15th March 2023 at Planning Committee or if the date has been pushed back in light of the additional commentary received.</p> <p>Kind regards, Beth Elisabeth Pywell MRTPI Senior Planner CBRE Planning and Development</p>	
407.	O		21-Dec-22
408.	O	<p>I am objecting strongly to the proposed development on the basis of its total lack of keeping with the local area, with plans to build towering flat blocks that will dominate the skyline and destroy much of the beauty of this conservation area in which I have lived for 17 years. This is a legitimate concern based on requirements to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of the area. Even without getting into the appalling plans to fell over 150 mature trees and bulldoze historic gardens (at a time when green spaces and plants are more urgently needed than ever), these plans are utterly out of proportion with and inappropriate to Clifton and the zoo site itself. I urge total rejection of these plans and development of more sympathetic, attractive plans that honour Bristol Zoo's long legacy.</p>	21-Dec-22

409.	O	<p>Dear all, after having gone through some of the documentation provided in the next tab, I would like to object to the current planning application. Below are some of my reasons: 1. The height of the buildings proposed will be disproportionately tall compared to the rest of the lower lying living areas. Such a massive block of flats in the area will lead to the surrounding streets becoming shadowy and much less attractive to the eye. Architectural designs today, should consider the wellbeing of surrounding communities and be inclusive. As mentioned during World Architecture Day 2022, architecture can make our lives better by protecting, developing and restoring health. It has the power to contribute to the physical, emotional, environmental, financial and social wellness of humankind, all while having a positive impact on the environment. 2. Secondly, as a critical part of Clifton's and Bristol's history and heritage, the design and planning of the new use of the space should have been done, or should be done now, with the participation of the impacted community - ie: the Bristolians, who have lived, live and will live with the Zoo and its future self. 3. Bristol is a city that strives to be inclusive, and promote a just transition. This exceptional site in one of the hearts of Bristol should be representative of this energy. The use of the 'Dugnad' process of communal decision making where people come together from across the community around a shared interest could be used. A technique called 'splotting' could also be applied allowing participants to map how they experienced and participated in their local place. Be part of a Just Transition. 4. As Heritage England had pointed out, the current design for the entire space is stocky and exclusive. If the aim is to open up the space and make it accessible to all, shouldn't the design be open, social and regenerative? - some examples of just transitions within architectural design: https://medium.com/design-council/design-for-a-just-transition-co-design-community-care-ccbe1136ee05 Thank you for your consideration, Kindly</p>	21-Dec-22
410.	O	<p>This proposal is completely inappropriate for what is one of the most iconic and beautiful parts of the City of Bristol. The sheer scale and mass of the proposed blocks of flat is completely out of character with the neighbouring properties and will seriously impact on the beautiful gardens that lie within the existing zoo grounds. While not against the principle of residential development it should be on a smaller scale, with lower buildings and more empathetic to its immediate environment.</p>	22-Dec-22
411.	O	<p>I have lived in Clifton for 20+ years adjacent to Bristol Zoo and it has always been a fantastic community asset. It will be a very sad reflection of our city if this application for planning is accepted. A green space used by many (irrespective of seeing animals) would be lost, mature trees cut down and in its place we would have a concrete jungle totally out of keeping with the Grade II + listed buildings which surround it. I understand the need for housing but I believe every application must stand on its own merits and as a local resident I find very little merit with this proposal. Therefore I urge our councillors to please REJECT this application.</p>	22-Dec-22

412.	O	WHY,WHY,WHY,WHY,WHY? Unbelievable. Firstly I am not against new housing of any sort and especially support affordable homes but the design of these flats is just not in keeping with the local area. SIX stories tall - NO parking - typical inner city design in a much more rural area. Secondly - 150 Mature TREES being cut down. Bristol zoo is a conservation charity - obviously only of animals which brings me to my third point.... WHERE are all the animals going? Apart from the Gorillas they are being palmed off to anyone that will have them. Perhaps I will be feeding them in cans to my dogs soon? If this is the legacy of Bristol zoo - then its a very sad day indeed. Its all about the money.	22-Dec-22
413.	O	I object strongly to the proposed plans for Bristol Zoo. I have lived in Bristol all my live and the zoo and Clifton have always been a beautiful space to spend time in. Modern blocks of flats are unsightly. They look unsightly in the city centre and in a few years time they will be out of date and unfashionable. Clifton is a beautiful area with stunning old buildings. Any development should be in keeping with the architecture of the area. Whoever the developer is, they are clearly trying to erect cheap material flats to maximise their profits. Bristol council should be looking after it's residents and keep areas of beauty-beautiful. The zoo gardens are mature and diverse and should be preserved at all costs. Protect historic treasures do not trash them with modern architecture that is not in keeping with the area at all.	22-Dec-22
414.	O	The proposal is a horrendous monolith to the picturesque and historically significant surroundings. It is wholly out of place. The design must reflect and match the style of buildings surrounding it. It must not be so over empowering of the nearby buildings. It overly dominates the skyline	22-Dec-22
415.	O	Absolute abomination of a design. I don't object to development but it should be houses similar design to those in the surrounding roads. Not stuffing in a high rise block of flats. It's too high and not sympathetic to the local environment and architecture - sticks out like a sore thumb - and the design will date terribly. Not to mention the problems with parking in the local area.	22-Dec-22
416.	O	The plans for these flats completely ruins the existing neighbourhoods profile. The surrounding road network is beautiful. These designs are not going to age well and will be an eyesore. Clifton landscape deserves better!!	22-Dec-22
417.	O	The aesthetics of the buildings look completely out of keeping with Clifton buildings. Surely they should be made in a similar stone, to match Clifton. Any other building that applied for permission in this material would not be permitted. Please don't ruin our beautiful area by allowing this.	23-Dec-22

418.	O	I am a former resident of Clifton, and the similar areas north of the downs. It's renowned for its stunning historic buildings and character, and the scale of this treasure is quite unique. It was a very special place to live and I miss it dearly. It has the odd but of modern infill, but they are few and far between, and small in scale. This application is an absolute outrage. It is so monstrous in scale and so unbelievably monotonous and ugly. It looks like a prison. Most of Clifton is grade I or II listed to preserve its historical character. This is a headache as a home owner, but one you respect and value as you and your neighbours all have to maintain the beautiful historic character of the area, together. This application is utterly out of keeping with the character and low level scale of the historic buildings already in the area. Including those along College, Guthrie and Northcote Roads. This should be immediately rejected.	23-Dec-22
419.	O	I am writing to object to the planned development at Bristol Zoo Gardens. The currently design is totally out of keeping with its heritage surroundings. Some of the buildings are block like and too high and imposing. They are unsympathetic in scale and design. The development as a whole does not preserve or enhance the character of the area. Of course, we need new homes and homes that are affordable. No one can disagree with this. However, we surely need to make sure the priority is for well-designed housing which is not totally out of keeping with its surroundings. I am particularly concerned at the loss of so many established and mature trees. Recent research by Prof Disney at UCL has shown that UK's old trees are critical to the fight to combat climate change. In his words: 'The value you have in large mature trees is almost incalculable and so you should avoid losing that at any cost - regardless of how many trees you think about planting.' Importantly, the development seems totally at odds with the conservation and ecology aims and values BCC and the Zoo constantly claim to champion. Once this historically rich site is lost we can never get it back. Bristol Zoo Gardens is iconic and its animals and garden have been a huge draw to people visiting Bristol for 185 years. Replacing this with such an unimaginative block is surely not the legacy we wish to leave to future generations?	26-Dec-22

420.	S	<p>Comments on Planning Application 22/02737/F - Redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens My comments fall into three different camps: 1. Reflection on my time visiting the zoo. 2. Comments on the architectural / technical proposals for the redevelopment. 3. Comments on Bristol Zoological Society's (BZS) decision to close Bristol Zoo Gardens. As I understand it Bristol City Council's Planning Officer (or Planning Committee) will solely consider the merits of redevelopment application and not retrospectively judge BZS's closure decision - although there is a "grey area" surrounding "case for redevelopment not proven" where the Planning Officer could delve back into the reasonings why Bristol Zoo Gardens were shut. My comments on BZS's closure decision are included in the hope they are read by BZS and that a U-turn might still be possible. Part 1 : Reflection on time visiting zoo. Just like many of the comments given so far, I'm starting from the 1970s with these two photographs. ADD PHOTOS I think they are 1975 and 1978. Nice flowers and I'm wearing the panda tee shirt. I haven't included more recent photographs of my children enjoying the zoo, but suffice to say that Bristol Zoo Gardens is a major part of the city and it is a great shame it has shut. Part 2 - Comments on Planning Application Submission It is sad that Bristol Zoo Gardens have closed but having read the Design and Access Statements, the Heritage Report, the Landscaping Proposals and viewed a number of the drawings I support: 1. The principle of "massing" of the development proposals around the perimeter to retain as much of the central gardens as possible. 2. The opening of the many new access points around the perimeter. 3. The retention of the Aquarium (former Bear Pit), Aviary, Monkey Temple and Terrace Theatre as structures that will be retained (and refurbished etc) as public garden features etc. Ditto retention of the Grand Terrace. 4. The conversion of the Entrance Lodge into the Clifton Conservation Hub (CCH) with café, exhibition and office spaces - even though the last thing Clifton needs is another café. I feel the following aspects of the Planning Application require further detailing: 1. Whilst the Design and Access Statement (page 10) gives overview details of the Management Board that will be responsible for the upkeep of the public gardens and structures (upkeep to be paid for via a Resident Service Charge to all residents, excluding the 20% "affordable housing residents"), the Planning Application proposals should provide greater details for the Management Board. Matters such as (i) legal powers, (ii) longevity of tenure, (iii) frequency of meetings, (iv) dispute resolution arrangements and (v) Mission Statement for the Board should be fully defined at this Planning Application stage. 2. Who owns the CCH building? 3. Details of the type and height of back (private) garden fencing (or walls?) for the houses in the central areas of the site, as this information is not shown on any Plan or Elevation drawing that I could find. 4. The high number of resident bicycle parking places and low number of resident car parking spaces should be applauded. Will the 6.8m wide main road be double-yellow-lined to restrict parking? 5. What prevents a further planning application being submitted (in the near future) for further housing on the West Lawn / East Lawn / Central Play Area etc? 6. What prevents "urban creep" for say paving over grassed areas for additional car parking ? Part 3 - Comments on Bristol Zoological Society (BZS) earlier decision to close the zoo. 1. It does seem like a "rushed decision" as there was a vary rapid change in policy between 2019 and 2020 when Bristol Zoo Gardens was declared no longer viable and "all eggs were put into one basket" at The Wild Place. Why is there no clear independent security of this decision? 2. Whilst the graph of long-term visitor numbers is declining, the rate</p>	27-Dec-22
------	---	--	-----------

	<p>of decline is surely only marginal. Why was no "extra marketing strategy" and/or "no fund raising appeal" attempted? 3. Clearly "the general public" is fully aware that large animals can no longer be kept in small enclosures and everyone understands how BZS needs to take this into account. Ultimately, given its limited land footprint, this means Bristol Zoo Gardens evolving into a "smaller creatures only" zoo with a second facility at The Wild Place catering for "larger creatures". Why wasn't the two-site re-branding of Bristol Zoo Gardens and The Wild Place into "small creatures" and "large creatures" ever tried? 4. There is a long way to go and I fear BZS have under-estimated the scale of the technical task, the time periods involved, the financial risks and extent of "bridging the gap" between the zoo closing and a redeveloped Wild Place opening. a) I suspect obtaining planning permission for the housing re-development will take significantly longer than any original estimate would have stated. This delay will "knock-on" to everything, not least the care costs of the animals currently caught in limbo. Ditto staffing costs. b) The eventual purchase price of the Bristol Zoo Gardens land by the Housing Developer might be sizeably lower given: i) Housing developer's forecast build costs increasing with inflation: ii) The "financial model" starting with a bank base rate of 0.1% in December 2021, but now having to deal with 3.5%. iii) General forecasts of house price reduction and the collapse of the buy-to-let market. c) The BZS's development costs at The Wild Place are probably increasing with various complication factors including: (1) Lack of skilled / specialist contractor resources / general "over-heat" of construction market (2) Difficult ground conditions at The Wild Place. (3) Difficult topography meaning that only a small proportion of the land is actually usable. (4) Logistics of building new facilities at same time as keep venue open. (5) Costs of utility infrastructure (power, sewerage connections etc). (6) The phasing of the Wild Place redevelopment. Will BZS wait for 100% of re-development to be completed or "part open" but risk new visitors thinking it was still mostly still a building site? d) The overall "bridging period" between the Bristol Zoo Gardens closing and the expanded Wild Place fully opening will probably be a lot longer than original envisaged, and hence the "profit" for use in (i) making the BZS yearly accounts more sustainable and (ii) funding new conservation work may be considerably less than originally thought. e) But perhaps my biggest fear is that The Wild Place does not have the heritage, tradition, location and following that Bristol Zoo Gardens has (even if it were to become "small creatures only") and hence I worry that BZS will face falling Wild Place visitor numbers in the years to come. Conclusion I do not support BZS's decision to close the Bristol Zoo Gardens and feel that a two-site strategy of "small and digital" at the current site with "large and wild" at The Wild Place was not properly explored - and ought to have been. I do not have the facts and figures behind BZS's decision, but presumably it was taken after extensive studies. I just find it strange there seems to be no public record of signatures from all of the BZS Trustees supporting the executive's decision. The closure of Bristol Zoo Gardens will mean that Bristol, as a diverse city, will be forever poorer. A successful, world-class, Wild Place at the M5-motorway junction will clearly help fill the void left behind - and let's hope it more than fills it, but also enhances it. As Bristol Zoo Gardens have closed, and unless BZS undertakes a U-turn, I support the Planning Application principles subject to the comments listed in the central "Part 2" of this letter.</p>	
--	---	--

421.	O	We don't need any more people or any more housing stock in Clifton. I don't care what the finished buildings will look like - blocks of flats are totally incongruous with the character of the area. Keep the gardens as they are and turn the rest of the site into a park.	28-Dec-22
422.	O	The plans shown for the redevelopment of the zoo in no way reflect the heritage, beauty and open spaces that are to be replaced. Mature trees should, in my opinion, not be removed for profit only. Sky vistas are important for our mental health. Access, presumed permanent, was promised to the beautiful gardens of the zoo, imagine this will now be shortlived. Concrete high rise buildings do not, in my opinion, complement the existing architecture rather scream "lets make money"!! I recognise the need for more housing and that such a prestigious site will not be left abandoned but surely we have architects in this country who can better reflect the existing community and present something with harmony.	29-Dec-22
423.	O	I wish to object to this planning application for the following reason: Bristol Zoo Gardens are within the Clifton Conservation area, and most of the buildings on the existing site are on the Local List. Clifton is a conservation area because of the historic nature of the architecture, the special character and appearance of the area, the distinctive views, the green spaces, and the trees and street furniture. These are all aspects of the area that the local authority should be preserving or enhancing. The proposed development does not comply with the planning obligations for a conservation area and should therefore not receive planning permission.	29-Dec-22
424.	O	I was horrified today to be made aware of the unsympathetic and overbearing nature of the proposed developments at Bristol Zoo. I believe that planning law requires that special attention is given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of the area. The proposals may be suitable for Broadmead, but surely not for Clifton. We don't want to lose the character of Clifton and such a large unsightly development would harm the area in so many ways. It's too big, it's overbearing, it's overwhelming, it's unsympathetic. Please reject.	29-Dec-22
425.	O	I wish to object to this planning application as the current plan does not take into account the current character of the Clifton area. The current planning law states that "special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of the area." The current plan shows a block of characterless flat which bear nothing in common with the existing local architectural and design of the building and thus the flat will stick out like an eyesore.	29-Dec-22

426.	O	To be clear, I am not in sight of this development, so cannot be accused of 'not in my back yard' syndrome. However, this is a place dear to my heart and that of many Bristolians. Is this a case of 'Big Business Wins No Matter What The People Say'? Sadly I think so, but having said that I still wish to lodge my objection to what would be a complete and utter eyesore on one of our most precious green and open areas for the general public in Bristol. This could have been turned into a place for 'green education' for our younger generations, but it will now sadly fall into 'fat cat developers' hands and become a concrete jungle instead. A forward thinking council with the benefit of future generations in mind. Anyone know of any? It certainly isn't Bristol that's for sure.	29-Dec-22
427.	O	Address: Bristol Zoo Gardens Guthrie Road Bristol BS8 3HA The proposed redevelopment of the Bristol zoo site is an abomination. How on earth can those buildings be allowed in a Conservation Area? The scheme is ugly and entirely unsympathetic to Clifton and its surrounds. The scheme will be blot on the landscape. Scale this development down - and please redesign this unimaginative mess.	29-Dec-22
428.	O	The outlook is not aligned to the conservation area. It is ugly in this area and looks so different in clifton. I will feel sad if I walk around here seeing this along the road. This is a very sad thing to see such contemporary sitting in a conservation area. Please do not do that.	29-Dec-22
429.	O	Architecturally Unsympathetic to the surrounding listed buildings and conservation area. Loss of trees & natural habitats. Increased pollution. Increased on-street parking pressure. Pressure on local primary school places. Insufficient 'legacy' for neighbourhood & local community. .	30-Dec-22
430.	O	Architecturally Unsympathetic to the surrounding listed buildings and conservation area. Loss of trees & natural habitats. Increased pollution. Increased on-street parking pressure. Pressure on local primary school places. Insufficient 'legacy' for neighbourhood & local community. .	30-Dec-22
431.	O	Having been to several of the Architects meetings held at Bristol Zoo to show the provisional ideas of the Zoo site, I still feel as I did then. These plans which have been submitted to the planning office pay no attention to the wish of the local and wider community to preserve and enhance the character of the area. The plans mimic high-rise office buildings or future cramped slum conditions. The plans pay no respect the value to the work the Bristol zoological society has been doing to enhance our wildlife, our environment and our unique city for over 100 years. It is appalling of the Savills agency and the Architects to submit these plans or the city planners to even consider them.	30-Dec-22

432.	O	Converting a zoo into a block of 196 flats sounds like a grubby deal to provide extra cash for the council. The proposed project will damage the neighbourhood by increasing the number of residents in the area without readjusting the current infrastructure. Hence, this project will burden the community already under pressure. The council does not seem to manage to collect rubbish in our community on time and each rubbish collection is leading to a messy street. This project will have a lasting damaging impact and shall be aborted.	30-Dec-22
433.	O	To build an eyesore where Bristol Zoo currently stands is horrific. I think the zoo should be replaced with something considered, that will add to the community, just like the zoo did. A beautiful gardens with amenities and picnic area would be a wonderful idea. Building hideous multi-storey flats in the middle of Clifton which is a beautiful area full of period and listed properties should be illegal. I am completely against the flats. I would like this area to be in keeping with what currently stands there; nature and stunning scenery.	30-Dec-22
434.	O	The Zoo's relocation to the Wild Place site leaves a heritage site which deserves to be developed to for the benefit of the city and its residents. Sadly the proposed redevelopment is not in-keeping with the character of the area in either form, scale or surrounding landscaping. The continuous frontage of blocks of flats dwarf neighbouring residential and college buildings, and considering the Conservation Area status of the neighbourhood, neither preserve nor enhance the character of the area. Given the Zoo's long history within Clifton and the public amenity, green space and communal value it has offered to generations of Bristol citizens and visitors, the site warrants a more fitting, thoughtful legacy that will benefit the neighbouring and citywide community than the housing estate currently proposed.	30-Dec-22
435.	O	Doesn't fit in with the architecture of clifton at all,	30-Dec-22
436.	O	I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development of the former Bristol Zoo site. The proposed development is utterly inappropriate in terms of scale and of visual impact and shows no regard for the unique character of the site. This has no place in a conservation area and will bring only detriments to local residents. It is clear that this plan seeks to maximise profit with zero regard for the fitting legacy promised to residents by Bristol Zoological Society. To allow this, or any similar sized development, on this site would be an unforgivable error that would permanently adversely affect the whole of the Clifton Downs area.	30-Dec-22
437.	O	Architecturally Unsympathetic to the surrounding listed buildings and conservation area. Loss of trees & natural habitats. Increased pollution. Increased on-street parking pressure. Pressure on local primary school places. Insufficient 'legacy' for neighbourhood & local community. .	30-Dec-22
438.	O	Architecturally Unsympathetic to the surrounding listed buildings and conservation area. Loss of trees & natural habitats. Increased pollution. Increased on-street parking pressure. Pressure on local primary school places. Insufficient 'legacy' for neighbourhood & local community. .	30-Dec-22

439.	O	This development is not in keeping with the surrounding area. It will bring much disruption to the area both during construction but also after the proposed works have been completed. Simply put, we need to make better use of the space for the current residents of Clifton and Bristol rather than 'cramming' in as many new homes as possible. This is a bad proposal.	31-Dec-22
440.	O	Dismayed as we were by the closing of the historic zoo, as frequent visitors we believed Bristol Zoo when they explained the animals needed to be moved to the Wild Place for ecological and welfare reasons. They told us more space was needed, and welfare could be guaranteed by the money from selling the site. This would appear to be misleading propaganda as we now understand few of the mammals will be moved to their alternative site - leaving the Zoo with inexplicable desire to make tens of millions from cramming high density housing onto this site. MY OBJECTIONS ARE : I object to the scale of the buildings - 6 storeys high. They will tower over us and our beautiful Georgian and Victorian streets. We are devastated that we will be deprived of the long vistas and mature trees that we value - and so should Bristol City Planning Department. I object to the number of dwellings - this has nothing to do with Bristol's "housing crisis" - it is pure greed. I object to the overwhelming nature and BLOCKHOUSE design - if only architects been employed who had any sensitivity and aesthetic skill. In summary - these plans should never have even been conceived as they ignore the very essence of the Conservation Area and the requirement to preserve this unique cityscape - or even enhance it - BUT Not Destroy it.	31-Dec-22
441.	O	I strongly object to the proposed application. This is not what I had been led to believe would be the plan for the beautiful space of the Zoo. The removal of so many trees and the height and breadth of the proposed apartment dwellings are simply not in keeping in the Clifton Conservation Area. These proposed flats would be more in keeping in the ever-changing City Centre, but totally bulky and unattractive for Clifton, in a spot where so many birds thrive and fly around. It is overbearing and not in keeping with this beautiful site and the congestion, noise and parking etc... generated by so many tall-build flats would be unworkable.	31-Dec-22
442.	O	1. The visual impact of the proposed buildings towering over the existing high perimeter walls and neighbouring properties will be detrimental and completely out of character with the area. 2. The proposal has inadequate provision for car parking for the number of dwellings. 3. There is no certainty or clarity how long term guarantees of public access and for funding the upkeep of the gardens are to be secured in perpetuity. neighbour	31-Dec-22

443.	O	The revised proposals have minimal changes. The interior of the flats has been amended, but little change has been made to the heights and massing of the buildings. This is a particular issue for Northcote Road and Guthrie Road where five to six storey buildings are proposed where currently the buildings are three to four storeys high. The development does not reflect the existing architecture or the historic nature of the site and area. The number of dwellings across the site will also have a significant impact on the amount of traffic in the area and on road safety, both during the construction phase and thereafter. Whilst I understand that this is an opportunity for the Zoo to safeguard its long-term future, it is very disappointing that the proposals are less than sympathetic to their surrounds and that little consideration has been given to innovative and thoughtful design and how it can sit well within a Conservation Area. I therefore strongly oppose this development for the reasons listed above.	01-Jan-23
444.	O	22/02737/F is going to severely disrupt this neighbourhood and add pressure to already stretched-out public services and infrastructure in this area. 22/02737/F will make acute issues such as lack of space in this neighbourhood worse. This neighbourhood already has to accommodate the influx of significant number of people during big events in the Clifton Downs. There still is no concept from the council on how to address parking space issues. The council so far has only introduced temporary solutions such as the conversion of parts of the Clifton Downs into parking space which is a disgrace and neither a green or sustainable solution to a growing issue. 22/02737/F will only add to this existing pressure. Second, 22/02737/F will cause much noise, pollution and disruption. The building site noise and pollution will affect both the immediate bordering buildings as well as the neighbourhood more widely due to the disruption to access roads. This neighbourhood already is struggling with significant noise pollutions due to frequent mass student parties. The council is aware of this issue and had to introduce a special police patrol to police unsocial behaviour. However, there are several petitions ongoing and social cohesion in this neighbourhood is already at risk. Third, pollution and stretch of public services. This neighbourhood already experiences infrequent collection of bins/recycling through council services. This is made worse due to the inconsiderate number of HMOs granted in this neighbourhood. Due to the high flux of students during terms, waste such as old furniture, mattress, kitchen utensils is laying on streets for weeks before the council is taking care of this. All together, council services are already not coping with the need. There is no sufficient consideration how council services will be expanded to accommodate the additional need of 196 residential units introduced through 22/02737/F. Lastly, the building design of 22/02737/F is not fitting in this neighbourhood as it is disproportionately big. There are many listed buildings in this neighbourhood and there is rightful concern on the damage 22/02737/F would cause to the integrity of this neighbourhood.	02-Jan-23

445.	O	It would be a travesty to blight this corner of Clifton with this block that is so very out of keeping with the area. From what we can see at present the development looks more like a communist prison. It is very lacking so many ways: - It would tower over all surrounding dwellings and building - It is devoid of any architectural aestheticism - The development necessitates the removal of many protected trees. This development is so far from the general mood of the country looking to build greener more environmentally spirited communities. Bristol has the opportunity to build something forward thinking, modern, green and good for the health and welfare of those living there. Let's not waste this fantastic opportunity.	03-Jan-23
446.	O	It would be a travesty to build such ugly dense blocks of flats in the middle of the conservation area. The plan is so very far away from the general mood of the country aiming for greener more environmentally friendly communities to live in. These blocks are: - Too tall - Too dense - Tower over the surrounding buildings - Necessitate the removal of precious and protected trees - Architecturally devoid of any aestheticism - Visually look like communist prison block There is the opportunity to build something forward thinking, modern, environmentally friendly, good for the community and the individual people and families who live there. PLEASE let's not blight this beautiful site for many years and generations to come.	03-Jan-23
447.	O	It would be a travesty to blight this corner of Clifton with this block that is so very out of keeping with the area. From what we can see at present the development looks more like a communist prison. It is very lacking so many ways: - It would tower over all surrounding dwellings and building - It is devoid of any architectural aestheticism - The development necessitates the removal of many protected trees. This development is so far from the general mood of the country looking to build greener more environmentally spirited communities. Bristol has the opportunity to build something forward thinking, modern, green and good for the health and welfare of those living there. Let's not waste this fantastic opportunity.	03-Jan-23
448.	O	It would be a travesty to build such ugly dense blocks of flats in the middle of the conservation area. The plan is so very far away from the general mood of the country aiming for greener more environmentally friendly communities to live in. These blocks are: - Too tall - Too dense - Tower over the surrounding buildings - Necessitate the removal of precious and protected trees - Architecturally devoid of any aestheticism - Visually look like communist prison block There is the opportunity to build something forward thinking, modern, environmentally friendly, good for the community and the individual people and families who live there. PLEASE let's not blight this beautiful site for many years and generations to come.	03-Jan-23

449.	O	Giving planning permission for housing should be denied. Bristol gardens is an historical site, which has been a much loved local amenity. Simply building houses is in direct conflict with the aspirations Bristol has as a green city. Considering all the alternatives (Eden project type, virtual zoo, city farm) all have much higher social and environmental values and would showcase Bristol as a futuristic thinking city. Building houses shows planning is stuck in old thinking. Deny the planning permission and give time for alternatives to be planned out.	03-Jan-23
450.	O	Overintensive development, buildings too big and too high, not in keeping with surrounding area. Incongruous in conservation area. More traffic and parking could impact residential areas and have detrimental effect on The Downs. The plans should be completely withdrawn, not tweaked. There should be a new submission by more enlightened architects taking into account local feeling and sensitivity of the location. The heritage of the area should be valued and respected.	04-Jan-23
451.	O	Although I no longer live in the BS8 area, my breath was taken away by the oppressive ugliness of the plans I saw yesterday for the re-development of the former Bristol Zoo gardens. Clifton is an area of outstanding architectural character. The proposed development would appear to be the City Council beginning the process of reducing this character in favour of cramming in nearly 200 dwellings. The development seems to turn its back on the centuries of elegance and grace, presenting a prison-like exterior to the immediate environment. Are the new residents expected to behave in a similar fashion? I do not object to the profits the developers could make but the granting of permission for them to desecrate a beautiful part of Bristol seems to me to be tantamount to vandalism.	04-Jan-23

452.	O	<p>Summary of Objection The role of zoos within the UK and throughout the world has obviously changed over time from what could be considered as traditional visitor attractions, to one where zoos are now centres of learning and excellence whose function is to ensure the survival of critically endangered species. From reviewing the latest available published figures, around 500,000 people visited Bristol Zoo in 2019. Since it opened in 1836, over 90million people have passed through its gates. Families have been entertained and interacted with the animals at close quarters. They have learned about the vital conservation work that is integral to saving endangered species across the planet. However, we are of the firm belief that the closure of this much loved and respected Zoo is premature and ill judged. We believe that the proposals to convert the site into a housing scheme has been poorly conceived and designed and fails to recognise the architectural importance of the wider area. Planning Policy The site of Bristol Zoo sits within the Conservation Area of Clifton & Hotwells. Clifton & Hotwells was designated as a conservation area on 26 September 1972 and extended on 16 February 1977 and 18 February 1981. The Clifton & Hotwells Conservation Area Character Appraisal was adopted on 14 July 2010. In exercising its planning functions in a conservation area, the local planning authority is under a duty to pay "special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance" of the area (s.72 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990). Bristol's conservation areas are the subject of policies in the Bristol Local Plan as described below. The Local Plan now consists of the Core Strategy which was adopted in June 2011 and the Local Development Policies plan, which was adopted in 2014. These documents alongside the Conservation Character Appraisal form the Development Plan and all planning decisions put before the Authority should be based around these local plan policies and National Planning policy and guidance. National Planning Policy is in the form of the NPPF 2021 which provides strategic and high level guidance to Developers and Local Authorities in relation to development proposals. Specific guidance in relation to housing development and the potential impact on heritage assets is detailed within Chapter 16 Conserving and Preserving the Historic Environment. This chapter goes into more detail as to what is expected of an Applicant when submitting developments proposals and how Local Planning Authorities should measure and assess such proposal in the context of the importance of such heritage assets, eg Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. Local Context The conservation area of Clifton & Hotwells focuses upon the development of terraces, crescents and streets that rise from Hotwells in the south before meeting the open landscape provided by Avon Gorge and Clifton Down to the west and north. The area is characterised by its dramatic climb from 10m above sea level at the lowest point alongside the Floating Harbour, reaching up to 90m at the highest towards Clifton Park where Bristol Zoo is located. Bristol Zoo is surrounded by buildings that are owned and operated by Clifton College (Guthrie Road and Northcote Road) and early, mid and late Victorian, 3 storey villas that are situated along College Road and the wider urban environment beyond. The predominant built form of the immediate area surrounding Bristol Zoo area large Victorian 3 storey (plus basement) villas which are either detached or semi-detached being either two or three bays wide. These properties are set back from the pavement edge with front mature front gardens and low boundary walls. There is a very strong and prominent building line that is consistent across the area. The dominant building materials used within these building is rubble limestone, pennant sandstone and</p>	04-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

	<p>Bathstone quoins and detailing. Windows are traditional timber sash with panelled front doors. The overall architectural style provides a strong sense of place that manages to combine residential elements along College Road with a strong and robust architectural style of Clifton College seen along Guthrie Road and Northcote Road. Figure 1 below provides an overview of the building type, context and character of the wider Bristol Zoo area. Of note and of relevance to this application is; - Blue highlighted buildings to the south of Guthrie Road - Listed Grade II - Brown highlighted buildings located along College Road and Northcote Road. These are buildings which add value to the townscape character and make a positive contribution to the conservation area. - Mauve highlighted buildings. Key unlisted buildings such as Clifton Pavilion and buildings belonging to the Clifton College along Guthrie Road and the wider educational establishment that contribute to the character of the area. Figure 1 Extract of Buildings Types surrounding Bristol Zoo. Taken from Clifton & Hotwells Conservation Character Area Appraisal 2010. Of greater importance is the wider views (medium and long distance) that are found within this part of the Conservation Area. Clifton Downs is located directly to the north of the Bristol Zoo site. It rises up steeply to provide panoramic views over the Zoo, Clifton and beyond. The significance of these views cannot be overstated and Bristol Zoo as well as Clifton College adjacent are identified as a 'Landmark of City wide importance' within the Character Appraisal. Figure 3 below, provides an extract of the important views that have been considered prominent within and adjacent to the Bristol Zoo site. As can be seen many of these views look north towards Clifton Downs (L23 - L27) but equally views are equally possible looking south from Clifton Downs across Bristol Zoo, Clifton and the wider urban environment (See green crescent shape in extract below). The applicant proposes to construct a six storey high apartment block (spanning the entire width of the site), along the northern elevation, that will rise above the existing ground level by some 19.35m. By doing so it will completely obliterate existing views looking south from the Downs across Clifton and the wider environs of Bristol. See photo image (figure 2) below. Figure 2 View looking south from Clifton Down onto northern boundary of Bristol Zoo. Red Line approximately defines height of proposed apartment block The overall setting and character of Bristol Zoo is one that has evolved and developed over nearly 180 years. There are buildings within the Zoo site and along the periphery of the site that do not compliment the historic character of the area but they in most instances do not impose or detract historic integrity of overall historic importance of this area. Figure 3. Extract of Important views as described in the Clifton & Hotwells. Conservation Character Appraisal. 2010. As can be seen from Figure 4 below, a clear sense of place and architectural style has been created over the development of this part of the Conservation area. This has allowed the Bristol Zoo site and the Clifton College site to form a 'hub' of larger institutional buildings that is surrounding by smaller scale but none the less, important Victorian residential buildings. These Victorian villas broadly define the east and western boundaries of the Bristol Zoo (and Clifton College) site along College Road and Pembroke Road. The open space of Clifton Downs then provides a natural 'full stop' to any development directly to the north which is bordered by Clifton Down Road. The Conservation Character appraisal states at para 6.1.4 that; The street pattern to the north of the conservation area is more regular, and sits more comfortably on a grid pattern of cross cutting streets, with the Zoo and Clifton College at their heart. The Applicant is attempting to redefine</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the very character of the conservation area by introducing inappropriate and poorly designed residential apartment blocks that will be entirely alien to the setting of the conservation area and its setting. Such buildings will be at odds with the overall architectural layout and theme of this area that has taken almost 180 years to evolve. These monolithic apartment blocks will impose an architectural style on this area that will be completely alien to this character and setting of this area and will fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area.</p> <p>Figure 4 Extract of Land use within the Clifton & Hotwells Conservation Area. 2010. Appraisal and review of the proposed design i). Comparative heights of buildings. There has been no critical analysis and discussion of the different roof heights of the proposed apartment block compared to the buildings immediately adjacent to the site along College Road, Guthrie Road and Northcote Road. There are no cross-sectional drawings to show how the proposed apartment buildings will relate to the existing buildings in height, scale and mass. If such drawings did exist, it would clearly show the disparity between the height of the proposed apartment blocks compared to the educational buildings of Clifton College and the Victorian residential villas along College Road. The apartment blocks (known as E1, E2 E3 and S1) will completely dominate the educational buildings of Clifton College, located along Northcote Road and Guthrie Road. From reviewing the proposed elevational drawings provided by the applicant, the buildings will rise up on average between 14,0m to 17,0m above ground level. It is accepted that there are ground level differences running north to south, but the overall impact of such inappropriately designed buildings being located directly opposite these handsome educational buildings will lead to a downgrading of the architectural value of these buildings and will have a detrimental impact within the conservation area. Equally and potentially of more importance is the impact on the northern block (N1 2 & 3) on the listed building in the North West corner of the site. (detailed as the Clifton Conservation Hub). This unique building which is listed Grade II will be completely dominated by the construction of this new apartment block. No attempt has been made by the Applicant to review or explain this impact or show the inter-relationship between the existing heritage asset and the proposed apartment block. ii) Loss of open green space within the site Whilst it is fully acknowledged that access into Bristol Zoo is via an entry fee, the Zoo has been designated as a Local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space. The area provides a traffic free space that allows visitors to interact with the animals at very close quarters. The proposals would completely and totally alter the character of this area by introducing tarmaced roads, parking spaces (for 121No vehicles) and garage parking throughout the site. The sense of place would be altered from a traffic environment to a fairly standard suburban housing estate. It will resemble a gated community that will restrict access to the general public and will eventually provide communal garden areas for the sole use and enjoyment of the residents. Inevitably the lack of parking spaces provided within the scheme, will mean that increasingly cars will be parked inappropriately along the internal access roads further detracting from what is currently a pleasant green open space. There is increasing concern that despite the assertion from the Applicant that the internal green areas will be open to the public, the layout and form of the proposed scheme will completely alienate the general public from visiting this site. The newly formed entrances into the site will provide direct road access into the site from College Road, Clifton Down and Guthrie Road. The invitation</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>for the general public to explore the internal green space will not be clear and it will be increasingly seen as the preserve of the use of the residents only. This is very much at odds with the zoo's historic role as a key part of the city's green / open space fabric, reflected by its planning designation as a Local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space. iii). Loss of historic boundary features</p> <p>The proposals for the development of the various apartment blocks along Guthrie Road and Northcote Road means that entire lengths of existing rubble and pennant sandstone boundary wall features will need to be demolished. These stone walls range between approximately 2.5m high to about 5.0m - 6.0m high at the junction of Guthrie Road and Northcote Road. The loss of such historic features to accommodate these apartment blocks will further degrade the historic fabric of the Zoo site and will have a detrimental impact on the conservation area in this locality. Equally the construction of the apartment block running parallel to Clifton Down (northern boundary) will also mean the entire loss of this boundary wall that currently exists. The drawings do not make it clear at all whether this boundary wall feature is being retained or not. It is assumed currently that the boundary wall will be demolished. There is an equally strong boundary wall feature that exists along College Road. It is not at all clear from the proposals as to whether this 2.5m high wall will remain intact or whether this will be demolished also. Further clarification should be sought from the Applicant as to his intentions. iv) Enabling Development It is accepted that in some instances in order to make a development commercially viable, some alterations need to occur to listed buildings and heritage assets. This is the case for the Giraffe House and other listed buildings within the site such as the Bear Pit, the Monkey Temple and the Aviary building. The Applicant is proposing to convert the Giraffe house into residential accommodation and the remaining heritage assets will be integrated into the wider landscaping scheme for the site. However, what has not been made clear by the Applicant is the justification for such a radical change from one use to another. Paragraphs 199 - 208 of the NPPF (2021) goes into greater detail as to how harm should be assessed and whether the significance of that harm is acceptable or not. The concluding paragraph (208) is of particular significance for this application. It states that; Local planning authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies. It is vital that the LPA carefully reviews the justification of harm to these important heritage assets and whether the principal of development here has been fully explained and justified. We are of the firm belief that the significance of harm that the proposals will have on the Conservation area as well as the listed heritage assets do not outweigh the benefits of the proposed scheme. v). Tenure & Ownership The affordable housing statement (Savills, October 2022) seems to suggest that the spread of first homes and affordable rented accommodation (40 No units in total) will be evenly spread out across the site and that as a result the scheme will be 'tenure blind'. However, if one analyses the accommodation schedule that has been prepared by the applicant, it is evident that Block S1, all 30 No units within this block will be rented and managed by a social housing provider. The 10 No first homes will be spread out between Blocks E2 & E3. We don't see how such a proposal will successfully integrate the different types of tenure into the scheme. It will only serve to potentially stigmatise the occupants of this apartment block (S1) and the overall housing scheme will be poorly integrated</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>as a result. vi) Loss of a Community Facility There is a clear and direct link back to the Bristol Core Strategy (2011) and the Development Plan Policies (2014) that seeks to prevent the loss of Community Facilities. The Local Plan does not precisely define what a community facility is, but at para 2.5.2 it states that community facilities can be; community centres and childcare facilities, cultural centres and venues, places of worship, education establishments and training centres, health and social care facilities, sport and recreation facilities and civic and administrative facilities. It may also include other uses whose primary function is commercial but perform a social or community role i.e. sport, recreational and leisure facilities including local pubs. Both Local Plan policy DM5 and Core Strategy Policy BCS12 make direct reference to the fact that the loss of Community Facilities will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no longer a demand for the facility or that the building/s are no longer suitable to accommodate the use and the building cannot be retained or adapted to another community use. Furthermore Policy DM5 goes on to state that the loss of a community facility will only be acceptable if a replacement facility can be provided in 'a suitable alternative location'. The location of the Wildplace Project is in a location (off Junction 17, M5) that will require visitors to arrive via car or other motorised transport. The site is totally inaccessible to people without the means of a car. The appeal of the Bristol Zoo site is that it is centrally located and it is accessible via bus or by foot or by bicycle. We would strongly argue that the Applicant has not fully and sufficiently demonstrated that the alternative uses of the Zoo as a community facility have been fully and carefully explored. There has been no critical analysis and explanation as to whether the buildings and the site as a whole can be enhanced, adapted or whether a mixed use scheme could be introduced in order to keep the Zoo site operating as a commercial concern in its current location. The Zoo has played a crucial and integral role in the local community for the past 180 years. The Applicant appears to be ignoring the very strong relationships that have developed over this period between the local community and the zoo and is basing decisions about the future of this facility purely on commercial and financial objectives. Scant regard has been paid as to the potential impact that the closure of this facility will have on the local community and its potential replacement in a total unsustainable location that can only be accessed if families or individuals have a car. Conclusions The City of Bristol Local Planning Authority have a legal duty which is clearly set out in the Listed Buildings & Conservation Act. The LPA must have special regard to protecting listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas. They must ensure that the setting and context of these important heritage assets are duly protected, preserved and enhanced. The NPPF (2021) places considerable weight on ensuring that these important heritage assets are duly protected and requires Decision Makers to pay due regard to ensuring that such assets are not negatively impacted by development proposals. LPAs are clearly advised that they should refuse planning permission if the impacts of a development outweigh the benefits of such a proposal. (ie the delivery of housing units). Overall the proposal that has been submitted by the Applicant for consideration does not preserve or enhance either the character or appearance of Clifton & Hotwells conservation area. The impacts on the various listed heritage assets (within and adjacent to the site) have not been fully justified and explained. The benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the impacts on these important buildings as defined above. The loss of green open</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>space within the site is of great concern and the proposals put forward provide no evidence that this space would be guaranteed for public use in perpetuity. We would recommend that your officers recommend refusal of this application and urge you to support our objection of this application. Both Local plan and National planning policy provide a clear route to substantiating a refusal of planning permission. Notwithstanding the above we have outlined below a number of reasons for refusal which we believe are relevant and pertinent to this application. Reasons for Refusal The proposed development due to its insensitive design, form, scale, positioning and due to the loss of original fabric, would fail to respect the existing special character and historic significance of the listed building. It would also harm the character and appearance of Clifton & Hotwells conservation area. The harm is not outweighed by adequate public benefit and therefore the proposal is contrary to the NPPF, adopted Policies BCS21, BCS22, DM26, DM30 and DM31, Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and relevant guidance from SPD2 - A guide for designing house extensions and alterations. The proposed development at roof level would impose visual disharmony and the impact on the adjacent educational and residential buildings. The change in building height would be particularly noticeable when viewed from Clifton Downs and would undermine the appearance of the Conservation Area thus failing to accord with Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The proposed works would amount to substantial harm, it is considered that there are insufficient public benefits associated with the development and would therefore fail to accord with the requirements of Paragraph 202 of the NPPF and Policies BCS22 - Conservation and the Historic Environment of the Bristol City Council Core Strategy (adopted June 2011) and DM31 - Heritage Assets of the Bristol City Council Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Document (Adopted July 2014) and is therefore unacceptable. By virtue of its siting, scale, form, mass and overall design the proposed development as currently designed would therefore appear as an unsympathetic and overly prominent addition in this setting, failing to preserve the character of the established street scene; this part of the Clifton & Hotwells Conservation Area or the setting of surrounding Listed Buildings. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018); Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; Core Strategy (2011) Policies BCS21 and BCS22 and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2014) DM26, DM29 and DM31. The Applicant has failed to suitably demonstrate that the loss of this important community facility is justified. The evidence put forward does not provide sufficient justification as to why this community facility has to close and why an alternative or more suitable appropriate use cannot be found in this location that would allow the site to be utilised and be maintained as a community facility for the longer term. Core Strategy (adopted June 2011) Policy BCS12 and Site Allocations Development Management Policies DM5. (Adopted July 2014) and is therefore unacceptable.</p>	
--	---	--

453.	O	As a Clifton Resident, I am firmly against this proposal at Bristol Zoo Gardens. We recently moved to the areas from London and the main attraction to the Clifton area was its history, period architecture and the green urban area (not easily seen in any major UK city these days). This proposal is completely incongruous with the rest of the area and would significantly detract from the desirability of living in Clifton. I am concerned with further lead to drop in house prices in the local area. I struggle to see why building an eyesore in our beautiful city would be in keeping with the ambitions for our city. Additionally, I am concerned about the height of the building 60ft taller than the existing perimeter wall. This again seems wholly unacceptable and unnecessary, and would result in significant loss of open sky and mature trees. The destruction of so many mature trees completely contradicts Bristol's ambition to decarbonise the city, as can be seen through the introduction of the low emission zone. To tax high emission cars and build this monolithic and uninterrupted structure makes no sense whatsoever. Profit should NOT be the driving factor of this development, but should sympathetically maintain the character of the area. Our son attends Butcombe Nursey, which is on Gutherie Road and the proposed development would not only be extremely disruptive to his time there (traffic / noise pollution / atmospheric & dust pollution), but also the proposed developments, in the long term would overshadow the nursery and children's playground. Concerned Clifton Neighbour, David Raspin	04-Jan-23
454.	O	This proposal is totally unsatisfactory. It is proposed that the site, in a historically important part of Clifton, is sold for maximum financial gain, to develop a facility outside Bristol. The scale and unattractiveness of the residential properties are totally out of keeping with the area. There will not be any social housing included. Already, the West car park development seems to be going ahead, despite overwhelming objections. If this plan is accepted, it will be a disgrace, revealing a lack of appreciation of aesthetic importance in such a sensitive area. Residents of Clifton, greater Bristol, and the wider region, will live with any development for centuries. Planners should support something that everyone, including the zoological society, can be proud of. The current proposal is not in that category. Any largely residential application should be turned down.	05-Jan-23
455.	O	1. Please do not allow random and unsuitable housing or other use on this beautiful site. Our city is rightly proud of this historic neighbourhood. I feel the proposals are not in keeping with the surroundings. 2. We should use existing empty premises for converting into accommodation, not open, green sites. 3. I am not persuaded that the site is not viable. Living along the road, I see the queues of people waiting to get in, experience the build up of traffic on beautiful days, when families are taking their children to the zoo. Many of those families will have limited access to green space. The zoo gives them the opportunity to run around, to learn about our precious wildlife and the importance of protecting our environment. Please don't let an ever increasing desire to make money take this away from those families.	05-Jan-23

456.	O	I object both to the zoo being closed and to the highly inappropriate planning submission currently being proposed. The zoo site has a massive historical value, which will be mostly destroyed if the present proposal were to be approved. The public have had the right to access these area of historical importance for generations. After so long, there is surely a legal right for all individuals to retain that access. The proposed plans are totally out of keeping with the beautiful Clifton historic architecture, most especially Clifton College and surrounding Victorian townhouses. Also, the proposed buildings are far too high and of a poor architectural design. The Zoo itself seems to still be a viable business and there seems to be no reason why it should not remain so. Let's not put individual financial gain ahead of the chance to save such an important and historical site for the benefit of all.	05-Jan-23
457.	O	1. Harm will be caused to overall historic interest. The Zoo has been on the site for so many years yet all this will be overridden. 2. Loss of communal value to a site that Bristolians and others have visited for generations. 3. Harm will be caused to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site, but all buildings will be turned into apartments. These buildings will be changed and become unavailable to the public. 4. Unjustifiable harm will be caused, the 'oasis' that the Zoo gardens provide being lost forever. 5. Change of use not proven. Bristol Zoo has not proved that it cannot continue as a public site. Its business case is unclear. Alternative uses remain unexplored. 6. Loss of public amenity. In similar cases green spaces have become private. 7. The proposed buildings are completely out of scale with the surrounding buildings, and are not in harmony with the Clifton College buildings or nearby houses. A huge monolithic block will rear its ugly head facing the Downs. 8. Loss of landscape. Almost 50% of existing trees will be lost; many more will be damaged. The public green spaces will be small. 9. The area may well lose its treasured conservation area status as a result of such a huge housing estate being built. This would be a tragedy for all Bristolians.	05-Jan-23
458.	O	I am really shocked that such a wonderful communal resource might be going. Being in the inner city, it is easily accessible to many people and has always been such a wonderful place for families and children. Bristol Zoo is Iconic..it is a site of great significance and is of Historic interest. The proposals involve a loss of landscape..reducing the public green space and losing trees. It has listing as a local Historic Park and Garden and is an Important Open Space. I cannot believe that the Council would allow a proposal which reduced any of these wonderful Zoological Gardens and allow building on any of the site. Please refuse this application for the many families who now have been enjoying this very special place, and to ensure that it remains for future generations. Thank You.	05-Jan-23

459.	O	Comments on behalf of Mall Gardens Residents Association: - Loss of Heritage - loss of a major public amenity for Bristolians which has enriched the lives of generations for over 150 years. The retention of the area as a public amenity in perpetuity is at risk. - Scale - large blocks of flats some as high as six stories are entirely out of keeping with the character of the area, which is a key conservation area. They are over intrusive and of poor architectural merit. - Aesthetics - high density accommodation which threaten the heritage asset of the gardens. More time is needed for the development of ideas and broader thinking on the future of the site (eg Eden Centre, RHS)	06-Jan-23
460.	O	The scale of the large blocks of flats are out of keeping with the character of the Clifton conservation area and the surrounding listed buildings. They are over intrusive and lack architectural merit appropriate for such a key and iconic site This is a historic and heritage site The development will result in the loss of a major public asset and amenity, potentially in perpetuity. The gardens are an integral part of the open spaces and inherent character of the Clifton area. The high density accommodation threatens the aesthetics and heritage asset of the site and gardens in particular. More time is needed for development of ideas, wider consultation and broader thinking on how the unique aspects of the site could be protected in the immediate and long term.	06-Jan-23
461.	O	Comments on behalf of Mall Gardens Residents Association: - Loss of Heritage - loss of a major public amenity for Bristolians which has enriched the lives of generations for over 150 years. The retention of the area as a public amenity in perpetuity is at risk. - Scale - large blocks of flats some as high as six stories are entirely out of keeping with the character of the area, which is a key conservation area. They are over intrusive and of poor architectural merit. - Aesthetics - high density accommodation which threaten the heritage asset of the gardens. More time is needed for the development of ideas and broader thinking on the future of the site (eg Eden Centre, RHS)	06-Jan-23
462.	O	The scale of the large blocks of flats are out of keeping with the character of the Clifton conservation area and the surrounding listed buildings. They are over intrusive and lack architectural merit appropriate for such a key and iconic site This is a historic and heritage site The development will result in the loss of a major public asset and amenity, potentially in perpetuity. The gardens are an integral part of the open spaces and inherent character of the Clifton area. The high density accommodation threatens the aesthetics and heritage asset of the site and gardens in particular. More time is needed for development of ideas, wider consultation and broader thinking on how the unique aspects of the site could be protected in the immediate and long term.	06-Jan-23

463.	O	While I am in favour of building more housing in Clifton, and I think the former zoo is a great site for it, I cannot support the plans for this development as they are. Although there does appear to be a lot of central green space, the 6-storey high walls surrounding the development are clearly designed to make the development feel exclusive and unwelcoming to outsiders or non-owners of the apartments, and are not at all in keeping with the rest of the area. The aerial view clearly shows that most of the apartment blocks dwarf the existing buildings of Clifton college, which are a gem of Clifton. The north view from Clifton down, which currently has a pleasing aspect of greenery will now be met with an imposing solid wall 25m high and 300m long, reminiscent of a London prison. The colours of the walls, although pleasant in the proposed drawings, will not be nice for long, and will stand out for all the wrong reasons in the future when they are dirty. In a development of this size, keeping the outer facade of the buildings clean and tidy will not be a priority. The buildings are just designed as square blocks with a few embellishments, to make them slightly more interesting, but all of the buildings in the surrounding areas have pitched roofs and stone facades. I also hope that the proposed 6-storeys will not be allowed, since there are no buildings in the local area which are higher than 4-storeys, except for Clifton college, which should be able to stand out from the development right next to it.	07-Jan-23
464.	O	The NPPF Guidance states, para 189 "These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance for the enjoyment of future generations." Blocks of luxury flats do not fit this bill. The Trustees took this hasty and incomprehensible decision at a time of national stress, the lockdown. One of the justifications for selling the zoo is apparently financial, yet for the last nine of the ten years prior to the Covid closure, there were never less than half a million visitors. It can thus be considered as being financially viable, even if current management requires changes. On heritage grounds alone therefore the zoo should be preserved. 150 years as one of Bristol's premier public assets should not be casually disregarded as is currently to be assumed if this proposal is accepted. On aesthetic grounds, the brutal scale and style of the proposed luxury flat buildings would be quite out of place in the context of the listed buildings which characterise Clifton. This proposal should be rejected to give Bristolians time to grasp the nature of this move and to understand the nature and scale of the loss that their children will suffer.	07-Jan-23
465.	O	I strongly object to this monstrosity of a development. It is not in keeping with the historical fabric of the area. For this to be even showcased to the public shows how out of touch the Council planning are. This development should be shelved. Also to add the removal of mature trees is an outrage. I thought we had a Councillor/Lord Mayor who was supposedly 'Green'. I trust she is objecting to this as well.	08-Jan-23

466.	O	I strongly object to this monstrosity of a development. It is not in keeping with the historical fabric of the area. For this to be even showcased to the public shows how out of touch the Council planning are. This development should be shelved. Also to add the removal of mature trees is an outrage. I thought we had a Councillor/Lord Mayor who was supposedly 'Green'. I trust she is objecting to this as well.	08-Jan-23
467.	O	We are writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development of Bristol Zoo's main site. As long standing residents of Clifton, we are deeply concerned that the historic character of the conservation area will be permanently blighted by this development. For all of the green washing that the Zoo and its partners may put in place, the development is essentially a housing estate. It will be totally out of keeping with its surroundings, overshadowing the streets around it and acting as a magnet for congestion. No amount of tweaking can ameliorate the grotesque nature of this development. We have serious doubts as to how accessible the zoo gardens will be in the future if they are turned over to residential use. We are aware that there are competing proposals for the use of the site which may be of far more use to the local community than providing overpriced apartments in a gated community for the privileged. Bristol City Council should think about the needs of the local community which they serve as opposed to letting the zoo dictate what should happen because of its alleged financial difficulties.	09-Jan-23

468.	O	<p>Comments: I would like to raise three further objections to those already raised:</p> <p>Economic Benefits The comment from the Council's Economic Development team - to the effect that "the Economic Benefits Assessment document represents a reasonable estimate of the potential economic benefits of the proposal" - cannot be taken seriously. The document is not balanced and does not follow - as the report claims - HM Treasury Green Book Guidance for reasons I have set out in my previous objection.</p> <p>Carbon Factors The Council's Sustainable City team have commented: "As SAP 2012 carbon factors were in use for Part L 2013 at the time of the initial submission, the use of these carbon factors has been continued for the revised statement (rather than Part L 2021). For the purpose of BCS14 calculations we consider this to be acceptable" The same applicant was recently awarded consent on the West car Park site. That application (21/01999/F) was submitted long before this application (22/02737/F). In a September 2022 revision to the Energy and Sustainability Statement accompanying the application 21/01999/F, the applicant's consultants, Hydrock, updated the carbon factors used in the calculation of the residual CO2 savings from the proposal from Pat L 2013 to Part L 2021. the comment from the Sustainable Cities team seems to indicate that the Council would find it acceptable under the newer application to make use of the older carbon factors. The Council's position should be considered in the light of the rather obvious point that it cannot be for the applicant to pick and choose the carbon factors which suit its purpose of seeking to demonstrate compliance with extant policy, still less, for the Council to consent to the wishes of the applicant when it is clear that the basis for the calculation has changed. To put this another way, the Council is sanctioning an approach to the calculation of carbon savings from renewable electricity generation which have not been reflected in the carbon intensity of generation for more than ten years. It is obviously out of date. It is incredibly disappointing to see a Council that has declared a climate emergency seeking to ease the path of an application based on endorsing the use of carbon factors that are completely divorced from prevailing reality. This view is unacceptable and must be changed.</p> <p>Affordable Housing As regards affordable housing, the Applicant's Planning Statement (from Savills, October 2022) states: "Application Policy BCS17 state that affordable housing will be required in residential developments of 15 or more dwellings. A minimum of 40% provision is sought in Inner West Bristol, subject to viability, although the Affordable Housing Practice Note (April 2018) allows a 20% provision subject to meeting the required criteria. The tenure, size and type of affordable units will reflect identified needs, site suitability and economic viability". Currently, the Council is likely to exceed targets it set for building new homes, but will fail to meet its target for affordable homes. The approach in the Affordable Housing Practice Note (AHPN) seemed inconsistent with a sincere attempt to deliver the required number of affordable homes. The AHPN does not form part of the statutory development plan. New policies cannot be set out in the Affordable Homes Practice Note, so the Core Strategy policies would remain the locally relevant ones. BCS17 in the Core Strategy states: Affordable housing will be required in residential developments of 15 dwellings or more. The following percentage targets will be sought through negotiation: - 40% in North West, Inner West and Inner East Bristol; - 30% in all other locations It would be extremely difficult, in the circumstances, to argue that 20% affordable homes is the outcome that would have resulted under the extant policy BCS17. If that is not the case, then it would be reasonable to argue that the AHPN had</p>	09-Jan-23
------	---	--	-----------

	<p>materially influenced the policy in ways that it cannot do. There is a general understanding (it is a matter of public record) that the applicant seeks to sell the land to generate revenue in support of its objectives. It is not the role of the Council's planning function, or the development control committee, to facilitate the achievement of a higher value for land than might otherwise be the case. In the context, therefore, and recognizing that there is likely to be sufficient residual value in the land value to justify a higher proportion of affordable homes, then if consent were given to the proposal, it would be difficult to argue that the AHPN had not given rise to a material change in the application of the extant policy on affordable homes, BCS17. The 20% affordable homes offered by the applicant a) is inadequate, and b) has been arrived at in a manner that is inconsistent with the application of BCS17.</p>	
--	---	--

469.	O	<p>The Planning Statement from Savills makes much of the context in which the application is made, in particular, the situation that Bristol, Clifton & West of England Zoological Society (BCWEZS) finds itself in. It also makes much of the economic impacts, as well as the supposedly sustainable nature of the proposal. Background The economic plight of the Zoological Gardens site is significantly of BCWEZS's own making. The publicly available Annual Report and Financial Statements for BCWEZS, made up for the year ending December 2019, reported on the 2020-2025 Strategic Plan. Included in the Plan were: - "Capital investment at both Bristol Zoo gardens and Wild Place Project"; and - "...a clear long-term vision and masterplans for both Bristol Zoo Gardens and Wild Place Project. Bristol Zoo Gardens transformed by the time of its bicentenary in 2036. Wild Place will continue to grow into an even greater wildlife adventure, while Bristol Zoo gardens will place a greater value on visitors' interactions with and understanding of individual animals. The Report and Financial Statements in the same document then reported that the closure of both sites as a result of the coronavirus pandemic was impacting on this strategy. It noted: Following the Coronavirus pandemic and the financial implications arising from the closure of both sites from 21 March to 19 June 2020 for Wild Place Project and 14 July for Bristol Zoo gardens, the Trustees will be reconsidering this strategy and the Society's ability to raise the capital needed to implement the planned major capital development projects. It will take time for the longer term implications for the Society to be more fully understood and the impact on its future longer term strategy. This will be the main objective for 2020 alongside the continued focus on ensuring both sites operate safely for our employees, visitors and animals and the implementation of cost saving initiatives. Note the wording here - reconsideration of the strategy was supposedly to follow, and not precede, the pandemic. The reported financial performance for the year was not at all suggestive of impending financial meltdown, though alarm bells were being sounded, as would have been prudent in the circumstances. The Report contains a Report of the Trustees, which was approved by the Board of Trustees, and signed off by its Chair on 24 September 2020. The accounts were signed off by the accountants on the 6th of October by the auditor acting on behalf of BCWEZS. Nonetheless, around two months after the Trustees Report report was signed off, at the end of November 2020, the Zoo reported that it was closing the Clifton site altogether, relocating to the Wild Place Project site in South Gloucestershire. Bristol Post reported: The new Bristol Zoo will offer spacious, modern facilities, significant growth in conservation and education work and a ground-breaking, innovative visitor experience, said a Bristol Zoological Society spokesperson. [...] The plans have been announced after the second lockdown forced Bristol Zoo Gardens and Wild Place Project to close, after months of closure during the peak spring and summer months. Although BCWEZS has been keen to draw links between the closure of the Clifton site and the pandemic, there is more than a suggestion that this has provided a somewhat convenient way for BCWEZS to give a decision that had been considered for some time a softer landing. This is because the visitor numbers at the Zoo site in recent years appear to have been negatively affected by the growth in visitor numbers at Wild Place Project, which BCWEZS also owns. Although what was written in the Annual Report and Financial Statements for the year ending end of 2019 gave no clear hint of this, as the Planning Statement for the West Car Park notes: A formal submission for pre-application request was made to Bristol City Council in March 2020. The proposed development submitted for pre-application</p>	09-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

	<p>comment related to a scheme for 78 dwellings (no affordable housing provision and a proposed density of 153 dph) and the buildings proposed ranged from 2-4.5 storey plus semi basement parking. It is clear, therefore, that well before the Report and Financial Statements for year ending 2019 were signed off, and in advance of the first lock-down linked to the Covid-19 pandemic, BCWEZS was exploring the option of developing the West Car Park. It is not entirely clear, therefore, that plans were not already afoot to sell the Clifton site well before the effects of the pandemic became known. Chris Booy, Vice Chair of Trustees, in his written statement regarding the Zoo's application on the West Car Park, noted: In late 2020, Trustees of Bristol Zoological Society voted unanimously to relocate Bristol Zoo to the Wild Place Project site. [...] This decision followed an extensive process to explore a number of options, as well as taking independent professional advice. It seems clear that preparatory work to inform the decision had been underway for some time. It is a little surprising that the Trustees Report remained silent regarding the preparatory work ongoing, including the pre-application submission to Bristol City Council. The Charity Commission's Guidance on preparing a trustees' annual report indicates: If your charity's income is more than £500,000 you also need to: - explain your strategy for meeting its charitable purposes - list any significant activities you undertook as part of this strategy - give details of what your charity achieved in carrying out these activities to meet its purposes The omission, in the Report, of any mention of the pre-application submission, or other work underway at the time, is an omission in the Trustees' explanation of their Strategy. In a video purporting to explain its decision, the CEO, Justin Morris, reports that there has been a 'significant decline over many years' in visitor numbers. The evolution in visitor numbers at the Clifton site has, between 2008 and 2019 (we have excepted the 2020 year for fairly obvious reasons) exhibited a downward trend overall. This is true for both total visitor numbers and paying visitors. The former exhibits a compound rate of decline of less than 1% per annum, the latter, a slightly higher compound rate of 1.4% (see Figure 1). Figure 1: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2019, Zoo Gardens Site Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements Neither of these rates seems 'precipitous', though equally, that they were happening would have been risen to consider additional forms of income generation and / or a change in the nature of the visitor experience, as mentioned in the Report and Financial Statements. The picture is rather different, though, if one looks only at the period before the Wild Place Project was up and running. In the period from 2008-2013 (2014 was the first full year where WPP was in operation), there is no obvious downward trend in visitor numbers at all (see Figure 2). There is no clear increase either (there is, possibly, for the paying visitors). Figure 2: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2013, Zoo Gardens Site Source: all data are from previous versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements The main period of decline in visitor numbers at the Clifton site coincides with the opening of WPP, and the increasing number of visitors choosing to visit there over time. This must have been foreseeable: a competing (even if run by the same entity) attraction of a similar nature to an existing one would be expected to draw some visitors away from the existing attraction. Indeed, as WPP visitors have steadily increased, it might be considered somewhat surprising that visitor numbers at the Clifton site held up as well as they did (see Figure 3). Figure 3: Evolution of Visitor Numbers over Time, 2008-2019, Zoo Gardens Site and WPP Source: all data are from previous</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>versions of the BCWEZS Annual Report and Financial Statements If BCWEZS wanted to maintain visitors at the Clifton site, establishing a competing attraction was a strange way of seeking to achieve that. Since 2013, total visitor numbers at the Zoo site have held up rather better than the number of paying visitors at the Clifton site: whilst the former have declined by 1.3%p.a. in the period up to, and including, 2019, the latter have fallen by 2.6% p.a. over the same period. In Chris Booy's statement referenced above, he noted that the decision was linked to operating losses in recent years, coinciding with the opening of WPP: The decision to relocate after 185 years of memories was not taken lightly, but after making an operating loss in four of the last six years, we had to move forward to safeguard the future of the Society. It might be considered, therefore, that decisions of the Zoological Society's own making have been at least partially responsible for its worsening financial performance. There was also a statement made to the effect that the relocation to WPP would enable 'millions more people to enjoy the magic'. The 2035 vision for the zoo sets out a target regarding visitors. By 2035, the aim is to: 'Engage and connect with more than 800,000 visitors and members per annum.' In 2019, across the Clifton site and WPP, there were 830,000 visitors (see Figure 3), or more than the target for WPP to achieve by 2035. The implication is that by 2035, the main effect of a strategy that achieves the 800,000 targets will have been a net transfer of the half a million or so visitors at the Clifton site to WPP. The potential environmental consequences of each scenario are explored below. The suggestion that the new zoo site will have, in the words of the Chair of the Trustees, Charlotte Moar, 'conservation and sustainability at its heart' is questionable. Indeed, BCWEZS's strategy looks like the antithesis of what an entity concerned with wildlife would do, recognizing that - as BCWEZS well knows - one of the major threats (if not the major threat) to species extinction comes from climate change (see below). Although this preamble may seem of limited relevance, it does need to be recognized that Development Management Policy DM31 (see further below) requires that: Where a proposal would affect the significance of a heritage asset, including a locally listed heritage asset, or its wider historic setting, the applicant will be expected to: i. Demonstrate that all reasonable efforts have been made to sustain the existing use, find new uses, or mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the asset; Given that BCWEZS's decision have been responsible for the drop off in visitor numbers at the Clifton site, then it might have been expected to take 'all reasonable efforts' to sustain the existing use (including, presumably, by closing WPP, or by rationalizing the use of each site according to suitability for key species). The application has not demonstrated that this has been done.</p> <p>Economic Benefits If applicants make claims for their proposal that are obviously unfounded, it is important that these are highlighted. The report by Savills - 'Economic Benefits Assessment' - is blatantly lopsided as an exercise in economic assessment, whilst also being riddled with errors and judgements of a questionable nature. Officers and Councillors are at risk of being seriously misled by this report. The report claims that: The assessment of economic benefits follows guidance from the Homes and Communities Agency Additionality Guide (HCA, 2014) and HM Treasury's Green Book (2020). This report does not, though, follow the HM Treasury's Green Book: if it can be said to have done so, it does so selectively and in a uniquely biased manner. The Treasury's Green Book would have required external costs and benefits to have been included in any assessment. These are genuinely public costs and benefits</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>and might have a central role in determining whether the harm to heritage assets is justified. Because no attempt has been made to identify any external costs (because the assessment fails to respect the guidance it claims to have followed), it could not reliably be determined whether the harm to heritage assets was justified. Without a proper appraisal of these matters, attaching monetary values as per the HM Treasury Green Book Guidance (including Supplementary Guidance), the Council cannot possibly determine whether the harm to heritage assets is justified. Nonetheless, we should explore the claims made further. The assessment suggests the reference case for the assessment is as follows: The reference case for this assessment is the site in a vacant state once the Bristol Zoo moves to its new home. We can compare this with the words in the Addendum to the Transport Statement from Peter Evans Partnership related to the same application: Bristol Zoo Gardens closed to members of the public in September 2022, after the submission of the planning application. However the zoo use remains the permitted use for the site. Therefore consideration of this use and the associated traffic generation in the baseline position as set out in the Transport Statement for the scheme remains appropriate. The Planning Statement sets out a range of benefits which are attributed to the application. 5.75. What is abundantly clear is that, while the nature of the movements may be different as the site moves from being a tourist attraction to a residential/community use, overall there will be a significant reduction in movements associated with the proposals (DM23 states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions). 5.76. It is also relevant to note that it is understood that in excess of 85.5% of visitors to the zoo currently travel by private motor car, while the application proposals not only seek to reduce total movements, but also to encourage alternative modes of transport. [...] 5.82. Residents will not be eligible for residents parking permits and so, in comparison with the existing tourist use where there would be significant use of the pay and display on-street parking, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in parking demand on surrounding streets. It is clear from the above that all the transport impacts are assessed against a baseline of the Zoo operating as an open visitor attraction, whilst the economic assessment assumes a baseline where the site is vacant. If the site was to be treated as an operating visitor attraction for the purposes of assessing transport impacts, why would the economic assessment take a completely different baseline as the basis for the assessment? It doesn't really matter which one believes is more relevant - given the site is, de facto, not open for business, then it seems difficult to sustain the fiction that it is still occupied. Either the claimed transport benefits are not as they are, or the claimed economic benefits are not as they are. The applicant is guilty of choosing multiple different baselines to suit whatever case it is seeking to make in a given document. A clear view is required on how assessment should proceed. Is it the Transport Statement or the Economic Assessment which is wrong? The approach to appraising the impact of the proposal is clearly not consistent across the application. Claimed Additional Homes The social and economic benefits of the site include a suggestion that the 196 additional homes are to be included as a social and economic benefit. There are relevant questions to be considered as to whether these homes are genuinely 'additional'. The Planning Statement is clear enough on the need for new dwellings due to a 'shortfall': BCC published its Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment 2020 to 2025 in June 2021, which confirms that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>sites. It confirms that the council only has a 3.7 years supply of housing land. The statement also confirmed that BCC is failing to deliver sufficient homes against the Housing Delivery Test, at 72% of the delivery requirement. The administrative area of Bristol is, therefore, in need of significant new residential dwellings to address the shortfall. The claim that the homes which are proposed will be additional raises questions regarding the counterfactual. If there is a shortfall against existing policy requirements, then it becomes more difficult to argue the 'additionality' case. Can it be argued that these houses are additional to what would otherwise be supplied when a) there is a shortfall against targets, and b) where growth in construction activity is limited by a shortage in availability of labour? If the homes were not developed here, the shortfall might, after all, equally be met elsewhere, though ultimately, the pace of delivery of dwellings may be constrained by the availability of suitably skilled labour. Employment Claims In respect of employment, the Assessment claims: The proposed development would generate more jobs, economic activity and revenues to the local government than the reference case which is the vacant site once the Bristol Zoo moves to its new home. The economic benefits include 125 on and off-site construction jobs during the 3-year construction period for residents of Bristol; 54 on-site jobs during operation (including people working from their home). Proposals such as this will not generate new 'jobs' in construction. The employment market across the UK is currently tight, and it is especially tight in construction. The Construction Skills Network suggests that there will be an additional quarter of a million workers required between now and 2026 (it is not entirely clear where they are expected to come from). The likely impact of this proposal is to contribute to overall construction activity, the pace of delivery of which may be constrained by the availability of sufficient workers with the relevant skills. The net effect of the proposal is likely to be, at the margin, to slow down the pace of delivery of everything else. The figures for the on-site jobs are even less defensible than those for the construction sector. The Assessment states: Once operational, the proposed development could generate up to 54 on-site full time equivalent (FTE) jobs upon completion based on the employment densities for each use class within the proposed development, including 41 homeworkers.⁵ The estimate for the numbers of homeworkers who will reside on-site is based on the ONS estimates of homeworkers as a percentage of working age residents in the South West⁶ and applying that on the household level. What this is identifying is - based on ONS estimates - how many of the residents at the site might be home workers. In order for it to be correct to claim the site might 'generate' these homeworking jobs, it would also have to generate the people. These are people who do not spontaneously emerge once the site is built: they do already exist. Nor does the development spontaneously create (anywhere) opportunities for homeworkers at the site. To attribute these jobs to the site is not credible. There may be some employment attributable to the development in terms of staff at the café, office and community hub, but one also needs to consider the relevant counterfactual. There might be some additional spend (relative to what would have occurred anyway) but much (not all) of it is likely to be 'displacement' of spend that would have occurred elsewhere. All this assumes that the appropriate counterfactual is a vacant site - if one took the view adopted in the Transport Assessment - that the baseline is a still functioning Zoo, then even on the methodologically flawed grounds that the employment claims are made, the change at the site would look very different. In summary, the claimed</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>employment generation is unsound. New Expenditure Similar comments can be made regarding 'new expenditure' by residents. The assessment makes the following assumptions: To estimate the additional expenditure from new residents, we take the average household expenditure for convenience goods, comparison goods and food and beverages as detailed in Table 2.6. We multiply the expenditure by the respective retention rates to estimate how much of this expenditure is retained in Bristol City's retail and restaurant units. We then multiply the result by the 196 additional households in the proposed development. This calculation gives an estimate of the weekly residential expenditure which is then multiplied by 52 to estimate the yearly expenditure. We estimate that the expenditure that would be retained in the local authority area to be approximately £1.5m per annum. The residents will not be 'new people' (other than any new-born children). They already exist somewhere, and they spend money. Correctly considered, the expenditure is likely to imply displacement of expenditure that would have occurred elsewhere (unless the occupants already live nearby, in which case, their expenditure patterns may be similar). It would be difficult to justify, however, attributing any additionality to this spend. Some incremental uplift might be attributable to the café simply because of its proximity to residents. This assumes, of course, that the appropriate counterfactual is a vacant site - if one took the view adopted in the Transport Assessment - that the baseline is a still functioning Zoo, then even on the methodologically flawed grounds that the 'spend' claims are made, the change at the site would look very different. The Assessment goes even further than this: 2.5.3. This additional expenditure is expected to support additional jobs in retail and food and beverage. Using average turnover per employee in these sectors we estimate that this will support 13 jobs for residents of Bristol, which are accounted for in the multiplier effect outlined in Table 2.5 above.</p> <p>2.5.4. Additionally, expenditure from new residents living at the Proposed Development would support employment in local shops and businesses in Bristol City. Again, it is very difficult to justify a view that the jobs supported would be 'additional'. The point at para 2.5.4. seems to be double counting the effect described in 2.5.3., which itself is not genuinely additional. GVA The Gross Value Added (GVA) calculations are effectively run off the employment assumptions discussed above: Gross Value Added (GVA) is an indicator of wealth creation by measuring economic activity associated with the operations in the development proposal. This section outlines the estimated GVA benefits which would be generated compared to the reference case. We have based our estimates based on GVA generated per worker in the South West region⁷ and the number of operational jobs created by each use type presented in Table 2.3. The proposed development scheme is estimated to generate £1.6m per annum. Given the questionable basis for the employment figures claimed in the report, then it follows that the claimed GVA figures are also unsound. There are other reasons, though, why the GVA figures are unlikely to be attributable to this site. This may seem counter-intuitive, but it comes back to the question of the relevant counterfactual: if this scheme were not given the go-ahead, would the same level of GVA be generated from construction across the year? If the labour market were not so constrained, then it might be possible to claim the GVA as 'additional', especially in conditions where the consenting process for housing was such that rates of build were in excess of what was required by Government (there was clear scope to argue that the development was 'additional', in the sense of being above levels required by Government policy). Neither is true in</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>this case. Construction-related GVA will not be affected by what in the UK context is a relatively small scheme. Tax Revenues as Economic Benefits The Savills Assessment goes on to describe how the proposals could lead to the generation of additional public sector revenue. It is rather odd to see taxes and other transfers included as 'economic benefits'. Council Tax revenue is not 'an economic benefit': it arises as a transfer of income from private households to the Council. The same is true of Business Rates, except that the entity paying is a business, transferring funds to (at least for the majority of them) Bristol City Council. The payment of CIL is also a transfer. The New Homes Bonus is a transfer of funds from central government to local government. Where do Savills imagine the New Homes Bonus payments come from? Does the revenue materialize from thin air? HM Treasury's Green Book notes: 6.7 Transfers of resources between people (e.g. gifts, taxes, grants, subsidies or social security payments) should be excluded from the overall estimate of Net Present Social Value (NPSV). Transfers pass purchasing power from one person to another and do not involve the consumption of resources. Transfers benefit the recipient and are a cost to the donor and therefore do not make society as a whole better or worse off. Only under quite specific circumstances should taxes be included as a benefit. The Assessment makes no such case. It presents all forms of what are, for the most part, forms of charge or tax as 'economic benefits'. Understanding the economic consequences of these transfers would require additional analysis of, for example, the deadweight loss implied by the imposition of the relevant taxes / charges. In reality, the extraordinarily marginal nature of these in the macroeconomic context is such that they would not tend to have any meaningful impact on the framework of taxation and spending that government would implement as a means to achieve its overarching fiscal objectives.</p> <p>Summary There is little in the Assessment of Economic Benefits that stands up to close scrutiny. The Assessment is lopsided in the extreme. It fails to follow Green Book principles in that none of the externalities associated with building out the proposal are considered. There may also be affects on asset values for neighbours that the assessment overlooks. These would not be public disbenefits, but private ones. Nonetheless, they are a reflection of the affect of the site on the amenity of the existing property owners. Transport First of all, it seems clear that - as per the above - the baseline for the Transport Assessment is no longer the relevant one. It is not clear what the BCWEZS would do in the absence of the application being granted consent but given that there appears to be no 'Plan B', then it would be strange to assume that the baseline for the assessment is a state of affairs which no longer prevails. The attempt, in the Addendum to the Transport Statement, to reassert that the appropriate baseline for the assessment is 'the zoo use' because this 'remains the permitted use for the site' belongs in the realms of magic realism. If BCWEZS has based its strategy on a presumption that one or other, or both, planning consents would be granted (irrespective of the nature of the application made), then to the reasons for presuming such an outcome deserve scrutiny, especially if they effectively imply a fettering of the discretion of officers and Councillors to arrive at a rational decision, achieved in a lawful manner. Nonetheless, the claims in the original assessment that, for example, the design of the scheme reflects an assessment that 'in this location it would not be necessary to own a car' and that the scheme provides 'infrastructure and promotion measures ... to encourage non private car travel' cannot be taken seriously: there are 118 car parking spaces proposed. As regards collectively owned vehicles, the Transport</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Statement notes: 'A car club space and car is proposed as part of the scheme.' That is suggestive of a scheme that does only the bare minimum. The supposed benefits of this car club space are overblown: Whilst provision of a car club vehicle still enables car travel the availability of this vehicle would reduce the need for residents to own their own private car, which in turn is a sustainable benefit to the scheme. This is also a benefit to the wider Clifton area as would enable local residents to use the shared vehicle instead of owning their own car. The aim for this vehicle to be electric brings environmental benefits. In other words, it's not even guaranteed to have the car as electric. The Planning Statement from Savills notes: 5.75. What is abundantly clear is that, while the nature of the movements may be different as the site moves from being a tourist attraction to a residential/community use, overall there will be a significant reduction in movements associated with the proposals (DM23 states that development should not give rise to unacceptable traffic conditions). 5.76. It is also relevant to note that it is understood that in excess of 85.5% of visitors to the zoo currently travel by private motor car, while the application proposals not only seek to reduce total movements, but also to encourage alternative modes of transport. [...] 5.82. Residents will not be eligible for residents parking permits and so, in comparison with the existing tourist use where there would be significant use of the pay and display on-street parking, it is anticipated that there will be a significant reduction in parking demand on surrounding streets. One could be forgiven for thinking that the two consultants' reports are discussing a completely different scheme, other than in the respect that they both assume - erroneously - that the effect of the proposal on traffic should be considered as if the Zoo was still open. The applicants may pretend all they wish that the Zoo hasn't closed, but it already has, and that decision was of the applicant's own making. The appropriate baseline for this assessment is a non-functioning Zoo, with no visitors, and no visitor traffic, not a state of affairs that has now passed, and for which there are - apparently - no clear plans to return to. But why, if the location is so 'sustainable' (what does it even mean for 'a location' to be 'sustainable?'), were 'in excess of 85.5% of visitors' to the Zoo, when it was still open, travelling by car? Why does the Transport Assessment assume that the behaviour of the would-be residents will be so different in the face of similar travel options? The reality is that the Transport Statement does not really envisage car-free travel, and is not expecting much by way of this in future. Indeed, notwithstanding the 118 car parking spaces, the Transport Assessment is happy to consider the potential for this number being exceeded. It includes a thoroughly unconvincing plan for what it appears to anticipate will be pressure for additional car parking: However BCC confirmed early in the pre-application process that residents of the BZG site would not be able to apply for on-street parking permits. This removes the potential impact of overspill parking from occurring on a daily basis, as pay and display parking locally is time limited. Therefore when residents move into the site they would be aware of whether they have space to park a vehicle or not. The level of car parking proposed is therefore designed on this basis. MfS [Manual for Streets] identifies at section 8 that lower car parking provision can be successful when adequate on-street parking controls are present, which is the case at the BZG site. Ineligibility for on-street parking permits would be made clear though any sales and marketing agent. With allocated car parking proposed this provides residents with a clear understanding as to whether their property is car free or not. The internal streets around the site would be managed by a management company to make</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>sure that no parking takes place outside of the marked parking bays. The presumption is that there would be controls feeding into habits, but as the above extracts indicate, parking restrictions locally are time-limited. Those using cars for travel into work would, therefore, compete for spaces outside the hours of time-restricted parking. Since the Statement mainly considers impacts relative to 'peak time' traffic, it is unclear whether the Statement has properly considered the possibility that would-be residents may simply take a chance on out-of-restricted hours spaces being available. Contrary to what is stated, therefore, it seems likely that there could be intense competition for local parking spaces in the hours outside the restrictions - the exact same hours when visitors to the Zoo would not have been seeking to park their vehicles. All o</p>	
470. O		09-Jan-23

471. O	<p>I find it difficult to believe that this application is considered to be complete given the lack of evidence on, notably, the environment / energy side. I have made these views known to relevant officers, but in the absence of a response to most recent questions, I note the following: The absence of an integration of a commitment to reduce embodied carbon in the design (both in terms of materials and the completely inappropriate scale) is not aligned with National planning Policy Framework, notably para 134 and the associated Guidelines. It is inconsistent with even the existing Net Zero Strategy, and not in line with stated policy in this respect. The Council has the ability through existing policies, notably BCS13, BCS14 and BCS15, to reflect the requirements of the NPPF in respect of design quality in its decisions. Given that the design fails in respect of embodied carbon / energy, then it should be refused. In respect of other matters, the 'Economic Benefits' assessment is completely lopsided. It claims to follow guidance on additionality from the now abolished HCA, making highly subjective decisions regarding the magnitude of these benefits. It also claims to follow guidance on appraisal from the Treasury Green Book. If it does so at all, it does so only in the most impartial and lopsided manner. No professional economist ought to render such a document on the basis that it captures the economic benefits. It is of concern that the comment from 'economic development' simply asks for further elaboration of these benefits without highlighting any of the very obvious deficiencies and shortcomings of the presentation. Whether or not the document concerned should carry any weight at all in a development control decision is moot, in any case, yet since the Committee and officers have tended to reference these in decision making, possibly considering this (rightly or wrongly) as part of the balance they must weigh up, then it seems entirely appropriate to indicate that the benefits assessment is, literally, Cyclopic in its outlook, focusing only on 'positive' benefits without weighing up - as per Treasury Green Book - the wider impacts of the development. These include, but are not limited to, environmental impacts, none of which have been considered in the assessment of benefits. In the expectation of further information and revision, these comments are not as detailed as they will be on receipt of a revised proposal.</p>	09-Jan-23
472. O	<p>It would be difficult to propose a less suitable development for this site for the following reasons: - The massing of the site is extremely poor, high density medium rise buildings are completely unsympathetic to surrounding listed buildings and green space. The gardens will be decimated along with the removal of 162 trees. - Six storeys is far higher than surrounding buildings and will be completely out of place. - The loss of the Zoo which has been a major public amenity for Bristolians for over 150 years. - Bristol needs affordable housing not luxury apartments. There are many brownfield sites strewn across Bristol which are craving redevelopment and which currently lie stagnant. These brownfield sites should use the massing and density that has been proposed for the Zoo site, not the Zoo. - The Zoo was thriving until the pandemic which brought financial havoc across the country. The owners seem to have jumped on this as an opportunity to wind the zoo up despite visitor numbers being higher than ever preceding the pandemic. This development is not what Bristol needs and so it should not be allowed to proceed.</p>	09-Jan-23

473.	O	The Zoo Gardens are an essential part of the city's heritage. It's shocking to see a unique resource such as this being discarded so casually. There will be a massive loss of mature trees. It seems that the financial justifications put forward don't stand up to scrutiny. The promise of permanent public access to part of the site cannot, it appears, be guaranteed. The Council should be intervening to protect this element of Bristol's history.	09-Jan-23
474.	O	I wish to register my objection to the planning application with reference 22/02737/F. The scale of the proposed development is disproportionate to the surroundings and its design is inappropriate to the neighbourhood. They do not enhance or preserve the character of the area.	09-Jan-23
475.	O	This planning application is very unsightly in an area of historical buildings. Furthermore, it will overlook school buildings, including boarding houses and bedrooms which is very inappropriate and unfair on the staff and pupils of the neighbouring school. It is an eyesore of towering flats in a nice, affluent area of Bristol. It will significantly affect the privacy of the school and overlook playgrounds too. Very against it as a resident in Clifton.	09-Jan-23
476.	O	I strongly object to this building planning. It's an historical area and to put new flat is going to look awful and make people not want to live here. The flats will tower over existing houses and a school. Privacy will be gone in both school and houses and the construction alone will be extremely disruptive to the nearby school.	09-Jan-23
477.	O	I have lived in Clifton for years and it is a lovely, private, safe and affluent area of Bristol. To accept and proceed with these plans would significantly damage this area. It would look awful and create all sorts of issues for privacy and driving and parking around the area with all those new flats/people, not to mention the risk to school children crossing the roads around there and the school buildings which would be overlooked by people in flats.	09-Jan-23
478.	O	I object to this development due to its proximity to Clifton College Preparatory School and its boarding house. Parking is already limited and traffic is already a potential hazard for pupils. It is also not in keeping with the aesthetic of the area.	09-Jan-23
479.	O	I appreciate that the area needs to be developed but the plans submitted are oppressive, not in keeping with the area and look like a old 1960s block. Terrible decision !	09-Jan-23
480.	O	Oppressive, out of keeping and generally awful !	09-Jan-23

481.	O	We strongly object to the proposed development on the former zoo site. The proposed development does not conform with Planning policy DM26: Local Character and Distinctiveness, of the adopted Site Allocations and Development Policies Local Plan (2014). The local area and in particular the surrounding school and residential buildings are period buildings and serve to enhance the unique character of this part of Clifton. The proposed new buildings are wholly inappropriate in size and character. They have complete disregard for the character of the surrounding Conservation Area, being of high density and modern design. The development also does not conform with the Council's adopted Urban Living SPD (November 2018). The spirit of this document is cited as being summed up by the following quotation: 'We shall be judged for a year or two by the number of houses we build. We shall be judged in ten years' time by the type of houses we build.' The proposed development achieves a large number of houses without due consideration to the type of houses being provided. The proposed development does not meet the stated aim: "New development should contribute positively to an area's character and identity, creating or reinforcing local distinctiveness". There is no positive contribution to the area's unique character and identity.	10-Jan-23
482.	O	Having seen the plans for the Clifton development I am very disappointed. This development seems to have been planned to maximize as much profit as possible without taking into consideration designing something which matches the beauty of the area. Clifton is an area that should be treasured and protected. I am also very concerned over the reported loss of 150 mature trees which should be preserved and protected in line with the character of the area and the loss of the historic gardens which seem to be being cut considerably. From the plans, this looks like it would be an eyesore and would reduce the loveliness of the area and damage the unique character.	10-Jan-23
483.	O	I lived next to the Zoo for ten years and am disgusted with the proposals. Any Architect who can design such brutalist and ugly buildings should be banned from his profession. The Zoo area is full of elegant Victorian buildings: these proposals are too tall, lack any charm, merely aim at packing in as many people as possible on economic grounds and take no account of people already living there. Remarkably - and stupidly - they are white! This is a rare and unusual chance to show some imagination and talent: these architects and developers clearly lack both. The plan must be rejected.	10-Jan-23

484.	O	<p>Bristol Zoological Gardens are LISTED as a local historic park and garden and are an important open space. There are national collections of some plants on the site as well as wildlife whose existence on this planet is threatened. The proposed building plans would result in the loss of a major and quite unique public amenity for Bristolians and for visitors to the city. The zoo has enhanced the lives of generations for over 150 years. During the last ten years alone it has been open to not less than half a million visitors a year. In these days when we are being encouraged to plant trees and to conserve our gardens and open spaces no fewer than 162 trees will be uprooted from this site to make room for high density, luxury accommodation in blocks which are unsympathetic to the remaining buildings on the site and to what will remain of the glorious gardens which have been appreciated by millions of people over the years. They have brought peace of mind and rest to many. It has been a site where people have asked to have their remains scattered, where weddings have been celebrated and where people have been able to sit and contemplate or wander with pleasure amongst the beauties of nature. The resulting harm of these plans to the public in terms of social and material harm cannot be justified on any basis. Many of the listed buildings will be turned into apartments, their very nature changed and the site will no longer be accessible to the public. The scale of the proposed development which includes six storey flats is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area not merely in terms of scale but also in terms of building materials. The need for change of use has not been proven certainly in financial terms and the trustees of the zoo have misled the public in asserting up to the last minute that the animals would be moved to the Wild Place. It has become apparent that this is not going to be the case. Only the gorillas and the lemurs will go there. I object to this planning application in the strongest possible terms.</p>	10-Jan-23
485.	O	<p>I object to this application because it is so obviously out of keeping with the character of the rest of the neighbourhood. There will be a loss of greenery and an increase in built up areas. The building work will be very disruptive to the whole area. I also doubt that the infrastructure is there to support all the extra residents - roads are already busy in that area.</p>	11-Jan-23
486.	O	<p>The proposed buildings on the periphery of the site are not respectful of the precious site within Clifton. The blocks of flats are bleak and too high. Clearly the developers are, as usual, hell bent on making maximum return without designing imaginative buildings suitable for the site.</p>	12-Jan-23
487.	O	<p>Having had a brief look at these proposals, I feel that the Zoo's development plans go against all the benefits that the area has derived from the Zoo Gardens in the past. The proposals seem ugly and inappropriate.</p>	12-Jan-23

488.	O	The Bristol Zoo has such a legacy within the community and the broader city - it is such a shame to see the conservation area being turned over for commercial use in the form of large apartment complexes that don't fit with the area. The community gardens, being surrounded by apartments, are not a good enough use of that space and will decrease community engagement in the area. I'm concerned by the increase in traffic, noise, and pollution that increasing the population in the area so drastically will bring. The plans for the project go against the feel of the neighborhood and are a drastic change.	12-Jan-23
489.	O	These proposals (a) are wholly unsympathetic, unsuitable and incongruent in scale, mass, form and design for a unique Conservation Area; (b) would overwhelm the proposed community garden and all the surrounding buildings. Note the professionally produced visualisations which have been commissioned by local residents. (c) are contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the statutory obligation to ensure that proposed development preserves or enhances the character of the Conservation Area; (d) will never attract people from across Bristol. (Who would want to come and see gardens in the middle of an upmarket housing estate?); (e) come nowhere near satisfying the requirements of sustainable design; and (f) present insuperable safeguarding and, because of the traffic they will generate, serious Health and Safety problems for the children of the adjoining school; They would do enormous damage done to the Conservation Area. They represent a thoroughly inappropriate legacy for the Zoo to leave after 186 years, particularly bearing in mind alternative options for the use of the site. A luxury housing estate some six stories high may, financially, be the best option for the Zoo but it would represent a disaster for the City of Bristol. It would allow the Zoo to sell the Gardens to a property developer for an estimated £40 million when it could easily adopt one of the alternative options that are available and which would enable the site to be developed in a sustainable manner and one which respects the integrity of the Conservation Area. The Committee is under no obligation to support an organisation which is in any event abandoning the City and has transformed itself from a conservation charity into, frankly, a greedy developer. The Zoo routinely claims made that the site will provide 'desperately needed housing' but this idea is risible. It is housing at the lower end of the scale that is needed in Bristol while the apartments proposed at the Zoo will be sold as luxury flats. The current design includes '20% affordable housing.' This is, most definitely, not social housing - but 80% of market rent and well out of range for key workers. If this scheme is approved there will be substituted for the iconic gardens of which the people of Bristol are rightly proud a series of ghastly, unimaginative tower blocks which will forever represent an ugly blot on the landscape. Future generations will wonder how this can possibly have been allowed. ;	13-Jan-23

490. O	<p>I object most strongly to this application. I do so for the following reasons: 1. Design. The Heritage Statement submitted in support of the application makes the following claim: 'the introduction of bespoke, bold architecture into this historically separate and different site will have negligible impact to [sic] the setting of the listed buildings of Clifton College, nor to its locally-listed buildings along Guthrie, College and Northcote Roads.' Nothing could be further from the truth. The shoe-horning of 5 and 6 storey perimeter blocks of flats of monolithic design lacking in any finesse is wholly out of keeping with the robust rhythm of weighty Victorian villas, constructed predominantly from dressed rubble and Bath stone detailing, that are the feature of the surrounding buildings. The proposals fail to take any account of the height, scale, massing, shape, form or proportion of the existing buildings, skylines and roofscapes. They cannot conceivably be said to satisfy the test of preserving or enhancing the character of the Conservation Area. 2. Daylight and sunlight. The overwhelming design of the tower blocks will impact significantly on the daylight and sunlight of the surrounding buildings. I support the objections of the residents of Northcote Road and Clifton College. 3. Traffic. The scheme involves the creation of 201 residential units. This will result in a significant increase in traffic with consequential effects on pedestrian safety and substantial pressure on on-street parking. The concerns of Clifton College and of the residents in Northcote Road are entirely justified. 4. Embodied carbon. The design means that the embodied carbon and greenhouse gas emissions (that is the energy generated and greenhouse gas emitted, associated with the materials and construction process) will be far above what is recommended. Giving consent to this proposal would be wholly inconsistent with the Council's declaration of a climate emergency. 5. Charitable status. The Zoo trustees are on record as saying that they have a responsibility to achieve maximum PRICE for the land. That is wholly wrong. Their responsibility is to achieve best VALUE in accordance with their charitable purposes which include a responsibility for environmental concerns - a matter which has been pointed out to them on numerous occasions and consistently ignored.</p>	13-Jan-23
491. O	<p>Objection - full Reasons for objection: 1. Harm to the overall historic interest and significance of the site 2. Loss of the Communal Value The plans do not address the need for more local and accessible green spaces (to address the increasing mental and physical health issues). The plans do not preserve all the mature trees and shrubs (valuable assets to address climate change issues). 3. Does not reflect the dilution of UK Government's housing targets. The proposal (for a housing development) does not reflect the relaxation in the UK Government's housing plan - aka 'dilution of the housing targets' (6/12/2022). This UK government decision to be more flexible / realistic with housing targets has been made specifically to protect key sites in areas of historic interest (e.g. Clifton), which the Government has now realised are at risk of inappropriate housing developments. 4. Squandering of a public space The proposal (for a housing development) does not reflect the concerns that 'some public spaces are being squandered' (Michael Gove, MP, (27/12/2022)</p>	13-Jan-23

492.	O	<p>Objection - full Any potential housing development on the former Bristol Zoo Gardens and West Car park site is totally inappropriate usage of this unique green site with it's cultural and historical significance, in a conservation area. In the 1960's Bristol Zoo was apparently very fortunate to be gifted a very large part of the former Hollywood Estate (164 acres), (now developed as Bristol Zoo's 'Wild Place'). Generosity of this kind is highly commendable. The Zoo Trustees should consider echoing this historic generosity, together with the support given to the Zoo by Bristol's citizens over the last 186 years, by gifting the whole site (Zoo Gardens and Zoo West Car Park) to the 'Citizens of Bristol for ever in perpetuity', - effectively as an extension to the Clifton and Durham Downs. Gifting the whole site to the Citizens of Bristol is something that the former Zoo and all Bristol citizens would be proud of for centuries. (The Zoo Trustees would make a significant 'profit' as a result of such a generous gift, as the on-going maintenance of the grounds and existing structures, would immediately cease.)</p>	13-Jan-23
493.	O	<p>Objection A) The Bristol Zoo Gardens and the adjacent (Bristol Zoo) West Car Park individual planning applications (22/02737/F and 21/01999/F) should be withdrawn and only reconsidered as a single site. The combined site has significant historic interest, a large number of mature trees, superb gardens, a large percentage of green space and historic walls. B) Treating the Bristol Zoo Gardens and Bristol Zoo West Car Park as potential housing development site(s) is totally inappropriate use of the historic site(s). This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for Bristol City to actively demonstrate a commitment to the ever increasing need for more green spaces for the mental health, physical health and well-being of citizens. The Downs (the green space, adjacent to the Zoo) has seen an unprecedented increase in usage in recent years. This is an opportunity for the City of Bristol (together with the Downs Committee, Merchant Venturers, Bristol University, etc.) to invest in the long-term future of Bristol citizens, by expanding the Downs green space, thereby making the ex-Zoo sites accessible to all citizens 'for ever hereafter' (i.e. consider protecting the Zoo site along the same basis as the Downs is protected). A precedent has already been set, as the Zoo's North Car Park site, has apparently already been reclaimed by the Downs.</p>	13-Jan-23

494.	O	Objection - full Reasons for objection: 1. Harm to the overall historic interest and significance of the site 2. Loss of the Communal Value The plans do not address the need for more local and accessible green spaces (to address the increasing mental and physical health issues). The plans do not preserve all the mature trees and shrubs (valuable assets to address climate change issues). 3. Does not reflect the dilution of UK Government's housing targets. The proposal (for a housing development) does not reflect the relaxation in the UK Government's housing plan - aka 'dilution of the housing targets' (6/12/2022). This UK government decision to be more flexible / realistic with housing targets has been made specifically to protect key sites in areas of historic interest (e.g. Clifton), which the Government has now realised are at risk of inappropriate housing developments. 4. Squandering of a public space The proposal (for a housing development) does not reflect the concerns that 'some public spaces are being squandered' (Michael Gove, MP, (27/12/2022)	13-Jan-23
495.	O	Objection - full Any potential housing development on the former Bristol Zoo Gardens and West Car park site is totally inappropriate usage of this unique green site with it's cultural and historical significance, in a conservation area. In the 1960's Bristol Zoo was apparently very fortunate to be gifted a very large part of the former Hollywood Estate (164 acres), (now developed as Bristol Zoo's 'Wild Place'). Generosity of this kind is highly commendable. The Zoo Trustees should consider echoing this historic generosity, together with the support given to the Zoo by Bristol's citizens over the last 186 years, by gifting the whole site (Zoo Gardens and Zoo West Car Park) to the 'Citizens of Bristol for ever in perpetuity', - effectively as an extension to the Clifton and Durham Downs. Gifting the whole site to the Citizens of Bristol is something that the former Zoo and all Bristol citizens would be proud of for centuries. (The Zoo Trustees would make a significant 'profit' as a result of such a generous gift, as the on-going maintenance of the grounds and existing structures, would immediately cease.)	13-Jan-23

496.	O	Objection A) The Bristol Zoo Gardens and the adjacent (Bristol Zoo) West Car Park individual planning applications (22/02737/F and 21/01999/F) should be withdrawn and only reconsidered as a single site. The combined site has significant historic interest, a large number of mature trees, superb gardens, a large percentage of green space and historic walls. B) Treating the Bristol Zoo Gardens and Bristol Zoo West Car Park as potential housing development site(s) is totally inappropriate use of the historic site(s). This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for Bristol City to actively demonstrate a commitment to the ever increasing need for more green spaces for the mental health, physical health and well-being of citizens. The Downs (the green space, adjacent to the Zoo) has seen an unprecedented increase in usage in recent years. This is an opportunity for the City of Bristol (together with the Downs Committee, Merchant Venturers, Bristol University, etc.) to invest in the long-term future of Bristol citizens, by expanding the Downs green space, thereby making the ex-Zoo sites accessible to all citizens 'for ever hereafter' (i.e. consider protecting the Zoo site along the same basis as the Downs is protected). A precedent has already been set, as the Zoo's North Car Park site, has apparently already been reclaimed by the Downs.	13-Jan-23
497.	O	To install the proposed buildings in a Conservation Area that includes residential homes and school buildings seems problematic. Not only are the proposed buildings too tall to be in keeping with their surroundings or protect the privacy of the present residents, but the additional traffic created on what is a small road would also create traffic congestion and danger for the hundreds of pedestrians, including school children, who use the area each day.	13-Jan-23
498.	O	It's hard to know where to start. My principal objections concern loss of amenity to the City community and the inappropriate replacement of a heritage site with mundane and over-tall flats. I am especially concerned about the loss of the wonderful gardens and about likely damage to the trees. The contemporary view about the urban environment is to make lives and local amenities just that: local, hence as an example the council's closure of Princess Victoria Street to motor vehicles. This proposal will force Wild Place visitors into their cars thus contributing to environmental degradation.	13-Jan-23
499.	O	I object to the closure of Bristol and it's conversion to housing on a number of grounds: 1) The records of the Zoo show it was profitable for most of the preceding decade, and could well be again post-COVID, many animals are not being relocated way (e.g. seals, lions) 2) The proposed buildings will not be harmonious with the surrounding houses or college buildings, and will make a very over-bearing block along the lengths of the surrounding roads. 3) The loss of public amenity is not tolerable - it would be much better, if the Zoo has to lose, to have the site developed with continued access to gardens, lake, and public facilities (e.g. a performance venue) - such as the proposals made by Clifton College Education Group	13-Jan-23

500.	O	Zoo and Housing Developer (Savills) making extraordinary financial gain - Zoo's closure reasoning does NOT support evidence of recent trends (pre covid) and profit. - Zoo's closure reasoning also CONTRADICTS the value of the site (plants, heritage) - Zoo's LACK of clear and transparent voting procedure - MINIMAL impact on social housing due to area - Modern housing architecture does NOT fit the local area (height, material, colour) - Well being of 2000+ students at Clifton College (plus other surrounding schools) NOT considered. The risk, and pollution, of traffic on pupils is NOT considered. - Roads NOT fit for increased traffic during peak times	15-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

Third consultation phase

16th January 2023 – 17th April 2023

STANCE	COMMENTS	DATE RECEIVED
501. O	I fully object to the proposed plans as they stand for the following reasons: Major concern over the height of the new buildings. They will limit light to the surrounding homes, school and frankly make no sense in a conservation area. Furthermore, the school grounds and buildings will be overlooked. Whilst I appreciate the need for homes - this is a completely inappropriate site. Due to size of the plot 200 homes requires a 'high rise' modern type build, will increase traffic (in an already busy area), reduce air quality, create major safety issues for the neighbourhood and 2 large schools and destroy the feel of the conservation area. Why does it have to be 200 homes - I fail to see the rationale for this number in this particular area. The overall management of the build in an area with constant flow of school traffic and children is a major concern. The area already suffers from unsafe drivers. I can't see a construction management plan. Whilst it would be wonderful to see this historic site continue to benefit Bristol - this current plan appears to benefit the pockets of the developers at the detriment of those who actually reside in Bristol.	16-Jan-23
502. O	I have not seen any part of the revised plan which considers the impact on the neighbourhood, surrounding schools, traffic and conservation area.	16-Jan-23
503. O	So many new documents added but I would suggest deliberately uploaded separately so that people don't have the time to go through each in detail. What is obvious though is that the plan is still to build 4/5 stories overlooking the Pre Prep and Prep schools and that residents of this new development would be able to spend all day looking at children should they wish which is very concerning. There is no comment in the plans and multiple other docs to address the safeguarding concerns of parents of Clifton College Pupils and the Developments proposed height will be an eyesore in amongst the Older period buildings. This looks like a plan out of the 70's where anything goes and are we so desperate for housing that all rules go out the window. To summarise: 1. Why shouldn't children attending Clifton College have the right to feel safe? 2. Why is it ok to build something so out of place with the area? Cannot believe this has even reached this stage but then we are talking about a Labour run Council!	16-Jan-23
504. O	My Son goes to school at Clifton College and I have a interest in the area as my family live in Stoke Bishop and lots of our friends live very close to this proposed development. These plans are terrible and very short sighted and greedy. The dwellings planned will make the local area look hideous and the security and privacy of pupils of Clifton College have been completely overlooked in the pursuit of money.	16-Jan-23

505.	O	I have placed several objections to these plans over the previous months. To my mind mismanagement of the Zoo's aims top my list, followed by inappropriate financial greed, inappropriate architectural dreams, and inappropriate hectoring of those involved with the outcome of traffic planning, amongst others. To those who have taken issue with Clifton College for fighting the planning application I ask; isn't taking care of No. 1 exactly what the Zoo are doing? Bristol Zoo Gardens are approximately 30 years older than the original Clifton College buildings. If Clifton College Chapel, and perhaps other buildings on the campus, is designated as a Grade 2 building by English Heritage could it not be feasible for Bristol Zoo Gardens to become part of English Heritage, Landmark Trust or National Trust to preserve what has been known for generations?	16-Jan-23
506.	O	I object most strongly to these proposals. Could I be thinking, possibly, that greed, misappropriation, misjudgement are involved? The artists' impressions of how the Bristol Zoo Gardens will look when completed are just an idealised utopia. Don't be seduced- in practice, the realities will be very different. Will the Conservation Hub actually include details of the surrounding conservation area outside the Zoo gardens? I think not. In theory there will be two kinds of people who will live in what is proposed- this who are able to afford what is on offer, and those who are unable to do so. There will be resentment between those who can and those who cannot. I have been unable to come to terms with the 40% of 'Affordable Housing' in this setting, therefore, for those who, like me, are not sure what this means, I recommend two pieces of reading. One is the entry posted on the 15th. July named 'Housing Enabling' and the other on the internet by The Bureau of Investigative Journalism on 'Affordable Housing'. There are approximately 20,000 names on the Bristol City Council's and surrounding areas waiting for 'Social Housing'. In the 1980s Margaret Thatcher's Government introduced the 'Right to Buy' for those in long term tenancy agreements, and some 2,000,000 Council owned properties became privately owned at a heavily subsidised Government rate. Less than 5% have been replaced by new builds. So why has Boris Johnson stated publicly that he intends to extend the scheme? Council/Social housing has always been, and will continue to be, a badly needed source of housing, especially as the population increases at an exponential rate. But, please, not in the Zoo's new build, even though inclusion of 'Affordable Housing' is compulsory. Therefore the whole scheme should be stopped in its tracks with immediate effect. No trees should be felled or damaged in whatever happens in the Zoo Gardens. The gardens themselves that will be open to the public will be a magnet for those aimless individuals who sit around drinking alcohol and leave their discarded containers for others to dispose of. The plans include a grand plan to save the Bear Pit and the Raptor Aviary. These are wild creatures that need to roam. I do hope that the Polar Bear Corner will not be saved. To see the Polar Bears in their confined quarters rocking their heads from side to side as a result of their madness was pitiful. They were shot, as I recall. I would like to see local billionaires offering a substantial collective amount to the present Zoological Society so that The Wild Place Project can go ahead but to leave the present Zoo Gardens and Car park without the shameful blocks of flats and new builds. Surely, in this day and age, an agreement along these lines could be mobilised? The present planning application is a disgrace and needs a radical rethink. It is not fit for purpose.	16-Jan-23

507.	O	<p>Should one drive from Cribbs Causeway, past Westbury on Trym and up Falcondale Road onto Westbury Road, there appears before one's eyes beautifully constructed buildings in what is a familiar red stone. At White Tree roundabout the Downs open up to the right whilst on the left are the buildings that used to be St. Christopher's School. That view continues until Spire Hospital at the top of Blackboy Hill. The houses there are just the frontispiece for Henleaze, Redland and Cotham, mostly in the locally quarried red stone. Turning right at the top of Blackboy Hill takes one onto Downs Road, and the commencement of more beautiful red stoned houses down Pembroke Road, (the only exception being called euphemistically 'Paddy's Wigwam'), and then The Avenue with Clifton College Prep School in red stone. And the The Zoo. Approaching Bristol from the Long Ashton Bypass one has the splendid view of the Crescents overlooking the river and harbour. Along the Portway there are no houses as such until one turns right up Bridge Valley road. At the top, on the right, is Canynge Road which leads into Clifton, but on the right there is a building called The Mansion House, and a substantial row of houses that, again leads to Clifton. What a splendid sight those red houses are. And then the Zoo. I have been familiar with what I have described for seventy odd years. I am dismayed to find the plans for the 'refurbishment' of Bristol Zoo gardens are not in keeping with what I have described, but more of mass habitation out of kilter with the conservation area surrounding it. The tall blocks on the perimeter of the zoo, with animals depicted, will be an eyesore, and once winter arrives with lights on in the windows and the heat pumps operating, they will appear more like a cruise ship at sea. So, with that in mind, I suggest that the planners insist on funnels being included in the plans and the whole being called, 'SS Clifton Encore'.</p>	16-Jan-23
508.	O	<p>The updated plans remain wholly inappropriate in an area of conservation. The proximity to the school, the Downs and a Resedential neighbourhood has not been considered in proposing a huge block of flats that are an eyesore. I'm not opposed to development but I can see no sensitivity demonstrated here. Strongly oppose</p>	16-Jan-23

509.	S	<p>It is not surprising a new housing development on a much loved zoo site attracts strong feelings. Notably when it came to finding means to support the zoo to stay open at this site with funding from this same public, that did not materialise. Bristol needs new housing. This is a large area of land being redeveloped with careful consideration to provide this very much unmet need. It is heartening to see a mixture of new housing including the provision of some affordable housing as well. The objections from the nearby private school and parents of pupils from this school strike me as incredibly unjustified and unfair. We should not be giving undue weight to the already very privileged to pull the ladder up from others in society (in this cases through maintaining the status quo of insufficient housing stock in Bristol). Finally, the following is not likely to be a popular opinion, and overall I remain supportive of this application, however I think more rather than less housing should be planned and provided. I do not think it is particularly good land use or equitable for the wider community that large tracts of this development are dedicated to public space. It would be better for this to be used instead to site more housing but I also understand that often people like having areas of green space next to them. It is worth considering that the zoo site is right next to the very large green space of the downs however.</p>	16-Jan-23
510.	S	<p>I remain supportive of this development. The housing proposals are simply beautiful and give the public access to a lovely garden for free. I do not sympathise or empathise with the reflexively negative commenters objecting to this proposal. As far as I can tell these people would only be happy if nothing ever changed, if no new people ever moved into Bristol, and they could maintain a static city. I implore the council to ignore the objections from people who are simply resistant to any change - they will never be pleased by any proposal. If it were up to them their own houses would never have been built in the first place as they would have objected to any building without a thatched roof. Modern buildings with timber frame construction are brilliant, long lived, and have a much lower environmental footprint. They allow for modern energy efficiency standards to be met and they can be built quickly. Bristol is a growing and vibrant city. Trying to block people being able to get new homes here is simply an injustice and is leading to increasing problems of housing insecurity in the aggregate. Consigning people who want new homes to only buying in the suburbs on brownfield sites is not fair and also not going to allow the city to meet climate targets. We need more density to promote alternative transport modes such as cycling, walking (not to mention fee paying customers to support more bus routes) which lessens the climate impact of people who would otherwise be spread further and more inclined to drive. Bristol Council should be embracing this fortunate position it finds itself in as a popular city for people to move by enabling more housing development at density. In time this will significantly support plans for e.g. a Bristol metro by providing the customers that will use it. I also think the arguments re "not enough affordable housing" should be ignored - the site needs to be commercially viable to support the new Zoo site, and also 20% of ~150 homes is a lot of new affordable housing that would not be available if this site is not built. International data from cities in New Zealand and Canada has demonstrated the clear correlation of easing housing development through e.g. permitting reform/planning rules promoting density, and reducing the rate of house price growth. This should not have to be explained but if you increase supply to meet demand, price falls. People understand this with daily</p>	16-Jan-23

	<p>purchases but seem to think housing is a special case. Notably in Harlem, New York City, USA recently a housing development of a large apartment block was opposed through similar arguments of "insufficient affordable housing" - the site is now being continued to use for its current purpose, a truck (lorry) stop. These objections are what I class as bad faith objections. Often such objections are made simply to prevent any new building and are not truly concerned with provision of affordable housing. Finally, I feel this site should not have any barriers to increasing density or implementing the full vision of its design. The architect has designed a truly beautiful site and it would be a shame to allow these NIMBYs who seem to be organising an undemocratic astroturf campaign against the development to win with their regressive arguments. These objectors just want to maintain their property values at the expense of the rest. The losers of such an outcome are the people of Bristol.</p>	
--	---	--

511.	S	<p>The BZG planning committee have made very detailed and considered changes to the original development proposal. It remains a much needed source of new housing in Bristol whilst preserving the heritage of the zoo site. It will add very well designed new housing to a very constrained housing stock in Bristol. I remain shocked at how selfish very affluent local residents and parents/members of an elite private school can be in carpet bagging this planning portal with objections to this extremely reasonable proposal. If this was so important to keep things as is these same people should have actually found a way to financially support the zoo to keep the site. Appeals were made and met with deaf ears at that time hence the BZG site being proposed. As it is, the BZG team are taking a very considered approach to the design which is above and beyond what a standard private developer should do: the site is being made accessible to the public and for free (this was not the case before when the zoo was open); they are providing a mix of housing for more affluent residents whilst also providing a significant percentage of affordable homes; there is real preservation of garden and iconic parts of zoo architecture. With the amended application the BZG has made amendments to reduce some multi-family housing due to the aforementioned objections. I personally do not think these changes were needed, but they did make them thus demonstrating the BZGs real commitment to acknowledging and responding to criticism as reasonably possible. In terms of the overall site, I remain fully supportive - we desperately need more homes in Bristol, and especially need more homes in central areas of Bristol. To really fight climate change at a council level we should be improving density so people can walk/cycle instead of commute to workplaces. Building densely supports business by increasing their market too. Building more homes helps increase the supply of housing and helps gradually deal with the homeless situation. These are not disputed facts. I hope the bad faith objections of NIMBYs in Clifton do not overwhelm reason when it comes to this application. Also it is worth emphasising, people in Bristol who own very expensive homes have a personal financial interest in keeping the housing stock limited at this end of the market - it inflates the value of their homes accordingly. Many of the objections appear to be obfuscating their true intent. Frankly if a detailed, well considered application like this does not meet an acceptable standard, what would? Inaction will lead to an empty undeveloped site, or some parking - that is not a good use of space. (I am not even acknowledging the what can only politely described as 'eccentric' proposal to build a VR zoo in a massive hangar building that has been astrourfed as a supposedly reasonable alternative). Finally, this whole process highlights the unfair nature of the state of planning permission in the UK. Who comments on these applications, and whose voices are unheard? Do comments on this application reflect the sentiment for the wider community? Do random comments from pressure groups reflect democracy or justice? I hope when the council considers these objections or comments in support of the application these questions are also considered carefully. I hope my comment does not appear intemperate but as a millennial medical doctor in the NHS and also researcher at the University I have struggled with the housing market in Bristol, and despite my profession being relatively well paid. I think the council should work for everyone rather than those sections of society who happened to buy housing 20-30 years ago when the average mortgage was 3-5 times an average yearly salary as opposed to the 10-20x it stands now.</p>	16-Jan-23
512.	O		16-Jan-23

513.	O	The designs for the new buildings are such a contrast to the rest of the houses and buildings in the area. They will create a visual block of hard materials in an otherwise nature lead community. The buildings will also cause a loss of trees and public green space. It is listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	16-Jan-23
514.	O	This preposterous monolithic rectangular development is an eyesore and visually so jarring compared to the period architecture of Clifton. It does not preserve the area, and certainly doesn't enhance it, which is the requirement for building on a conservation site. It looks like the architect "copied and pasted" a Swindon office block design and tried to transplant it into a conservation area with no consideration of the surrounding neighbours and environment. Parking is insufficient for the number of flats based on average car ownership, which will strain existing resources. The architect seems to have worked hard to develop a design that will decimate as many of the mature trees as possible - over 46% of those on the site - which is not in keeping with the zoo's legacy nor compatible with the conservation area. After living in Clifton for many years and spending periods serving as a parish councillor, I can honestly say this is the least appropriate planning application I have seen in over two decades.	16-Jan-23
515.	R	This preposterous monolithic rectangular development is an eyesore and visually so jarring compared to the period architecture of Clifton. It does not preserve the area, and certainly doesn't enhance it, which is the requirement for building on a conservation site. It looks like the architect "copied and pasted" a Swindon office block design and tried to transplant it into a conservation area with no consideration of the surrounding neighbours and environment. Parking is insufficient for the number of flats based on average car ownership, which will strain existing resources. The architect seems to have worked hard to develop a design that will decimate as many of the mature trees as possible - over 46% of those on the site - which is not in keeping with the zoo's legacy nor compatible with the conservation area. After living in Clifton for many years and spending periods serving as a parish councillor, I can honestly say this is the least appropriate planning application I have seen in over two decades.	16-Jan-23

516.	O	<p>The short, medium and long term impact of changing Bristol Zoo into a housing development will in total damage the importance of the history associated with Clifton, along with the damage it will do to the current wildlife associated with Bristol. Short term: The huge variety of trees and flowers currently in the zoo will be removed to create a large building site. We should be preserving and protecting the small amount of wildlife which we still have in this city. Why can the Bristol zoo been turned into a national trust site, a beautiful garden and museum for family to spend time in nature. Medium Term: The pollution (noise and chemical) pollution caused by such a significant amount of work will have an extremely negative impact on the surrounding homes, children will be breathing in pollutants caused by all the clogged traffic. This is to provide only a small amount of flats for an elite group of people (this is not the way to solve the housing crisis in Bristol), we have seen other developments like this in Bristol & London which are viewed as investments and do not bring more homes but just bring profit to the businesses. Long term: We loose one of the most important and historical parts of Bristol. So many people in the UK have a memories of visiting the zoo, spending time with family. The zoo is such an important historical landmark we should we celebrating its history and turning it into somewhere future generations can enjoy.</p>	16-Jan-23
517.	S	<p>My comments are the same as those supporting the original application, with the addition that the further information enhances the scheme. For the record, my original comments were: I believe this application meets all the necessary planning guidelines/policies and would deliver much needed housing into Clifton, including affordable homes. It is also a very attractive development and allows the central historic gardens to be open to the public for free. The development of the site will allow the Zoo to continue its development of a new Bristol Zoo at its Wild Place site together with its ongoing conversation and education work, which would benefit everyone living in the Bristol area and beyond.</p>	16-Jan-23
518.	O	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development/planning application. The monolithic blocks are absurdly incongruent with the surrounding structures in design , scale , mass and form . They will completely overwhelm the gardens and obliterate streetviews of the sky, mature trees , and the nearby historic buildings that characterise Clifton. The entire development is entirely disproportionate and totally unsympathetic to Clifton and a violation of the neighbourhood. I deeply regret the passing of the zoo and the proposed development must be stopped.</p>	16-Jan-23

519.	O	I oppose this proposal primarily on the basis of its complete failure to preserve or enhance the Clifton conservation area. - Failure of the architecture to respond properly to or integrate with the surrounding established character and context - Overbearing, over-intensive and unsympathetic scale of development - Unjustified and irreversible harm to listed buildings - Appearance of a gated community, even a prison complex behind high walls, completely the opposite of what Bristol considers as its general outlook on life - Public access not legally assured - Not allowed for in the statutory local plan - Failure to give "considerable weight" to a heritage asset - Therefore not in accordance with applicable conservation legislation - Clear danger of erosion of BCC's standards applicable to future conservation area planning proposals I support the BCC Conservation Advisory Panel's submission, and that of Historic England, who have commented that the closure of the zoo site will have a pronounced harmful impact on the significance of the site (and have not withdrawn this view while giving credit for some extremely minor revisions).	17-Jan-23
520.	O	I have read the applicants' new replies to the planning officer and viewed most of the supporting documents. My chief objection remains, relating to the failure to abide by requirements of the conservation area status of the local area and resulting incongruous and overbearing design. The latest inputs on the conservation area and heritage appear to acknowledge harm and speak of "mitigation" rather than "enhancement". There are some arguments referring to "enhancement" but they are weak or even bogus, relying on the quality of the development and public access rather than the design or density of the development. The objections based on the scale and blockiness of the buildings are unmitigated by the very minor proposals to soften the outline and to limit overlooking. The proposal says there need be enough free market dwellings to contribute about £1300 each in estate service charge to fund the public realm aspects. But there could be many fewer dwellings, contributing less than this, if proper account were taken of using volunteer gardeners, surpluses from events, and voluntary public donations (compare with quantum of such funds collected by Clifton Suspension Bridge). The idea of the Clifton Conservation Hub is extremely welcome and could be very successful as well as a source of funding for the public realm. I ask the planners to take full account of the risk of blowing the whole concept of conservation area status out of the water, yielding an unmanageable precedent not only in Clifton but elsewhere. Among all the public comments I have noted only one recent one in support and as it is anonymous there must be doubt about the weight to give it.	17-Jan-23
521.	O	Highly uncreative & poor use of a valuable public space. Poor architecture. Jarring to local environment.	17-Jan-23

522.	O	Once again I write to object to this scheme. Tower blocks surrounding the site - totally out of keeping with the present Clifton landscape. A blight on an attractive part of Clifton. The whole project appears to be a money making exercise for the Zoo. Please take note of the myriad objections you have received over the long time this proposal has been in the pipeline. If this proposal goes ahead it will be a matter of great upset and regret to many of the citizens of Bristol. I also note that very few of the animals are being relocated to the Wild Place. Lions, penguins and meerkats, to name a few, are waiting for some other Zoo in the world to take them - they will not be at the Wild Place at all.	17-Jan-23
523.	O	To whom It may concern, I wanted to raise my objection to these plans base on the historic site at Bristol Zoo. Although I am a resident of Bath, I live in Bristol for the vast majority of my life, and have visited the zoo on hundreds of occasions. My grandparents, parents and children have all visited the site with me, so it hands been an intergenerational part of my life. I do not believe these plans have taken in the full historical significance of the site, which one gone will be lost forever. A much more detailed plan and analysis must be taken of the site, which is such a huge part of Bristol's heritage. This will cause irreversible damage to a historic site, and take it from the public's reach. There are also massive concerns about the lack of green space, and also that generations of people will lose access to a site that promotes conservation and sustainability in the centre of the city. To remove this for housing is a step backwards when it comes to improving the cultural heritage and green credentials of the greatest city on Earth. Bristol Zoo is a unique place, and more care must be taken over its future. Thank you for your time, and I implore you to understand the strength of emotion these words have within them, and to reconsider this planning permission.	17-Jan-23
524.	O	Again we write to object to the current proposals for these developments. Previously you have ignored all objections from residents of adjoining properties, many other local residents, interested friends and professional advisory bodies. This is to the detriment of Clifton and needs to be corrected ASAP. To date you are failing in your duty to enhance and protect the conservation district of Clifton. Some of the land was covenanted by previous residents and other benefactors to the city. This should be honoured and even celebrated for its unquestionable worth and contribution to the benefit and reputation of the city of Bristol. Various promotional misinformation has been disseminated and it appears from the current plans that only the Zoo will benefit particularly financially. Alternative proposals should be considered where the architecture and density is reconcilable with surrounding listed buildings. Yours faithfully Ruth and David Slinn	18-Jan-23

525.	O	The proposed plans to develop the existing Bristol Zoo site are not in keeping with the existing conservation area surrounding it. The scale of the buildings and the unimaginative design will dwarf the existing buildings that surround the zoo i.e. Clifton College, potentially blocking light along with creating an eye sore in the local area of period architecture and general street scenes of Clifton. The proposed design looks more like a housing estate than a high end development. The amount of dwellings proposed will increase traffic and stretch already over used street parking availability. A small number of townhouses would be more appropriate rather than a mass over development of this site. I live 5 minutes walk of the zoo site and to upkeep our period property we have to get planning permission from the Council to maintain the building (eg change windows) and trim the trees. I completely understand the need for these rules in order to keep the conservation area... but then to allow a development like this in the area defeats the point! From an environmental point of view the amount of mature trees the developers will have to pull down within the zoo in order to build the new development is also a big concern.	18-Jan-23
526.	O	This development does not appear to be in keeping with the character of the Victorian area. The number of units seems excessive and will change the ambience of the locality. 196 new properties in a small area will cause congestion on the roads, additional noise and parking issues. All the local facilities such as the doctors surgery are already under pressure and this will just add to the situation.	18-Jan-23
527.	O	I am objecting strongly and seriously against the above application. The proposed Zoo's application for the main site plan bears no relation to its unique conservation area. It would look unsuitable in any part of this great city due to its unsympathetic and massive scale, which will dwarf the proposed community garden. It is brutalistic and Putinesque in design. The application is working against respecting a conservation area and contrary to the National Planning Policy. The site faces The Downs with its natural beauty currently enhanced by neighbouring listed buildings. The plan will take the soul out of a beautiful area which has been enjoyed for centuries by the people of Bristol and even more so with the arrival of the Zoo in the mid nineteenth century. Who will benefit from this?	18-Jan-23
528.	O	This can not be allowed to happen, with so many children attending Clifton College, what is but in place for their safty? What about boarding children? These buildings will look directly on to the school! What about all the extra traffic with all the child pedestrians? Absolutely should not be allowed to go ahead	18-Jan-23

529.	O	Having recently seen some scale visualisations of the Zoo's proposed housing development for their main site, I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the plans put forward. Bearing in mind that planning law states that for a conservation area, "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of the area", it seems to me that the monolithic mass and form of this proposed development is entirely incongruent with such a historic conservation area in design, scale, mass and form and in its overall impact. These large, long, flat-roofed block housing developments are overpowering and appear totally out of keeping with the surrounding conservation area.	19-Jan-23
530.	O	I wish to object to the proposed plans for the redevelopment of the former Bristol Zoo Gardens site. The appearance of the proposed development is incongruous with the surrounding historic buildings. In addition, the scale and height of the blocks of flats will have a negative impact on the level of light and skyline views in adjacent roads and buildings. I consider the removal of a significant number of mature trees and the negative impact of this on wildlife to be a serious concern and inappropriate for a conservation area. The parking and road safety issues in the area, which will result from the additional vehicles associated with the development, is of significant concern and another reason why I object to this planning application.	19-Jan-23
531.	O	We object to the proposed development/planning application. The six storey blocks are not compatible with the Conservation area and are an abuse to the legacy of the Bristol Zoo. Public access to the gardens and magnificent trees will be lost forever, this too is unacceptable. More careful consideration must be made of a site which is such a huge part of Bristol's heritage and played such a large part in the lives of generations of its residents. The proposed development will be immensely damaging to the precious place that has promoted conservation and sustainability in the centre of the city.	19-Jan-23
532.	O	object on multiple grounds - congestion, safe guarding (Young children at school in neighbouring buildings), health and Safety. This appears to be motivated by financial return rather than enhancing the community.	20-Jan-23
533.	O	The proposal is at odds with Bristol's ambition to be Carbon Zero city by creating an environment that will reduce green space, increase traffic and destroy what is a beautiful part of our city - it would never happen in Bath!	20-Jan-23
534.	O	Received a letter from the Zoo and the pictures on the first page showing a park area all look great. I looked at the next page and see 6 story buildings are being proposed. 6 stories is far too high and out of keeping with the general nature of Clifton. Any new build should be no higher than the typical Victorian properties in Clifton and designed in a style far closer to the other Victorian buildings in the area - not modern high rise blocks of flats. These are visually out of character with Clifton.	21-Jan-23

535.	O	Through the enormous mass of documents revising the plans, I couldn't see anything addressing the awful external nature of the proposed development. The proposals are still totally out of keeping with the visual appearance of the local area and would be a blot on the landscape. Any development must fit in with the rich architectural character of this part of Clifton - the proposals have total disregard for the fact this is a Conservation Area.	21-Jan-23
536.	S	All the new properties should have covered balconies. Surely we learnt that during the pandemic, and makes them feel so much more airy, accessible, environmental (plants), communal and practical. Could envisage buying one of the new properties, as this is potentially a lovely development, but only if with a balcony (or terrace if ground floor).	21-Jan-23
537.	S	Looks like a fabulous idea. However I would propose 2 things: Firstly that almost all the properties have a covered balcony - so much nicer to live in and environmentally sound - covered to provide an outside space even in inclement weather. Secondly - consider stone/brickwork as used in the Redland Girls School development (Bath stone?) Which looks lovely and in keeping with the area. Some indication of likely prices of resulting properties would be interesting please.	21-Jan-23
538.	S	buildings could be more attractive - more glass, more balconies	21-Jan-23
539.	S	support it if they all have covered balconies, would make it lovely.	21-Jan-23
540.	S	just make all the apartments with a covered balcony/terrace - so much better for enjoyment of the outdoors	21-Jan-23
541.	S	All the new properties should have covered balconies. Surely we learnt that during the pandemic, and makes them feel so much more airy, accessible, environmental (plants), communal and practical. Could envisage buying one of the new properties, as this is potentially a lovely development, but only if with a balcony (or terrace if ground floor).	21-Jan-23
542.	S	support it if they all have covered balconies, would make it lovely.	21-Jan-23
543.	S	buildings could be more attractive - more glass, more balconies	21-Jan-23
544.	O	My original objections are unchanged by the revised proposals. The proposed development is in a Conservation Area The design of the houses is totally out of keeping with the Victorian houses in the neighbourhood and indeed most of Clifton. What's more they are high, much higher than most of the perimeter of the existing site so will stand out very prominently. I don't object to new houses being built but it is a Conservation Area and therefore the design should be in keeping with the surroundings and the heritage of Clifton.	21-Jan-23
545.	S	Looks like a fabulous idea. However I would propose 2 things: Firstly that almost all the properties have a covered balcony - so much nicer to live in and environmentally sound - covered to provide an outside space even in inclement weather. Secondly - consider stone/brickwork as used in the Redland Girls School development (Bath stone?) Which looks lovely and in keeping with the area. Some indication of likely prices of resulting properties would be interesting please.	21-Jan-23
546.	S	buildings could be more attractive - more glass, more balconies	21-Jan-23
547.	S	support it if they all have covered balconies, would make it lovely.	21-Jan-23

548.	S	just make all the apartments with a covered balcony/terrace - so much better for enjoyment of the outdoors	21-Jan-23
549.	S	All the new properties should have covered balconies. Surely we learnt that during the pandemic, and makes them feel so much more airy, accessible, environmental (plants), communal and practical. Could envisage buying one of the new properties, as this is potentially a lovely development, but only if with a balcony (or terrace if ground floor).	21-Jan-23
550.	S	just make all the apartments with a covered balcony/terrace - so much better for enjoyment of the outdoors	21-Jan-23
551.	S	Looks like a fabulous idea. However I would propose 2 things: Firstly that almost all the properties have a covered balcony - so much nicer to live in and environmentally sound - covered to provide an outside space even in inclement weather. Secondly - consider stone/brickwork as used in the Redland Girls School development (Bath stone?) Which looks lovely and in keeping with the area. Some indication of likely prices of resulting properties would be interesting please.	21-Jan-23
552.	O	Bristol Zoo is the jewel in Clifton, Bristol's crown, world re known and it's gardens and buildings of historic interest. It is a travesty to allow it to be desecrated in favour of new expensive flats when the real need in Bristol is for homes for young people and people on low incomes. It is not clear why the Zoo cannot continue, there is no transparency on why these decisions have been made Loss of public amenity, while climate change is on everyone's minds, almost half of the trees be removed and some of the others may be damaged. The buildings proposed will completely overpower the surrounding buildings, they will completely change the character of the area Please Bristol Council be brave and be the first council in the UK to reject a commercial application, in favour of being seen to do the right thing for local people and the city of Bristol. If there is no going back for Bristol Zoo then please reject this application and insist on housing for young people and low income families who currently cannot find suitable housing.	21-Jan-23
553.	O	It's very disappointing to see such a valuable site be potentially ruined by blocks of monotone flats which don't have any character or individuality. Clifton is a beautiful, historic area of Bristol, where the buildings are unique. The proposed flats would tower over the decades-old buildings and impose on the rest of this beautiful area. Bristol zoo was a special place to so many. The council should invest in something which would do it justice, like a botanical garden or green area. There are so few areas in Bristol which aren't packed full of tower blocks and social housing. Clifton is special in this sense, which is why some many chose to live here. Bristol city council should value their residents and stop putting money before everything else.	22-Jan-23
554.	O	We would like to object again to the proposed development at Bristol Zoo which would undoubtedly make life difficult for Clifton College. The buildings overpower all those nearby and the parking provision appears totally inadequate. Moreover, the strain on local services such as doctors' surgeries would be excessive.	23-Jan-23

555.	O	We would like to object to the proposed development at Bristol Zoo. The intended buildings at the edge of the site are totally out of keeping with the surrounding late nineteenth century architecture, in building materials, design and scale. This is particularly undesirable in a conservation area. Moreover, it is surely unrealistic to think that private houses within the site will mix with play areas and paths for cyclists travelling at speed. Such density of housing would set a dangerous precedent for future development in Clifton. We would also deplore the felling of any trees at the site. Jon and Pat Millington	23-Jan-23
556.	O	The minor modifications recently made to this Application entirely fail to address the concerns of CHIS who consider it to be clearly contrary to BCS 22. It represents an over-intense and overbearing development which would, without reasonable justification, adversely affect the character of this part of the Clifton Conservation Area and the setting of its listed buildings. Our views are entirely in line with those of Bristol City Council's Conservation Advisory Panel of which CHIS is a member and whose letter of 20 November 2022 sets out in some detail the architectural poverty of the scheme and its detrimental impact on heritage assets.	23-Jan-23
557.	O	The following represents a slightly revised version of the comments originally posted on August 7th. CHIS strongly opposes these depressingly unimaginative and potentially destructive proposals which are entirely unacceptable. The scheme includes half a mile of modern blocks of Flats several storeys high adjacent to all the Zoo boundaries which will dominate and overpower the neighbouring streets. This is especially the case along the west perimeter which would face the monolithic block proposed for the West Car Park site, permanently altering the feel, landscape, treescape, and skyline of the Conservation Area. The scheme takes little, if any, account of the heritage, character and sense of space that makes this historic neighbourhood special, if not unique. Despite strong concerns expressed during various public consultations, it has been the experience of residents that most of their concerns have either been dealt with only at the most basic or cosmetic level or just completely ignored. The following points summarise some of the most blatantly pernicious aspects of the proposals : 1. 196 dwellings represents a massively over-dense development of the site. 2. Given the provision of only 100 parking spaces the circular access drive is likely to be permanently littered with cars and so appear even less discreet than the plans suggest. 3. The potential impact on the Conservation Area is poorly considered. In particular, the impact on the surrounding listed buildings and gardens of a development so monolithic in its scale and massing has not been justified. Especially appalling in this respect is the block on the northern boundary, 4. The proposed terracing is not appropriate in this area. 5. The loss of trees will be compounded by the inevitable damage to the roof systems of many other trees by infrastructure work. We urge rejection of this highly damaging Application.	23-Jan-23

558.	O	<p>The Clifton & Hotwells Improvement Society strongly opposes these depressingly unimaginative and potentially destructive proposals which are entirely unacceptable in their current form. The scheme includes half a mile of modern blocks of Flats several storeys high adjacent to all the Zoo boundaries which will dominate and overpower the neighbouring streets. This is especially the case along the west perimeter which would face the monolithic block proposed for the West Car Park site, permanently altering the feel, landscape, treescape and skyline of the Conservation Area. The scheme takes little, if any, account of the heritage, character and sense of space that makes this historic neighbourhood special, if not unique. Despite strong concerns expressed during various public consultations, it has been the experience of residents that most of their concerns have either been dealt with only at the most basic or cosmetic level or just completely ignored. The following points summarise some of the most blatantly pernicious aspects of the proposals : 1. 201 dwellings represents a massively over-dense development of the site. 2. Given the provision of only 100 parking spaces the circular access drive is likely to be permanently littered with cars and so appear even less discreet than the plans suggest. 3. The potential impact on the Conservation Area is poorly considered. In particular, the impact on the surrounding listed buildings and gardens of a development so monolithic in its scale and massing has not been justified. Especially appalling in this respect is the six storey block on the northern boundary. 4. The proposed terracing is not appropriate in this area. 5. The loss of trees will be compounded by the inevitable damage to the root systems of many other trees by infrastructure work. We urge rejection of this highly damaging Application which, far from leaving a worthy legacy, would irrevocably damage one of the finest sites in Bristol.</p>	23-Jan-23
559.	O	<p>The reasons for my objection are as follows; 1. The proposed buildings are not architecturally sympathetic to the period and style of the adjacent buildings. 2. The proposed buildings appear higher and closer together than neighbouring buildings. 3. The proposed development will create an environment which is not in keeping with the feel and ambiance of the existing area. 4. I am horrified that such a beautiful and historically important site would be given over to such vulgar and unattractive buildings. I totally agree there is a need for additional housing in Bristol but I cannot support any development which is not architecturally in keeping with the existing buildings in that particular area. 5. The number of proposed housing units will result in a site that is overpopulated for the size of actual building plots compared with adjacent and neighbouring homes.</p>	23-Jan-23

560.	O	There's still time to save the one and only Bristol Zoo, so much history and progress would be lost. This unique Bristol institution has huge cultural and architectural significance. It is of unrivalled importance to the identity of Bristol as well as providing irreplaceable value to the people of the wider area too, as an educational and spiritual sanctuary from the fast pace of modern life. Sell part of the Cribbs Causeway site for houses instead, it makes so much more sense, in terms of transport links, there is no history there and very little evolutionary development - Clifton holds the soul of Bristol Zoo. If the Clifton site as we know it is destroyed, we will truly lose Bristol Zoo forever. This is an ill thought plan, made in a snapshot of time by an unrepresentative management. Don't give up on Bristol Zoo Clifton, adapt where necessary to survive and save this Bristol Institution for the families and people of the past, the present and possibly most importantly our families of the future.	23-Jan-23
561.	O	The aesthetic and scale of the buildings proposed is entirely out of keeping with the historic features and character of Clifton, the reason residents chose to live in this area. The height and stark design of the buildings proposed further emphasises this. Clifton's character has been preserved against previously sought developments, for example the destruction of the Lido. I feel that this proposed development would be looked upon as similarly short sighted in years to come. On street parking in Clifton village and towards the downs is stretched as it is. With the density of residents proposed the number of vehicles (when parked and when on the road) would be a huge problem for the narrow quiet streets of the area. I also object to the proposed removal of so many mature trees, for wildlife and conservation and with air quality improvements otherwise sought in the City. Acquiring an appointment at the local GP surgery or dentist is already a huge challenge with the number of patients, the massive density of units proposed will put all local services under further strain.	24-Jan-23
562.	O	Whilst it seems inevitable that the Zoo site will be used for building it is still important that the area be used for the benefit of as many and diverse individuals as possible. This includes access as an open space and housing provision for people of limited means or with disability. It seems sad that the committee in charge of housing development should be willing to accept a 20% provision of such accommodation in return for a guarantee of the work being commenced quickly (short term benefit) whereas the full 40% legal requirement would be of major long term benefit. The original much vaunted open access to the site and provision for its long term maintenance now seems at risk. The suggestion that ongoing costs of this should be borne by the residents (apart from those in social housing) and this necessitates the maximum number of residents and the minimum of those in social housing is a spurious way of reducing the % of social housing. I would suggest that there should be a sum of money put in trust by the developers for the grounds maintenance from the outset.	25-Jan-23

563.	O	I note that there is no guarantee of perpetual public access to the gardens. Indeed, access gates with keypads, such as are proposed for the pedestrian gate on the boundary alongside Clifton Down Road, are definitely not 'open access'. Whilst the site is currently gated, there is no reason for this to be perpetuated. To create a ghetto, albeit one with wealthy residents seems undesirable. The revised proposals do not address the concerns raised by myself among others to the original high density and physical height of the block of flats, N1 etc. . Amendments to the layout within the blocks are immaterial when the block itself is the problem.	25-Jan-23
564.	O	The density of the proposed housing, in particular high rise Block N, is too great for the area. The character of Clifton Down Road is of individual buildings the majority of which were originally designed as single family dwellings although I accept that some are now subdivided into flats. A monolithic high structure would adversely impinge on the area and should be avoided. The existing boundary wall currently conceals the buildings within the zoo grounds, that should remain its purpose.	25-Jan-23
565.	O	The revised proposal still consists of excessively high blocks all around the site perimeter which are far taller and denser than any surrounding buildings. The design does not compliment or reflect local building styles. The number of mature trees that will either be removed or relocated is very concerning as is the proximity of building works very close to trees being retained.	26-Jan-23

566.	O	<p>I strongly object to the proposals insofar as they relate to the southern end of Northcote Road in particular. There have been only minor changes to building E2 and no changes at all to building E3. Contrary to the impression given (for instance Penoyre & Prasad's answer to Q2 raised by Clifton College, as set out in Appendix 5 of the October 22 Planning Statement), building E3 has been set no further back than shown in the October 2021 consultation, nor has it been reduced in height. Building E3 itself dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road in scale and height, as is clearly shown in document BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1. What is not shown so clearly in that document is its height in relation to numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road, both substantial Victorian houses. Based on the proposals, building E3 would be over 8 metres taller (measured to the eaves) or 6.5 metres taller (measured to the ridge) than these houses, contributing strongly to the overbearing effect. I have previously raised a concern as to the adverse impact on the front gardens of numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road from overshadowing, particularly the loss of afternoon and evening sun. I do not believe that this has been addressed. The gap between buildings E2 and E3 is of limited benefit to those neighbours who are positioned further along Northcote Road, particularly towards the southern end, where the unrelenting mass of building E3 will dominate. The daylight and sunlight assessments show adverse impacts to several rooms in residential properties in Northcote Road, beyond BRE guidelines, with rather trite comments such as 'retained daylight levels are considered acceptable' or 'the neighbouring residential properties will generally remain with adequate levels of daylight and sunlight'. To whom they are considered acceptable is unclear, but it is certainly not the owners of the properties concerned. Nor does there appear to be any recognition that it is generally the principal reception rooms (those on the lower floors) that are worst affected, and where the loss of residential amenity will be most felt. To summarise, those residents towards the lower (southern) end of Northcote Road are particularly severely impacted by the proposals, largely because of the extreme height of building E3 and its proximity to neighbouring properties, but also because it is positioned in such a way that it will take away much of the afternoon and evening sun. Without a significant reduction in the scale of this building, I urge the planning committee to reject the proposals.</p>	26-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

567. O	<p>I wish to reiterate my objections to the proposed development. I am extremely disappointed that, despite our having raised objections on numerous occasions throughout the consultation process, the applicants have made no changes of any significance to the proposed Building E3. This building is, quite simply, far too tall relative to existing neighbouring properties in Northcote Road. This is in a Conservation Area whose character should be preserved if the term is to mean anything at all. As it stands, building E3 would tower over neighbouring properties, dominating the outlook even from upper floors, and casting lower floors and front gardens (which currently enjoy a sunny outlook) into shadow for much of the day. The effect on those of us living in the area in terms of mental health and wellbeing would be devastating. Quite apart from the issue of height, the proposed buildings are not at all sympathetic to their surroundings: the overall design of the site, comprising high blocks placed around the perimeter, has the appearance of the worst sort of gated community, designed to keep people out rather than to contribute to the wider community. If the site is to be developed for housing, then please make it more sympathetic to its surroundings to avoid doing irreparable harm to buildings that have stood there since the Victorian era, as well as their residents. This could be done by reducing the height and massing of buildings and setting them further back from the perimeter.</p>	26-Jan-23
--------	--	-----------

568.	O	<p>I strongly object to the proposals insofar as they relate to the southern end of Northcote Road in particular. Contrary to the impression given (for instance Penoyre & Prasad's answer to Q2 raised by Clifton College, as set out in Appendix 5 of the October 22 Planning Statement), building E3 has been set no further back than shown in the October 2021 consultation, nor has it been reduced in height. Building E3 itself dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road in scale and height, as is clearly shown in document BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1. What is not shown so clearly in that document is its height in relation to numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road, both substantial Victorian houses. Based on the proposals, building E3 would be over 8 metres taller (measured to the eaves) or 6.5 metres taller (measured to the ridge) than these houses, contributing strongly to the overbearing effect. I have previously raised a concern as to the adverse impact on the front gardens of numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road from overshadowing, particularly the loss of afternoon and evening sun. I do not believe that this has been adequately addressed. The gap between buildings E2 and E3 is of limited benefit to those neighbours who are positioned further along Northcote Road, particularly towards the southern end, where the unrelenting mass of building E3 will dominate. The daylight and sunlight assessments show adverse impacts to several rooms, beyond BRE guidelines, with the rather trite comments that the 'retained daylight levels are considered acceptable' or 'the neighbouring residential properties will generally remain with adequate levels of daylight and sunlight'. To whom they are considered acceptable is unclear, but it is certainly not the owners of the properties concerned. Nor does there appear to be any recognition that it is generally the principal reception rooms (those on the lower floors) that are worst affected, and where the loss of residential amenity will be most felt. Those residents towards the lower (southern) end of Northcote Road are particularly severely impacted by the proposals, largely because of the extreme height of building E3 and its proximity to neighbouring properties. Without a significant reduction in the scale of this building, I urge the planning committee to reject the proposals.</p>	26-Jan-23
569.	O	<p>The buildings on the boundaries of Guthrie Road, Northcote Road and A4176 are excessively tall. The elevations are very domineering with little in their design relating to properties in the surrounding area.</p>	26-Jan-23

570.	O	<p>For 186 years Clifton was fortunate in hosting Bristol Zoo. Taking words from www.followthebrownsigns.com, such sites "encompass a huge variety of interesting places to visit, people to meet, things to do and sights to see, seamlessly incorporating all our history, geography, culture and heritage into a little appreciated and massively underestimated tourist network. Each one is important in its own special way and inspiring people to get interested in a variety of different things they didn't even know could be interesting...". Unlike sites that acquired brown signs through accidents of history (National Trust properties are typical examples), the Zoo was founded in the spirit of the words above, for the benefit of local residents. The inheritors of the property now propose to destroy this heritage. One can appreciate why National Trust protection was deliberately made strong, as some owners will contrive "end justifies the means" logic to justify monetizing an asset that means little to them. Sadly there are few brown sign sites to relieve the housing monoculture that makes up most of Bristol. I feel strongly that the city should encourage the Zoo trustees to try much harder to have the site continue in some form as "a permanently established attraction or facility which attracts or is used by visitors to an area and which is open to the public without prior booking during its normal opening hours". [The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016]. Wild Place Project, 6 miles north, has nothing like the pedestrian catchment area. One way the Council can do this is by refusing thoughtless and insensitive plans. The many objectors to the proposed conversion to a housing estate make it obvious that the interior and exteriors of the numerous functional blocks of flats completely fail to measure up to the aspirations of current local residents for future residents. I urge the committee not to acquiesce in the creation of such an uninspiring collection, on a site with such potential. Even if some of the site has to be sacrificed to housing, given the conservation area context the bar for planning committee approval should be high eg a design that could be a serious submission for a Housing Design or Civic Trust Award. I don't believe that the planning committee should feel pressured into giving a quick assent, as owners themselves can be unhurried in pursuit of their objectives (as an example, planning consent for the nearby 2-16 Clifton Down Road site was given in April 2020, but building work has not yet started). Please reject the application, and give time for alternative proposals to be more fully developed.</p>	27-Jan-23
571.	O	<p>The revised proposals have minimal changes. The interior of the flats has been amended, but little change has been made to the heights and massing of the buildings. This is a particular issue for Northcote Road and Guthrie Road where five to six storey buildings are proposed where currently the buildings are three to four storeys high. The development does not reflect the existing architecture or the historic nature of the site and area. The number of dwellings across the site will also have a significant impact on the amount of traffic in the area and on road safety, both during the construction phase and thereafter. Whilst I understand that this is an opportunity for the Zoo to safeguard its long-term future, it is very disappointing that the proposals are less than sympathetic to their surrounds and that little consideration has been given to innovative and thoughtful design and how it can sit well within a Conservation Area. I therefore strongly oppose this development for the reasons listed above and in my original objection of 6 July 2022.</p>	29-Jan-23

572.	O	<p>I am writing this because I strongly object to the development of Bristol Zoological Gardens into housing. It has so much community value and cultural significance that Bristol and England would lose forever and never be able to replace it. Generations of Bristolians have first learnt about nature and developed a lifelong love and understanding of the environment at the Bristol Zoo . Many of us voted for green councillors, and expect them to strongly and unequivocally oppose this application on ecological grounds as there can be no justification for turning a conservation zoological garden into flats with all the environmental damage of the relocation of the site and the subsequent additional driving and both in the clifton conservation area and by everyone in Bristol that has to drive to take their children to south Gloucester Zoo. This will harm the generations to come by depriving an opportunity to learn by observation and interaction. The new South Gloucester Zoo is destined to fail as it is a terrible experience. Something people would do once or twice unlike the current Bristol zoo site being somewhere that you meet regularly. Its new site already has terrible numbers and with the current Trustees in charge will most probably be deemed more profitable as housing within a few years. I believe with the right people in charge of the zoo it would still be a thriving well loved financially viable zoo and I believe it could be again. I believe that the Shareholders, the councillors and the public have been misled into believing this is inevitable as the trustees try to present it as a fait accompli. The zoo needs to change and adjust to modern expectations. Instead of building another zoo the focus should be on relocating the larger animals and focussing on community engagement and environmental education. These listed buildings are of historic importance and I believe there are many ways this busy and popular site could have been monetized through new innovative environmental exhibitions and attractions. Instead of long term planning to fund an additional unwanted Zoo with the expectation the original could be sold for profit. It is not surprising that trustees are from property development businesses because if you ask a property developer how you make money at a zoo that they say build some housing. It is clear that this application needs to be refused but it looks like there should also be an enquiry into how this has come about. The lack of community engagement, lack of transparency, and the misleading of all local stakeholders. The remit of the Zoo and the local council is to protect the environment that we live in and amenities that we have access to. Despite having one of the more green councils we have seen the steady decline in central Bristol attractions that can be walked to while replacing with car only accessible alternatives. West Bristol is particularly badly catered for now with council releasing the Lido into private exclusive ownership, The Icerink into student flats, and community centres long disappeared. Please protect the Zoo from this shameless profiteering and destruction of a well loved historical community resource.</p>	29-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

573.	O	<p>I am writing to you because I strongly object to the development of Bristol Zoological Gardens into housing. It has so much community value and cultural significance that Bristol and England would lose forever and never be able to replace it. Generations of Bristolians have first learnt about nature and developed a lifelong love and understanding of the environment at the Bristol Zoo . Many of us voted for green councillors, and expect them to strongly and unequivocally oppose this application on ecological grounds as there can be no justification for turning a conservation zoological garden into flats with all the environmental damage of the relocation of the site and the subsequent additional driving and both in the clifton conservation area and by everyone in Bristol that has to drive to take their children to south Gloucester Zoo. This will harm the generations to come by depriving an opportunity to learn by observation and interaction. The new South Gloucester Zoo is destined to fail as it is a terrible experience. Something people would do once or twice unlike the current Bristol zoo site being somewhere that you meet regularly. Its new site already has terrible numbers and with the current Trustees in charge will most probably be deemed more profitable as housing within a few years. I believe with the right people in charge of the zoo it would still be a thriving well loved financially viable zoo and I believe it could be again. I believe that the Shareholders, the councillors and the public have been misled into believing this is inevitable as the trustees try to present it as a fait accompli. The zoo needs to change and adjust to modern expectations. Instead of building another zoo the focus should be on relocating the larger animals and focussing on community engagement and environmental education. These listed buildings are of historic importance and I believe there are many ways this busy and popular site could have been monetized through new innovative environmental exhibitions and attractions. Instead of long term planning to fund an additional unwanted Zoo with the expectation the original could be sold for profit. It is not surprising that trustees are from property development businesses because if you ask a property developer how you make money at a zoo that they say build some housing. It is clear that this application needs to be refused but it looks like there should also be an enquiry into how this has come about. The lack of community engagement, lack of transparency, and the misleading of all local stakeholders. The remit of the Zoo and the local council is to protect the environment that we live in and amenities that we have access to. Despite having one of the more green councils we have seen the steady decline in central Bristol attractions that can be walked to while replacing with car only accessible alternatives. West Bristol is particularly badly catered for now with council releasing the Lido into private exclusive ownership, The Icerink into student flats, and community centres long disappeared. Please protect the Zoo from this shameless profiteering and destruction of a well loved historical community resource.</p>	29-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

574. O	<p>I am objecting again to the proposed development as it contravenes the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy Policy BCS22 by failing to 'safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance', namely the site of Bristol Zoo Gardens. The modifications to this Application are minor and are clearly contrary to BCS 22. The proposed development is over intense, unsympathetic to the period and style of the adjacent buildings and negatively impacts them. It will adversely affect this part of the Clifton Conservation Area and the setting of its listed buildings, views shared by Bristol City Council's Conservation Advisory Panel. The National Planning Policy Framework states that heritage assets should be sustained and enhanced and that 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation' (para 199). It continues that 'local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance.'(para 206). This proposed development does not ensure this or meet these criteria. There is a shortage of affordable housing in Bristol and it is very disappointing that the provision in this scheme will be reduced by half so that the work can start more quickly and a greater number of non-social housing residents can cover the ongoing costs of the long-term maintenance of the site. This appears to be a back handed way of reducing the affordable housing provision which obviously does not generate the level of income that the other units might do. This approach is both short sighted and short-termist. The issues caused by traffic from the 196 proposed units will severely impact the area around the site. It is naïve to expect that residents will not have cars and those numbers are likely to be higher than the numbers suggested by Bristol City Council's calculations. The area already has traffic issues at school drop off and pick up times. It is also an area that is frequented by school children throughout the day. The amount of traffic that this development will produce will lead to it being unsafe for school children (4-18 yrs olds) to circulate during the day. The views of Northcote Road as submitted on 13 January are very deceptive. They present Northcote Road, with the proposed development, as light and airy. The road is not like that now even on a bright, sunny day. The views also omit to show the southern end of Northcote Road with the extreme height and massing of building E3. The views presented by the developer are misleading and misrepresentative and do not clearly show the effects of the height and scale of the proposed development. Building E3's height and location has not changed. It remains domineering and overbearing. Its scale and height dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road (see doc. BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1) including no 1 and no 2 Northcote road, both tall, substantial Victorian houses. Building E3 is significantly taller (8m measured to the eaves) than these and will block more light from Northcote Road due to E3's extreme height. The overall massing and scale of the proposed buildings on Northcote Road need to be reduced to ensure more light reaches Northcote Road and for reasons of safeguarding as they look directly onto the school and a number of its boarding houses. I strongly object to the proposed development in its current form and ask that it is rejected by the Planning Committee.</p>	29-Jan-23
--------	---	-----------

575.	O	<p>I am objecting to these proposals as a parent for the following reasons: 1. Road Safety. I have serious concerns about road safety as the scheme is in close proximity to a large school consisting of both day and boarding pupils. The pupils are obliged to move around their campus to access different classrooms, sports fields etc. and the proposed scheme will cause an increased level of traffic, both during the construction phase and afterwards. This will jeopardise the safety of children moving around their school site. The entrances proposed for Guthrie Road and Northcote Road will have a particular impact as they are two of the main areas where parents pick up and drop off children. At peak times, there are already traffic jams, poor parking and bad driving and this will only be exacerbated by an increased number of cars. Entrances here are likely to significantly increase the risk of accidents to school children. 2. Parking. The scheme proposes 201 dwellings with 120 car parking spaces. This will not be enough parking spaces. While it is desirable and necessary to reduce car use, the reality is that most households have at least one vehicle. Where are these extra vehicles going to park? Again, the impact of this is increased traffic on the roads around the Zoo looking for parking spaces and once again, there will be an increased risk to children's safety. 3. Design. The design of the buildings is poor and lacks harmony in relation to its site. The surrounding Conservation area and the buildings adjoining the site consist of detached houses and imposing, listed school buildings broken only by trees and green spaces. These bear no relation to the proposed scheme which does not sit comfortably in this context. The buildings are too tall, overbearing and constitute a solid mass with no redeeming features. Inspiration seems to have been Stalinist Russia with a few plants added, perhaps to soften the corners, or to allude to the listed gardens that once occupied the site. The scheme does not reflect or relate to the pink sandstone of the neighbouring buildings, nor does it relate to the materials and colours of the Zoo's perimeter wall. Its sits in ugly contrast with its surrounds and will be an eyesore that is likely to date quickly. The new buildings are concentrated around the perimeter of the Zoo's site causing neighbouring houses, school playgrounds and boarding houses to be completely overlooked. In some instances, the new buildings are taller than the existing houses and the school being overlooked is a safeguarding issue. Will all the windows overlooking the school have opaque or frosted glass? This scheme is an opportunity to develop an historic and much-loved Bristol site. It is an opportunity to come up with innovative and thoughtful design, showcasing how a contemporary development can enhance a site bound by Conservation Area regulations. This scheme fails on all counts. It is pedestrian, lacklustre and is missing the vision and thoughtful consideration given to the historical context and site surroundings in local developments, such as the ss Great Britain and Wapping Wharf.</p>	29-Jan-23
------	---	--	-----------

576.	O	I want to voice my objection to the current plans for redevelopment on the old and historic Bristol Zoo site. The proposed development at the site is very disappointing and completely out of keeping, not only for within Clifton and the local area, but in the historic site of Bristol Zoo itself. The proposed development dwarfs the current Zoo buildings and boundary walls (which are not small) and will lead to the new buildings being very imposing. Unless the proper protections are put in place any public areas which are kept could be removed again in the future, taking away public access to the historic site and important green area of the city. I am not against the redevelopment of the site but the current plans need to be significantly altered before they are acceptable. Also, current TPOs seem to have been completely ignored. This is a clear indication of the lack of care the developer is showing towards, not only the site, but the local area and residents.	29-Jan-23
577.	O	Having reviewed the plans for the new development on the former site of Bristol Zoo I would like to register my objection to the plans in their current format. More should and must be done to work with the historic character of the site rather than in spite of it. This is especially the case for the characterful walls of the former zoo, which give it much of its distinctive personality and clear link to its former use/history (much like the old city walls). This link to its previous use will become all the more important as time passes and generations lose memory with the site's original use. Currently, the plans create an overbearing fortress rather than an inviting walled garden or park. The design is currently more suited to the industrial warehouses of the docks or paintworks than a former low height zoological gardens. This does not appear sympathetic or in keeping and creates little distinctions between the different city neighbourhoods and their characters. As such, the development as proposed would have an overbearing impact at street level especially due to the height, cladding design and scale of the proposed blocks. It is also unclear what combination of facilities will support the new residents to make a liveable, walkable city and draw in natural foot traffic from non-residents (e.g. a GP surgery and other mixed use facilities other than the park). There appears to be an excessive amount of trees being felled which are covered by TPOs. Again this appears to indicate a lack of working with the site, with TPOs trees being seen as an easily overcome hurdle than a feature worth preserving. Bristol has been doing much in recent years to positively deal with the legacy of previous developments. The plans in their current format are more akin to the rushed post-war reconstruction/infil of bombed out Bristol than a modern, sustainable and liveable city development. This is something that the city has spent many of its recent years attempting to reverse and the plans in their current format would be a step backwards to the ill thought out blocks of the 60s and 70s.	29-Jan-23

578.	O	<p>I am writing this because I strongly object to the development of Bristol Zoological Gardens into housing. It has so much community value and cultural significance that Bristol and England would lose forever and never be able to replace it. Generations of Bristolians have first learnt about nature and developed a lifelong love and understanding of the environment at the Bristol Zoo . Many of us voted for green councillors, and expect them to strongly and unequivocally oppose this application on ecological grounds as there can be no justification for turning a conservation zoological garden into flats with all the environmental damage of the relocation of the site and the subsequent additional driving and both in the clifton conservation area and by everyone in Bristol that has to drive to take their children to south Gloucester Zoo. This will harm the generations to come by depriving an opportunity to learn by observation and interaction. The new South Gloucester Zoo is destined to fail as it is a terrible experience. Something people would do once or twice unlike the current Bristol zoo site being somewhere that you meet regularly. Its new site already has terrible numbers and with the current Trustees in charge will most probably be deemed more profitable as housing within a few years. I believe with the right people in charge of the zoo it would still be a thriving well loved financially viable zoo and I believe it could be again. I believe that the Shareholders, the councillors and the public have been misled into believing this is inevitable as the trustees try to present it as a fait accompli. The zoo needs to change and adjust to modern expectations. Instead of building another zoo the focus should be on relocating the larger animals and focussing on community engagement and environmental education. These listed buildings are of historic importance and I believe there are many ways this busy and popular site could have been monetized through new innovative environmental exhibitions and attractions. Instead of long term planning to fund an additional unwanted Zoo with the expectation the original could be sold for profit. It is not surprising that trustees are from property development businesses because if you ask a property developer how you make money at a zoo that they say build some housing. It is clear that this application needs to be refused but it looks like there should also be an enquiry into how this has come about. The lack of community engagement, lack of transparency, and the misleading of all local stakeholders. The remit of the Zoo and the local council is to protect the environment that we live in and amenities that we have access to. Despite having one of the more green councils we have seen the steady decline in central Bristol attractions that can be walked to while replacing with car only accessible alternatives. West Bristol is particularly badly catered for now with council releasing the Lido into private exclusive ownership, The Icerink into student flats, and community centres long disappeared. Please protect the Zoo from this shameless profiteering and destruction of a well loved historical community resource.</p>	29-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

579.	O	<p>I am writing to you because I strongly object to the development of Bristol Zoological Gardens into housing. It has so much community value and cultural significance that Bristol and England would lose forever and never be able to replace it. Generations of Bristolians have first learnt about nature and developed a lifelong love and understanding of the environment at the Bristol Zoo . Many of us voted for green councillors, and expect them to strongly and unequivocally oppose this application on ecological grounds as there can be no justification for turning a conservation zoological garden into flats with all the environmental damage of the relocation of the site and the subsequent additional driving and both in the clifton conservation area and by everyone in Bristol that has to drive to take their children to south Gloucester Zoo. This will harm the generations to come by depriving an opportunity to learn by observation and interaction. The new South Gloucester Zoo is destined to fail as it is a terrible experience. Something people would do once or twice unlike the current Bristol zoo site being somewhere that you meet regularly. Its new site already has terrible numbers and with the current Trustees in charge will most probably be deemed more profitable as housing within a few years. I believe with the right people in charge of the zoo it would still be a thriving well loved financially viable zoo and I believe it could be again. I believe that the Shareholders, the councillors and the public have been misled into believing this is inevitable as the trustees try to present it as a fait accompli. The zoo needs to change and adjust to modern expectations. Instead of building another zoo the focus should be on relocating the larger animals and focussing on community engagement and environmental education. These listed buildings are of historic importance and I believe there are many ways this busy and popular site could have been monetized through new innovative environmental exhibitions and attractions. Instead of long term planning to fund an additional unwanted Zoo with the expectation the original could be sold for profit. It is not surprising that trustees are from property development businesses because if you ask a property developer how you make money at a zoo that they say build some housing. It is clear that this application needs to be refused but it looks like there should also be an enquiry into how this has come about. The lack of community engagement, lack of transparency, and the misleading of all local stakeholders. The remit of the Zoo and the local council is to protect the environment that we live in and amenities that we have access to. Despite having one of the more green councils we have seen the steady decline in central Bristol attractions that can be walked to while replacing with car only accessible alternatives. West Bristol is particularly badly catered for now with council releasing the Lido into private exclusive ownership, The Icerink into student flats, and community centres long disappeared. Please protect the Zoo from this shameless profiteering and destruction of a well loved historical community resource.</p>	29-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

580.	O	I fully support the comments below as put forward by save bristol zoo campaign. We desperately need exciting ways to enhance the lives of Bristolians to improve their wellbeing and overall mental health. Squeezing more houses into an already over crowded city will not achieve this. There have been great alternatives put forward, particularly the ground breaking virtual zoo concept, that would be such a great attraction for our city and bring much needed tourist income. Please think strategically and conserve this unique site - a site that deserves so much more than just more boring houses that will only benefit a few. Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	30-Jan-23
581.	O	Application no, 22/02737/F I am writing to object to the proposed development of the Bristol zoo site on the grounds that the area isn't suitable for housing. The buildings proposed are not in keeping with the area. Mr Alexander Bruce Resident of College Rd	30-Jan-23
582.	O	This proposal is entirely inappropriate for the area.	30-Jan-23
583.	O	This is such a great opportunity wasted - we don't need more housing as much as we need stimulating activities for us all. The other non-housing related proposals offer so much more in terms of tourism, genuine sustainability during a climate emergency, and amenity to the whole of the Bristol population and beyond. We owe it to the legacy of Bristol Zoo to replace it with something innovative, fun, and engaging, supporting people's mental and physical health. There are plenty of other sites for housing that are better suited to such purposes. PLEASE save this precious and historic space and amenity for generations to come - something Bristol can be proud of. Thank you.	30-Jan-23

584. O	<p>We OBJECT to the above planning application for the following reasons - Out of keeping with the conservation area - Over developed and way too high buildings - Overlooks the boarding houses and playgrounds of Clifton College so is a safety hazard and completely unacceptable. - Congestion of an extra 200 residents in the roads already very congested, there are not enough parking spaces provided within the development and the surrounding roads are already congested enough. - Extra traffic is a safety issues to both Clifton College and Clifton High School - Demand on services, hospitals and doctors in the area are already oversubscribed - Schools in the area are already oversubscribed - The strutures proposed are too tall and cover the whole perimeter of the existing zoo, a block of grey is incredibly ugly and out of keeping for this area of outstanding beauty with Durdham Downs. - 4-6 storey buildings proposed, a 6 storey building on the northern boundary by the Downs is completely unacceptable for local historic buildings and architecture and completely out of keeping. - The plans drawn up are deceptive and shown green space in the middle, however the whole perimeter is surrounded with a mass of 4-6 storey buildings looking into Clifton College and surrounding houses gardens, bedrooms etc</p>	30-Jan-23
585. O	<p>The proposed redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens is completely out of keeping for the conservation area of Clifton. The modern blocks of flats above the perimeter walls tower above the street and gardens. These monolithic blocks are entirely incongruent with our area in design, scale, mass and form. They will overwhelm the gardens and obliterate street views of the sky, mature trees and the glimpses of historic buildings that characterise Clifton. A construction project on this scale in a conservation area will completely detract from the desirability and preservation and enhancement of the character of the area. The scale and design may be suitable in a city centre, but is surely inappropriate for our conversation area and looks like something more suitable for Disneyland with hideous balconies with stencils of animals and a humongous 6 storey high green brick giraffe on the side of a building. We were led to believe that the sale of the Zoo Gardens was to pay for new enclosures at Wild Place, but this does not seem to be the case as only the Gorillas and one species of lemur are being relocated! The rest have been shipped off to other zoos, this was not the impression we were given when the Zoo needed to maximise the value of this site. The Zoo is retaining some communal garden space, but it is expected that over 150 mature trees will be removed for this hideous proposed development along with the historic ornamental garden. The towering blocks of flats around the perimeter will not make the communal garden space desirable. The proposed housing development on the north side along Clifton Down and the east side Northcote Road show a building of almost 300 metres of monolithic, uninterrupted block of flats up to 6 storeys high, towering over the existing high perimeter wall and dominating the neighbouring historic buildings. On the north side along Clifton Down from the historic zoo entrance is 150 metres of monolithic, uninterrupted blocks of flats rising to 6 storeys high, some 60ft taller than existing high perimeter walls. Along Guthrie Road near Clifton College's historical buildings the scale is once again overwhelming and completely out of keeping for an area like Clifton in a conservation area. It has to be opposed until a more moderate low level development (3 storeys high max) is proposed that is in keeping with the conservation area and not in some cheap brick with giraffes on the side which is</p>	30-Jan-23

	completely out of character with the bath stone and other quarried stone already seen so much in the surrounding roads.	
--	---	--

586.	O	<p>The issues caused by traffic from the 196 proposed units will severely impact the area around the site. It is naïve to expect that residents will not have cars and those numbers are likely to be higher than the numbers suggested by Bristol City Council's calculations. The area already has traffic issues at school drop off and pick up times. It is also an area that is frequented by school children throughout the day. The amount of traffic that this development will produce will lead to it being unsafe for school children (4-18 yrs olds) to circulate during the day. The views of Northcote Road as submitted on 13 January are very deceptive. They present Northcote Road, with the proposed development, as light and airy. The road is not like that now even on a bright, sunny day. The views also omit to show the southern end of Northcote Road with the extreme height and massing of building E3. The views presented by the developer are misleading and misrepresentative and do not clearly show the effects of the height and scale of the proposed development. Building E3's height and location has not changed. It remains domineering and overbearing. Its scale and height dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road (see doc. BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A- 2602-PL1) including no 1 and no 2 Northcote road, both tall, substantial Victorian houses. Building E3 is significantly taller (8m measured to the eaves) than these and will block more light from Northcote Road due to E3's extreme height. The overall massing and scale of the proposed buildings on Northcote Road need to be reduced to ensure more light reaches Northcote Road and for reasons of safeguarding as they look directly onto the school and a number of its boarding houses. I strongly object to the proposed development it is all too high and out of keeping for the conservation area and historical buildings are lost.</p>	30-Jan-23
------	---	---	-----------

587. O	<p>Whilst I consider that it is a shame that Bristol Zoo feels it must move from its historic and easily accessible site in Clifton to a much more remote and unsustainable location adjacent the M4 motorway as this seems rather contrary to its ecological and conservation objectives, I broadly welcome these proposals. This is because I believe that a carefully designed residential development is the best alternative use of this site. I also consider that it is laudable that the applicants seek to maximise the number of dwellings present and at the same time preserve its gardens. Likewise, I welcome the potential to reduce fly-parking arising from the removal of the Zoo. Nevertheless, I have many concerns about these proposals as they stand. My primary concern is that the buildings are too tall and will overshadow the adjoining properties and dominate this part of Bristol. Thus even a casual visit to the area in which the Zoo is situated will indicate that with the exception of the prominent landmarks provided by several church towers, the Cathedral Spire and the tower of Clifton College, the buildings surrounding this site are of a relatively uniform 3 or 4 storey height. This is true not only of the immediately adjacent area, but of most of the Clifton and Clifton Down areas. As this is not true of the current proposals and I fear the that will visually dominate this area unacceptably. I consider this to be particular problem in respect of Clifton College where it seems that the range of historic buildings adjacent to Guthrie Road will dominated by the new buildings and this will ruin the College's setting by creating an unwelcome intrusion into its backdrop from the south. Whilst placing the taller buildings on the northern site of the site where the ground rises would seem to be sensible, those on the other sides must not be allowed to overshadow the existing buildings on Guthrie, Northcote and College Roads. The current proposals fail in this respect. Likewise, a casual visit to the area in which the Zoo site is located will indicate that most of the building are constructed in the warm colours provided by red sandstone and creamy limestone walls. However, the current proposals seem to be finished in a rather drab cold colour more befitting of a 1970s multi-storey municipal car park than this location and they will do little to enhance its appearance. I notice that the brochure I have receive makes a play of the fact that this development will sit 'sympathetically within the walled gardens' already on the site. To be successful this development must also be sympathetic to the area outside this wall and in this respect, I consider that it fails dramatically. So more need to be done to harmonise this development with its wider surroundings and not just eth former zoo site itself. Consequently, whilst I would not wish to see a pastiche of the surrounding Victorian architecture, I feel a design more in keeping with its neighbourhood in terms of height and colouration could readily be devised. Hence, I feel it rather smacks of something being parachuted in from outside with little thought for its neighbours and needs to be significantly changed. I also consider that Guthrie Road is very busy with Clifton College pupils in term times and so steps must be taken to maximise their safety during the construction of this development. This could best be achieved by the implementation of a Construction Management Plan. As I note that no such document is provided in spurt of this application, I would suggest that it is necessary to devise one forthwith. This strategy must be based on the premiss that works access to the site is obtained only from Clifton Down Road and the large vehicle are not routed through the surrounding residential areas. Overall, therefore, whilst this proposal has much to commend it, I feel that it has a number of fairly obvious shortcomings which must be addressed before it is approved. Under these circumstances I must object to it. Paul Johnson Town and Transport planner</p>	30-Jan-23
--------	--	-----------

588.	O	I am disappointed to note that the latest proposal are very little changed from their predecessors meaning that the chance to create a feature which enhances the locale is being lost. It is difficult to see why the promoters are continuing to believe that grey is a sensible colour for such a prominent development as it more suited to bunkers, machine-gun nests, multi-storey car parks, gasworks and other such utilitarian structures. Indeed, its hard to believe that anyone who has spent any time at all in Bristol has noticed that it rains a fair bit and so the use of warmer colours is highly desirable. In short the local residents are the people who will have to live with this development and their opinion on its appearance deserves to take precedence over imported architects. Regards Paul Johnson	30-Jan-23
589.	O	I have previously commented on the plans to redevelop Bristol Zoo for residential purposes and whilst I was broadly supportive to these proposals, I was very disappointed with the unpleasant visual aspects of the proposed design. As a long-standing local resident is a matter of great concern that the unsightly eyesore which constitutes this design has not been significantly modified in the latest proposals. Indeed, it is hard to discern what changes have been made and good design cannot be replaced by the meaningless spin set out in the Design Guide. Therefore, I must continue to express my disgust at the unsympathetic nature of these proposals which are wholly out of keeping with the surrounding historic area. I must also emphasis that successful design does not stop at the site boundary but must produce a development which fits into the local environment comfortably. The current proposals fail on these grounds and so should not be allowed to proceed unmodified. Moreover, permitting this ill-fitting development to proceed, will set an unhealthy precedent for the future and could easily lead to a rash of similarity ill-conceived development proposals in the Clifton district which will destroy the ambience of the local area. Hence, the applicant should think again and devise something more keeping with the situation of the site.	30-Jan-23

590.	O	I object to the proposed plan because: The proposed medium rise buildings are out of character with the surrounding area. 'Affordable ' and 'for social rent' are not defined in the plans. Few houses, as opposed to flats, are planned. Those that are, will no doubt be astronomically expensive as houses in Clifton always are. This debunks the claim that the zoo sale will provide, admittedly, much needed housing ie houses, not flats, in Bristol. There are already plenty of flats available for private rent in Clifton , at similar prices to other parts of the city. Only some of the accommodation that is planned will have access to on road or off road parking. Although the bus service has improved, this means that the accommodation is less likely to be suitable for families. The proposal that the residents' service charges will fund the upkeep of the public garden is unsustainable in the long, or even medium term . Only a small proportion of the beautiful and historic gardens are to be retained, presumably the lawn and other easy to maintain areas. Instead of planning permission for an inner city, densely populated housing estate , the council should have bought or helped to buy the site to keep the gardens, accessible to the public for a small annual fee. Alternatively a body, such as English Heritage it the National Trust could have taken over the gardens.	30-Jan-23
591.	O	I cannot see a significant difference between the revised and original plans, which I have already objected to. These plans are for an up market housing estate with few units large enough to accommodate families. There are already plenty of similar sized apartments in Clifton available to buy or rent. The design of the blocks is totally out of character with the surrounding conservation area. It is unlikely that the gardens, which will initially be available for public use, will remain so in the future. Many trees will be cut down. The herbaceous border within the zoo gardens, will be bulldozed, in spite of it being award winning and also, over the years, has had the ashes of loved ones scattered on its soil, with the zoo's permission. The twenty per cent of affordable units will still be too expensive for key workers, at eighty percent of their market price. Some wealthy developer will gain from these plans, not the people of Bristol.	30-Jan-23
592.	O	Do we not have enough overpriced houses, or flats in this area. Part of the reason we moved here is because of these beautiful historic places.	30-Jan-23
593.	O	Keep area clean air, housing means cars and pollution, historic building and gardens need to be kept for city heritage and future generations pleasure. Little available centrally apart from this and museums for out children, developers should make houses in outer Bristol area and invest in public transportation.	30-Jan-23
594.	O	i think that the develoment is to big not in keeping with the area . Also there not enough social housing being made available .	30-Jan-23

595.	O	<p>Dear Bristol City Council, Bristol Zoo's well-loved, animal park and historical gardens will be forever lost to the people of Bristol if this application is approved. A city is not just a place to work so that you can pay a mortgage on some over-priced housing - it is a place to live and live well. Bristol needs attractions and spaces for all members of society including the youngest and the oldest to enjoy. The Zoo has served this purpose since 1836 and there seems to be no good reason for stopping now. Bristol Zoo is so much more than gauping at some caged animals. It's a place where small children can run around safely, where picnics can be had on the lawns while learning about parrots, splash about in the water features on hot summer days, walk through a jungle and feed the parakeets from your hand or stroll through the butterfly enclosure. Sure, times change and the concept and the role of zoos naturally have to change as well. But just closing down is not in the public interest. (But very much in the interest of property developers that have smelled a nice and profitable opportunity). The Wild Place has never been remotely close to a replacement for many reasons, but above all how inaccessible it is. Firstly, it is not in Bristol, but by a major motorway junction in South Gloucestershire. Try to get there if you don't want to or can not drive. It involves an hour's bus journey from central Bristol and a miserable walk from an out-of-town shopping centre and crossing the M5. The Wild Place claim that it is "an easy 15 walk" but I challenge you to attempt that with a tired toddler and granny with walking aids. If Bristol is so keen to hit net zero and wants to encourage active or public travel, why close down one of the few attractions that can be enjoyed by all, at any time of the year, that is within easy reach? The planned housing will not make a dent in the housing crisis but will create some extra luxury appartments in an already exclusive address. The trustees of the Zoo have failed in their duty to safeguard and run this wonderful little oasis. I want this planning application to be rejected and the site to be returned to public use.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Liv Franzén</p>	30-Jan-23
596.	O	I object to the redevelopment proposal	30-Jan-23

597.	O	<p>Some will be familiar with Peter Self's article on planning for the new London airport in the 1960's "Nonsense on Stilts", in which he argued that the criteria for the location would favour Hyde Park. But there is, as yet, no London Airport in Hyde Park. Here, we would have a similar instance of an agglomeration of buildings to be dropped in the wrong place - wrong on aesthetic and heritage grounds, but that also fail to meet criteria for a holistic assessment of the total carbon budget: embodied carbon, but also in terms of motorised transport and congestion. The decision to build on this land presents an irreversibility and a 1960s-style proposal. It does not appear that the option of running Bristol Zoo on two sites has been given adequate consideration. The benefits for children of pedestrian, bicycle or bus access would keep a safely accessible zoo in Clifton. Children often prefer to study small mammals, fish and insects, however much they love the megafauna. The Clifton Zoo should remain open. Bristolians will have their right to participate in a proposed removal of a historic public good - if you will, its enclosure, the term not accidentally the same as that of the Scottish experience. In the '20 Ideas for Bristol' exhibition in the late 1970s, in cooperation with Bristol Zoo, the Bristol public showed their flair for new ideas, the legacy of which is visible today in Sustrans' cycle paths, the retention of the cranes on the docks, the ferry services, yet in the proposed enclosure and sale - to whom we know not - of our heritage, we have no say in alternatives, in spite of the various constructive alternative proposals already made. There is, to my knowledge, no comparable example worldwide of selling off a public good, an asset that happens by chance to be at the disposal of decision-makers who appear to be guided by the values of property developers rather than zoologists (and the Zoo's Director is an archaeologist, not a zoologist). Many of the proposed mitigating factors - restrictions on parking, the proportion of affordable housing etc., or the guarantee of public access to the site, will be up for negotiation after the sale. If new residents padlock the gates, there will be scope for civil disorder, or the public will simply be forced out. The proposal fails as it stands to satisfactorily account for its long-term carbon budget. It will impose strains on local services. It will reduce the attractiveness and value of surrounding properties. Crucially, a public good that has lasted for 186 years will be stolen from the community, 'enclosed', without due consideration of alternatives and their economic, environmental and educational benefits. An opportunity to enhance the image of the City, and its attractiveness to visitors, will have been squandered. And the loss of green space and trees, recognised as sources of health and mental wellbeing to urban residents, will be similarly irreversible. There remain, of course, questions of possible conflicts of interest of key decision-makers, which are presumably outwith the considerations of the Planning Committee, but I do hope that a community asset that I have valued all my life can be retained. Until the case for change of use is proven, permission should not be granted.</p>	30-Jan-23
598.	O	<p>The zoo is a community (whole city) resource, and this zone of the city should remain as an amenity for all. The present plans are essentially for a select private dwelling complex. The zone must be kept as a city-wide resource, with ecology and biodiversity as its core function.</p>	30-Jan-23
599.	O		31-Jan-23

600.	O	<p>As a lifelong Bristol resident and parent I very strongly object to this proposal and to the principle of privately developing this historic and important public amenity. Aside from its historic and environmental importance, there are few spaces in the city where children have a space safe from traffic to play and run around, and to have contact with nature. Bristol Zoo Gardens is one of those sites. It has been so for generations of Bristol families and should remain so for generations ahead. Regardless of what happens to the animals, this site is a historic and important space for all Bristolians and should remain as a public amenity in perpetuity. Turning this site over to housing, destroying both architectural heritage and natural space and removing it as an educational, open space for all to access, would be a crime in my opinion. I have read the evidence regarding BZGs accounts and other reasons for wanting to close the site and do not believe a strong case has been made. In fact, there seem to be many unanswered questions and inconsistencies. There would need to be a far more robust case made for any change of use before an irreversible decision was made that would take away a unique, precious and much-loved place from future generations of Bristolians.</p>	31-Jan-23
601.	O	<p>As a long-term resident of Clifton I wish to strongly object to the BZG plans for the zoo's redevelopment. I regard the zoo as one of the most special places for the public to visit in Bristol, with its long history of education and conservation regarding the animal kingdom and its historic gardens. Because it's in Clifton, it is easy to visit by public transport and has always been a much loved and well used place for families. Wild Place is only really accessible easily by car which makes it a much less attractive option for Bristol families. I am also sceptical of the potential range of animals which will be housed there. I would be surprised if there have penguins or seals, for example, or an aquarium, all of which educated visiting children over the years. Having read the BZG's reports, I do not believe there was ever a financial case for the zoo to close, and I think this should be revisited. If it can't remain as a zoo, then the site should remain a public amenity in perpetuity. I am not convinced that it will remain as this if the development is allowed. The houses/flats will be expensive and I think with the passage of time, the wealthy owners will object to the public having continued access. The planned density and height of the proposed housing is totally unsuitable to this site. Bristol does have a significant housing shortage but there will be only 20% affordable housing. This development will not make much difference to the shortage, providing instead more housing for wealthy Cliftonians. There will be a loss of at least 80 trees and 31 groups or part groups of trees which contravenes of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy Policy BCS22. If Bristol is trying to become a Greener place, with cleaner air and more tree covers, then this is totally wrong.</p>	01-Feb-23
602.	O	<p>I object strongly to these plans for housing that have been submitted regarding the site at the Zoo.</p>	03-Feb-23

603.	O	I wish to object strongly to the proposed Plan to change the Zoo Gardens into a housing development. This area comprises many special trees and is a wonderful green area for everyone to enjoy in the future. The area is a national treasure and should be secured for the future. Yours faithfully Sonya Clifton	03-Feb-23
604.	O	Three grounds: Aesthetic. The images suggest that it will be large and overwhelming in this predominantly residential area. The style is incompatible with surrounding buildings (and only consistent with the unattractive blocks of flats around the waterside area. Amenity. This will lead to the destruction of a major local amenity, a much loved and well-tended green space with the loss of a number of mature trees. The idea that residents will continue to pay to support access for outsiders is risible. It is increasingly clear how much green space contributes to the wellbeing of inhabitants Moral. This space exists because it has been supported and loved by Bristol's population for many years. It does not feel correct that this should now be given over to the ownership of a small number of rich people who will be able to buy the flats.	03-Feb-23
605.	O	I object to the plans for development of Bristol Zoo Gardens as currently proposed because: 1. I believe the Trustees of the Zoo have not properly fulfilled their obligations as Trustees to pursue the purpose of the Zoo, but are driven by a profit motive and interest in development of the site instead of being informed by conservation or environmental education. 2. It has not been established that there is a need for change of use or that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. 3. The loss of this site as a communal asset is huge and the plans proposed are unlikely to protect public access in the long term. 4. The design proposed is completely inappropriate in terms of scale and style with the surrounding area. Stylistically the buildings proposed are too massive and unbroken, forming a continuous block out of keeping with the environment of the area. 5. Detriment to and loss of landscape and green space and important trees. This is a significant garden of historic importance and immense value to the urban environment and is listed and an important open space and a Historic park and garden.	03-Feb-23
606.	O	The scale and appearance of the proposed scheme is inappropriate for the location. It does not enhance the conservation area in any way.	04-Feb-23
607.	O	The overbearing appearance of multi-storey flat blocks is not in keeping with the local architecture, especially in a conservation zone. It's such a shame that an iconic piece of Bristol is about to be destroyed.	04-Feb-23
608.	O	The proposed development of the old Bristol Zoo site is entirely out of keeping with the conservation area that it sits within. It is far too big - the scale of the buildings overwhelms those around it and it is the wrong style entirely and out of keeping with its surroundings. Added to this, the loss of green space and mature trees are very sad. The space could be a real value add to the local area, with the right kind of development but this one is not it.	05-Feb-23
609.	O		06-Feb-23

610.	O	The design proposed is completely inappropriate in terms of scale and style with the surrounding area. Stylistically the buildings proposed are too massive and unbroken, forming a continuous block out of keeping with the area. It is also detrimental to the landscape and green space and important trees in a significant garden of historic importance and immense value.	06-Feb-23
611.	R	I live about 10 minutes walk from the zoo. In my road there are perhaps 10 households who ought to be considering downsizing in the next 10 years, and for whom flats on the zoo site would be most suitable (I'm not interested in 'retirement' flats such as the Vincent development). I know that developers 'try it on', but the artist's impressions that I have seen are a bit tall - lop off one or two floors and all would be well. I suppose I'm an IMBY (in my backyard, please!). Martin Robinson	07-Feb-23
612.	O	Bristol Zoo with its historic gates, gardens and buildings have played a huge part in generations of the local community, whilst bringing visitors from further across the UK and abroad. With them bringing financial benefits to the zoo and surrounding area. This historic venue should remain accessible for future generations. The importance of this space, is not just emotional but the plant life is vital to the local ecology. There is much focus on the local area introducing clean air zones and pedestrian only spaces and introducing additional housing will only be detrimental to the local infrastructure. Bristol Zoo and it's gardens has seen generations volunteering to tend the garden space and provide a welcome clean space for children to play and learn. There are many other spaces in the surrounding area that would welcome affordable housing but introducing additional multi-million pound housing will not benefit younger generations battling to enter the property ladder.	07-Feb-23

613. O	<p>I object to this planning application on the following grounds: 1. Loss of trees in a conservation area, many of which will be mature specimens and tree cover is needed amongst all the proposed flats, not only for greenery but also to keep the area cooler in our increasingly hot summers. 2. Design of proposed properties is out of character with buildings in the area. It is reminiscent of the height and scale of the Prora Buildings on Rugen, Germany, supervised by Albrecht Speer, the great Nazi Architect. It will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding Victorian buildings as it imposes a solid wall of buildings, rather than the roof line of a Victorian Terrace. The proposed buildings, especially those in Guthrie Road, will not reflect the wonderful stonework of the College Buildings nor the Music department buildings. A good example of best practice is the new build done by Clifton College at the bottom of the Avenue, where the casual observer would not know this was a complete new build as it matches the surrounding buildings. This was an award winning development. 3. This is overdevelopment in a conservation area and with the proposed number of flats (196), where would all the owners park, which is important as we now all live within a parking scheme that could not absorb that number of cars. 4. This development would overwhelm the streetscape and ruin a once peaceful location in Clifton. It will not enhance the area nor will it reflect the green space it borders (the Downs). The proposals are extremely ordinary and boring, more like a 1960s design for a city centre than a conservation area in Clifton. This proposal is poor and badly thought out. I object totally to this.</p>	07-Feb-23
--------	---	-----------

614.	O	<p>Overall Comment The Campaign to Save Bristol Zoo Gardens (SBZG) started with an investigation into how the Zoological Society had made its decision to close the Clifton site and into the business reasons provided. The Campaign found that these reasons which would support their claim that the Zoo was no longer viable on the Clifton site were unfounded. The following points below specify how the application is in breach of planning law and policy. Change of Use not justified The Campaign has enlisted the support of accountants and a former Zoo Director who have confirmed that there is no reason the 186 year old site should not continue in business as a successful visitor attraction. Income, profitability and visitor numbers had all been positive in the decade preceding 2020 and all showed sign of recovery to their pre-Covid levels prior to the Zoo's closure. The picture of the Clifton site as an inevitable failure is false and the decision to sell all their property in Clifton was taken to provide capital funds for their Wild Place Project in Gloucestershire. Both Local Plan policy DM5 and Core Strategy Policy BCS12 make direct reference to the fact that the loss of Community Facilities will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no longer a demand for the facility or that the building/s are no longer suitable to accommodate the use and the building cannot be retained or adapted to another community use. Furthermore Policy DM5 goes onto state that the loss of a community facility will only be acceptable if a replacement facility can be provided in 'a suitable alternative location'. The Zoo's own figures indicate that there is still a continuing demand and zoo keepers and zoologists confirm that the site is suitable for certain species of animal. Many alternative community uses have been proposed, ranging from a city farm to an Eden Project style gardens. Sufficient time has not been given to explore these possibilities or their funding. The Wild Place is not a suitable alternative location, requiring car transport, whereas a city zoo is easily accessed by public transport, bicycle or on foot. Ecology and Sustainability The Bristol Tree Forum has already challenged the Zoo's claim of a 38% increase in biodiversity as it is based on outdated methodology. They estimate the outcome to be a 22% net loss. The loss of trees is excessive and experts fear for the remainder when surrounded by building works and then by tall buildings. The proposal to plant '2 for 1' is less than the Council's Tree Replacement Standard. Demolition and rebuilding is not the preferred approach by RIBA due to the loss of embodied energy in demolition and the carbon cost on construction materials. A Bristol environment expert supporting the Campaign estimates the carbon cost of the construction proposed on the site would be equivalent to running the existing buildings for 2500 years. Adaptation or reuse is to be preferred. Public amenity The proposed public access and maintenance of the gardens is to be funded by a levy on the residents. But there is insufficient evidence that this right will be granted in perpetuity as this access is permissive and could be modified or withdrawn. It is the prediction of many objectors to his scheme that the residents will object to funding a public amenity and in time it will become a private space. The scheme provides no long term protection of public access. This could be provided by the dedication of the site for public access in perpetuity under section 16 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, which would be binding on subsequent owners. Alternatively, designation as a town or village green. The Zoo could apply for voluntary registration under the Commons Act 2006 Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site The May 2022 Heritage Statement acknowledged the harm that is caused to the site and Conservation Area through the departure of the Zoo from its historic home, a point echoed by Historic England. The SBZG disagrees that this harm is justified by the current proposal. The significance and irreplaceability of</p>	07-Feb-23
------	---	---	-----------

	<p>the site as a whole is fundamental to this application. Bristol Zoo Gardens is the oldest one in the UK and the fifth oldest in the world. It has been open for 186 years. NPPF 189 states: 'These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations'. Loss of Communal Value Defined as 'Value deriving from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.' in English Heritage, Conservation Principles, 2008. At the public level, hundreds of thousands of people have visited the Zoo as children, as adults and with their own children for more than 150 years and the loss of this experience is not to be taken lightly. Additionally, the ashes of many people have been scattered within the herbaceous borders - to be lost under a roadway - while others have held weddings and celebrations in the Pavilion, which will be lost to flats. Harm to listed buildings The original and particular use of many of the buildings is integral to their historic significance and is cited as a key reason in the listing designations of the four animal houses on the site, justifying their listing at Grade II and their national importance. Harm to an asset of this significance should clearly be only as a last resort. The D&A statement refers to 'Historically significant buildings retained and sensitively converted to unique, environmentally sustainable homes'. But the SBZG finds that such conversion would completely change the presentation and significance of these buildings, meaning the loss of: the Clifton Pavilion, Great Aviary/Parrot House, Giraffe House and the Museum/Activity Centre, all to apartments. It is not considered that the applicant has made the case for the level of harm proposed to the listed buildings within the site. Justification of harm It is recognised by the NPPF that new uses are sometimes needed for heritage assets to generate income for their long-term future. In order to do this, it may be necessary to cause some harm, but it is clear that in identifying the 'optimum viable use' for a heritage asset, the optimum viable use is one that causes the least harm to significance. The SBZG argues that the proposed scheme would cause significant and irreversible harm and is not justified. Alternatives Other proposals for the site have been put forward either in broad outline or in detail and this suggests that other schemes are possible. Covid has provided a distraction so that disposal of the site is presented as a finished decision. But this is a nationally important site and time could usefully be taken to allow further time for ideas or to run a competition to determine its future. The Campaign's preference is that it reopens as 'a Zoo fit for the 21st century' which was the Zoo's strategy up to 2020. Design Even if there were no alternative to building densely on the site, the proposal is a homogeneous scheme that does not respond to the architectural character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area, which is predominantly large detached and semi-detached villas alongside imposing educational buildings situated within a verdant landscape and tree-lined avenues. The scale of development within the southern end of the site would be over-intensive with a consequential poor relationship with the adjacent school and its listed buildings. The north building at six storeys is an unrelenting monolithic block that does not respond to the character and appearance of the area. The relationship between the existing listed buildings and the scale and location of proposed development is extremely poor, in particular the Bear Pit would be overly dominated by new development. Landscape Bristol Zoo Gardens are a locally listed heritage asset designated as a Local Historic Park/Garden and an Important Open Space. The Avon Gardens Trust has voiced concerns around the loss of trees, the viability of translocating other trees and</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>hedges and the general impact on green infrastructure from ground and environmental disturbance during the long phases of works and the eventual overshadowing from tall buildings. Cars and Parking The Grand Terrace is a defining feature of the gardens and is not worthy of being used as a deliveries and service route. The circular road to access houses needs to be rethought not least as it creates another visual and psychological barrier for free pedestrian access to the green spaces within the site. There is concern that there will be insufficient car parking provision, which will result in the reality of extensive areas of on street parking throughout the site. SAVE Bristol Zoo Gardens Campaign February 2022</p>	
615.	O	<p>I object to the loss of a communal space with established transport and bus links. This space should be preserved for the good of the community as a safe, easy accessible space for families and members of the community to come together. The historic nature of the site is so valuable to bristol and I feel further consideration should be given to options to replace the zoo which also provide the same opportunity for the communities, not only in the local area, but as a central meeting place for families across the city.</p>	07-Feb-23
616.	O	<p>This development will mean a loss of communal and green space for the community. It should be conserved as a green recreation space for the community to enjoy.</p>	07-Feb-23
617.	O	<p>I object to the plans for the Bristol Zoo Gardens site for a number of reasons: - increased traffic and noise due to increased housing in a conservation area - insensitive/overbearing/gigantic design on edge of a green space and within a conservation area - removal of many mature trees to make way for housing development Please re-consider the change of use to this site and find a more sensitive solution? It's not all about the financial yield from selling large numbers of dwellings - its about developing it sensitively for future generations to admire rather than the incongruous monstrosity currently suggested.</p>	07-Feb-23

618.	O	After a lifetime's association with the Zoo gardens it is extremely sad to see its closure although I completely understand reasons for it. It is no place for large animals but I would have thought great consideration would be brought to this historic and rare site. I understand the beautiful facade will remain but images of proposed huge new buildings are actually very disconcerting. Surely any new build should be strictly in keeping with the surroundings in this very special and rare conservation area. With Bristol so up and coming and very much in the world's eye nowadays surely it is essential to maintain responsibly this exceptionally beautiful and most loved area. The approach to Clifton Village, the Downs and Suspension Bridge should enhance many visitors experience of our beloved City. I am sure someone can produce beautiful plans for new buildings/homes which will be in keeping in size and structure with the area. Tall 'soviet bloc' structures will have the most negative effect. We surely have many imaginative, talented developers and architects who could make this an impressive project and not just about cramming in as many dwellings as possible in the space. I am pleased to know that there will be some recreational public space, but for how long? I am not against progress which is essential but some sensitivity must surely be shown here.	08-Feb-23
619.	O	The closure of Bristol Zoo was a sad event in itself, but along with many others I'm now concerned about the plans for redeveloping the site. The proposed development of nearly 200 residencies in the space the zoo once occupied would be concern enough, but it now appears that the proposed buildings are in no way sympathetic to the area they will occupy. How do blocks of no doubt exclusive flats fit with the character of the surrounding buildings and the area in general? Whilst there may have been sound economic reasons for moving the zoo, surely this site deserves a more fitting and more inspirational development?	08-Feb-23
620.	O	This proposal is not for the good of the community at all. Furthermore, the disruption to the surrounding areas, not least of all the school will be extremely detrimental, for what is, in essence, a high rise development. This entire project is flawed and should not be allowed as will be blight on the neighbourhood.	08-Feb-23
621.	O	I write on behalf of myself and my wife as local residents of many years standing. The proposed development is awful. It is out of scale to its surroundings, overbearing, of no architectural merit, destructive of an historic space and its gardens, and utterly inconsistent with the commitment to high amenity standards in Bristol's Core Strategy and the standards required of development in a conservation area.	08-Feb-23
622.	O	The development is totally out of character in a conservation area. The tall block of flats on Guthrie Road will overlook a school and will lead to inappropriate behaviour with regards the children. The blocks should be much lower and set behind a wall so not visible from the school buildings.	08-Feb-23

623.	O	It seems, from local campaign literature, that the designs for housing are not in keeping with the character of Clifton, and do not preserve or enhance the character of the area. Indeed, they appear detrimental. I would request that the design is significantly modified so that it remains in keeping with Clifton, and its Georgian and Victorian architecture. I would also request that the character of the grounds of the Zoo are retained. I did understand from literature produced by the Zoo before its closure, that this was the intention. This, however, no longer appears to be the case. I have no objection to the building of new homes but firmly believe that there should be limited impact on the character of Clifton.	08-Feb-23
624.	S	Three BZG planning committee proposals are detailed and allow for continued access to the area for the community in Bristol. This will provide new, good quality housing in central Bristol which is desperately needed. I'm sorry to see the Zoo go but it would be foolish to turn this area into residential space. Particularly because there's no shortage of green space just across the road, i.e. the Clifton Downs!	08-Feb-23
625.	O	Bristol Zoo Gardens is a green and educational space and should not be developed for numerous flats and exclude the majority. There are numerous reasons for ensuring it is not developed, including the tourism value set out by BCC itself before the pandemic. The demand has not diminished but increased. Here are just a few reasons for objecting: Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space. Exclusive or restricted access to the site and buildings that are higher and more densely packed than those surrounding just don't work for residents and visitors. BZG brings visitors to the area and that brings value to the local economy. This is not the time for taking away - we need to build on such great amenities for the long term future	09-Feb-23

626.	O	<p>The proposed housing development is totally inappropriate for the area. - It is too high and blocks light and openness. - It is too dense, extensive and flat/block-like, looking more like a fortress - The appearance is not in keeping with the Victorian and other houses in the area. - It causes the loss of mature trees that provide oxygenation, habitat for birds and other fauna - It causes the loss and destruction of world- renowned herbaceous borders that mean the loss of flora and fauna - There is no protection for public access to the whole area, in perpetuity. - The density of the building will require extensive parking on site. There is insufficient street parking already so there is no space for the cars of additional residents. Nobody can reasonably believe that the home buyers will not have cars that need parking. Just because the area has buses doesn't mean they can get to where they need to, by bus. Overall, the scale, density and height of the development is wrong for the area and the impacts beyond just the building have not been considered. If they had, these would not be the outcome.</p>	09-Feb-23
627.	O	<p>SAVE Bristol Zoo Gardens Campaign; Campaign Group; Customer objects to the Planning Application Overall Comment The Campaign to Save Bristol Zoo Gardens (SBZG) started with an investigation into how the Zoological Society had made its decision to close the Clifton site and into the business reasons provided. The Campaign found that these reasons which would support their claim that the Zoo was no longer viable on the Clifton site were unfounded. The following points below specify how the application is in breach of planning law and policy. Change of Use not justified The Campaign has enlisted the support of accountants and a former Zoo Director who have confirmed that there is no reason the 186 year old site should not continue in business as a successful visitor attraction. Income, profitability and visitor numbers had all been positive in the decade preceding 2020 and all showed sign of recovery to their pre-Covid levels prior to the Zoo's closure. The picture of the Clifton site as an inevitable failure is false and the decision to sell all their property in Clifton was taken to provide capital funds for their Wild Place Project in Gloucestershire. Both Local Plan policy DM5 and Core Strategy Policy BCS12 make direct reference to the fact that the loss of Community Facilities will not be permitted unless it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no longer a demand for the facility or that the building/s are no longer suitable to accommodate the use and the building cannot be retained or adapted to another community use. Furthermore Policy DM5 goes onto state that the loss of a community facility will only be acceptable if a replacement facility can be provided in 'a suitable alternative location'. The Zoo's own figures indicate that there is still a continuing demand and zoo keepers and zoologists confirm that the site is suitable for certain species of animal. Many alternative community uses have been proposed, ranging from a city farm to an Eden Project style gardens. Sufficient time has not been given to explore these possibilities or their funding. The Wild Place is not a suitable alternative location, requiring car transport, whereas a city zoo is easily accessed by public transport, bicycle or on foot. Ecology and Sustainability The Bristol Tree Forum has already challenged the Zoo's claim of a 38% increase in biodiversity as it is based on outdated methodology. They estimate the outcome to be a 22% net loss. The loss of trees is excessive and experts fear for the remainder when surrounded by building works and then by tall buildings. The proposal to plant '2 for 1' is less than the Council's Tree Replacement Standard. Demolition and rebuilding is not the preferred approach by RIBA due to the loss of embodied energy in demolition and the carbon cost on construction</p>	09-Feb-23

	<p>materials. A Bristol environment expert supporting the Campaign estimates the carbon cost of the construction proposed on the site would be equivalent to running the existing buildings for 2500 years. Adaptation or reuse is to be preferred. Public amenity The proposed public access and maintenance of the gardens is to be funded by a levy on the residents. But there is insufficient evidence that this right will be granted in perpetuity as this access is permissive and could be modified or withdrawn. It is the prediction of many objectors to his scheme that the residents will object to funding a public amenity and in time it will become a private space. The scheme provides no long term protection of public access. This could be provided by the dedication of the site for public access in perpetuity under section 16 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, which would be binding on subsequent owners. Alternatively, designation as a town or village green. The Zoo could apply for voluntary registration under the Commons Act 2006</p> <p>Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site The May 2022 Heritage Statement acknowledged the harm that is caused to the site and Conservation Area through the departure of the Zoo from its historic home, a point echoed by Historic England. The SBZG disagrees that this harm is justified by the current proposal. The significance and irreplaceability of the site as a whole is fundamental to this application. Bristol Zoo Gardens is the oldest one in the UK and the fifth oldest in the world. It has been open for 186 years. NPPF 189 states: 'These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations'. Loss of Communal Value Defined as 'Value deriving from the meanings of a place for the people who relate to it, or for whom it figures in their collective experience or memory.' in English Heritage, Conservation Principles, 2008. At the public level, hundreds of thousands of people have visited the Zoo as children, as adults and with their own children for more than 150 years and the loss of this experience is not to be taken lightly. Additionally, the ashes of many people have been scattered within the herbaceous borders - to be lost under a roadway - while others have held weddings and celebrations in the Pavilion, which will be lost to flats.</p> <p>Harm to listed buildings The original and particular use of many of the buildings is integral to their historic significance and is cited as a key reason in the listing designations of the four animal houses on the site, justifying their listing at Grade II and their national importance. Harm to an asset of this significance should clearly be only as a last resort. The D&A statement refers to 'Historically significant buildings retained and sensitively converted to unique, environmentally sustainable homes'. But the SBZG finds that such conversion would completely change the presentation and significance of these buildings, meaning the loss of: the Clifton Pavilion, Great Aviary/Parrot House, Giraffe House and the Museum/Activity Centre, all to apartments. It is not considered that the applicant has made the case for the level of harm proposed to the listed buildings within the site.</p> <p>Justification of harm It is recognised by the NPPF that new uses are sometimes needed for heritage assets to generate income for their long-term future. In order to do this, it may be necessary to cause some harm, but it is clear that in identifying the 'optimum viable use' for a heritage asset, the optimum viable use is one that causes the least harm to significance. The SBZG argues that the proposed scheme would cause significant and irreversible harm and is not justified.</p> <p>Alternatives Other proposals for the site have been put forward either in broad outline or in detail and this suggests that other schemes are possible. Covid has provided a distraction so that disposal of the site is presented as a finished decision. But this is a nationally</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>important site and time could usefully be taken to allow further time for ideas or to run a competition to determine its future. The Campaign's preference is that it reopens as 'a Zoo fit for the 21st century' which was the Zoo's strategy up to 2020.</p> <p>Design Even if there were no alternative to building densely on the site, the proposal is a homogeneous scheme that does not respond to the architectural character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area, which is predominantly large detached and semi-detached villas alongside imposing educational buildings situated within a verdant landscape and tree-lined avenues. The scale of development within the southern end of the site would be over-intensive with a consequential poor relationship with the adjacent school and its listed buildings. The north building at six storeys is an unrelenting monolithic block that does not respond to the character and appearance of the area. The relationship between the existing listed buildings and the scale and location of proposed development is extremely poor, in particular the Bear Pit would be overly dominated by new development. Landscape Bristol Zoo Gardens are a locally listed heritage asset designated as a Local Historic Park/Garden and an Important Open Space. The Avon Gardens Trust has voiced concerns around the loss of trees, the viability of translocating other trees and hedges and the general impact on green infrastructure from ground and environmental disturbance during the long phases of works and the eventual overshadowing from tall buildings. Cars and Parking The Grand Terrace is a defining feature of the gardens and is not worthy of being used as a deliveries and service route. The circular road to access houses needs to be rethought not least as it creates another visual and psychological barrier for free pedestrian access to the green spaces within the site. There is concern that there will be insufficient car parking provision, which will result in the reality of extensive areas of on street parking throughout the site.</p> <p>SAVE Bristol Zoo Gardens Campaign February 2022</p>	
--	---	--

628.	O	<p>In their 2020-2025 Strategy the Bristol, Clifton and West of England Zoological Society made it clear they intended to develop both the Bristol Zoo and Wild Place. That was the right approach. Sadly the Society have reneged on that strategy and for reasons that have been shown to be arguable, have decided to sell the site. Furthermore the Society has not established the case for a change of use. The proposed redevelopment is fundamentally to raise as much money as possible money to spend at Wild Place. BZG is a unique asset to Bristol with its glorious mature gardens, a selection of animals birds and insects suitable for being kept in the enclosures they are housed in, a strong focus on education and in a location easily accessible for the population of our city. It is harmonious with the surrounding buildings of Clifton. It has been highly successful in drawing large numbers, and with few exceptions has been profitable year on year. The visitors come to enjoy both the zoo and the gardens. The proposed new gardens will not be of the same interest to the public. The case for maintaining a city zoo alongside Wild Place should have been more fully explored. London Zoo with out-of-town Whipsnade should be the model for Bristol. It should be in the interest of Bristol City Council to do everything it can to enable the Society to keep to their own 2020-2025 strategy. Bristol City planning department should throw out the plans for the Bristol Zoo site to become a housing development with 196 housing units, many of which will be out of character with surrounding Victorian Clifton - a Conservation Area and a heritage site. It will result in fewer mature trees and adversely affect local wild life. Wild Place, although good in its own way, is not re-providing much of what the Bristol Zoo does so well. I am a local resident. and my family - wife, children and grandchildren - have all greatly enjoyed the Bristol Zoo and learnt much from our many visits. I therefore strongly object to the plans - both in principle and much of the detail.</p>	09-Feb-23
629.	O	<p>I do not think the proposed development is in keeping with the character of the area. I think the the scale is out of proportion with surrounding buildings and the style of building is not appropriate.</p>	10-Feb-23
630.	S	<p>I support this application. I was saddened by the news that the gardens were to close having been a visitor there for over 65 years. However, times have moved on and the most important work that the zoo carries out in wild life conservation must be supported. There is an opportunity here to build some very exciting modern and sustainable housing that Bristol can be proud of. It is also an opportunity to create a place were anyone can come to enjoy, unlike a pay to use facility. Over the years the zoo has become much more of a garden and recreational place than somewhere to come to learn about animals -the emphasis has shifted now we live in an age of beautifully researched and filmed television. I hope there will be a way to create some kind of covenant to prevent the gardens from becoming a gated community and also that the Zoo will always maintain an interest in the development as a place of education. I am very enthusiastic as long as it can be maintained as promised.</p>	10-Feb-23

631.	O	Having looked at the proposed redevelopment plans for Bristol Zoological Gardens, I strongly object to the height of the block of flats alongside the main entrance. The new building(s) will be out of proportion to the surroundings and will dominate the area in a detrimental way.	11-Feb-23
632.	O	I object to these plans on the grounds of loss of light or privacy for surrounding buildings, and especially of light on the roads and pavements. The number of residences will be detrimental to local highway safety, and increase every local traffic and parking issue. The increase in noise will adversely affect local residents, people using the Downs for recreation, and local wildlife. The claim that locals can use the gardens is questionable (how long for? Who maintains or polices the area?). The building have no regard to local conservation or designs, they're monolithic and add nothing to what is a distinctive local character and period. The boxlike appearance of the development is thoughtless and illfitting.	11-Feb-23
633.	O	I object to proposed buildings in the planning application that are of a greater height than those on the site when it was Bristol Zoo.	11-Feb-23
634.	O	Dear madam, dear sir, suggested design will sadly be in extreme negative contrast to the beautiful, much appreciated trademark architecture of Clifton. While new developments are welcome no or very little consideration seems to have been taken to blend a new functional residential building into the unique architectural signature of Clifton/ Guthrie road. Modern at hire tire has so much more to offer than what is envisaged here. I and my family strongly object to the design as shown in information sent to us, and we object wholeheartedly. Prof Dr Guido Pieleles	12-Feb-23
635.	O	Not only does this planning not explain what exactly will happen to the mature garden and trees that are in the grounds , it is not what was suggested in the original planning of course no affordable housing is planned within this . The plans say demolition of selective buildings this is not clear enough do we have to wait until the developers accidently destroy things before they become accountable.	12-Feb-23

636.	O	<p>I strongly object to this application and think that the whole zoo and the total space should be saved for future generations. I think this site would be such a sad loss to the people of Bristol and a huge loss to tourism for Bristol. It would be a loss of communal value and space. It is a green and educational space and should not be developed for numerous flats and exclude the majority. I also understand that the business reasons provided by the zoo as to why the zoo was no longer viable on the Clifton site were unfounded and the application is in breach of planning law and policy. Bristol Zoo Gardens is the oldest one in the UK and the fifth oldest in the world. It has been open for 186 years. NPPF 189 states: 'These assets are an irreplaceable resource and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations'. The need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear, and alternatives have not been explored. This planning application does not explain what exactly will happen to the mature garden and trees that are in the grounds, however, I understand that the loss of trees will be excessive, and experts fear for the remainder when surrounded by building works and then by tall buildings. The proposal to plant '2 for 1' is less than the Council's Tree Replacement Standard. The plans says demolition of selective buildings - this is not clear enough. Do we have to wait until the developers accidentally destroy things before they become accountable? The new building(s) will be out of proportion and not in-keeping to the surroundings and will dominate the area in a detrimental way. The buildings have no regard to local conservation or designs, they're monolithic and add nothing to what is a distinctive local character and period. The boxlike appearance of the development is thoughtless and ill-fitting. There will be loss of light or privacy for surrounding buildings, and especially of light on the roads and pavements. The number of residences will be detrimental to local highway safety, and increase every local traffic and parking issue. The increase in noise will adversely affect local residents, people using the Downs for recreation, and local wildlife. The claim that locals can use the gardens is questionable (how long for? Who maintains or polices the area?). I understand that the scheme provides no long-term protection of public access. The proposed public access and maintenance of the gardens is to be funded by a levy on the residents. But there is insufficient evidence that this right will be granted in perpetuity as this access is permissive and could be modified or withdrawn. What if the residents will object to funding a public amenity and in time it will become a private space? This is a nationally important site and time could usefully be taken to allow further time for ideas or to run a competition to determine its future. Bristol Zoo Gardens are a locally listed heritage asset designated as a Local Historic Park/Garden and an Important Open Space. Bristol Zoo should be saved.</p>	13-Feb-23
637.	O	<p>I am shocked to see the nature of the proposed development at the zoo site. The design is unsympathetic and overbearing and totally unsuitable for a conservation area. A conservation area is designed to preserve or enhance the area's character this large scale development will do the opposite. The only aim here is to maximise the monetary value upon the site. The design will overwhelm the gardens, obliterate street views and dominate the surrounding area. It appears the zoo's plans are very different to what was promised.</p>	13-Feb-23
638.	O	Shame to lose such a great space to yet more housing	13-Feb-23
639.	O	Way too many flats!	14-Feb-23

640.	O	I would like to strongly object to the application concerning Bristol Zoo Gardens and the erection of 196 residential units. Whilst it is essential to build new homes, consideration must be given to the existing character of the area. There is the opportunity here to open out the former zoological gardens in a way that would both enhance the area and give benefit to Bristolians. The proposed scheme closes off the area with quite forbidding block of housing, shutting out some light and completely changing the nature of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the existing trees, many planned to be felled, are an essential part of the character of the area. Furthermore, the proposed housing makes no acknowledgement of the existing Victorian and Edwardian buildings and would make a huge impact on the architectural character of the area and far from preserving it, would unalterably change it. It would appear that 'special attention' by the current architects has not properly been directed at 'preserving or enhancing' the area.	14-Feb-23
641.	O	Whilst I am not generally against the redevelopment of the Zoo Gardens the proposed buildings will be a Blot on the local area. It looks more like a prison block than a prime residential development. There nowhere near enough parking for the number of properties proposed and the local streets are already clogged up with cars, some so much so that Emergency Services struggle to get through! The whole scheme needs to be scrapped and returned to the drawing board.	14-Feb-23
642.	O	The site of the old Zoo Gardens is historic and a legacy should, in my opinion, be left so the whole of the Bristol community can continue to enjoy the plant collection and gardens in their entirety, as well as reminding us of its past. There are too many housing units for this size plot and the building plans do not appear aesthetically pleasing or in keeping to the legacy we were led to believe would be incorporated, they look like concrete blocks with little consideration for the surrounding environment. What happened to the idea of conservation, I feel we have been led to think this was going to be with the legacy in mind not some developer making money.	14-Feb-23
643.	O	I object strongly to this application. Surely we can do better than this dreadful proposal. Let's have a rethink about it and try to show a little bit more imagination. Thank you.	14-Feb-23
644.	O	The beauty and character of Clifton and The Downs is a treasured part of Bristol's heritage. Clifton is rightly a conservation area which has largely and wisely been protected from insensitive development. This application would be comical if its aim was to show how ignorance of scale and insensitivity to surroundings could create a "monstrous carbuncle" in the heart of Clifton. That is a serious proposal is alarming! It is worthy of a post war Moscow suburb at its worst. It adds nothing to the character of the area but potentially blights it. I object in the strongest terms possible.	14-Feb-23
645.	O	This type of construction is a monstrosity. It is not in line with a historical site or inline with the local area. I strongly object to this Mediterranean style housing and the concrete jungle with as many people as possible. It is way too high and the whole plan needs to be re-looked at.	15-Feb-23

646.	O	I am objecting to the subject planning application which lies in a conservation area and includes listed buildings. The overall design is out of scale with the adjacent buildings and is overbearing in nature. There will be a loss of public amenity space and many significant trees will be lost (and others potentially damaged). The business case demonstrating the existing use is not viable is unconvincing and so the need for change of use is not made. Overall, neither the principle of change nor design details are acceptable and should be refused.	15-Feb-23
647.	O	Not in keeping with the area Looks like a prison block Six stories too high 196 homes is far too many It's likely a high number of car ownership thus creating problems with parking, causing traffic delays at peak times Invasion of privacy for surrounding properties and gardens, including Clifton College School sites	15-Feb-23
648.	S	I strongly support this proposal which provides much needed housing. The design is well thought out by a top class architect. It is sensitively designed and fits in well. The current owner is leaving the main features of the Gardens for more public to view. Previously you needed to pay to enter the Zoo to see them. Bristol Zoo gardens have closed. The move to the Wild Place will benefit more people and provide a more natural environment for the animals. The disposal of this site will benefit world wide animal conservation.	15-Feb-23
649.	O		16-Feb-23

650.	O	<p>Morning Matthew, I hope you are well. We understand from Sinead McKendry of Savills that they have issued a clarification additional to our Objection dated January 2023, grateful if you could note our clients position in this light: 1) In our objection dated January 2023, we note that "A Visually Verified Montage (VVM) view has been provided from across the College playing fields (The Close), from the base of the Cricket Pavilion. However, this only demonstrates the outline of the proposed South Buildings along Guthrie Road with a height of 3 to 4 storeys and not the larger scale development that sits at a higher level, namely the proposed perimeter apartments that make up the North Buildings with a maximum height of 6 storeys or the East Buildings which range in height from 3 to 5 storeys." Our concern with the VVM is not simply the location it is taken from but rather what it does/does not show in terms of detail, notably we do not think it shows the full impact of the taller buildings on the BZG site on the College's Main Campus. As such our objection still stands. 2) In regard to Location we state the following in our objection dated January 2023, "Additionally, the proposed view included within the VVM is neither taken from the protected Local View (LC24) which runs from the south-west corner of the College's Grounds or the identified Long View (L25) as identified in the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area Character Appraisal (CACA) Important views and Landmark Buildings Map. Long views are long distance views across the City to key features or landmark buildings. In this instance Long View L25 stretches from the grounds of Clifton College northwards across the College and BZG site, both of which are identified within the CACA as Landmarks of City-wide importance. As a consequence of this the College consider the VVM does not accurately reflect those protected views, as identified in the CACA, and request an updated VVM which accurately reflects the impact of the proposals at the BZG site on Local View LC24 and Long View L25." The College did last year request that a VVM be taken from the School Grounds, however, this should not have discounted VVM's from the two identified CACA protected views, but rather added to these to ensure that a robust approach is taken to all views across the Conservation Area. Whilst the College's priority is to ensure that the College itself is duly considered in the Planning Process, as reflected in the attached email correspondence, this does not change the Policy position on protected views which are clear on where these are located and it is felt should have also been drawn from to provide comprehensive coverage across the entirety of Colleges main campus (in line with the CACA identified views). As such we consider our concerns to still be relevant and recommend that Historic England are asked to confirm that they are content with no VVMs of these protected views, in their assessment of the overall proposals. Additional to the above I would appreciate if you could confirm that the planning application is still on track for a decision on 15th March 2023 at Planning Committee or if the date has been pushed back in light of the additional commentary received. Kind regards, Beth Elisabeth Pywell MRTPI Senior Planner CBRE Planning and Development</p>	16-Feb-23
651.	O		16-Feb-23

652.	O	i saw that the Zoo was originally paid for by subscription by the citizens of Bristol .. It is an amenity for the people of Bristol and should not be sold off and moved outside the city, It is easily accessible by bus. It's the fifth oldest zoo in the world. Foreign investors and developers often hiding behind British Companies are NOT interested in our historical buildings,, the cost of the proposed housing to be built is over sized and very expensive and will not be built for Bristol people. The reasons for closing the Zoo are not valid and there has been no real clear evidence that the zoo closure was necessary. The council should NOT allow this development to take place.It will ruin that area of Clifton. Yje people of Bristol love the zoo as it is..	16-Feb-23
653.	O	I want to lodge a strong objection to this prposed development on the grounds that, as pictured, the design is completely out of character with the neighbouring buildings and significantly impairs the aesthetic of this beautiful part of Clifton. Why have the planners produced a design that is nothing like the neighbouring area? Whenever any of the residents want to do any kind of alteration to their Clifton property - even felling a tree or putting in a driveway, we are subject to stringent planning regulations. It seems that different rules are being applied to this enormous housing development and that one set of planning standards apply to them, another to the local residents. This is unacceptable. I am not objecting to the building of new homes. I recognise that this is necessary and beneficial. But these should be radically redesigned to be in materials, and in a design, that is compatible with the historical architecture in the surrounding conservation area.	17-Feb-23
654.	O	I am deeply concerned at the scale and style of the building proposals in relation to the local environment and the conservation area.	17-Feb-23

655.	O	<p>As a resident of Northcote Road, I wrote in July 2022 and then again in November 2022 to outline some of my objections to Bristol Zoo's proposals for building large residential buildings on the main Zoo site. Since then our Northcote Road Residents' Association has received the final report from the professional organisation which we commissioned to carry out a light survey - outlining the light issues which would affect all eight of the houses in our road - caused by the planned building of the blocks of flats in such a very close proximity to our houses. You are most likely aware that the Zoo planners do accept that the houses in Northcote Road would be the most seriously affected by the new buildings so I hope that you will be making special note of the objections brought forward by Northcote Road residents. It is clear that the enormous height and form of the proposed buildings will have a more overbearing impact than I had anticipated. Despite some assurances given to us during several Zoom meetings with the planners, no significant adjustments have been made from the original plans - our suggestions have been disregarded. It is now clear that the proposed buildings will totally change the environment of all the dwellings here. Top floors will lose their views completely. The main living room in my flat, which I have long claimed to have one of the best views in Bristol, will lose this view completely as well as a significant amount of sunlight during the day. Flats and floors lower down within all six houses in Northcote Road will lose much more daylight of course. All of us living in this road are likely to experience a feeling of being enclosed by these buildings. I am not objecting to the principle of new housing being built on the main Zoo site (though I am very much more in sympathy with the "Save Bristol Zoo Gardens" campaign) - it is principally the height of the buildings proposed all round the perimeter which I object to. I should add that the actual loss of light and views to our homes has only become clear when I looked at the new visualisations that the Northcote Road Residents Association have commissioned. The Zoo's published images for what Northcote Road would look like are seriously misleading. In general, it is clear that more and more people living in Clifton, as they find out about the Zoo's plans, are realising that that the proposed flats would be totally unsympathetic and out of character with being placed in a Conservation Area. I urge you to reject these plans.</p>	18-Feb-23
------	---	---	-----------

656.	O	<p>I wrote on July 4th 2022 to object strongly to Bristol Zoo's proposals for building large residential buildings on the main Zoo site. I write as a resident of Northcote Road, immediately adjacent to some of the enormous blocks of flats being proposed. Since my last letter, revised proposals have been submitted by the Zoo. My original criticisms remain but I would like to make some additional comments. The Zoo has made the most minor and cosmetic of adjustments to their plans and these revised plans just do not address (at all) the concerns raised by myself and my neighbours. The plans for high density and totally inappropriately tall blocks of flats remain and the proposed development is quite clearly totally inappropriate for this conservation area. The visualisations commissioned by one of my neighbours show clearly the completely overwhelming impact the buildings will have. It is no exaggeration to say that they will have a devastating impact on the totality of the local environment - and not just where I live in Northcote Road. The massive block housing developments proposed - very close to the adjacent roads (some of which are very narrow) - are totally out of character with the environment of this part of Clifton. A few particular points arising out of comments made recently on the planning website (Summary of Design Changes and Revised Documents): - The planners have stated that the buildings opposite Clifton College are "in keeping with the local character". Having lived and worked within the buildings of Clifton College for 34 years, I assert that this statement is very wide of the mark. - I dispute the statement that "a traffic analysis demonstrates that the proposed development would generate less traffic than the average daily traffic associated with Bristol Zoo and would cause a reduction in local on-street parking". I have observed local traffic and parking in the area (Northcote, Guthrie and College Roads) for over 40 years (at all times of day) and, knowing the number of units of accommodation proposed and about the limited amount of parking which will be provided on site, I cannot accept this statement. - It is also stated that the noise during the construction phase is not being considered as part of the Noise Impact Assessment. I would suggest that it is vital that consideration of the noise impact during construction should be included as this will be of huge importance to local residents over a period of, I estimate, 5 years of clearing the site and construction of new buildings. The noise and general impact of such a large construction site - in very close proximity to many living spaces - is likely to be enormous and, I predict, is very likely to have a seriously adverse effect on the mental wellbeing of local residents, myself included. Finally, I would like to express great concern about the future of the Zoo's Education Centre (next to the Clifton College Music School). This was a new build just a few years ago and, as I have seen myself, it is a "state of the art" building able to be used for all kinds of educational purposes. As I walk past it each day, I can see that it is, thankfully, still being used. However, the proposed building plans have one of the large residential blocks in the place where the education centre now sits. This obviously means that the Education Centre will be demolished. This is nothing short of criminal - to destroy such a new and useful facility; a terrible waste of resources. I know that the Zoo plans to build a new Education facility at The Wild Place but this will cost a great deal of money and, being much further from the centre of Bristol, make it more difficult and costly for students to reach. This - and the elimination of the wonderful herbaceous border - are just two examples of the needless destruction that will take place if the Zoo's plans are allowed to go ahead. I urge you to reject these plans</p>	18-Feb-23
657.	O		18-Feb-23

658. O	<p>I object to this application 22/02889/LA and the associated application 22/02737/F. These two applications are a scheme for redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens from a site of public, natural and cultural heritage to private, residential housing and they should be considered together. I have read the report provided by Save Bristol Zoo Gardens (Report) as well as applicant's main planning documents. This is not a comprehensive list of reasons but several which are important to me.</p> <p>1. The Zoo provided misleading reasons for its closure. According to the planning statement, the Zoo suffered a decline in visitor numbers from 1m to about 500,000 a year which caused the Zoo to make a loss. The reason for this loss is blamed on the small site, inability to meet the animals' needs, and inadequate parking. The Report shows that the Zoo's attendance numbers are better than comparable zoos, not that far off London Zoo, and that the Zoo has made profits in recent years including with Government support during Covid. The Report states that the majority of the Zoo's animals will be sold or given away. The public is being led to think that the majority of the animals will be kept and given larger enclosures at the new site, when this is not the case. It may be a better match for the Zoo's conservation aims but ultimately feels like they are deliberately fudging things. Like many friends and family, who have grown up with the Zoo, we were initially behind the Zoo's closure as we believed the reasons given. But it looks like we were not properly informed.</p> <p>2. The Zoo is a very special site for Bristol. Housebuilding should not be something to be pursued at the expense of destroying the special character of our City. Decent housing should be a right for all. Many Bristolians are unhoused, or live in housing which makes them cold and sick. Yet Bristol Post reported in 2021 that there are over 1,000 empty homes in the city. Why should the Zoo be developed into houses? The site has been a well-loved public place for 180 years. The fact that it charges an entry fee is not relevant. Anyone who has ever been there will remember visitors of all description: class, race, gender, age, locals using the playground, tourists gawping, a couple on a date, a family's special day out, schoolchildren, even visiting scientists. If housing trumps everything (which is what the current Mayor has said), then we should be building on the Downs, or tearing down the Suspension Bridge in favour of a newer, wider bridge. We don't do that because these places are special and part of the character of our City. The Zoo is part of Bristol's cultural heritage. Developing the Zoo into housing is no way "respecting the character and heritage of the site". It will mean Bristol and its citizens lose one of the defining features of our City. The Zoo and 196 households will be richer, but the rest of us will be poorer for it.</p> <p>3. The Zoo shouldn't be allowed to act like a private developer in relation to what has become over 186 years, a public asset. Query whether the Zoo, as a charity, has powers to make this application if it is against the broader public interest. Bristol Zoological Society is a charity dedicated to conservation and education. It runs Bristol Zoo as well as the Wild Place Zoo in South Gloucestershire. As a charity it has tax exemptions because of the public benefits of its objectives. But what if this application can be seen as a conflict between the objectives of conservation and public benefit? This means while it may be lawful under its constitution to take the best action for conservation and education, this comes at the expense of the value and importance of the Zoo site to the City and its people. Does the Zoo not have a duty of care to the public? In "A Pattern Language" (1977) by Christopher Alexander and others, it states "When you build a thing you cannot merely build that thing in isolation, but must repair the world around it, and within it, so that the larger world at that one place becomes more coherent, and more whole." In 2023, more and more people</p>	18-Feb-23
--------	--	-----------

		<p>accept that keeping wild animals captive makes them suffer. What if a zoo for the future doesn't do that anymore, while maintaining the public interest for some kind of zoo at this site. Could development at this site be used to repair the damage caused by zoos of the past and create a positive way forward, encouraging greater empathy with animals and natural habitats both familiar and alien to us, to benefit the Zoo's animals and the wider public of Bristol? If the Zoo doesn't want to pursue this, could they be encouraged to sell to a publicly minded entity that will? In summary, this site has special significance to Bristol and its people and it should not be turned into housing of any kind.</p>	
659.	O	<p>As described in many other objections the scale and nature of the proposed buildings are totally contrary to the conservation objectives of both the immediate and surrounding areas. The proposed tall buildings are not compatible to the open nature of the existing site or adjacent Clifton downs. The profile is more akin to a concrete Eastern European development and certainly contrary to the natural and open space which to date has governed the planning constraint on all changes, including private dwellings, in the area</p>	18-Feb-23
660.	O	<p>Bristol Zoo is a historic park of cultural significance and is not just a brownfield site ripe for redevelopment. It is a major tourist attraction and could continue to be so even without all the animals because it is so beautiful and fondly thought of by millions of people. The proposed loss of a large number of mature trees which are of botanical and ecological significance is particularly sad especially at a time of climate emergency. There is also a loss of listed buildings and an over- large development in a conservation area.</p>	18-Feb-23

661.	O	<p>I wish the planning permission to be refused on a number of grounds: - the site is a tremendous green space that has been accessible to generations of the people of Bristol to enjoy but also a pull for visitors to our city from far and wide. We would, therefore, be shooting ourselves in the foot to squander this valuable communal resource on several levels. - whatever is said now there is a high degree of certainty that significant numbers of the mature trees and parts of the gardens will be ruined and access to whatever is left of what remains will be limited. - the number of listed buildings and gates on site will undoubtedly be harmed also - what right have we to watch & accept the destruction of our heritage. - the proposed design does not offer complimentary buildings to those already standing in the nearby area. - purely from the business case perspective, the need for change of use has not been proven and there are numerous alternatives being put forward that should be explored before the proposed sabotage of this asset is sanctioned. Please let's stop and think before such a destructive plan of action is given the go ahead for the benefit of a few rather than the many.</p>	19-Feb-23
662.	O	<p>I am writing once again to respond to the latest reply from the Zoo to the Northcote Road Residents Association's submission on light impacts to our properties. This time, the zoo has produced a set of visual images that completely disguise the impact on the streetscape of this over-bearing and disproportionate development. The inclusion of mature trees disguising the over-looking balconies, height and proximity is disingenuous, to say the least. There is nothing in the report that reassures us that our neighbourhood and quality of life will not be materially affected by this enormously out-of-keeping development, which seriously detracts from the character and heritage of the area. The scaling back of the development by a storey or increasing the set back from the edge of the already narrow and congested road would restore some space and light in a real way - and would be more helpful and honest than a pasted tree on an architect's picture. We would also like to endorse, again, the significant objections that the College has made with respect to failure to consider traffic impact on the surrounding roads, having conducted analysis when the school was not in operation. I trust the analysis will be done when the full congestion and pupil movements can be seen in full, because the danger and safeguarding impacts of construction and ongoing residential traffic on top of the current levels will be unsustainable in the proximate roads. Once the character of Clifton is lost, it can never be restored and this development, if allowed to proceed in its current form will be a shameful legacy for the zoo and the Council that approves it. Our fundamental opposition to this scheme remains and we ask that you reject it without serious modifications to its scale and sensitivity.</p>	19-Feb-23

663.	O	<p>Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space. Submitting your comments I wish the planning permission to be refused on a number of grounds: - the site is a tremendous green space that has been accessible to generations of the people of Bristol to enjoy but also a pull for visitors to our city from far and wide. We would, therefore, be squandering this valuable communal resource on several levels. - whatever is said now there is a high degree of certainty that significant numbers of the mature trees and parts of the gardens will be ruined and access to whatever is left of what remains will be limited. - the number of listed buildings and gates on site will undoubtedly be harmed also -what right have we to watch & accept the destruction of our heritage. - the proposed design does not offer buildings complementary to those already standing in the nearby area. - purely from the business case perspective, the need for change of use has not been proven and there are numerous alternatives being put forward that should be explored before the proposed sabotage of this asset is sanctioned.</p>	19-Feb-23
664.	O	<p>The development does not either preserve or enhance the character of our area. The development is unsightly and resembles a barrier, and is not at all in keeping with other properties in the vicinity.</p>	19-Feb-23
665.		<p>Please see below the continued personal objection from 6 Northcote Rd for this current application. We would request this be considered in conjunction with the earlier objection from Humphreys & Co for the Northcote Road Residents' Association of 6th February which you published on your portal on 8th February.</p> <p>Our Personal Outlook at 6 Northcote Rd They say a picture is worth a thousand words. We are happy to have published these pictures below which show the direct damage that would be inflicted on our own outlook at 6 Northcote Rd if this proposed development were to be approved in its current form. Living in a maisonette, this shows the before and after impacts on our first floor – our main living and working space – and our main bedroom on the second floor.</p>	19-Feb-23



Although the Zoo and architectural team have visited us and are aware of this, we are deeply distressed that no significant, subsequent effort to address this blatantly and hugely adverse outcome for all the residents of 6 Northcote Rd has been attempted. Indeed, to add huge insult and considerable hurt to injury, the individual architect responsible for the design of the scheme actually stated publicly “you’ll just have to close your curtains”.

We know we have no right of view. However, our panoramic outlook of trees sky and historic buildings stretching over 1000 metres would be reduced to barely over 20 metres ie. by 98%. Mostly, we would be left looking directly at a brick wall plus a few windows with no sky visible from within the spaces within our rooms. The images shown here also suggest there might well be some issues of overlooking from windows opposite that are higher than our living spaces that have not been fully understood or adequately addressed. It has also been suggested that we won’t be affected by overlooking from the top floor terrace as it is to be a maintenance access only balcony. However, even if this were so, there is also a private terrace just over 23metres away (top right picture – top left corner) which given its proximity and greater elevation clearly looks down into our key living spaces. This proximity and minimal level of separation at such elevations is completely out of character with the area in which we live.

Unsurprisingly, the net impact of this proposed development is to make us feel trapped and imprisoned in a brick walled cell and yet, simultaneously, we also feel vulnerable in our key spaces to breaches of privacy and overlooking.

Unfortunately, the height and extent of our windows and the low sills (see photos) also massively amplify the visual impacts of this development on all our key living spaces. There is nowhere in our key living spaces to escape its overwhelming, intrusive and dominant presence. While we are fortunate that at our elevation our very large windows will help maintain higher levels of daylight than lower floor

	<p>residences, the significant losses of sunlight on sunny days (estimated almost 50% reduction on March 21st) will be very noticeable and also greatly diminish our wellbeing, especially in retirement. Mostly, we will not see the sky anymore from within our living space, let alone enjoy the spectacular sunsets. This is absence of visible sky is a huge and devastating loss.</p> <p>Surely this is a major, easily preventable and self-evident loss of residential amenity: as it is so clearly intrusive, completely overbearing and dominant and very damaging to our wellbeing. How can this be justifiable when it is clear to us that the reduction of this development by either just two units or two storeys directly opposite would help to significantly minimise this damage without intrinsically damaging the capability or principle of residential development - if that is what is to be decided? These adjustments would also benefit other residents and help begin to address other grave concerns and objections about the scheme.</p> <p>Other Key Objections</p> <p>We do not wish to simply restate all the arguments elsewhere previously expressed in detail by the letter by Humphrey's & Co on behalf of the Northcote Rd Residents' Association but would briefly make the following points which we believe should be read in conjunction:</p> <p>Unsympathetic and Inappropriate Design plus Insufficient Public benefit</p> <p>It has been clear from the very beginning that this scheme was never designed with any serious consideration of the neighbourhood and conservation area in which it fits. The oft publicly stated aim by the Zoo team was to maximise the value of the site for the charity within whatever was allowable under planning law. Understandable though this approach may be, the result is a proposed residential development that is simply unsuited for such a sensitive location and the conservation area in which it is located. As has been made clear elsewhere in our previously submitted legal letter, the development fails to deliver significant public benefit, it doesn't fit within the adopted Local Plan and it is <u>not</u> required to deliver the Core Strategy. By virtue of its scale and inappropriate design and height it does more damage to the proposed public amenity of the gardens and harm to the neighbouring conservation area than looks to be justifiable by overstated public benefits. This can be seen by the level, nature and sources of the hundreds of objections, including from the Council's own Conservation Advisory Panel. Even Historic England's support is highly qualified about the principle of residential development and the quantum. On the limited evidence they were provided with, it appears to have focused its attention more on the design of a few parts of the scheme in relation to specified historic assets than assessing its holistic impact on the surrounding conservation area. We have not found anyone who actually lives in the neighbourhood or Bristol who finds the design "sympathetic" as is required under the NPPF.</p> <p>Proposed Quantum</p> <p>In terms of quantum the Zoo argues that the built development and hardstanding footprint has been reduced from 22% of the site to 21% of the site from 23,200sq metres to 21,900 sq metres. This is only a simple two dimensional representation of the impact. At an average of 4 storeys there will be closer to 100,000 sq metres of hardstanding developed space. As most of the existing structures are only one or two storeys (and often only netting) the quantum mass increase is probably closer to 400% with the average heights now moving up to 4 storeys. It is this considerable increase in average height, mass and quantum that would have a very damaging and overbearing impact within the gardens and beyond. This could</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>easily be reduced by some more selective reductions in height and articulation. The fact that the Zoo says it must have 156 units development to the gardens (despite the resultant damage to the site and the conservation area) to fund the preservation of other assets suggests a flawed funding model and circular argument. This needs challenging or re-assessing and alternatives considered before being accepted at face value.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy BCS9: Loss of Green Infrastructure</p> <p>We struggle to see how the self evident damage to a very mature ecosystem for a protected Open Space and Historic Gardens sits comfortably with Core Strategy Policy BCS9 which states <i>“Loss of green infrastructure will only be acceptable where it is allowed for as part of of an adopted Development Plan Document or is necessary, on balance, to achieve the policy aims of the Core Strategy.”</i> Despite various and contested mitigations proposed to eventually remedy the damage, it is inevitable there will be significant loss and damage that will be done to the green infrastructure for many years to come. Especially in light of the previous arguments above, how can it be reasonably argued that the development of this site would not constitute a loss to green infrastructure that is avoidable?</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>It has been obvious that the very nature of the site and its setting has created significant and unforeseen challenges for high levels of residential development. Obviously, permission for exclusive residential housing set amongst mature trees with a lake was always going to make the most money if it were allowed. Against this, other offers couldn’t compete financially while the zoo took its “must maximise value” approach. However, if this application were rejected then it would surely be possible that less valuable and more sympathetic developments and alternative arrangements could be explored which the Zoo has not previously felt relevant and has not previously shown any interest in exploring. This is such a sensitive site with so much history and meaning to so many people as has been evidenced by the scale and nature of the objections. In this light this application should be rejected for this proposed residential development and proper time and consideration should be given for a rethink. The high levels of objections and their nature suggests the previous consultative process employed has not proven to be sufficiently <i>“proactive and effective with the community”</i> (NPPF). However, with the right attitude and a more open-minded and genuinely consultative approach it seems inconceivable that this site cannot raise a significant amount of money (tens of millions of pounds) for the Zoo <u>and</u> leave an asset and legacy that the Zoo, the Council and Bristol can be proud of.</p>	
--	---	--

666.	O	<p>Dear Development Management Team Re: Bristol Zoo Gardens - Application 22/0737/F - Objection to Bristol Zoo Planning As a deeply concerned resident of 6 Northcote Rd and unofficial "Chair of the Northcote Rd Residents Association" I object to the above application on several grounds. I am not an expert but have tried to read and understand the 200 documents provided as best I can and their implications. If I have unwittingly misinterpreted anything I hope allowance will be made for this. I also hope there will be plenty more time to get independent expert advice and for more genuine dialogue and consideration to be given before any decisions are made. Key General Objections and Comments: 1. The sheer scale, length, height and form of the proposed perimeter residential blocks as it currently stands will significantly damage rather than preserve or enhance the character of this beautiful, historic Clifton Conservation Area in general, beyond the Zoo Gardens. It will dominate and intrude into the local neighbourhood in the adjacent streets. It will significantly reduce the sense of spaciousness and residential and visual amenity that is currently a feature of this area. It will significantly deprive people of the views of sky, sunlight and the glimpses of mature trees as they live work and play (the children in Clifton College) in the neighbourhood. 2. These same characteristics of scale, height and proximity have resulted in numerous breaches of BRE planning guidelines for reductions in daylight and sunlight within the proposal adversely affecting many of the directly neighbouring properties, residents and children. This is already causing many people significant stress and worry about a real deterioration in their living and home working environments. The scale and impact of the losses of daylight and sunlight for most of the neighbourhood adjacent to the Zoo has been significantly under-represented. The report provided by the Zoo's daylight and sunlight surveyors appears to include many significant errors and numerous omissions in the presentation of its data. However, if this scheme were approved, based on the data presented and contained within the reports it appears there will be significantly darker and gloomier winters for much of the neighbourhood and almost all of the adjacent residents. This is contrary to impressions implied by the surveyors' written conclusions. In an environment when we are increasingly understanding the importance of mental health and wellbeing for adults and children and we are aware of the vital importance of daylight and sunlight, surely we should not be choosing to breach BRE guidance in such an important aspect merely to aid additional profit for the few. 3. The scheme does not appear to be as environmentally positive as implied which is extremely disappointing for a proposal from the Zoo. 4. The suggestion that a few access entrances will make the gardens a wonderful unique community asset that many people beyond the neighbours will visit, seems overplayed in an area where the magnificent Clifton Downs are adjacent. 5. Although the scheme clearly satisfies the planning requirements for social housing there would seem to be very little social benefit that a 20% price reduction on price and 30% reduction on rents in c.40 Clifton properties (built over several years) which command almost twice the price of other properties in many other parts of the city. Thus, this development should not be considered as a major social benefit nor a reason to build an unnecessary large numbers of homes to maximise the profits for the Zoo if it is to the immediate and permanent detriment of the local community and the historic character of the conservation area. This is especially true when there are so many more and better located brownfield sites elsewhere that can build higher quantities of more affordable housing. 6. Even if permission were given for a reduced scale of lower level housing to a more environmentally suitable scale</p>	20-Feb-23
------	---	--	-----------

	<p>(perhaps 50%) one questions whether this really is the best use of such an absolutely unique heritage 12 acres site. No matter how nicely it is dressed up, the greater likelihood is that this proposed development will simply become a pleasant, affluent housing estate with some nice gardens and a nod to social housing. It will not really do anything to help the less well off and most needy, nor will it contribute anything substantial to the housing shortage. It will perhaps provide c.60 new homes per year, (12 "affordable") with the first phase completed in 3-4 years' time. Neither will it provide much of significant benefit to remaining non-Clifton Bristol residents. Overall, the development seems much more likely to leave a permanent, unwanted and "visible legacy of darkness" for its neighbours depriving them of far more pleasure and amenity in the short and long term than it will ever return. Without being a planning expert but just by walking around the perimeter it is fairly easy to imagine that many of these problems and most of these objections might be resolved - quite simply, by reducing the existing heights of all the blocks of flats by two storeys around the entire perimeter. Of course, this would limit the potential profit from this particular development and this particular site. However, this profit can only be realised and is only significantly increased by the agreement for change of usage to allow the development of high value housing. This is why we very much hope and are relying on Bristol City Council to make the right long term decision for both Clifton and Bristol. Its role is not to maximise profit for developers. If it does make the right decision then it can help ensure the Zoo and its trustees do leave a legacy they can be proud of rather than a "dark legacy of resentment" to the Clifton Community in which the Zoo has resided for over 150 years. If this current application were approved the latter legacy would seem to be the more likely outcome. The Northcote residents have been very frustrated, disappointed and distressed that the zoo planning team have pursued this planning application with such apparent disregard for the clearly expressed concerns and constructive suggestions made during consultations with their neighbours. The Zoo team have produced a number of impressive professional documents in support of their proposal. However, these appear to provide a rather flattering gloss over the plan's defects and its limitations and impacts. The zoo has repeatedly made it clear to us that the planning application has been submitted with the intention of extracting the maximum potential value for the site, albeit within a significant number of constraints due to the special and unique historic characteristics of this site. This proposed plan demonstrates that intent very clearly. More Specific Detailed Objections and Comments: Breaches in BRE guidance for Daylight and Sunlight: Devla Patman Redler report The Zoo team's Savills surveyor has admitted that these surveys are something of a "dark art" so I thought I would look at these closely upon the advice of a professional planning consultant. It was pointed out that surveyors are unlikely to produce reports for their clients which suggest that the proposed scheme's viability is threatened as a result of breaches in the BRE guidance on light reductions. Disturbingly, there appear to be a significant number of clear errors and even large numbers of omissions in at least some of their tables of source data provided in their appendices. By using N/A in certain rows of their appendices they have omitted to show and include many dozens of windows that that experience adverse effects of greater than 20% reduction for the Vertical Sky Component and 20% reduction in the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours. Each of these 20% reductions in light represents a breach of BRE guidance. I estimate there are many dozens of errors and possibly hundreds of omissions. This has resulted in significantly incorrect percentages being quoted and I have not found the report to</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>be impartially or fairly representative. All the errors and omissions seem to be in the favour of the development despite the many breaches of the BRE guidance with subsequent widespread negative impacts on much of the neighbourhood. 6 Northcote Rd For example, at 6 Northcote Rd, First Floor where we live, the summary table only shows a reduction in VSC of greater than 20% on 1 window rather than for the 3 windows that the data clearly implies - if the calculations had been completed correctly. These 3 windows represent 100% of our most important living space as they are our prime living and working space 16 hours/day in a post Covid working from home environment. As far as we can envisage, we will actually lose almost all sight of the sky from the room and simply be looking from all parts of the room and beyond at a plain brick wall just 21 metres away. This wall will tower several metres above our windows and the skyline on this floor. This brick wall "feature/view" will intrude into and throughout all the key living spaces in our flat even including the kitchen. The data would also appear to indicate that we may lose more than 20% of our Annual Probable Sunlight from especially in the winter months when sunlight is scarce. However, this data is not highlighted in the report. The impact of such developments on our lives and wellbeing would be massively detrimental, especially as one of us is prone to SAD in winter. We don't really understand the NSL calculations so we can't comment usefully except to say that in light of the data and the presentation of what we have seen so far in this report we are deeply concerned and very distrustful. Elsewhere: Across the report we note numerous VSC errors and omissions: Table 10.2 6 Northcote Rd should indicate that 5 out of 17 windows (29.4%) have more than 20% reductions in VSC (failures) rather than 3 out of 17 failures (18%) as reported. Note this equates to a significant 63.3% error in favour of the proposal. 5 Northcote Rd indicates only 1 window out of 11 has more than 20% reductions in VSC (9%) when the data shows 4 failures (36.3%) 4 Northcote Rd indicates 1 out 11 windows (9%) fail when there are actually 3 failures(27.3%) 3 Northcote Rd indicates 4 out of 14 windows fail (28%) when there are actually 7 failures(50%) 2 Northcote Rd indicates 7 out of 15 windows (47%) when there are actually 8 failures(53%) 1 Northcote Rd indicates 8 out of 15 windows (53%) fail when there are actually 10 failures(71%) Pooles House indicates 17 out of 71 windows (24%) fail when there are actually 23 failures(32%) Everything appears to have been significantly (mis)represented in favour of the development - I have estimated 71 errors and as many of these houses are split into flats the percentage impacts of these losses can be very significant for different households. Annual Probable Sunlight Hours As far as I can see the tables in the appendix are full of N/A's which do not generally show the percentage sunlight reductions nor do they show the calculations for the amount of APSH lost across hundreds of windows Pt. 4.15 states: o Sunlight will be adversely affected if there are 0.8 times former sunlight hours during either period o The reduction in sunlight will over the whole year will be greater than 4% APSH Pt. 10. states: If the overall annual loss is greater than 4% of APSH, the room may appear, colder and less cheerful and pleasant. However, for the data provided for the Northcote Rd residential properties it would appear that over 95% of the windows will get a reduction in APSH greater than 4%. Over 90% of windows will get reductions of over 20% light in the winter months, some from existing low levels of light, especially the lower floor flats. This is a significant adverse impact for very many people which has not been highlighted in the surveyors' report The level of both errors and omissions in this report would appear to significantly undermine the accuracy and validity of the numbers quoted and potentially, the conclusions about the adverse impacts of this development. If the same level of</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>omissions or errors is true across the whole report, across all the properties it appears to massively underplay the impacts of the loss of daylight and sunlight on the direct neighbouring communities to the Zoo's perimeter. The Townscape and Visual Assessment The proposed development is in a wonderful, unique and historic conservation area where the guidance states that: See Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, section 72, paragraph (1)</p> <p>72General duty as respects conservation areas in exercise of planning functions.</p> <p>(1)In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any [F1functions under or by virtue of] any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Much has been done within the inevitable constraints of the site itself within the walls to preserve the main beautiful features as far as possible - given the desire to build hundreds of housing units! Unfortunately, this has resulted in the housing being pushed to the perimeter wall. Here, it is clear that in many cases the net effect is the opposite of preserving or enhancing the conservation area within which the Zoo sits. The biggest problem seems to be the sheer scale, length height and form of the structures in such close proximity to the neighbouring residents and streets. While some of the structures might work in some places as small infills in a district, this entire development is on a very different scale. i) There is almost 600 metres of a continuous modern blocks flats which is entirely out of character with the conservation area. The combination of height, continuity and proximity to the wall especially on the narrower streets such as Northcote Rd will overpower and dominate the neighbourhood like nothing else in Clifton. While the properties are claimed to enhance the sense of a "walled garden", the fact they tower 50 - 60 feet above the wall in many places creates more of a sense of a "walled city or fortress". Some have called it Stalinesque. In general, 2-4metre walls with a one or two storey storey structure previously behind them (not always solid but see through) now have 4 or 5 storey buildings proposed - rising up to 60 feet higher than before. ii) The flat roofs do not complement the pitched roofs of the Clifton roofscape but obscure them in places. In some cases, they also bring the tops of the buildings closer to the street and their neighbours creating a more domineering impact. iii) The height and proximity to the streets and other properties obscures the sky, plus key glimpses of mature trees and the historic buildings such as Clifton College which are so much part of the character of this historic neighbourhood. This is especially true on the South end of Northcote Rd where residents live and work and children study and play and walk to and from classes. It also clearly applies to views from Guthrie Rd. iv) The level of loss of sky and sunlight loss in winter for the hundreds of people who walk along Northcote Rd every day and live or work or play in many of these neighbouring properties will be substantial. It will create even longer darker winters that will surely be to the detriment of the hundreds of people affected, just when we are all at our most vulnerable. It is noticeable that the proposal is very sparse on images at street level. These would give a much better sense of what the potential impact of the proposed development would be. Many pictures are plans, aerial photos or simply, rather flattering sketches. A walk around the perimeter looking up easily shows the difference. Mostly, it is very hard to see how the proposal can be said to be "preserving the character" let alone "enhancing it". Elsewhere in Clifton, where buildings of comparable heights exist they are rarely directly opposite, so close to each other or so close to the pavements or thoroughfares. They are either at least 28 - 35 metres away from each other and set back from the pavements or they</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>have many "look throughs". These elements help sustain and create a sense of spaciousness and sky that characterise the neighbourhood. The report summary Pt. 8.9 clearly states that the development will "increase the effect of urban closure," " provide increased visual closure of the local street views" and "substantial adverse effects" for "private residential properties on Northcote Rd." Apart from the improvements of replacing some low quality buildings at the top of Northcote Rd, the only beneficial effects acknowledged in the report appear to be the few glimpsed views into the site through the proposed new access points. At best, these "positive" effects have been acknowledged as slight. The larger number of adverse effects in the report are either judged as moderate or substantial. The photos 37 -47 in the appendix provided in support of this judgment regarding the level of adverse effects experienced really do not give any accurate sense or feeling of the adverse impacts of this development - which are a lot more powerful than implied. The report suggests the adverse impact for Northcote Rd is moderate. Maybe this is partly because it states that this is a "strongly urban environment". However, despite some urban features especially at the North end this categorisation does not seem so true at the South end where the Victorian terraces and residential buildings are. Photo 42 does show that the lower end of Northcote Rd feels more suburban rather than urban as described in the report. This photo also shows that at least 30% of the mature greenery viewed from this location would be obscured by the proposed development - which is obviously an adverse impact. Clifton is a spacious suburb and the high levels of sky and visibility and mature trees visible throughout. These characteristics help it retain this spacious feeling even when more urban features are occasionally present. The increased height of the buildings and greatly increased sense of closure along Northcote Rd especially at the southern end of Northcote Rd will completely destroy this sense of suburban spaciousness. The report does however acknowledge the severe adverse impact and high sensitivity of the scheme for the residents of Northcote Rd at the South end. This makes it all the more surprising and disappointing that the proposal was not adapted in this respect, especially given the constructive suggestions made by the residents during the consultations for some appropriate height reductions and cut throughs. These were ignored, much to our considerable distress and frustration. Environmental Concerns I am not an environmental expert but how likely is it really that several years of building works and demolition, uprooting over 100 mature trees, introducing 200 new homes, 400 new permanent residents plus 100+ cars is actually going to support or enhance the environment? I see the Tree Forum in a public comment has suggested that the Zoo's claim of an improvement in its sustainability is wrong and that there will indeed be a significant deterioration. I do not understand how such a unique 12 acres site, relatively undisturbed/stable for so long with so many mature and unique trees and vegetation habitats can be considered appropriate to redevelop in this way on this scale for so little housing and social benefit</p> <p>Conclusions It is understandable that the trustees of the Zoo and their team of experts may feel they need to put in as strong a plan as possible so that they can maximise the potential profit for the site and so that feel confident that they are not at risk of being sued for not fulfilling their fiduciary duties. However, the scale of this scheme proposed and the apparent disregard of almost all the valid major concerns expressed by the neighbourhood during consultations has been enormously disappointing and distressing. The omission of helpful images at ground level which could have been produced plus the volumes of omissions and errors in data presented need to be rectified and clearly presented and made</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>available for all to see and understand. For a site of this size the detrimental impacts need to be better explained and understood. I believe the Council might consider an independent review or new reports for these items. If this current proposed scheme were approved, I believe the Zoo's legacy would be far from what it desires. While doing very little to address the crisis of affordable housing, the proposal currently risks leaving an embittered darkened neighbourhood permanently diminished in many of its unique and precious qualities, surrounding quite a posh housing estate. The profit from approving the change of usage and this scheme would clearly benefit the zoo and the developers by millions of pounds. However, it would be at the direct expense of Clifton which would suffer years of massive disruption as the site was transformed for such a large project plus longer term enduring negative impacts of something that so clearly fails to preserve and enhance the character of the area in many important respects. Surely, if housing has to be approved, at the very least a much "lower rise" solution is required. This would benefit the internal zoo site residents as well as the entire neighbourhood. Alternatively, could the zoo and the Council give something like the OurWorld proposal a better consideration for a more fitting and suitable legacy for the benefit of the whole of Bristol? If this change of usage and the scale of this residential development were to be allowed by Bristol City Council now, this could be a massive, opportunity lost for this historic unique site, forever. This would appear to be for the sake of a few expensive dwellings benefiting a few hundred mostly quite privileged and affluent people, plus some profit for the property developers and some extra "windfall" millions which are desired but not actually required by the Zoo - which is a charitable trust. All of this would be at the expense of Clifton, its unique and outstandingly beautiful neighbourhood and conservation area and of no significant benefit to the remainder of Bristol. We all understand the reason for the loss of the Zoo which is a very sad loss for the city and the neighbourhood. It has brought much life and vitality and happy memories to so many for over hundred years and will be greatly missed. Surely, we all deserve something more fitting in its memory, than a large, overbearing, "rather posh housing estate".</p>	
--	--	--

667. O	<p>Dear Matthew As you are the Case Officer for the above, I am writing to ask for your advice and help regarding a number of matters concerning the Bristol Zoo Planning Application Ref. 22/02737/F and in particular, I have questions regarding the processes likely to be involved from now. I am a resident of 6 Northcote Rd and Chair of the Northcote Rd Residents Association. You will have seen various objections, concerns and fears expressed from different Northcote Rd residents, who are almost certainly the Zoo's residential neighbours potentially most adversely affected by the proposed development. This was acknowledged in the townscape assessment and to us personally, by the Zoo planning team. Our Primary Concerns Our concerns have been primarily based on the potentially overpowering, overbearing, overshadowing and intrusive impacts of the immediately adjacent proposed blocks of flats planned so high and so close to us all. In our particular part of the neighbourhood at the bottom end of Northcote Rd, the incongruence of the design and its scale and potential adverse impacts on the townscape in an historic conservation area plus the significant losses of daylight and sunlight, really are much larger than the planning application and some of its supporting documents imply. There is nowhere in this part of Clifton where such large-scale block of continuous modern housing development exists directly opposite other housing in such close proximity. We have been particularly concerned by the quality, limitations and implications of two documents supplied in the application: 1. The daylight and sunlight survey: acknowledged privately as a "dark art" by Geraint Jones the Savills surveyor, this was full of inaccuracies, with dozens of omissions and seemed utterly misrepresentative of the effects of the development. Some more but not complete detail about the levels of omissions and inaccuracy is contained in my personal, previously submitted objection. 2. The townscape and visual impact assessment: where the suggestion that this was all an urban rather than suburban landscape (only really true for some parts of the wall) and a few select photos in the appendix gave no impression at all of the impacts of the scale of this development in reality as experienced at ground level. For example, appendix photo 45 seems to imply that two mature trees and a significant amount of sky will not be obscured by the 5 storeys intended block, which they surely will be. Indeed, the overall planning application is very light in demonstrating this real ground and street level visual impact - using just a couple of highly selective sketches. This seems surprising for the most major development in Clifton for decades where surely everyone should be getting a much fuller and proper representation of the proposed outcome. Given the huge negative impact of these current planning designs on what I believe you call the "residential and visual amenities" of the residents of Northcote Rd, we are all very worried that decisions are now going to be made based on what we believe to be either inaccurate, substandard, biased or misrepresentative documents. And, although we know that loss of private views and property price losses are of no relevance to planning decisions, for some of us the potential adverse impacts in the current proposal are genuinely heart breaking. If implemented, they would seriously diminish the quality of our lives and our living. This would be true if we stay or if we leave after having incurred the costs of moving and the devaluations of our properties Our Questions We are exceptionally keen to know that the planning process will allow our concerns and our alternative viewpoints and/or documents to be properly considered. This is especially so given the undoubted potential scale of damage to our mental and financial wellbeing from these current plans. However, we freely admit we do not know how best to ensure this can happen. Are you able to advise us please? We have become increasingly worried partly</p>	20-Feb-23
--------	---	-----------

	<p>because of what everyone feels has been a "sham tick box neighbourhood consultation" process by the Zoo's team and partly because some of the documents commissioned by them seem biased and misrepresentative - perhaps unsurprisingly. In their clear pursuit for maximum profit, the Zoo planning team repeatedly seem to have shown almost complete disregard for the concerns expressed by neighbours on all sides of the Zoo including the West Car Park and Clifton College. If possible, we would like to know the following please: i) What is the process from here on in and where or how do we at Northcote Rd get our concerns properly explored? ii) What happens on the Monday 12th September determination date/what is the process? iii) What is likely to happen or could happen after this date? iv) Is there anything we could do privately in advance that would help/or we could do afterwards? v) Will there be another independent light survey commissioned? vi) Will there be a requirement to model ground level and street views of the development from inside and outside the zoo? Will they be independent? If so, who will pay for them? vii) Would it make sense for the neighbours to commission some of these services and if so, by when would they now be needed? Could we be given access to some of the Zoo's team data/models already built to help do this? viii) Would it be helpful to submit some more illustrative pictures and corrected photographs of the visual impact at ground and street level even if not terribly sophisticated? Would it be helpful to submit these with some constructive suggestions? ix) Would it be possible for you or a representative of the Planning Committee to meet briefly with us and literally see things from our points of view? And if so, when? (A late afternoon as the sun drops is quite illuminating!) In our experience, once people have seen the current heights of the proposed development in relation to the existing trees and buildings on Northcote Rd a short 5 minutes' walk is sufficient to reasonably visualise how (shockingly) overbearing the impact would be. This is all due to the combination of the proposed building heights and their proximity to the street. It is immediately obvious that huge amounts of sky and practically all glimpses of mature trees and of the historic buildings, plus almost all the late afternoon sunshine will be obliterated. It is these characteristics that give this part of the neighbourhood its character and keep it feeling suburban and spacious, despite some low-level urban features being present. Once these features or characteristics are lost, the Northcote Rd area becomes much more urban, more enclosed and quite a lot darker for much of the afternoon and early evening. Some of these elements were slightly acknowledged but in a very understated way in the townscape assessment.. In our personal instance at 6 Northcote Rd, the proposed outlook changes from looking at broad skies and trees stretching almost a mile away to simply looking at a 50ft -60 ft high brick wall just 66 feet away, with barely a glimpse of sky from any window - intruding and dominating all our key living and working spaces. To visualise this potential change is truly shocking and deeply dispiriting. It is a genuinely distressing experience I now have many times each day, every day since the planning application was submitted - after the last consultation we were all shocked by the absence of any fundamental changes. I would really welcome an opportunity for you to visit us so that you can so simply and easily visualise all this. The adverse impact here at this end of Northcote Rd is evidently many times worse and much more instantly visible than that of the West Car Park. Yet, if there were a meaningful conversation with the neighbours we feel these particular concerns might be reasonably addressed with some reductions in heights and scale or increases in distance in the right places. The Northcote Rd residents are not inherently opposed to plans for housing. However, we have</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>become very upset by the Zoo's approach which has come across as feigning interest, feigning sincerity and feigning concern. They have proposed a scheme with almost complete disregard for our clearly expressed key concerns and constructive suggestions and which is directly and very evidently at the significant expense of our own mental and financial wellbeing. The current application clearly seeks to maximise their profit with complete disregard and at huge direct emotional and financial costs to their direct neighbours. (They can only get an extra million pounds because we, collectively, lose a million pounds so to speak!). While we appreciate both the Zoo's needs for money and Bristol's needs for housing it is surely not the responsibility of the Council to maximise the profits for the Zoo, to the clear disadvantage of the existing neighbouring community. The legacy the Zoo's team are proposing to leave Clifton after 186 years does not currently appear to be either an inspiring or a happy one for its erstwhile neighbours. We are now very much hoping and relying on the Planning Committee to help address this matter fairly - obviously, with full regard to planning law and planning guidelines. We understand there are many stakeholders and demands including present housing needs and Zoo trustees to be taken into account. As the Northcote Rd residents who are directly adjacent, we have been acknowledged as the most adversely affected of the residential neighbours. We simply cannot see how the current plans for our neighbourhood can reasonably be argued to preserve and enhance the neighbourhood's character. More detailed examination and understanding of the significant reductions in daylight and sunlight plus the obliteration of almost all views of historic buildings and trees from within the terrace and at street level show the development would significantly damage the neighbourhood's character for us all and massively diminish the quality of very many more lives at our end of the development than it will ever enhance. We would like to be reassured we will be given a proper and fair chance of proper representation regarding our expressed concerns and we would very much like to understand how best we might achieve it. Any advice you can give will be greatly appreciated. Please do forgive the length of this letter. I know things are slow in August but given the pending September 12th determination date I would greatly appreciate your prompt acknowledgment of your receipt of this and welcome your response and advice as soon as possible, please. Many thanks and best regards</p>	
--	---	--

668.	O	<p>I strongly object to the proposals insofar as they relate to the southern end of Northcote Road in particular. There have been only minor changes to building E2 and no changes at all to building E3. Contrary to the impression given (for instance Penoyre & Prasad's answer to Q2 raised by Clifton College, as set out in Appendix 5 of the October 22 Planning Statement), building E3 has been set no further back than shown in the October 2021 consultation, nor has it been reduced in height. Building E3 itself dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road in scale and height, as is clearly shown in document BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1. What is not shown so clearly in that document is its height in relation to numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road, both substantial Victorian houses. Based on the proposals, building E3 would be over 8 metres taller (measured to the eaves) or 6.5 metres taller (measured to the ridge) than these houses, contributing strongly to the overbearing effect. I have previously raised a concern as to the adverse impact on the front gardens of numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road from overshadowing, particularly the loss of afternoon and evening sun. I do not believe that this has been addressed. The gap between buildings E2 and E3 is of limited benefit to those neighbours who are positioned further along Northcote Road, particularly towards the southern end, where the unrelenting mass of building E3 will dominate. The daylight and sunlight assessments show adverse impacts to several rooms in residential properties in Northcote Road, beyond BRE guidelines, with rather trite comments such as 'retained daylight levels are considered acceptable' or 'the neighbouring residential properties will generally remain with adequate levels of daylight and sunlight'. To whom they are considered acceptable is unclear, but it is certainly not the owners of the properties concerned. Nor does there appear to be any recognition that it is generally the principal reception rooms (those on the lower floors) that are worst affected, and where the loss of residential amenity will be most felt. To summarise, those residents towards the lower (southern) end of Northcote Road are particularly severely impacted by the proposals, largely because of the extreme height of building E3 and its proximity to neighbouring properties, but also because it is positioned in such a way that it will take away much of the afternoon and evening sun. Without a significant reduction in the scale of this building, I urge the planning committee to reject the proposals.</p>	20-Feb-23
------	---	---	-----------

669.	O	<p>I wish to reiterate my objections to the proposed development. I am extremely disappointed that, despite our having raised objections on numerous occasions throughout the consultation process, the applicants have made no changes of any significance to the proposed Building E3. This building is, quite simply, far too tall relative to existing neighbouring properties in Northcote Road. This is in a Conservation Area whose character should be preserved if the term is to mean anything at all. As it stands, building E3 would tower over neighbouring properties, dominating the outlook even from upper floors, and casting lower floors and front gardens (which currently enjoy a sunny outlook) into shadow for much of the day. The effect on those of us living in the area in terms of mental health and wellbeing would be devastating. Quite apart from the issue of height, the proposed buildings are not at all sympathetic to their surroundings: the overall design of the site, comprising high blocks placed around the perimeter, has the appearance of the worst sort of gated community, designed to keep people out rather than to contribute to the wider community. If the site is to be developed for housing, then please make it more sympathetic to its surroundings to avoid doing irreparable harm to buildings that have stood there since the Victorian era, as well as their residents. This could be done by reducing the height and massing of buildings and setting them further back from the perimeter.</p>	20-Feb-23
------	---	--	-----------

670.	O	<p>I strongly object to the proposals insofar as they relate to the southern end of Northcote Road in particular. Contrary to the impression given (for instance Penoyre & Prasad's answer to Q2 raised by Clifton College, as set out in Appendix 5 of the October 22 Planning Statement), building E3 has been set no further back than shown in the October 2021 consultation, nor has it been reduced in height. Building E3 itself dwarfs the other buildings in Northcote Road in scale and height, as is clearly shown in document BZG-PPA-ZZ-ZZ-DR-A-2602-PL1. What is not shown so clearly in that document is its height in relation to numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road, both substantial Victorian houses. Based on the proposals, building E3 would be over 8 metres taller (measured to the eaves) or 6.5 metres taller (measured to the ridge) than these houses, contributing strongly to the overbearing effect. I have previously raised a concern as to the adverse impact on the front gardens of numbers 1 and 2 Northcote Road from overshadowing, particularly the loss of afternoon and evening sun. I do not believe that this has been adequately addressed. The gap between buildings E2 and E3 is of limited benefit to those neighbours who are positioned further along Northcote Road, particularly towards the southern end, where the unrelenting mass of building E3 will dominate. The daylight and sunlight assessments show adverse impacts to several rooms, beyond BRE guidelines, with the rather trite comments that the 'retained daylight levels are considered acceptable' or 'the neighbouring residential properties will generally remain with adequate levels of daylight and sunlight'. To whom they are considered acceptable is unclear, but it is certainly not the owners of the properties concerned. Nor does there appear to be any recognition that it is generally the principal reception rooms (those on the lower floors) that are worst affected, and where the loss of residential amenity will be most felt. Those residents towards the lower (southern) end of Northcote Road are particularly severely impacted by the proposals, largely because of the extreme height of building E3 and its proximity to neighbouring properties. Without a significant reduction in the scale of this building, I urge the planning committee to reject the proposals.</p>	20-Feb-23
671.	R	<p>Hi Jeremy You do not know me, and we have never met. I am Chair of the neighbourhood forum that covers the area: Clifton, Clifton Down, Hotwells and Harbourside I am also founder & Chair of Clifton Neighbours I have an interest in the future of the Bristol Zoo Gardens Site. I understand the planning application may now be considered at the Development Control A Committee on Wednesday 15th March 2023 I would like the opportunity to stand and speak briefly at that meeting to represent the views of the community. Perhaps you could let me know if that is possible. Regards Gerry Swarbrick Clifton Neighbours</p>	20-Feb-23
672.	S	<p>I personally think that it is terrible that fellow parents and the College have mounted such a petty organised assault on the zoo's plans. From all of the information that I have been able to find it would appear that the plans put forward are robust and I for one fully support them in their enterprising efforts to build more houses whilst keeping their beautiful gardens open into the future.</p>	20-Feb-23
673.	O	<p>The housing is too dense and not in keeping with houses in the area. They are too close to the adjacent roads and too high. The development is not suitable for the general public to be able to use the facilities.</p>	20-Feb-23

674.	O	<p>Clifton has a housing style of architecture that its residents and visitors admire. The proposed housing on this site makes no attempt to blend in with our traditional buildings. The "boxy" elevations are, I consider, quite ugly. As they have car parking at ground level they are one floor higher than necessary. The higher buildings on Northcote Road and Guthrie Road will dominate these roads. The proposed public access comments by the developer sounds good but I cannot imagine the residents making these visitors welcome. Will there be any facilities for these visitors? Will there be any visitors wanting to visit with their picnic baskets and barbecues and sit on the lawns? Too many of the existing trees are being removed. I visited a new housing development in Bath a few years ago and there were virtually no parking places included on the site. Residents were expected to use public transport, taxis or car hire. Why are there over 100 car spaces being included in this scheme? Bristol has a real car transport problem. Why allow more cars into the City? Other uses for this site should be considered. They may not be as profitable for the Zoo but may benefit the residents of Bristol more.</p>	20-Feb-23
675.	O	<p>Please think about the potential for harm that development of this site will cause - the major objection I would raise relates to the buildings proposed - the sense of scale is overbearing. The monolithic appearance is completely detrimental to an area of such stunning historic architecture, and whilst I am a fan of combining old with new architecture, this is not sympathetic or appropriate - the Zoo site holds significant heritage value for Bristol - the huge loss of Communal Value to the people of this city and further loss of valuable, precious green urban space and public amenity is permanently diminished - the harm to listed buildings, that however sympathetically they are converted, they will no longer be accessed by the public and will have their community purpose lost and their use permanently altered. - has the Zoo's justification for abandoning the site been proven? or are they using the pandemic lull as a for a revamped plan to one single site (that was gifted to them) and opportunistically cashing in? - please don't overlook the fact that it is listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space - with grave concern that half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. This site is so special, make a decision that enables it to stay that way. Change is inevitable, but it should be better change, for the good of the wider Bristol and regional society it serves - spaces like this are too precious.</p>	20-Feb-23

676.	O	<p>With the confirmed departure of the Bristol Zoological Society ('the Society') in Clifton, there is need to consider change of use of the zoo site as it holds such significance both in terms of heritage and its position in a conservation area, adjacent to Clifton College School and a range of significant historical buildings . This is the largest building scheme in Clifton for many decades (perhaps ever), and must be very carefully planned and orchestrated. This application saddens me as it appears the line between need and greed has become blurred. The Society will not be the ones commissioning or managing the build, and all safeguards must be thought through by planning, ahead of any proposal being passed. - loss of light or privacy - the scale of the proposal will overlook Northcote Road properties (in particular) and limit their light, and privacy. At most, any buildings on that perimeter should not stand taller than those existing buildings in Northcote Road - overshadowing - the adjacent Northcote and College Roads are very narrow, with resident parking bays or double lines - roads that the height and overscaled apartment blocks along the perimeter walls would dominate at a scale disproportionate to all adjacent conservation area buildings - highway safety - there is no detail about a street lighting plan, nor how this will impact the locality. The plan denotes seven new entrances, four of which will allow vehicular access, which will impact the surrounding streets which are already crowded with school vehicles at any time of day (mini buses, maintenance vehicles, delivery vehicles and full size coaches) plus parents at drop off and pick up times in numerous cars. - traffic and parking issues - whilst the Society have been making efforts to explain their proposal through production of printed materials distributed through letterboxes in the neighbourhood, the literature is misleading, as it fails to illustrate any cars (bar one parked under an awning), but depicts children playing and families picnic-ing, ambling or in a learning space. The gardens look lovely, but the reality is this is a housing development for 201 homes. Cars will need to access the suggested 120 spaces provided in 'undercroft' or 'covered parking' but this is not denoted in any illustrations, giving a false representation of the planned 'other-worldliness' atmosphere. Guthrie Road and the surrounding streets encompass the 'hub' of the Clifton College school campus. The existing traffic for school drop off and pick up times is already unmanageable, despite efforts by the school to encourage the 'if you care, park elsewhere' mantra and are unable to restrain parking on yellow lines, yellow zigzags, and road corners. The proposal suggests an increase in pedestrians in the area, who will be in jeopardy with the subsequent congestion generated by a housing scheme of this scale. The Society propose that residents of the site will be less likely to need a car, but on what grounds do they know that? The lack of parking spaces will create spill out into surrounding roads directly or indirectly - perhaps through visitors to the 'free' gardens - amenity - the concept of amenity suggests that a building project would be considered attractive and agreeable, adding pleasantness to a surrounding area. The design to date illustrates overdevelopment of six storey structures which will dominate surrounding homes and detract light, limit privacy and possibly present safeguarding issues for the adjacent school buildings and play areas - wildlife - 44 trees to be relocated in a limited landscape? Where is the plan for these trees? Trees are not just what is illustrated on the surface by trunk, branches and foliage - they have established and interlinked root systems - whilst on the surface it looks like the trees are accounted for, and the significant ones will be left in place, what about their roots? There is little detail, if any, about the affect the installation of utilities, drainage and water management which all require deep digging and excavation will have significant impact on the roots. The gloss of the</p>	20-Feb-23
------	---	---	-----------

	<p>leaflet sounds reassuring, but the tree report from the tree experts shows more concern that must be factored into this decision. - historic buildings - this is the most significant project of scale in Clifton ever to be proposed, and must be in keeping with the architectural assets of the locality. The scale and design of the proposal jars with neighbouring historic buildings - conservation - the Society holds conservation amongst it's key objectives, but this proposal does not fully integrate the context of building conservation for all the elements, only in the existing buildings e.g. Clifton Pavilion and the Giraffe House - design - the standout flaw of this application is the scale of overdevelopment around the perimeter - appearance of the development - the glossy illustrations are misleading for many people who will take a leaflet at face value and believe the Society will deliver the application on based on those illustrations. The reality, sadly, is more likely to be that the Society will be long gone, having sold the site and secured the funding needed for the Wild Place Project site. As members of the proposed Management Board of the 'gardens' they will have no influence or say on the build project I object to this planning application, and hope that one evolves that is of better scale and is more fitting in local scale and conservation interpretation. As the Society's brochure says 'it is important we leave a legacy we can be proud of in this beautiful part of the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area'. Well then, do just that, not this.</p>	
677. O	<p>I object on a number of grounds, most significantly: - Loss of a historic and significant site which provides community value and encourages significant beneficial tourism to the area. - The need for change of use has not been proven - the zoo's financial performance was fine and the long term strategy was to continue to maintain it until there seems to have been a financially motivated change of heart to generate £ to invest in the new WildSpace site rather than commit to the historic Bristol Zoo site. - The proposed housing is far too large and overbearing and not in keeping with the area. IMHO it is totally inappropriate in design, scale and intent</p>	20-Feb-23

678.	O	<p>Dear Sir, We wish to register our strongest opposition to the proposed application for development of the Zoological gardens in Clifton. I was born in Clifton and have been involved with Clifton properties all my life. First as a tenant and then when I married an owner. Like many others my wife and I have put our hearts and souls into maintaining and improving the properties that we own. Never in our wildest dreams could we conceive such an appalling scheme for these wonderful gardens. In all honesty it is totally beyond our comprehension that something so crass as this has been proposed for one of the jewels in Bristol's crown. The buildings are more like prison blocks than apartments and in no way can they possibly enhance and improve the area for future generations. It will be a disaster should greed and avarice be allowed to win the day! Just the loss of so many trees should be sufficient enough to oppose the scheme.</p>	21-Feb-23
679.	O	<p>I would like to register briefly my objection to this development project. It seems amazing that a project of this kind is seriously being considered. It is quite obvious that the appearance of the buildings that would be erected are not appropriate for this conservation area and will cause irreparable damage to the natural and cultural character of this neighbourhood. The loss of so many mature trees is also unacceptable. I live in a flat in Clifton and every time I asked Bristol City Council whether I could improve the energy efficiency of this flat by installing double glazed windows or new, more efficient sash windows with wooden frames, I was told that this is not acceptable. The same applies for minor changes proposed to a totally hidden roof area. Having now realised the sort of changes that would take place in Clifton with this new development, I must admit I am shocked by the double standards.</p>	21-Feb-23

680.	O	<p>As a near neighbour of Bristol Zoo Gardens, I have been affected negatively and relentlessly by every stage of the development proposals. Our contact with the "zoo committee", both through Zoom and at gatherings, has been politely restrained, always cordial, but frustratingly fruitless. The suggestions that my neighbours and I have raised with "the committee" have only been addressed marginally with the most minor tweaks here and there, the overall modifications to our requests being superficial and barely perceptible. The big picture remains much the same as it always has, with structures of 4, 5, and 6 storeys looming high and at close range. 1. The key complaint is the excessive size, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed development in close proximity to our homes as well as dominating this Conservation Area. Besides dwarfing our residences, the immediate area will suffer as the surrounding suburban roads are reduced to shadowy canyons - and the shadows will be undeniable. The considerable pedestrian 'traffic' on the pavements, especially for younger pupils, will no longer enjoy full daylight in the shrouded route - nor will visitors to the proposed park within. 'High Rises' will smother this neighbourhood beyond recognition. 2. Computer generated images produced by the zoo are comical in content, verging as an insult to our intelligence and our familiarity with these perimeter roads. Mature trees appearing immediately inside the zoo wall do not presently exist, nor would they reach such a stage for another 50 years. Furthermore, given their proximity to the projected buildings, there is no way in which they could survive and provide a shield to buffer the current residences. 3. The modernist monolithic architecture would be more appropriate in an entirely different setting or cityscape, not in a residential Conservation Area consisting of listed buildings and handsome Victorian homes whilst also abutting the classic setting of a prominent school and its impressive campus. Sight lines will have clearly been violated in multiple locations. From street level, gone are the glimpses of trees and the abundant daylight. Equally so, gone are a large proportion of mature trees within the 12 acres, all of which enrich the healthy well-being of this area. The artists' impressions take great liberties in distorting reality of the scene. 4. The towering height of these overbearing Blocks of Flats would adversely affect and diminish the daylight, directly and indirectly, onto properties, pavements and roads, as has been confirmed by the professional light studies which were commissioned by my neighbours. Apart from reduced daylight, the present outlook from these properties will be obliterated by apartment blocks directly opposite and at close range to our homes. Nowhere else in Clifton can be said to afford such an opportunity for prying eyes across narrow roads on such a grand scale. 5. Public 'benefit of access' to the proposed site is insignificant compared with the free public access provided by the nearby spacious Clifton Downs which have no overlooking monotonous houses, but feature trees, space and open skies. Who would choose to visit an artificially created enclave, surrounded by blocks of flat and in the proximity of other visitors, yet with The Downs so nearby? Bristol Zoological Gardens would leave a lasting legacy to this community if the emphasis remained on its splendid gardens. The proposals include the decimation of a majority of its mature trees. This development is alien to the character of this site as part of a Conservation Area as well as being a Historic and Community Asset. If all of these are violated by a brutalist style housing development on such a grand scale, little praise can be offered for the zoo's proclaimed intent for conservation. Detailed and persuasive arguments were submitted by Humphrey's & Co on February 6th, which I recommend and to which I defer. To conclude, the major fear of these proposals is the ghastly height, size, scale, scope and proximity of</p>	22-Feb-23
------	---	--	-----------

		buildings which, in no way, blend with the local community. If approval is given, they will prove to be an appalling intrusion to the immediate neighbourhood and to the character of Clifton as a Conservation Area.	
681.	O	The size of the proposed development is totally out of keeping with the local area and impacts negatively on the Clifton conservation area. The proposed felling of over 40% of trees on site does not conform to conservation guidelines. The site will unsafely mix a huge increase in traffic on the site with pedestrians and there is no guarantee that the site will remain open to public pedestrian access in the long term. This reduces an open space amenity and increases pollution and built up areas. Whilst the site proposes to have affordable housing, it is unlikely to be in high enough numbers to meet housing needs, instead providing high net worth individuals with luxury premises at the expenses of demolishing or converting historic buildings of community and cultural value. Change the use of the site by all means but do not grant permission to developers motivated by profit with no thought to a valuable community resource and open space.	22-Feb-23

682.	O	<p>There was a time when Bristol Zoological Gardens elicited warm praise and loyal appreciation from Bristol residents, as well as from far afield - roadside directional signs attest to that. Alas - No more. The stunning oasis of calm, so conveniently situated within the community, will be severely diminished as an inspiring social and learning venue, surrounded on all sides by towering structures of massed humanity - hardly a conducive setting for enjoying a day out in "natural" beauty. I'll take the Downs and Ashton Court any day. The relentless lines of vast perimeter flats fail to reflect this Conservation Area. Local homes near the site, as well as a very large school, will be overlooked from all angles by their close proximity. Balcony potted plants and quirky animal murals will not disguise the boxed brutalist style of these monoliths which in no way enhance the area or preserve the character. A Clifton Carbuncle sums it up accurately. Anything which is constructed must correspond in height, scale, shape, form and proportion to existing buildings in the vicinity, and there are a significant number of listed and locally listed buildings on the doorstep, whether residential or within the College. The proposed designs fail to reflect these imposing architectural styles, even worse with such an abrupt clash at close range. The Roads: These will suffer from traffic overload and pressure for parking, especially with the elimination of road space due to the proposed access points for vehicles and pedestrians. Considering the City of Bristol's commitment to traffic reduction and elimination, this is a recipe for further pollution and mayhem, exacerbated by the daily school run. Pupils of all ages traversing the roads to lessons will face increased jeopardy for safety. Northcote Road: Consider the narrow one-way thoroughfare with a single pavement, where residents will be overlooked by 4 and 5 storey structures. A similar fate awaits the school for its many teaching buildings, playground, library and boarding houses. Tall buildings, lining one side, will smother the outlook as has been cited in light surveys. Elsewhere in Clifton, where buildings of such height exist, they aren't directly opposite or nearly so close to each other, or so near the pavement. Light Surveys: I defer to my neighbours who have found, through professionals, that BRE guidelines will have been breached, although it's blatantly obvious that the reductions will be considerable, especially for those at lower elevations. Winter light, especially, will simply be eclipsed to an intolerable degree. Those with lofty views, although receiving more daylight, will still be confronted with a walled expanse from most angles. The plan itself: There is no clear indication in the published plans of how the proposals will actually LOOK from key views. An artist's impression is not good enough with such a watered down, softened appearance intended to look more appealing. Landscape in the Zoo site: I refer to the detailed BTF analysis for a number of shocking statistics, regardless of the replanting scheme. Depressing is the projected net loss in biodiversity of 22%, in contrast to the Zoo's projection of a net gain of 38% Even more depressing is the planned loss of a third of the mature trees. The present Zoo, uniquely, is a masterpiece of GARDENS, as is proudly proclaimed in its name. Plans for the development of communal public parkland cannot possibly keep or maintain such a paradise that has been created over the decades. This alone will be a huge loss, even at ground elevation. Infrastructure in the Community: 200 dwellings would suggest a population surge of twice that number. Can the public services manage that, bearing in mind the need for medical appointments and other services? The total number of dwellings in this area has grown gradually, but a surge would be detrimental in this environ. Pollution: Much has been said about the environmental benefits of this project, but the pollution generated in the area during construction will be undeniable and permeating. This will not be a case of</p>	22-Feb-23
------	---	---	-----------

	<p>"Wait till the dust settles." The cement pollution alone, during construction, has been proven to affect those, especially with respiratory conditions -- and seriously so, lasting for life. In a similar vein, the mental health of pupils and residents will surely take a knock, just as it is during these deliberations. And finally: It is obvious that I strongly object to the proposals on many counts. Most immediately is the sheer size and scope of the plans regarding structure, height, style and the volume of housing. As has been stated by others, the original founders of the Zoo would be saddened and shocked to know that a housing estate is on the cards. The plans are completely out of character with the surrounding Conservation Area and come not even close to enhancing or improving it. Housing is not the appropriate answer for the Zoo's legacy. But - if it must be so, a far smaller scale should be the ultimate aim.</p>	
--	---	--

683.	O	I am concerned about the scale and number of the additional residential buildings that seem totally out of keeping for a conservation area. This large construction project that will bring significant heavy goods vehicles and plant machinery during construction will have a detrimental effect on local traffic, increase pollution and could compromise schoolchildren's safety in Guthrie Rd and College Rd. If and when completed, this scheme will bring with it too many additional residents' vehicles for the inadequate parking proposed for the development. A spurious assumption that residents probably won't have vehicles would not I'm sure hold water. These additional vehicles will invariably park in the local residential roads that are already choked with cars especially during University term times when we are inundated with student vehicles that rarely move. The proposal that will bring yet more vehicles to Clifton without providing any additional parking is surely counter to BCC's environmental and transport policies and certainly impacts on residents such as ourselves who do not have off road parking. It appears obvious that high density, high price housing planned to enrich the developers is driving a proposal that will add little to the local community, will increase road traffic and pollution whilst removing an historic and aesthetically appropriate visitor attraction. I totally understand the Zoo's need and wish to move and understand that something must use the valuable space they vacate. The alternative proposal floated for a future environmental visitor attraction seems to have many merits. But I object totally to the proposal for high density scheme that does not consider the impact on the local community as currently configured.	22-Feb-23
684.	O	This is a disgusting waste of an important site which is important to the heritage of Bristol and the memories of its residents, it should not become another site for apartments for wealthy people. It's a disgrace and the money spinning of Bristol Zoo is an insult to the important heritage they have inherited and should be safeguarding. Their plans for a new 'zoo' seem to lack both animals and attraction. This site is a site filled with important memories and aspects of Bristol's history. If it is not going to continue as a zoo (meaning thanks to Bristol Zoo's rubbish omens there will no longer be a zoo in Bristol) then it should become either a public space people can use or a museum.	22-Feb-23
685.	O	i object to the housing development at bristol Zoo. i have been there for college and as kid. it would be a shame to see bristol zoo become something that means it can no longer be a zoo. it should stay as a zoo and remain as a zoo	22-Feb-23
686.	O	A dreadful loss of a public amenity and historic site. The zoo is part of the fabric of Bristol and no evidence it needs to be closed with no other possible outcomes	22-Feb-23

687.	O	The decision to close down the site should be reconsidered as it seems not to have followed good governance processes. The Zoo is a heritage asset that should be preserved. It has the same significance to Bristolians as the Suspension Bridge, the Museum, the SS Great Britain and the Picture House on Whiteladies Road. If the Council refuse these redevelopment plans then the Zoo would be forced to reconsider the closure. Time is needed to see if a public space can be created. I do not believe that builders will honour public access. The new buildings are large and out of keeping. It is not a brownfield site, it is a mature Victorian garden.	22-Feb-23
688.	O	1Conservation Loss of trees and plants 2A "green city"replacing a green space and public amenity with a housing estate and car park 3Proposed buildings completely out of scale with the surrounding buildings 4Damage to Bristol heritage a city proud of its history , 5 th oldest zoo, internationally acclaimed	22-Feb-23
689.	O	I strongly object to the plans to build a luxury housing estate on the site of the Bristol Zoo Gardens. The gardens have been open to the public for 186 years. The queues of people visiting the Zoo before it closed demonstrates its significance to generations of people of Bristol. The historical and environmental damage this development will cause are not justified. The whole of the beautiful gardens and planting on this site should be preserved with its mature trees, historical herbaceous border, various ecosystems and the amazing biodiversity it offers (per the BZS website) for future generations to enjoy. Examination of the financial reports for the Zoo show that the Clifton site is financially viable. Losses have been generated by millions of pounds being spent on consultancy fees to facilitate the sale of the site. Although there were no visitors during lockdown, the Zoo received £2.5million in business continuation insurance. Indeed the Zoo generates far more money and visitors than the Wild Place. The Zoo has misled the public into believing that the sale of the Clifton site is necessary as the only option. This is not the case as the KPMG report they commissioned includes other possible courses of action - none of which were presented to their shareholders. The Clifton site is listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space. It should stay this way. There is much public goodwill and support to explore options that will keep this site as a public green space rather than a luxury gated housing estate "Saving Wildlife Together" is the motto of the Zoo. The Council should start by saving the wildlife and biodiversity of the Clifton site by saying No to the Planning Application.	23-Feb-23

690.	O	<p>I strongly oppose the plans for the zoo gardens for the overbearing nature of the proposed blocks of flats that show no sympathy for the Clifton conservation area and the neighbouring buildings. lack of sympathy the design shows for this conservation area and its neighbouring buildings, the poor quality of the public park, loss of sunlight to neighbouring streets and the access issues around Guthrie Road. The proposed buildings give the appearance of a prison block and are totally unsuitable for a conservation area. The perimeter buildings are too overbearing, too large and extensive, too close to the perimeter and have no sympathy in scale or design to the neighbouring buildings. The new buildings completely overshadow and dominate the Zoo entrance building. The view of the site from the Downs will be a wall of modern buildings that remove the feeling of openness and visual amenity from the Downs where currently the buildings are well below the tree line. The main access point on Guthrie Road opposite the school is completely inappropriate for such a large site. This is a street with chicanes to slow traffic, which makes it hard for traffic to move along it. On top of that, the stretch of road next to the site entrance is used by the school to load and unload school buses several times each day- other streets being unsuitable for this purpose. If the main entrance is located on Guthrie Road, the number of dwellings on the site needs to be decreased significantly The public park is hidden away within this gated community with controlled access. The wall of tall surrounding buildings will deprive the park of sunlight and make the area feel walled in. The access roads within the site represent further loss of green open space. The beautiful heritage gardens will be ripped up along with established trees. This is not conservation. The neighbouring streets will lose sunlight for much of the year as they will be overshadowed by the excessively tall, uninterrupted blocks of flats.</p>	23-Feb-23
------	---	--	-----------

691.	O	<p>I strongly object to the plans for the Bristol Zoo Gardens. The layout of the site, with overly tall buildings around its perimeter, and narrow gated access makes it feel unwelcoming to the public. Much of the public garden space shown on the plans is actually access road and should not be classified as garden space especially as most of the car parking spaces are in the central part of the site. There is no similarity to the amenity of the current zoo gardens. There does not seem any guarantee that once the development is completed that public access will be maintained to the gardens in the long term. Such access is more assured if the public gardens form a solid area fronting onto Clifton Downs Road rather than lost within the gated community. I object to the loss of a visitor attraction that brings people into Clifton from outside Bristol. The community conservation centre is unlikely to have the equivalent economic value to the area and this negative impact has not been taken into account in the economic report. The public gardens have been dubbed down into an area surrounded by and crossed by access roads that are overlooked and shaded by excessively tall buildings around its perimeter and within it. I object to the amount of traffic that will be generated around the local roads of the site by this volume of housing plus that of the West Car Park site. No account seems to have been taken of parking needed by visitors to the residents of these sites. The loss of the car parks on Clifton Down Road is not mentioned. These visitors and the Clifton College drop off/pick up traffic will create substantial parking problems in the area with cars driving around looking for parking spaces, on top of all the additional traffic wanting to access the site. All this excess traffic is of a concern for the safety of the pupils of Clifton College who spend a lot of time each day walking between buildings in this area. The density of the development is too great to maintain public safety around this site. I object to the design of the perimeter buildings. These are all too tall, reducing the light into the public gardens substantially. The surrounding roads will feel like dark alleyways - especially College Road with blocks of flats situated close to the road on both sides. The architectural design bears no relation to the historical buildings that have been preserved nor to the surrounding buildings of Clifton conservation area. I object to the view of the site from the Downs with its 6 storey tall buildings built up to the boundary wall. The frontage should be no more than the current two storey height.</p>	23-Feb-23
692.	O	<p>I object to this development on the basis that it will result in a loss of Communal Value. I have a young family and we have visited the Bristol Zoo many times with family and friends. My children love this space and it will be a real shame to lose such an historical site.</p>	23-Feb-23

693.	O	<p>We are incredibly disappointed at the closure of the zoo. It was one of the main reasons for choosing to live and invest in Clifton. We chose Clifton as a place to live and raise our children because of its local amenities, good schools and level of safety. We feel that the closure of the zoo was unjust and if so many other businesses could bounce back after the pandemic so could the zoo which was one of our safe havens during covid when it was open. We also feel that removing a green site and 46% of its trees is not right. It is a beautiful and historic site and is one of Bristols landmarks. Our friends and family who travel to visit us from the UK and abroad have always looked forward to visiting the zoo with us a family. We don't believe that the alternate site is as promising as the Zoo CEO says it is and certainly is not an attraction that we as a family would travel to see. SAVE OUR ZOO AND COMMUNITY!!!</p>	23-Feb-23
694.	O	<p>Comments: Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. And should of being listed in totality. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.</p>	23-Feb-23

695.	O	Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. And should of being listed in totality. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	23-Feb-23
696.	O		23-Feb-23
697.	O	I object on the grounds of harm to overall historic interest. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. I object to these planning plans and to the entire concept of turning the zoo into a property development scheme. Sure change the zoo but don't destroy it! The need of change of use is not proven.	23-Feb-23
698.	O	I object on the grounds of harm to overall historic interest. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. I object to these planning plans and to the entire concept of turning the zoo into a property development scheme. Sure change the zoo but don't destroy it! The need of change of use is not proven.	23-Feb-23
699.	O	It is a corrupt and outrageous thing that brings ignominy on our council and business people to allow the closure of our zoo and to them take away the land from Bristolians. This is an exclusive decision that the majority of the city oppose.	23-Feb-23
700.	O	This is a disgraceful ugly exclusive plan that will impact the area negatively in appearance and architecture. Plus the corrupt dealings around it will be probed for evermore especially to hold certain people to account.	23-Feb-23
701.	O	I would like to register my strong opposition to this planning application. Whatever happens to the zoo, the gardens should be retained, with the historic animal enclosures, for the enjoyment of all the residents of Bristol, as it was set up in the first place. I have personally enjoyed many days at the zoo with my children and grandchildren. It has always been a safe place to go to play and learn about animals and I hope both of these aspirations will continue.	23-Feb-23

702.	O	Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. And should of being listed in totality. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	23-Feb-23
703.	O	Comments: Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. And should of being listed in totality. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	23-Feb-23
704.	O	I object on the grounds of harm to overall historic interest. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. I object to these planning plans and to the entire concept of turning the zoo into a property development scheme. Sure change the zoo but don't destroy it! The need of change of use is not proven.	23-Feb-23

705.	O	I object on the grounds of harm to overall historic interest. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. I object to these planning plans and to the entire concept of turning the zoo into a property development scheme. Sure change the zoo but don't destroy it! The need of change of use is not proven.	23-Feb-23
706.	O		23-Feb-23
707.	O	I strongly object to the sale of the zoo. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored.	23-Feb-23
708.	O	I object to the sale of the Bristol zoo - Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. In addition, the need for change of use is not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored.	23-Feb-23
709.	O	I object to this property development project as it causes unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. In addition, the need for change of use is not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored.	23-Feb-23
710.	O	I strongly object that the only solution for this site is housing. I feel that the Bristol Zoological Society have not given any consideration to alternative use of the space. If given away to housing, Bristol & its visitors will have lost a unique piece of cultural space for all to use and benefit by. I hope that there will be enough public support to at least delay a decision on its future. We owe it to the founders and sponsors of the Zoo to at least be open and debate this issue and not to steamroll into permanent redevelopment of a beautiful landmark. I and others will be pressing our City councillors and trustees of the Charity to think and search their consciences to make a reasoned decision to benefit all and not the few.	23-Feb-23
711.	O	I object to the application in the strongest possible terms. The application is in itself an act of cultural vandalism. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale an overall design an appearance, would harm the character and appearance of the Clifton Conservation Area. It would have a devastating impact on Clifton and Bristol. My understanding is that, if the application is approved, there is no right of appeal against that decision. However, there s an avenue of legal redress by way of an application for judicial review, which has succeeded in many similar cases.	23-Feb-23

712.	O	I strongly object to the sale of Bristol Zoological Gardens to a property developer. For 187 years it has been an integral part of the life of those of us who live in Clifton and in the wider Bristol area. Like many who live in Clifton I do not have a large garden and the zoological gardens have always been a green and safe place for my children and grandchildren to play without fear of cars or dogs and also a place for them to learn to appreciate the trees plants birds insects and animals that live in this beautiful space - not only those in captivity but those who choose to live there of their own accord. Once all this is destroyed it will be impossible to replace and Bristol will be a poorer place to live.	23-Feb-23
713.	O	Don't do it.	23-Feb-23
714.	O	The level of debate with local residents was poor at the outset. The suggested buildings are not sympathetic to the area. A communal green space could be an alternative which could be used by everyone in Bristol, a Bristol gardens. Many trees will be removed which is at odds with the governments green policies	23-Feb-23
715.	O	We are incredibly disappointed at the closure of the zoo. It was one of the main reasons for choosing to live and invest in Clifton. We chose Clifton as a place to live and raise our children because of its local amenities, good schools and level of safety. We feel that the closure of the zoo was unjust and if so many other businesses could bounce back after the pandemic so could the zoo which was one of our safe havens during covid when it was open. We also feel that removing a green site and 46% of its trees is not right. It is a beautiful and historic site and is one of Bristols landmarks. Our friends and family who travel to visit us from the UK and abroad have always looked forward to visiting the zoo with us a family. We don't believe that the alternate site is as promising as the Zoo CEO says it is and certainly is not an attraction that we as a family would travel to see. SAVE OUR ZOO AND COMMUNITY!!!	23-Feb-23
716.	O	I object to this development on the basis that it will result in a loss of Communal Value. I have a young family and we have visited the Bristol Zoo many times with family and friends. My children love this space and it will be a real shame to lose such an historical site.	23-Feb-23

717. O	<p>Granting permission to build apartment blocks by turning this open space into a concrete jungle, with buildings standing at 6 stories high, will never be sensitive or in keeping with the surrounding architecture and current beautiful gardens. We all know that this is a listed historic park and treasured open space. What are you as councillors doing to uphold and protect this, because as we all know, once a green, open and public site gets obliterated, it can never be transformed back to what it was again. History will be lost. Proposals of the gardens being "open to the public" is a farce, it's impossible to guarantee how long the gardens (if at all) will be open to the public. It's obvious that the residents will want the gardens to be private and will have no obligation to open it to the public - why would they?! As far as objecting this, it's nothing about being entitled neighbours, it is about being a normal local person of Bristol who have the knowledge of the full extent of manipulation behind the Zoo's PR. We, as Bristol people, know that we have been duped into lies and false claims of what is happening to the few green spaces left in the city. A promised conservation area (apparently run by a 'conservation and education charity') could be entirely obliterated and tarmacked over. How can you justify any development from a charity, this 'charity' is a con, there is nothing charitable about any of their plans and if granted this site will always be known as a fat cat financial gain for a few. You have the power to not let this happen. This is an educational space, an environmental haven that is currently not being respected. It must be opened up to the general public, the Bristol tax payers, the people of Bristol. Closing the zoo and developing the site in the KPMG report was one of seven other options - please do not rob this from the thousands of people who enjoy, love and cherish this National Treasure of a site. If approved, the increased amount of traffic and parked cars commuting too has been proved that it will be a major pollution concern. There are other knock on effects of just covering up a green space, their are air quality concerns, road safety for multiple local school children and serious health implications of pollution being brought into the area with more people and cars. Thank you for taking the time to read and digest my serious concerns for any concrete development at this site.</p>	23-Feb-23
718. O	<p>I strongly object to this application for the following reasons: 1. The building proposed are too high and overpassed 2. The design is out of keeping the surrounding buildings which include many listed buildings and houses of historical interest 3. No credible justification has been given for the Zoo closure 4. Research appears to have revealed that the Zoo was profitable and that income has been squandered on consultancy fees 5. It seems that the Zoo's accountants offered 7 future options to improve profitability - only one of which was closure. The other options have not been disclosed and possibly not explored. 6. The decision has been taken by a very small number of people and without proper consultation with the people of Bristol 7. The infrastructure needed for this development would irreparably damage the roots of important trees and it is estimated by the planners that a large number (up to 42% would disappear) 8. A large part of the gardens will be built on and such as remain will be subdivided and surrounded by road and parked vehicles. It seems unlikely that the residents will be prepared to pay for their upkeep 9. I feel strongly that the whole garden should be saved as a park for the use of the Bristol public Professor Ian Sutherland 8 Canynge Square Bristol BS8 3LA</p>	23-Feb-23

719.	O	I object to the loss of mature landscape being cleared for building. What is the point of planting trees in an effort to aid the environment only to then bulldoze long established trees.	23-Feb-23
720.	O	I would like to register my strong objection to the proposed plans for Bristol Zoo. I grew up in Bristol and spent many days at the Zoo learning and enjoying the open green spaces. The current plans will destroy this for future generations, decreasing Bristols value as a place to live. Bristol Zoo is a historical site and an important landmark which the public value highly and should not loose full access to. I also feel it is wrong and unnecessary to lose so many of the mature trees at the site which would be a loss for the local biodiversity. The need for change of use is not proven and the only solution should not be housing. Alternatives for a public site should be considered.	23-Feb-23
721.	O	I lived near the zoo for many years and object to it being developed for housing. My first objection is to the loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space and an important asset to the people of Bristol. I also object to the harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Surely this is important and something for the people could be done with the site to make it a going concern.	24-Feb-23

722.	O	<p>AMENITY Summary of objection: The proposed plans do not retain sufficient amenity space. The ratio of development to retained space is inappropriate and unacceptable. The development as a whole is overly-dense and inappropriate both for the Zoo Gardens site and in the context of the surrounding area. Detail: The proposals do not adequately address how public amenity space will be supported and protected into the future. Views are expressed that objections to the proposed development are based in NIMBYism - that affluent middle class locals in Clifton are up in arms because of the impact of the development on their neighbourhood and house values. This is a profoundly unhelpful and divisive argument. The concerns about loss of amenity under these proposals would apply wherever the Zoo happened to be located. This should concern all stakeholders. The amenity of the Zoo is measured in its unique value to the City as a whole - to all of its residents and communities, to visitors to the City, to its contribution to income from tourism and to the City's profile and reputation. Historically the Zoo has worked to extend its reach to everyone. It could undoubtedly do much more, but it remains the case that it is an accessible attraction and the community space and gardens should be preserved - as are for example the Clifton Downs - for the benefit of all. The quantum of housing and developed proposed in the Application is inappropriate for the site and the surrounding area. The housing is too extensive and the elevations are too high. Insufficient acreage is retained for public amenity. At the heart of the proposal for development is a fundamental conflict between providing high value housing on the site and maintaining public access - who will control access? When will it be allowed? Will it be free? Who will monitor use of the gardens? Who will attend to (and pay for) security? Potential purchasers of expensive housing on site are extremely unlikely to want unlimited visitor access around their properties. This factor is not adequately addressed in the Proposals.</p> <p>CONSERVATION AND HISTORIC BUILDINGS Summary of objection: The Proposal fails to protect significant historic buildings on the site. It is at odds with the Council's own policies for the surrounding Conservation area. The plans do not merit exceptional treatment. Detail: The Zoo Gardens site is of historic importance, and structures within it have protected status. Planning restrictions apply without exception to all other buildings in the surrounding area, restricting development. These restrictions exist for a reason - to ensure that the historical fabric of the area is maintained and that any proposed development is sensitive and controlled. The Proposals for a dense, modern housing scheme with unrelieved elevations are not sensitive to the site nor to the surrounding area. In the plans, much of the existing historic gardens appear to be removed to gain development density. The Tree Removals Plan (LUC-11585-LD-PLN-011) is one example, which appears to suggest that approaching 40% of mature trees stock will be cut down. Several large tracts of established areas of garden will be removed. This irreversibly damages the public amenity offered by the site. It runs a coach and horses through statements made by the Applicant that conservation and preservation of the natural environment is centrally important.</p> <p>DESIGN AND APPEARANCE Summary of objection: The proposed development as a whole is astonishingly ugly. The proposed building elevations are far too high and out of all symmetry and proportion with the site itself and the surrounding buildings. The architects could not have done a better job of designing a series of truly horrible 1970s style units. Bristol deserves better, rather than showing the world exactly how not to make best use of a beautiful and unique historic site.</p> <p>DUE PROCESS AND PLANNING PROCESS Summary of objection: The case for development of the Zoo Gardens site has not been the subject of proper public consultation. Valid</p>	24-Feb-23
------	---	---	-----------

		<p>concerns exist about the basis of Bristol Zoo's decision to sell, and the conduct of the Board of Trustees. Approval of this scheme would be a deeply reckless step on the part of the Planning Committee and extinguish any opportunity for wider (public) consideration of options for the Zoo Gardens. Any such decision may also in time prove to be one which would undermine the reputation of the Council and City of Bristol. Detail: I am concerned that the decision to sell the site for development has been ill thought out, has ignored alternative proposals to secure the future of the site, and has been founded on public statements about future economic and financial viability which are unproven. There have been suggestions in public that the Zoo Board's conduct in securing shareholder approval was at best high handed and at worst manipulative. There has been an absence of public consultation which - given the history and prominence of the site - is both shocking and unjustifiable. Imagine this process happening for London Zoo? (No I can't, either.) The Board's responsibility to consult extends not just with those who have funded or donated, or left legacies to support the operations of the Zoo and its upkeep as a public space, but to all stakeholders. Decisions made in private session are wholly in conflict with the legal responsibilities of Trustees. The decision to sell is also at odds with the stated charitable objects of the Zoo and its overarching responsibility to act in the public interest. If any of these concerns over due process are shown to have foundation, the Board of Trustees may - may - have been found in time to have acted improperly. The relevance of this in planning terms is that if Planning approves this scheme, any opportunity for proper public consultation or the development of alternative proposals will be permanently lost. It will effectively cement 'sale with planning for development' as the only option for the future of the Zoo Gardens. This leaves the way open for any future owner of the site to bring forward alternative, potentially more densely designed schemes - or to leave the site to deteriorate in the hope of a more favourable future planning environment borne of desperation just to see something happen with it. Plenty of examples of such sites exist.</p>	
723.	O	<p>The loss of this historic and integral part of the City of Bristol would be devastating. I strongly object to the idea to the planning proposed for this site as I believe the entire site should be for the people of Bristol and remain as both a zoological and botanic garden. The long established gardens, the historic space, the children's activity areas and the vast learning opportunities currently on this area are unequalled in central Bristol. The message of conservation and green space, clean air, climate change and our wider world which is intrinsic to the zoo and all it stands for; to build housing here would wipe out this message. It is paramount that future generations continue to have access to this site for both for educational, health and social reasons. A housing estate no matter how luxury will not offer any of these things, I do not believe continued 'children's play space or gardens' will last long. It will be a permanent black mark against the city of Bristol if this historic, beautiful and vitally important space does not remain for the people of the city.</p>	24-Feb-23
724.	O	<p>I object to the change of the natural ecosystem of the area.</p>	24-Feb-23

725.	O	The gardens should be designed for everyone to be able to use them and not for private benefit. This is an important green space for the people of Bristol and has many historic buildings which the people of Bristol have enjoyed for years. Please do not act purely for profit but consider other community beneficiaries.	24-Feb-23
726.	O	Please keep Bristol Zoo as a garden.	24-Feb-23
727.	O	I strongly object to the Bristol Zoological Society's proposals to redevelop Bristol Zoo for housing. I accept that there is a national housing crisis but I do not accept that it is appropriate to remove and redevelop important cultural assets of significant benefit to the regional and city community. It is irresponsible to contemplate such loss for housing. I object on three grounds. (a) The planning application is unlawful in failing to be subject to Environmental Impact Assessment. (b) It is necessary by law for Bristol City Council and the applicant to pay special attention to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The planning application is unlawful in failing this test and in paying minimal regard the character and appearance. (c) The proposals, if approved and implemented would remove an internationally recognised Cultural Institution and a Community Asset, in conflict with policy. 1) The planning application breaches EIA Regulations and Case Law in salami slicing the property in order to avoid EIA being undertaken. The West Car Park and the Zoo Gardens should be subject to EIA to assess the significant environmental impacts of each proposal and the cumulative environmental effects. The two sites are linked by virtue of ownership and by virtue that one is operationally linked to the other. The Townscape and Visual Impacts are severe. 2) The application proposals breach the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the "LB & CA Act") in failing to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area (Article 72(1)). Clifton Conservation Area was designated in 1970 and the Conservation Area Appraisal was updated in 2010. The Clifton Conservation Area Appraisal lists Bristol Zoo among six "crucial landmarks nationally and on Bristol's landscape" (para 6.3.2); and states, "The variety and quality of views in Clifton are a critical component of the area's special interest," (para 6.2.3). The proposals conflict with Long View L25, Local View LC21 and a Landmark of City Wide Importance (see Map 4). The cumulative effect of high density housing development on West Car Park and Bristol Zoo will result in a canyon effect. This will result in substantial harm Long View L25. High density insensitively design development on Guthrie Road will cause substantial harm to listed assets at Clifton College on Guthrie Road. The proposals substantially conflict with listed buildings, heritage and the Clifton Conservation Area, in conflict with the Appraisal and the LB & CA Act. Core Strategy Policy BCS22 requires that "Development proposals will safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including ... Conservation Area." The proposals conflict with Policy BCS22 with regard to scale, design and massing. I do not accept the position of Historic England. These proposals will result in substantial harm to the Conservation Area and the important listed buildings on Guthrie Road at Clifton College. (3) Bristol Zoo is a quasi community use. It is no different in community significance to St George's Bristol (a privately owned institution for public use through paid access) or Bristol Beacon (publicly owned for public use through paid access). Bristol Zoo is similarly privately owned for public use through paid access. The point being that these are national important public assets, each of which provide Community Facilities recognised under Core Strategy Policy BCS12 and each is "easily accessible by walking, cycling and public transport, and re open to	24-Feb-23

		<p>all members of the community." It is not acceptable to simply accept the Zoo's case that the use in Clifton is no longer viable and therefore allow the Zoo to be redeveloped for housing. The Zoo Gardens are in community use and should be retained for community use, and every effort should be made to seek alternative community uses - a test set by most other Local Planning Authorities. It is reputationally reprehensible to contemplate it being acceptable to remove and replace a Nationally Significant Cultural and Community Institution with housing. We need to protect our heritage and cultural spaces for future generations, which is part of what Sustainability is about: protecting spaces for future generations. Careful consideration should be taken over the most appropriate locations for new housing, which is much needed, but not at the expense of national significant places rich in culture, nature and biodiversity. Planning Committee should think long and hard. We need more housing but at what price to nature, culture, amenity, community? If the Bristol Zoological Society no longer wishes to operate a zoo, then other community uses must first be explored. This planning application should be refused and or deferred for further consideration.</p>	
728.	O	I would like to see this space continue to be used for conservation, education, biodiversity, and overall a beautiful public space to enjoy. I don't think residential units would provide any of these things	24-Feb-23
729.	O	I object to the plans on the following grounds: 1. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. 2. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. 3. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	24-Feb-23

730.	O	<p>I object to any housing development on this site on the following grounds: 1. It is probably one of the most loved, visited, nurtured, maintained Bristol heritage sites. My grandmother, born circa 1880, had family membership there and her great great grandchildren similarly visited the zoo and gardens up to its closure. Countless Bristol families share similar associations. It should remain 100% open to the general public to use and enjoy as a unique outdoor space. It should not become a housing estate. 2. The sustainability/green/ reducing carbon footprint argument for moving the zoo to Wild Place is vacuous. Most Bristol visitors will have to use motorised transport to reach Wild Place making a longer journey. Meanwhile the proposed housing estate residents will be adding to the already busy roads crossing the Downs/ or the city centre in order to approach the zoo site. Increased carbon footprint in both cases. 3. Bristol local government/leaders have sanctioned too many housing developments which have not lived up to expectations e.g. the long awaited housing developments round the harbour. We cannot afford yet another mistake in which a place of natural beauty is ruined. Once the iconic zoo buildings, flower beds, lake and trees are destroyed we can never recover those historic features. Please think again.</p>	24-Feb-23
731.	O	<p>I believe there will be a colossal loss of Communal Value. This is part of what makes Bristol, Bristol. We have to stop these important historical sites, loved by generations disappearing from us, without a public fight. We saved Whiteladies Cinema, Bristol Old Vic and there has been no real or public attempt to save Bristol Zoo. The site means so much to people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered. I understand the need for selling this site has not been proven. It has been made by a few people and not with the option to keep it open. The need for an open and safe space for my small children to be able to enjoy the outdoors will be taken away. The public green space proposed is much smaller, will have roads with many cars, bikes and delivery drives going through on a daily basis will mean it will not be a safe open space and that sense of freedom children can get from being able to safely explore will be gone. None of the other options have been explored, when the site was decided to close and I believe we should have new options explored publicly.</p>	25-Feb-23

732.	O	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed development of accommodation and associated parking on the site of a local community facility - the historic Bristol Zoo Gardens. My objection is based on the material loss of amenity proposed by the development, which appears to have been hastily proposed on the back of COVID financial after effects, (which have since been proved to be unnecessarily pessimistic), as have been detailed by the Downs for People comments and not reiterated here. At the very least the negative financial implications of maintaining two complementary zoo sites, if both provide different animal environments, needs to be revisited. The implications of moving an economic resource from a Bristol visitor attraction to a South Gloucester visitor attraction does not appear to have been considered. The amendment and destruction of historic buildings and amenity do not seem to me to be justified without a much wider consultation of how such amenities can be preserved and developed, (whilst preserving the zoo in a form acceptable to modern ideas of small animal welfare) for further generations of Bristol residents and visitors. It is not idle sentimentality to seek to preserve the oasis of the Zoo Gardens. The loss of nearly half of the mature trees and a car free environment is surely out of sync with these times of increased consciousness of climate change and a lauded 'green' city, despite the adjustments proposed to the development. There is no guarantee that public access will be maintained to diminished gardens, especially if residents are expected to cover the cost through their service charges. At the very least the planning department should delay a decision permitting the development to go ahead whilst other means of maintaining the existing amenity are explored more fully. As someone who used the zoo for many years and am still an occasional visitor, I had been under the impression the zoo had already been sold, and that there was therefore no chance of working to secure its future for others to enjoy. After all, although the KPMG consultant's report on potential ways of developing the zoo as a site gave a number of options, the only option put forward to the shareholders or shared more widely was the option of selling the site. Please do not take a hasty decision, the detrimental effects of which can never be undone.</p>	26-Feb-23
------	---	---	-----------

733.	O	<p>I am writing as a concerned citizen of Bristol in response to the very deep concern about the development of the Bristol zoo site. I am of the very strong belief that the site must be retained as a community asset rather than sold to private concerns that will result in the site being developed and its heritage status lost to the community. Since starting a family in Bristol we regularly used to visit the zoo as a wonderful and beautiful open space and gardens much to the tremendous delight of our children. This has been the case for hundreds of thousands, if not millions of children and families throughout its long history. It has not only served the local Bristol community for well over a hundred years, but also the rest of the country where it has held iconic status. I remember watching Animal Magic with Johnny Morris from my childhood home in Manchester and being enthralled, entertained and educated about the many different animals that came to my attention and how it promoted a lifelong interest with wildlife. Though I am happy for the main aspect of the zoo to move out to its new site where animal welfare will be better I am still of the opinion that the present grounds represent a heritage that should not be taken from the people of Bristol the principle to repurpose for the wider Bristol community is very strong. The site is a green space with beautiful gardens that have been appreciated by many generations of visitors. I hope that this green area is maintained, especially in this day of concern about the loss of the green environment and the general effects of urbanisation. I am aware that the green expanse of the Clifton Downs is on its doorstep but this should not be mistaken for more of the same with its nurtured gardens and heritage nature. I also have a concern that the height of any building work will seriously be a blot on the landscape within this low rise area. Indeed the lovely architectural heritage of this area must be maintained. On a political front if the residents of Bristol see what they deem as their heritage and belonging to them, again taken away by people and organisations of wealth then this will be seen as another insult to people of less means and an insult to a just society. This cannot be allowed to happen. Please refrain from developing the Bristol zoo site to the detriment to the local people, the wider Bristol community as well as the environment and wildlife.</p>	26-Feb-23
734.	O	<p>I object to the planning application for Bristol Zoo Gardens on the basis that the application is wholly inappropriate. There will be a loss of a communal space, the gardens are listed as a local historic local park, there is a planned loss of trees and a public green space. There will be limited public access. The overall design of the buildings is out of character and not to scale with surrounding buildings. A gross overdevelopment of the site. There will be harm to listed buildings on the site.</p>	26-Feb-23

735.	O	Comments: Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. And should of being listed in totality. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	27-Feb-23
736.	O		27-Feb-23
737.	O	I object on the grounds of harm to overall historic interest. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. I object to these planning plans and to the entire concept of turning the zoo into a property development scheme. Sure change the zoo but don't destroy it! The need of change of use is not proven.	27-Feb-23
738.	O	I object on the grounds of harm to overall historic interest. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. I object to these planning plans and to the entire concept of turning the zoo into a property development scheme. Sure change the zoo but don't destroy it! The need of change of use is not proven.	27-Feb-23

739.	O	<p>Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. And should of being listed in totality. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.</p>	27-Feb-23
740.	O	<p>An irreplaceable part of Bristol's heritage and identity is threatened. Bristol Zoo, as was frequently mentioned, is nearly 200 years old and is the 5th oldest in the world. It is city zoo, a rare thing in the UK and that helps make it part of Bristol's identity, as much as the Suspension Bridge, the docks, Bristol Museum or the SS Great Britain (the youngest addition). No one would sanction the Suspension Bridge if it got into economic difficulties, so why Bristol Zoo? The Zoo is an asset, part of what makes Bristol unique and gives our great city an identity; that identity is part of what makes Bristol attractive to visit, to live in and to bring business to. Heritage is proven to be vital to both social, spiritual and economic life. The Zoo is part of Bristol's heritage. Losing it will damage Bristol. The Local Economy has suffered from the current closure of the Zoo. Beyond so called 'soft value', the Zoo brings hundreds of thousands of pounds into the city every year. A trip to the zoo for a non-Bristolian brings money to cafes, restaurants, shops and other heritage sites in the city. The loss to local businesses is already being keenly felt. The Wild Place is not a substitute or replacement for the Zoo - if the Zoo goes, it dies; it will not be reincarnated elsewhere. It was claimed in its own publicity that the Zoo was moving to the Wild Place. This was such a spin on the truth as to easily be called a lie (and I'll get to some more of those in moment). The Wild Place is a very different set up to the Zoo and very few animals are moving there. It is its own entity and will continue to be so. Beyond the lack of and variety of animals at the Wild Place there is also a lack of beauty there. That may sound a bit esoteric but the Zoo isn't just the animals, it is also the exceptional Gardens. Many of the hundreds of thousands visitors might never have been somewhere with such visually stunning borders, trees and horticultural beauty. Long established gardens can bring you peace, wonder, and a reassuring sense of continuity, without you even realising. The Zoo Gardens provided calming food for the soul to go with the thrilling food for the mind provided by the wildlife there. And there was always ice cream for just actual food. The Wild Place will have some animals but not as many nor as varied as the Zoo has and it will have no gardens, no beauty. The sense of wonder on offer is halved. Shenanigans at the top - spin, concealing/massaging</p>	27-Feb-23

		<p>the figures, dictatorial decisions. Closing the zoo and selling the land for development as housing was presented by the execs to the shareholders as the only option. That meeting was by all accounts an ambush and the decision was presented as fait accompli. This seemed rum at the time, but since then further information has been trickling out that casts doubt on both the process and the decision. The KPMG report had other options none of which were revealed to or discussed by the shareholders. When shareholders asked to see these other options, they were denied. If closing the Zoo was the only option, why not share the report? What is being hidden? The attendance numbers for the Zoo have been falsely spun too. 500,000 visitors a year, and a gradual increase in the last few years leading up to Covid. The zoo was profitable too, also showing an increase in the years leading up to Covid. So why close a business that, but for a Covid blip, was on the up? Finally, Bristol Council's complicity in the decision to close is either only just excusable if the wool was pulled over their eyes too, but it's inexcusable and immorally complicit if they knew that other options were available but ignored them. Refusing planning is the first step on showing that the council are going to reexamine this decision themselves with impartiality and integrity. Whether it is ineptitude or malice, there is huge doubt about the decision to close which means the right thing to do is refuse all permission to develop pending a review or a reversal.</p>	
741.	O	<p>Dear Planning Team, We are very concerned about the size of the planned developments. The buildings planned appear unsympathetic, overbearing and totally incongruous with this conservation area. The high storey domestic accommodation also worryingly gives residents direct line of sight into the neighbouring school, exposing the children. We object wholeheartedly to the current plans.</p>	27-Feb-23

742.	O	I object on the following grounds: Loss of a considerable public and educational amenity for the whole of Bristol and beyond when it has not been demonstrated that there are no other viable uses for the site including as a reimagined zoo Loss of historic gardens, buildings and heritage assets contrary to the NPPF: there is no evidence of any public benefit which could be derived were this application to be accepted The proposed public access to the remaining gardens is permissive and not granted in perpetuity, meaning that as it would be funded by a levy on the residents, it is vulnerable to being withdrawn. Once developed, cars and service vehicles are to be allowed onsite undermining the character and tranquillity of the Zoo Gardens and its safe environment for families with children Poor scheme, design and scale of multi-storey buildings around the perimeter of the site are out of keeping with and would dominate the important surrounding listed buildings within the Conservation Area Loss of over 80 established and beautiful trees and their haven for wildlife	27-Feb-23
743.	O	Still considering myself to be a true Bristolian, I was saddened at the decision to close the site. I regularly visit my home town and have fond memories of visiting the zoo with family and friends both as a child and as an adult. I regularly visited by myself up to it's closure. The location provided many hours of school educational, learning experiences and provided great opportunity for people from all backgrounds to experience so of the rarest animals in captivity raising awareness of wider global impacts on wildlife and conservation. The site has significant amenity, cultural and historical value to the people of Bristol and to the wider country. The suggestion to convert the site to a housing development again looks to be a money making step with little regard for the people of Bristol and the reflection for the cultural heritage. Bristol has lost a valuable visitor attraction within the city and whilst the new site will be larger it will not be as nearly accessible to all members of society It won't be a site that is in walking distance of other visitor attraction to encourage access during visits to the centre and other iconic landmarks and more over will not be within Bristol. The redevelopment will no doubt lead to loss of green space and impacts on eco system services and biodiversity as a result but as with all development will be a process of getting as many pounds out of the ground as possible. The proposed development will no doubt have more of an impact than suggested as is often the case. The development will not be of benefit to the people of Bristol and will only cater for the benefit of those who can afford to live there. Whilst I can not envisage the site being reopened as a zoological site,(more is the putty) I can't help but think that the site would be better as a greenspace, botanical garden to be used for public events, festivals, and recreational use, whilst helping improve the carbon impacts of the city rather than as another multiple million pound housing estate. For the reasons of impact to amenity, loss of ecosystem and green space, loss of cultural and heritage I can do nothing but object. This is a tragic loss of an iconic site and the council needs to take serious steps to prevent housing development and preserve / enhance and protect the site for future generations of Bristol folk and the wider country.	27-Feb-23
744.	O	This is a disgraceful ugly exclusive plan that will impact the area negatively in appearance and architecture. Plus the corrupt dealings around it will be probed for evermore especially to hold certain people to account.	28-Feb-23

745.	O	It is a corrupt and outrageous thing that brings ignominy on our council and business people to allow the closure of our zoo and to them take away the land from Bristolians. This is an exclusive decision that the majority of the city oppose.	28-Feb-23
746.	O	I am heartbroken that the zoo has closed and the idea that this hallowed land is marked for residential development is truly salt in the wound. I believe it represents an enormous harm to the cultural, ecological and social value of Bristol and, on a personal level for me and my family, has diminished the local area to such an extent that we are planning to move away. It makes me sad beyond words that the place my small children loved most in the world was taken away from them. We visited at least twice a week. My two year old will likely not even remember this place which means such a huge amount to me. The site of the zoo should be listed, protected and preserved as a public space, ideally with a focus on wildlife and conservation. It is CRUCIAL that there is an accessible and central outdoor space that celebrates the natural world for future generations of Bristolians. It is unacceptable and untrue to state that something of this nature is not economically viable. This has not been proven. The Wild Place, not even in Bristol, is not an acceptable replacement. It is not accessible for families without a car, for one thing - and how is encouraging car use in line with green principles? The strength of feeling people hold for the zoo and the memories it holds for generations should not be taken lightly - this could be capitalised on and protected rather than desecrated and undermined. Despite the current proposal, there is no guarantee whatsoever that the gardens will remain open to the public in the future. And how likely is this really once it's a private residential community? I urge and beg you to reject this application.	01-Mar-23
747.	O	The loss of Bristol Zoo and the green spaces it offers would be hugely detrimental to the city of Bristol. It has huge historic significance and contains many listed buildings and beautiful spaces and the loss of trees and other plants would be awful. The buildings proposed are not in keeping with the local area and the change of purpose for the site has not been justified. There have many times since the zoo has closed that myself and my children have thought we would have gone to the zoo today had it been open and it is a huge loss to an area which doesn't offer a lot for children in particular.	02-Mar-23
748.	O	This space, without animals, should be for all the people of Bristol to enjoy. The proposed plans do not reflect this ethos. Luxury housing is not an appropriate plan for this space. Moreover, the cutting down of so many trees would be so damaging. Support heritage and history for all of Bristol to enjoy. Rather than financial wealth for a few. There are so few chances to save local heritage sites, save this space for the future generations.	02-Mar-23

749.	O	I object to the overall design of these buildings and the loss of landscape. When I read the arbculturalists report on the trees showing the shading pattern of the buildings, how mich disruption the buried utilities causes to roots, it seemed clear that the proposed structures were not compatible with the existing plants survival and an unacceptable number of mature trees would be moved or sacrificed. How can this be acceptable in a city ambitious to address climate change? I am sympathetic to the housing needs of Bristol residents but these are not the houses needed surely? Please hold back and reconsider what is being proposed here, who is benefiting and whether the grant of planning permission is in the interest of the constituents who deserve Council support or those who already have priveledge and support, and finally if this development is in any way aligned with this charities mission. Thank you	02-Mar-23
750.	O		03-Mar-23
751.	O	I have lived in Bristol for 60 years and was a frequent visitor to the zoo with my children. They now bring their children to the zoo so the site is important to us all. I accept that the zoo wants to remove the animals, but surely this space could be kept as a public amenity somehow. I am very sad to see the proposal is to simply build over the area. Surely Bristol could do something more imaginative than this. The visual impact of the proposed buildings will very much detract from the surrounding area in this historic part of the city. All those visitors, many from overseas, who come to visit the suspension bridge near by will see just a few dominating and out of keeping buildings. Something which adds to the area, which benefits many more people than could live in the proposed buildings, would surely encourage our international visitors to keep visiting and help keep Bristol as a key city, not 'just another city'. I strongly object to the proposal. It is out of keeping, out of scale and is inappropriate exploitation of a unique asset.	03-Mar-23
752.	O	I have lived in Bristol for 60 years and was a frequent visitor to the zoo with my children. They now bring their children to the zoo so the site is important to us all. I accept that the zoo wants to remove the animals, but surely this space could be kept as a public amenity somehow. I am very sad to see the proposal is to simply build over the area. Surely Bristol could do something more imaginative than this. The visual impact of the proposed buildings will very much detract from the surrounding area in this historic part of the city. All those visitors, many from overseas, who come to visit the suspension bridge near by will see just a few dominating and out of keeping buildings. Something which adds to the area, which benefits many more people than could live in the proposed buildings, would surely encourage our international visitors to keep visiting and help keep Bristol as a key city, not 'just another city'. I strongly object to the proposal. It is out of keeping, out of scale and is inappropriate exploitation of a unique asset.	03-Mar-23
753.	O		03-Mar-23

754. O	<p>Before moving to Bristol 39 years ago, a yearly visit o Bristol and friends always included a visit to Bristol Zoo, and we have continued that practice of taking visitors. It has been such an important part of our life here, and for those of countless others. The queues of families waiting for entry in the summer are testament to this. It would seem a cynical financial land grab to send the animals to other zoos, and to replace with large gated-entry housing and parking for 120 cars; to trash those beautiful gardens, an obscenity. This land is a Bristol gem and should remain intact and returned to what so many of us know as a financially successful centre of animal conservation, enabling future generations to enjoy and perhaps unknowingly to be educated, or preserved and developed as a Botanical Garden to be enjoyed by all. The zoo gardens and several defined buildings are categorised as Heritage Assets. I draw attention to Policy BCS22 from Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy and urge you to put Bristol in charge, as the Trustees have clearly abdicated responsibility, and state a position regarding this, or any further private housing proposals on the land. "Development proposals will safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including: - Scheduled ancient monuments; - Historic buildings both nationally and locally listed; - Historic parks and gardens both nationally and locally listed; - Conservation areas; - Archaeological remains"</p> <p>Policy BCS22, any development proposals on the zoo's site should safeguard or enhance the heritage assets and the character and setting of that area of acknowledged importance. Plan Policy DM31 "development in their vicinity, will be expected to have no adverse impact on those elements which contribute to their special architectural or historic interest, including their settings</p>	03-Mar-23
755. O	<p>I have lived in Bristol for 60 years and was a frequent visitor to the zoo with my children. They now bring their children to the zoo so the site is important to us all. I accept that the zoo wants to remove the animals, but surely this space could be kept as a public amenity somehow. I am very sad to see the proposal is to simply build over the area. Surely Bristol could do something more imaginative than this. The visual impact of the proposed buildings will very much detract from the surrounding area in this historic part of the city. All those visitors, many from overseas, who come to visit the suspension bridge near by will see just a few dominating and out of keeping buildings. Something which adds to the area, which benefits many more people than could live in the proposed buildings, would surely encourage our international visitors to keep visiting and help keep Bristol as a key city, not 'just another city'. I strongly object to the proposal. It is out of keeping, out of scale and is inappropriate exploitation of a unique asset.</p>	03-Mar-23

756.	O	I have lived in Bristol for 60 years and was a frequent visitor to the zoo with my children. They now bring their children to the zoo so the site is important to us all. I accept that the zoo wants to remove the animals, but surely this space could be kept as a public amenity somehow. I am very sad to see the proposal is to simply build over the area. Surely Bristol could do something more imaginative than this. The visual impact of the proposed buildings will very much detract from the surrounding area in this historic part of the city. All those visitors, many from overseas, who come to visit the suspension bridge near by will see just a few dominating and out of keeping buildings. Something which adds to the area, which benefits many more people than could live in the proposed buildings, would surely encourage our international visitors to keep visiting and help keep Bristol as a key city, not 'just another city'. I strongly object to the proposal. It is out of keeping, out of scale and is inappropriate exploitation of a unique asset.	03-Mar-23
757.	O	I now spend half my time in .Bristol where my partner lives and have loved the city ever since being a student at the university.The proposed development will have a detrimental effect on this historical and famous area. It certainly will not "improve and enhance." The visual impact be out of keeping with the surrounding buildings. The increase in traffic, without the existing zoo carpark, will be detrimental. The zoo site is nationally famous and the reputation of the city is bound in with historical things like this. It is as iconic in its way as the suspension bridge. I accept that the zoo has/will move away, but just to remove any evidence by sticking up high-rise flats is philistine. Why ruin such a reputation for the benefit of the developer alone? Young people want to come and live and work in Bristol because of its reputation, don't destroy that. The development itself will not alleviate the housing shortage, these dwellings will be for the rich. What about the not-so- rich who will lose a child friendly area which is within walking district of Clifton? This is a crass, insesitive proposal when so many more appropriate solutions have been made.	03-Mar-23
758.	O	Too many mature trees will be removed to allow for extensive building, according to the plans submitted. A third of the trees in the site will be removed if the current plans are approved, destroying what is at present an oasis of greenery and tranquility within a busy city. We need more trees to contribute to the clean air zones of our city, not less. Removing so many trees goes against all the plans to improve air quality locally and fighting climate change. Building in the way it has been proposed would be a great loss of a public amenity at a time when there is a strong movement worldwide to improve access to green spaces to encourage people to be more active outdoors. The development plans shows that the blocks of apartments are too large and blank in architectural value, completely out of character with the surrounding buildings. The planned high density building is not appropriate for a conservation area with too many apartments being squeezed in inappropriately to this historic site. I object in the strongest terms to this application and ask for this application to be rejected. Thank you.	04-Mar-23

759.	O	The plans show that too many mature trees will be removed to allow for extensive residential building of 196 units, according to the current submission. A third of the trees in the site will be removed if the current plans are approved, destroying what is at present an oasis of greenery and tranquility within a busy city. We need more trees to contribute to the clean air zones of our city, not less. Removing so many trees goes against all the plans to improve air quality locally and fighting climate change, as well as destroying a renowned garden. Building in the way it has been proposed would be a great loss of a public amenity at a time when there is a strong movement worldwide to improve access to green spaces to encourage people to be more active outdoors. The development plans shows that the blocks of apartments are far too large and lacking in architectural value, completely out of character with the surrounding buildings. The planned high density building is not appropriate for a conservation area with too many residences being squeezed in to this historic site. It is inappropriate. I object in the strongest terms to this application and ask for this application to be rejected. Thank you.	04-Mar-23
760.	O	Bristol Zoo has not made a case for relocation. The proposed development is completely inappropriate to Clifton Conservation Area. The proposed buildings are overbearing, too dense and would completely change the nature of the area. As in other, similar developments, the stated inclusion of accessibility to the public after development, is likely to disappear, and the community created would be likely to be gated.	04-Mar-23
761.	O	There are a multitude of reasons why I object to the proposed development. IT IS BRISTOL ZOO. It has been enjoyed by the people of this city for hundreds of years. When it sells the site, the zoo cannot guarantee the public access to the gardens it talks of. This is greenwash. We will lose a public amenity that has huge communal value. The proposed redevelopment is ugly in the extreme and is completely driven by the desire to maximise profit. It is beyond Ironic that Bristol Zoo, a conservation charity is putting forward a proposal that will hugely damage these unique 12-acre gardens. I urge the council to reject this plan and give the time needed to seek a more sympathetic and appropriate future for this site.	04-Mar-23

762. O	<p>I wish to object to this planning proposal for the following reasons: 1. Under National Planning Policy Framework 2021, the site falls under the category of Heritage asset (NPPF, 16 [Conserving and enhancing the historic environment] para 189) since it is of significant "local historic value", the gardens having been continuously curated since 1836. As NPPF states, such an asset is "an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations." Construction of a multistorey estate on this special site would contravene this area of national policy. 2. Under Bristol City Council's own Conservation and the Historic Environment Policy BCS22 from Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, "Development proposals will safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including: - ... - Historic buildings both nationally and locally listed; - Historic parks and gardens both nationally and locally listed; - Conservation areas; - ..." The site of the proposed development contains multiple protected heritage assets (The Zoo's Monkey Temple, and Eagle Aviary, Bear Pit (now Aquarium); the main entrance building, the Giraffe (now Gorilla) House building and south entrance gates, all Grade II listed). In accordance with Policy BCS22, any development proposals on the zoo's site should "safeguard or enhance the heritage assets and the character and setting of these nationally recognised assets". It is highly questionable whether a high-density multistorey estate constructed in the close vicinity to these assets would align with this Policy. The zoo gardens are an irreplaceable long-cultivated part of Bristol's identity. Under the Bristol Local Plan document Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Policy DM31 (Heritage Assets) any heritage asset is defined as "a finite non-renewable resource that can often be irreparably damaged by insensitive development"; Moreover the Policy states that: - "Great weight is given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.", and that - "development in their vicinity, will be expected to have no adverse impact on those elements which contribute to their special architectural or historic interest, including their settings". The nature and massing of a multistorey estate development on this site will be overbearing, with high-level adverse impact on the gardens' setting and amenity value. Moreover, the close proximity of the proposed development will not conserve the character of the listed assets in any way. The proposal is therefore at clear odds with Policy DM31. Additionally, the proposed architecture would have significant impact on the conservation area where the site is located. Per Policy DM31 "Development within or which would affect the setting of a conservation area will be expected to preserve or, where appropriate, enhance those elements which contribute to their special character or appearance." The proposed slab-type architecture, massing and height would in no way align with Policy DM31. Aside from compliance with local and national policy, the scale of the proposed development would have significant adverse impact on the local urban infrastructure, which has not evolved to accommodate such housing density or mass. Development of this scale would necessitate considerable additional expenditure on local infrastructure (traffic controls, road strengthening / widening etc) to ensure that all residents and visitors to the gardens under the proposed development's housing and leisure intentions could safely enter and exit the site. For the above reasons I strongly object to this development proposal and request that this planning application be refused.</p>	05-Mar-23
--------	---	-----------

763.	O	Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. Loss of Communal Value. Harm to listed buildings. Social & material harm unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. Loss of public amenity. Loss of landscape.	06-Mar-23
764.	O	Under National Planning Policy Framework 2021, the site falls under the category of Heritage asset (NPPF, 16 [Conserving and enhancing the historic environment] para 189) since it is of significant "local historic value", the gardens having been continuously curated since 1836. As NPPR states, such an asset is "an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations." Construction of a multistorey estate on this special site would contravene this area of national policy. Also protected under Bristol City Council's own Conservation and the Historic Environment Policy BCS22 .	06-Mar-23
765.	O	I am quite frankly totally gobsmacked that the Bristol Zoo trustees are seeking to sell the Clifton site of Bristol Zoological Gardens. The clue is in the whole name - it is Bristol Zoo Gardens. To sell what has for almost 200 years been a basic part of the fabric and heritage of the City of Bristol is nothing less than cultural vandalism. Countless generations of Bristolians and their families have spent thousands of hours of enjoyment and fun at the zoo and its gardens. Bristol Zoo Gardens has provided relief and environmental escape for Bristolians wishing to enjoy a unique park on the edge of the beautiful Avon Gorge, especially for those without the means to travel out of the city to other places of leisure. The trustees make the specious argument that it is necessary to sell the Clifton site in order for the zoo to survive economically. They highlight the unusual loss which the zoo made in 2021 in particular as justification for the need to sell Bristol Zoo Gardens, but this is completely disingenuous because that was during the height of the coronavirus pandemic when the zoo was legally forced to be closed, and people had to stay at home. It beggars belief that the trustees use the loss made during that year as a primary reason for selling the site. I'm afraid to say that this smacks of economic opportunism on the part of the trustees as a way to make a lot of money, regardless of the consequences for the wellbeing, history and culture of Bristol. Bristol Zoo is the 5th oldest zoo in the world, and is internationally renowned. It is also much loved by Bristolians. The gardens themselves have won many awards and have matured over the course of 186 years and there are many plants which are unusual and unique and should be highly protected. I have been a member of Bristol zoo for over 40 years. My children are all now in their thirties, but I had been taking them to the zoo since they were babies. They had many happy times there as child members, including things like birthday parties and picnics on the lawn in the summer. I am afraid I have no respect for people who seek to destroy so much of Bristol's history. What is the urgency? Thousands of people (except during the pandemic) would come every year to enjoy Bristol zoo and its gardens. The Clifton zoo has been very popular not only with Bristolians, but people from around the region, including South Wales, and from further afield. Such an attraction has poured millions of pounds into the economy of Bristol for decades. Selling Bristol zoo gardens will lose the City of Bristol all that economic benefit. All for the sake of short term gain. It is yet another example of selling off the family silver. And the actual reality is that Bristol zoo has always been a major economic driver for the city, whilst business interests have contemptuously seized the opportunity of the forced coronavirus pandemic closure during one year to justify selling such a unique and integral part of Bristol's attraction and culture over 186	06-Mar-23

	<p>years. The Wildplace Project will never come close to providing the same benefits to the city as Bristol Zoo Gardens, and being sited out of the city means that to travel there will mean more car use; but mostly it will mean a serious loss of income for the Zoo and Bristol because the number of visitors will decline dramatically from the numbers who visited the Clifton site. I used to go almost weekly to the zoo gardens. I went recently to the Wildplace Project and it was a sad experience - hardly anything of interest, no gardens, and almost nobody there. As someone without a car, it holds no attraction for me to make a special journey, whereas I could walk to the Clifton site in about 30 minutes - a good walk for me, and good for my health. And as for a so-called improvement for the animals: I was shocked that the giraffe house for example was tiny - no bigger than the old iconic giraffe house at the Clifton site. After over 40 years I shall be cancelling my membership and I am sure that I will not be alone in doing so. The permanent loss of both culture and income will be huge.</p>	
--	---	--

766.	O	<p>There is no doubt that the closure of Bristol Zoo Gardens would be absolutely wrong. It is a national treasure and a safe, green space for the people of Bristol and beyond to learn about wildlife and enjoy the outdoors. As a GP in Bristol and mother of three Bristol Zoo lovers, I have multiple concerns regarding this proposal, which I will summarise: 1. It is an environmental disaster. The proposals to remove 42.5% of the trees, as well as other mature gardens tended to for over 180 years, to be replaced by apartment blocks of up to six storeys is disgraceful. If we all behaved in a similar way to this so-called 'education and conservation charity', global temperatures would soar and air quality would be dire. There are already 28,000-36,000 deaths in the UK every year due to human made air pollution (www.gov.uk) and this development would only worsen this tragic problem. Is this the precedent that we want to set to our children and future generations of Bristolians? Which green space will be next to go? 2. This is an incredibly important and irreplaceable public asset. Bristol Zoo is the 5th oldest zoo in the WORLD and a truly loved public asset. The proposal that the remaining gardens would be open to the public is completely unrealistic. Who will be paying for the upkeep of these gardens? The residents of the new apartments I should think, who will have absolutely no obligation to keep these gardens open to the public. This is an unsustainable idea. 3. This is NOT a solution to Bristol's housing problem. Surely what we need is housing that is affordable to the majority, not the minority? In addition, the number of vacant homes in Bristol is rising (reported as 3765 by the Bristol Post in August 2022 using data from a freedom of information request to Bristol City Council and Action on Empty Homes). If we are to build more homes despite the thousands of homes vacant in the city, wouldn't even the Wild Place site be more appropriate to build on, avoiding the need to destroy one of Bristol's biggest visitor attractions, with a much higher number of visitors annually than the Wild Place? Surely other options should be considered. 4. This is NOT in the best interests of the animals. I was initially led to believe that this may be best for animal welfare, however have since been made aware that only two mammals are being moved to the Wild Place. The others will undergo/ have undergone traumatic journeys to unknown new homes. I'm sure the transportation of these animals, loved and admired by so many at Bristol Zoo, is not a straightforward or painless procedure. In summary, the closure of Bristol Zoo Gardens is bad for the animals, bad for the people (present and future), bad for Bristol, and sets a terrible precedent for protecting the future of our planet and reducing morbidity and mortality due to air pollution. Please make the right decision.</p>	06-Mar-23
767.	O	<p>As a Bristol resident I am concerned about the potential loss if public amenity and while a green space is planned, similar projects have resulted in the space being privatised and fenced off. This is a valuable green space and almost half the trees will go resulting in loss of landscape. We will lose a historic garden and a valuable green urban space that supports communities. The zoo and gardens have been a resource for Bristol residents for generations. Have all options really been explored?</p>	06-Mar-23
768.	O	<p>I am strongly objecting on the grounds of the loss of a very long standing and cherished Public amenity . Bristol will be a lesser place to live if this development goes ahead.</p>	06-Mar-23

769.	O	Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. Loss of Communal Value. Harm to listed buildings. Social & material harm unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. Loss of public amenity. Loss of landscape. At a time of difficulty for so many people and when so many public services are being eroded the loss of this public amenity and community centre is an unjustified loss for the people of Bristol.	06-Mar-23
770.	O	As a resident of Clifton I object to this proposal which involves the destruction of many magnificent trees and plants in this historic botanical garden. Some of the trees have been nurtured for over 250 years and are irreplaceable. As a whole the gardens are of great scientific and historic interest and part of Bristol's cultural history which should be preserved for the enjoyment of the public and not cynically destroyed in a scramble for profit.	07-Mar-23
771.	O	I feel that the design and scale is totally inappropriate for our conservation area.	07-Mar-23
772.	O	The Business case for this application to sell the zoo has not convincingly been made. Despite spending excessively on consultants the Zoo management explored none of their suggestions apart from sale. Even if the zoo cannot remain in its present form the gardens do need to remain as a public amenity in much their present form with long term guarantees of status. The Zoo's current proposals involve significant loss of trees and garden space while the building proposals are aesthetically jarring in relation to the existing buildings and the location of the site. The Zoo and Gardens have been a valuable and popular resource for locals and tourists for generations, especially for children, and would represent a great loss were they both to go in their present form.	07-Mar-23
773.	O	As the Zoo planning team have not allowed access to their own models, we are having to rely on the images that could best be derived from the Zoo plans. Of course it would be much better if the Zoo planning team did allow access as we all could see what their intentions really are. However, from the best images that can be derived, I am astonished to see how the flats construction are not in keeping at all with the fabulous buildings that are currently in Guthrie Road and on the perimeter of the whole Zoo. They are entirely incongruent with the area in design, scale, mass and form. With the flats being such large blocks these buildings will completely overshadow existing buildings. So we would expect the buildings to be more proportionate and sympathetic to the Clifton area. I dont live in Clifton but it is an area that is frequently visited quite often using the Guthrie Road route. It is currently a very beautiful part of our city and should continue to be but the current design of these buildings will degrade the area so much.	07-Mar-23

774.	O	I object to the design of the development and the change in use of the area. This has been an area that the general public have been able to enjoy for years. It is a beautiful space for Bristolians to be able to visit with mature trees and gardens. The downs are close by but this is a totally different type of space and not the same. Mental health is something being held with more regard and importance. Green Social Prescribing is a success in the Bristol area and this is just the type of place that it perfect for helping people suffering with depression etc... For many people living in urban Bristol access such a space by public transport is of vital importance. The mature trees and gardens should not be ripped up for property development and this should not be a gated community for just the wealthy to visit. This is an local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space Do not let commercial greed destroy and take away this setting for so many people to enjoy. I	07-Mar-23
775.	O	It is well known, but little regarded, that there are many disadvantages in preparing design proposals from the metropolis for the genius loci of an historic city in the provinces and this scheme illustrates it very well. . But there is one potential advantage for a metropolitan elite, concerning the provision of private outdoor space, and an exploration of that feature alone will serve to demonstrate how ill-fitting are the proposals for the Bristol Zoo site. London has demonstrated time and again the inability of their architects to design effective, private outdoor spaces for flats, since the first C20 mansion blocks grew balconies. Reduced of late to becoming transparent, wind and rain stricken and offensive to townscape with residents' clutter, such balconies are mostly entirely unsuited to the British climate. Flat-owners have been progressively failed by architects, in even medium-rise blocks. Unfortunately the London architects for the zoo site still fail to grasp these issues. When the designs are coupled with flat roofs and hideously level parapets, one has to start asking questions such as why are the ground- and first-floor flats not given open space on ground level with private stair access, and roof pavilions as climate havens on flat roofs given to second- and third-floor flats, served by private stairs and dumb-waiters? . Such solutions provide ready opportunities to create modelled roof scapes that would respond to listed buildings and the historic streets of Clifton, and the need for a green architecture. Where were such assessments by the client body at concept and by the planners at pre-application stages? . This retired conservation architect accordingly supports the analysis of the project by Downs for People, the objections of the Victorian Society, Bristol CAP, and Avon Gardens Trust. Equally the idea of a virtual zoo is unhelpful.	07-Mar-23

776.	O	I object to the current application because :- 1. A large housing development on this site will destroy the special historic nature of the zoo gardens which are a heritage resource and also constitutes a loss of public amenity. 2. This scheme is too dense with overbearing buildings on the perimeter in terms of massing and height and particularly the semicircle of new houses built within the gardens constitutes gross overdevelopment. 3. I welcome free public access to the garden space but this needs to be secured by a legal transfer of ownership of the garden space rather than simply conditioned to ensure it continues in perpetuity.	08-Mar-23
777.	O	I object to the current application because :- 1. A large housing development on this site will destroy the special historic nature of the zoo gardens which are a heritage resource and also constitutes a loss of public amenity. 2. This scheme is too dense with overbearing buildings on the perimeter in terms of massing and height and particularly the semicircle of new houses built within the gardens constitutes gross overdevelopment. 3. I welcome free public access to the garden space but this needs to be secured by a legal transfer of ownership of the garden space rather than simply conditioned to ensure it continues in perpetuity.	08-Mar-23
778.	O	I strongly object to the plans for the closure and redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens. As a close neighbour, I am deeply concerned at the loss of a valuable heritage, cultural, environmental and social asset, without what appears to be due consideration on the part of the zoo for the ecological and social damage that the closure and redevelopment of the site will have or any attempts to save the zoo or consider alternatives to redevelopment. The zoo is an intangible cultural asset - as the 5th oldest zoo in the world it has a unique place in the social history of the world and the development of zoos as a place of education, conservation and entertainment. As the home for many years of Alfred the Gorilla, not to mention the various significant figures who helped found and support the zoo, it has a unique place in Bristol's history and as a place of enjoyment, rest, education and repose it has an important part in many resident's personal histories. The pandemic showed us the vital importance to social and mental health of having green spaces to visit and enjoy - the zoo gardens has provided a welcome green space for me, and many other Bristol residents and families to visit and relax in, secure in the knowledge that the space was car free, enclosed and safe from dog walkers, scooters, bikes and the numerous other dangers to pedestrians and those trying to enjoy the outdoors. At the same time, the ecological and climate crisis (which Bristol council itself has acknowledged) has emphasised the importance of parks, gardens and green spaces as lungs for our cities and ways of mitigating urban flooding - partially caused by uncontrolled development and the replacement of permeable soil and trees with impermeable tarmac. The plans for redevelopment have the potential to cause immense social, environmental and even physical harm. The redevelopment will remove a green space for citizens to enjoy (because the plans will not only decimate the available green space but also have no mechanism for ensuring the continued public access to what little open space remains). The redevelopment intends to remove vast quantities of the existing green space and almost half of the trees in the zoo site - many of which may be unique or of particular age and heritage deserving of protection - causing immense damage to the ecosystems that exist and flourish in the gardens. Not only will the environment of the zoo gardens be damaged by the redevelopment	08-Mar-23

	<p>(at a time when the zoo itself is exhorting its supporters to join its campaign to protect and support local ecosystems and the environment) but the local environment will be harmed - both by the environmental damage of redevelopment of what is essentially a green site of lawns, gardens, trees and ecosystems; by the environmental damage associated with building and by the environmental damage of creating a housing development and associated residential traffic in an already high traffic residential area. For the entire length of its nearly two century history, the zoo site has been closed to cars, safe for pedestrians and not contributing to an atmospheric crisis. Under the plans for redevelopment this will change. Car parking is incorporated into the zoo's plans so for the first time in its history, cars will be allowed on the zoo site, adding to the traffic congestion in the local area, and causing potential traffic danger to existing residents, the school children who attend Clifton College (which borders the zoo on three sides of the site and whose ages range from kindergarten to secondary school age) and the public accessing the redeveloped site - particularly when there are minimal efforts at ensuring the safety of the different users -especially pedestrians, those with impaired vision or mobility or those with children - whose access to the site will be hampered by no attempts to control the use of cars, bikes or scooters through the site. The plans as they are developed show no regard to the specific historical or cultural importance of the site nor to the very distinct character of the local area. There are no assurances that the listed heritage assets within the zoo site will be kept, maintained or even incorporated into the areas to be accessible by the public (even though continued public access to the site after redevelopment is by no means guaranteed or guaranteeable) and the plans for the housing areas are too massive and completely out of scale and character with the surrounding buildings and housings, all of which is sufficiently distinctive to have created a local conservation area. In summary, I feel that the zoo has failed to explore alternatives for closure and that the plans for the redevelopment of the site pose significant environmental, social, cultural, historic and completely unjustified harm and represent the great and grave loss of a site of significant communal value.</p>	
--	---	--

779.	O	<p>Whatever your opinion is about zoos, this application is about the land and its future. If this application is successful it will never be possible to protect what is wonderful about this small corner of the city. The plans submitted are highly unlikely to represent in any way what is finally permitted. That Group's proposals and their reiterative amendments for the old W.H.Smiths site on Clifton Down Road should be a warning, bearing little resemblance to the original permission given. As proposed, the haven of these historic gardens are effectively destroyed. Consider the probable on-site vehicles - residents' cars, taxis, delivery trucks, trades vans - as you see in any street in the city. The denser the housing the greater the number of vehicles sharing space with pedestrians. And there is no guarantee that a future developer or the residents wouldn't just turn it into a private gated community. It would be a lost public amenity. I am very concerned about the loss of trees likely to follow any development of this site. It seems to be very easy to find reasons to remove trees that are supposedly protected, however precious the species or their amenity value. How many of these new dwellings will contribute to resolving the city's housing crisis? And how many are likely to be second homes or worse still bought for Airbnb or similar? Clifton is full of this and getting worse. It's a lucrative business and ludicrous to think this would not be a prime target for such ventures. If the council were to put its own social housing on the site, not densely packed and at affordable rents for homeless families it might be a supportable proposition. As it is this smacks of poor management leading to an unimaginative money grubbing scheme. Where is the evidence that such a drastic change of use is necessary? Is this a proper use of the assets of a historic charity based on conservation? There is no excuse for the bland and ugly proposed flats. Where is the reference to local architecture? And why are they so high as to distort the scale of nearby buildings? They are clearly designed to cram in as many "units" as possible for the greatest monetary return. This is a Conservation Area with a large proportion of listed buildings some of which are on this site. Does Bristol City Council really want to share the opprobrium that will follow from its complicity in the destruction of these beautiful gardens for such a crass development?</p>	08-Mar-23
780.	O	<p>The gardens are an important asset to Bristol's reputation as a green city and should not be used for private benefit. They should be kept as a communal area for the residents of Bristol and an attraction for visitors from elsewhere. It is important to maintain every green space we have both for our own mental and physical health and the wider world.</p>	08-Mar-23
781.	O	<p>I am dismayed at the lack of protection for Bristol Zoo Gardens. It is a special place for Bristol citizens - and for tourists. It is unique in being close to the city. It is accessible to the disabled, has listed buildings, trees, gardens and has an important research and educational role. The case for replacing this historical landmark with housing suggests that those promoting such a scheme have been economical with the truth. The Council has a duty of care to preserve and save the zoo from irreplaceable loss.</p>	08-Mar-23

782.	O	<p>I strongly object to the plans for the closure and redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens. As a close neighbour, I am deeply concerned at the loss of a valuable heritage, cultural, environmental and social asset, without what appears to be due consideration on the part of the zoo for the ecological and social damage that the closure and redevelopment of the site will have or any attempts to save the zoo or consider alternatives to redevelopment. The zoo is an intangible cultural asset - as the 5th oldest zoo in the world it has a unique place in the social history of the world and the development of zoos as a place of education, conservation and entertainment. As the home for many years of Alfred the Gorilla, not to mention the various significant figures who helped found and support the zoo, it has a unique place in Bristol's history and as a place of enjoyment, rest, education and repose it has an important part in many resident's personal histories. The pandemic showed us the vital importance to social and mental health of having green spaces to visit and enjoy - the zoo gardens has provided a welcome green space for me, and many other Bristol residents and families to visit and relax in, secure in the knowledge that the space was car free, enclosed and safe from dog walkers, scooters, bikes and the numerous other dangers to pedestrians and those trying to enjoy the outdoors. At the same time, the ecological and climate crisis (which Bristol council itself has acknowledged) has emphasised the importance of parks, gardens and green spaces as lungs for our cities and ways of mitigating urban flooding - partially caused by uncontrolled development and the replacement of permeable soil and trees with impermeable tarmac. The plans for redevelopment have the potential to cause immense social, environmental and even physical harm. The redevelopment will remove a green space for citizens to enjoy (because the plans will not only decimate the available green space but also have no mechanism for ensuring the continued public access to what little open space remains). The redevelopment intends to remove vast quantities of the existing green space and almost half of the trees in the zoo site - many of which may be unique or of particular age and heritage deserving of protection - causing immense damage to the ecosystems that exist and flourish in the gardens. Not only will the environment of the zoo gardens be damaged by the redevelopment (at a time when the zoo itself is exhorting its supporters to join its campaign to protect and support local ecosystems and the environment) but the local environment will be harmed - both by the environmental damage of redevelopment of what is essentially a green site of lawns, gardens, trees and ecosystems; by the environmental damage associated with building and by the environmental damage of creating a housing development and associated residential traffic in an already high traffic residential area. For the entire length of its nearly two century history, the zoo site has been closed to cars, safe for pedestrians and not contributing to an atmospheric crisis. Under the plans for redevelopment this will change. Car parking is incorporated into the zoo's plans so for the first time in its history, cars will be allowed on the zoo site, adding to the traffic congestion in the local area, and causing potential traffic danger to existing residents, the school children who attend Clifton College (which borders the zoo on three sides of the site and whose ages range from kindergarten to secondary school age) and the public accessing the redeveloped site - particularly when there are minimal efforts at ensuring the safety of the different users - especially pedestrians, those with impaired vision or mobility or those with children - whose access to the site will be hampered by no attempts to control the use of cars, bikes or scooters through the site. The plans as they are developed show no regard to the specific historical or cultural importance of the site nor to the very distinct</p>	08-Mar-23
------	---	--	-----------

		<p>character of the local area. There are no assurances that the listed heritage assets within the zoo site will be kept, maintained or even incorporated into the areas to be accessible by the public (even though continued public access to the site after redevelopment is by no means guaranteed or guaranteeable) and the plans for the housing areas are too massive and completely out of scale and character with the surrounding buildings and housings, all of which is sufficiently distinctive to have created a local conservation area. In summary, I feel that the zoo has failed to explore alternatives for closure and that the plans for the redevelopment of the site pose significant environmental, social, cultural, historic and completely unjustified harm and represent the great and grave loss of a site of significant communal value.</p>	
783.	O	<p>What a shame the proposed buildings are so huge - totally out of proportion and will change the area, not for the better. The plans I have seen look more in line with ubiquitous office blocks/student accommodation rather than fitting in/blending in with the area.</p>	08-Mar-23
784.	O	<p>I object to the current application because :- 1. A large housing development on this site will destroy the special historic nature of the zoo gardens which are a heritage resource and also constitutes a loss of public amenity. 2. This scheme is too dense with overbearing buildings on the perimeter in terms of massing and height and particularly the semicircle of new houses built within the gardens constitutes gross overdevelopment. 3. I welcome free public access to the garden space but this needs to be secured by a legal transfer of ownership of the garden space rather than simply conditioned to ensure it continues in perpetuity.</p>	08-Mar-23

785.	O	I object to the current application because :- 1. A large housing development on this site will destroy the special historic nature of the zoo gardens which are a heritage resource and also constitutes a loss of public amenity. 2. This scheme is too dense with overbearing buildings on the perimeter in terms of massing and height and particularly the semicircle of new houses built within the gardens constitutes gross overdevelopment. 3. I welcome free public access to the garden space but this needs to be secured by a legal transfer of ownership of the garden space rather than simply conditioned to ensure it continues in perpetuity.	08-Mar-23
786.	O	The Bristol Zoo Gardens have taken many years to mature. There are interesting and beautiful trees which would be lost if this development were to go ahead. The botanical variety of this space would be gone forever. The green space proposed would be smaller and there is a likelihood that over time public access may be lost. The proposed buildings are out of keeping with the area .	08-Mar-23
787.	O	The context of this planning proposal arises with the charity's decision-making and the push to abandon the zoo's main site in favour of a plan for building expensive homes for humans with a view to using the capital resulting from this to build animal homes elsewhere. The homes in the Wildplace outpost are likely to cost a great deal more than the funds that may be available in theory, take a great deal longer to build and may never actually be built. No full options appraisal of other possibilities than closure appear to have taken place, nor has there been adequate public consultation and engagement on that or on the building plans for the Clifton site. At the limited meetings that I have attended following the 'fait accompli' there was minimal opportunity to really discuss the key environmental and conservation issues, the loss of amenities, appropriateness of the development, and who or what profits from this. The animals are last in line, followed by the public and visitors for whom this was a valuable public benefit as required by charitable status. The loss of such a valued amenity and asset within the city of Bristol for families, schools and the wider population is implied by the possible acceptance of this proposed 'planned' development currently under discussion. The evidence available does not support the argument that conservation and high quality environmental management at a local and national level will be enhanced, and there is little guarantee that there will be wildlife benefits. An independent assessment and review is clearly needed with consultation on a broad front and a delay in giving planning permission would facilitate this critical step.	09-Mar-23
788.	O	I am a Clifton resident and have been for 15 years. The loss of Bristol Zoo as a public amenity and outdoor community space is huge. We need more of these spaces, not less! Loss of gardens, trees, play spaces - where children can play safely and educationally - the benefit of this space for children's development is immeasurable.	09-Mar-23

789.	O	The loss of this public space is going to have a huge knock on effect for people of all ages. The gardens are accessible (both within the space and by public transport) We have an opportunity to reach a number of the targets in the one city plan such as high quality green spaces for all and most importantly move us towards reaching our own promise of managing 30% of pur land for nature. There are so many new developments in Bristol... alongside the loss of facilities and decline in the quality of our green spaces. We are a green capital...let's be brave and preserve this space for people and nature rather than build YET ANOTHER exclusive housing development.	09-Mar-23
790.	O	I am appalled at the proposed plans for overbearing and totally unsympathetic flats bordering the Bristol Zoo site. This is a Conservation Area, on a main route into Bristol so highly visible to many people. The proposed overbearing flats will have a highly deleterious affect on neighbouring properties including listed buildings, (such as the chapel) belonging to Clifton College.. Neighbouring Victorian properties such as Northcote Road, also in the conservation area will have their views blighted by such appallingly ill-conceived properties. As someone who lives 5 minutes from the Zoo site I very strongly object to these planning proposals for a gated community largely consisting of very expensive flats and the blighting of a much loved and very important and unique area of the city..	09-Mar-23

791.	O	<p>The Clifton zoo site is a unique heritage of trees and flowers managed and developed over 186 years to delight the residents of Bristol, and welcome visitors from all over the world and by so doing support the economy of Bristol. It has been a centre of education for enabling children and adults to learn about animals and ways to conserve and support them over the world. It is very much loved by all who have experienced it in so many different ways and it will be a tragedy for Bristol if it were to lose it for a rather mediocre housing development. The decision that the Bristol Zoological Society has made to close the Clifton Zoo and move all operations to the Cribbs Causeway Wild place site without proper consultation with the users of the zoo and with zoo and business people who have appropriate knowledge is an issue to be undertaken as soon as possible. The Bristol Zoological Society shareholders and trustees structure and mode of operation needs to be updated. It is not too late. In my opinion the sale of the Clifton site will not raise enough money to make Wild Place a successful single zoo for Bristol, whereas having both sites will be very attractive and will bring people to Bristol. The Clifton site is financially viable as a zoo albeit needing new strategic plan organized for animals who will enjoy being there. This proposed development of the Clifton zoo site being considered here will involve the destruction of a large part of the garden and the around 40% of the trees. How can this be defended when we need established trees and plants to help us reduce our carbon footplate, and gardens give much wellbeing and enjoyment to both adults and children. The listed buildings will no longer be available but converted into flats and any part of the garden site not built on by the development will have no security to remain well tended with public access and will have cars and it will not give the same sense of wellbeing that the beautiful Clifton Zoo garden does. To summarize The Clifton Zoo Site is a beautiful mature and unique place which has been enjoyed by millions of people for at least 186 years. All the evidence shows that it would be viable if it was developed appropriately into a better zoo. It would be a tragedy to lose it for the development of housing which would not be affordable for those who most need housing in Bristol.</p>	10-Mar-23
792.	O	<p>A Green Argument for Retaining Bristol Zoo in Bristol Loss of Communal Value: For many years Bristol Zoo has provided entertainment and education to families in Bristol. They can get there by bus with a bus to the Zoo from the Temple Meads via the centre. To combat Global Warming we need to travel less and use Public Transport when we do. People say that we can solve the transport problem by going electric; but there is not enough copper in the world to do this. Bristol Zoo provides 12 acres of a green oasis. The proposed development is for expensive housing and lots of cars. The proposal is to cut down almost half the trees on the site. They have already cut down most of a 100 year old tree. Although the proposal suggest that part of the site will be open to the public, that would require public money if there is no zoo garden to attract paying contributors. Is the Council going to pay? Need to Change not Proven: Evidence from looking at the zoo accounts over the last decade; does not suggest that the Zoo gardens could not be self sustaining. They will need to change and clearly the current management do not wish to do so; however there is a significant group of influential people who would like the opportunity to develop and maintain this historic and valuable resource for the people of Bristol. Please do not approve the change of use for the Zoo Gardens and allow time for a plan for keeping the Zoo Gardens to be created.</p>	10-Mar-23

793.	O	This planning is alarming!!!! to Demolish this wonderful Zoo after 185yrs with all its Heritage You must Reconsider your plans once this site is lost you can never replace it no matter what you do So much of our country's fantastic architecture is being bulldozed away	10-Mar-23
794.	O	As a Bristol resident I am horrified that the Bristol Zoo Gardens could become a housing development. Ok so perhaps it is a brown site - ripe for redevelopment. It is also a hugely historic asset to the City of Bristol attracting thousands of visitors every year, providing education, leisure, beauty, interest and so much more to many. The gardens alone warrant botanical special interest. It has been providing this for years and the proposed development could see this jewel lost forever.	10-Mar-23
795.	O	I urge BCC not to allow planning permission for the construction of luxury housing in an already wealthy area of Bristol. The Site could no longer be considered an amenity for the people of Bristol and the proposed development would enhance no-one except for the developers. The Bristol Zoological society should be asked to invite creative and sustainable ideas for usage of the site internationally.	10-Mar-23
796.	O	I am against the proposed redevelopment of the site. The blocks of flats proposed are tall, require removal of many established trees, will increase traffic (not just residents' cars but also deliveries), impact negatively on the safety of school children around the site as well as runners and cyclists and leave the surviving garden part as an enclosed yard and not a genuinely open space. Even with a proportion of affordable housing, market forces mean this is not going to meet the needs of low income families that cannot access decent housing and is, to my mind, a smokescreen to mask a commercial development that is out of character with the nature of the Downs. It's not green and not in the spirit of the site or the conservation area as a whole. Neither does it address genuine housing needs for the city.	11-Mar-23
797.	O	I am appalled by this proposed housing development at Bristol Zoo Gardens. It is simply horrendous. I cannot believe that anyone thinks it is suitable in any shape or form for this beautiful conservation area that is so special to Bristol. The buildings appear like huge blocks of white concrete which will dominate and totally overwhelm their surroundings. They will be seen for miles around as a blot on the landscape. They have nothing in keeping with the historical Victorian buildings that are the character of Clifton. Added to this is the question of the sustainability of 196 dwellings in a small conservation area which will be mostly unaffordable for the people who really need housing. So developers are out to make money and squeeze in as many houses as possible without any regard for the people who will live or who already live there and the inevitable irreversible damage to the environment that such an unsympathetic development will cause. To destroy the legacy of the world famous Bristol Zoo in this way is a tragedy. If this development is permitted to go ahead then it will be seen as something akin to the concrete blocks built in the 1960s. People in years to come will look at it with horror and bewilderment and say "how could this monstrosity ever have been allowed?"	11-Mar-23

798.	O	Don't lose the heritage site. Save the site as gardens	11-Mar-23
799.	O	The proposed development of the site of Bristol Zoo fails to give sufficient weight to the historic and cultural significance of the site and its buildings. These are part of Bristol's heritage and could be redeveloped in a way that would respect the history of site, preserve its function as a tourist attraction and therefore boost tourism which would benefit all Bristol citizens. I feel strongly that alternative proposed developments that would preserve the zoo's heritage for the benefit and profit of the people of Bristol have not been sufficiently explored. The planning committee should reject the current proposal on the grounds that it does not protect Bristol's cultural heritage and the historical and architectural importance of the site. The proposed development is wholly inappropriate and would have a detrimental economic impact on the city as a whole as well as destroying an important part of the city's cultural and social history.	11-Mar-23
800.	O	I object to the Zoo's planning application on the following grounds: 1. The Zoo is a significant part of Bristol's history and is therefore of heritage value. 2. Long established trees and plants will be lost from an area that is listed as a local Historic Park & Garden. 3. The garden is a valuable green urban space that gives pleasure to hundreds of thousands of visitors every year. 4. The site is within easy reach for Bristolians, unlike the Wild Place site, and is a popular place for family events both large and small. 5. Listed buildings on the site will be lost or become inaccessible. 6. The proposed apartment buildings are ugly and out of keeping with the surrounding area.	12-Mar-23
801.	O	The surrounding buildings are in Pentland red stone or Bath stone so white concrete tall structures are totally out of sympathy with those existing Victorian structures. The proposed structures are also too tall. They should not exceed the height of the surrounding wall of the perimeter so that they blend in with the neighbouring properties. Further information on the landscaping of the gardens and ponds should be given and details of the proportion of social housing identified, This is a very sensitive site which does not lend itself to white tower blocks of no character which dwarf the surrounding buildings, roads and pavements. I strongly object to the submitted plans.	12-Mar-23
802.	O	I object on the grounds: 1) lost communal value, 2) lost historic interest, 3) opposite of what the climate emergency demands, massive increase in embodied and ongoing emissions, and reduce educational engagement opportunities. We are all so lucky to have this historic civic institution, founded and guarded by some of the Bristol great and good. I strongly believe they would be horrified, like the vast majority of Bristolians today to see a tiny group of developers try to destroy this. Civic society, through planning decisions, must remove such temptations, by making clear the space must remain fully for public benefit. There is no proven need for change of use. The previous was profitable. It was modernising education and animal welfare. Bristol's BBC and ecological heritage could lead the world in developing virtual and educational city zoos.	12-Mar-23

803.	O	As a Bristol resident I am appalled that a city which has been awarded Green Capital status can think of allowing a heritage site, such as Bristol Zoo, which has important scientific value as well as communal value, to be turned over for the building of luxury homes. The botanical significance of the plants and trees in the Zoo Gardens is widely recognised and appreciated not only by Bristolians, but also by visitors from South Wales and the South-West. Many mature trees will be felled as well as long-established herbaceous borders to make space for car-parking and expensive houses. The Zoo gardens have been a much-loved and much-used green public space for almost 200 years, a place also for celebration, weddings and the scattering of ashes, part of the emotional fabric of the city. Change of use is neither called for nor proven, and whereas it might make sense to transfer the animals to a better-equipped site, the proposed financial exploitation of this invaluable inner-city green area for the benefit of a few rich people flies in the face of all our hopes and aims for a better green future for everyone. How can Bristol pride itself on being a sustainable city, the UK's first Cycling City and a former European Green Capital, if it allows its current and future citizens to be deprived of a treasured public amenity with historical significance?	12-Mar-23
804.	O	I'm objecting to this planning application on a number of grounds. 1.. Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The zoo has been part of Bristol for such a long time, changing it into residential property as this planning application requests would damage the significance of the site. 2. Loss of Communal Value. This is a valuable urban green space that has been enjoyed by people across Bristol for many years. Turning it into residential property will inevitably lose some of this communal value. 3. Loss of public amenity. An ancient green space would be changed, and some of it lost forever. At a time when focus is on the environment this seems unjustified.	12-Mar-23
805.	O	1. This site is of historic value to the city of Bristol and as such any new developement should continue to be enjoyed by future generations. 2. It is a large part of the environmental landscape in this part of the city and should be protected. 3. It is a site that has been enjoyed by significant numbers of people over the years and not just by a small number of individuals within an exclusive housing scheme. This is unjustified harm to the wider community. 4.The need for more exclusive housing in this part of the city is not proven and as such the change of use is also unproven	12-Mar-23
806.	O	The proposed development constitutes a loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller, and may not remain public. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	12-Mar-23

807.	O	One of the reasons that we bought the house that we live in was for the wonderful green spaces of the Downs and the Zoo. My children spent many happy hours in the beautiful gardens there and enjoyed the park as in fact it was the nearest playground to our house. Bristol is woefully endowed with play spaces for children. The proposed building are totally out of proportion with the existing buildings and present a "wall" of flats more in keeping with the centre of the city. The proposed buildings do not offer any architectural merit and do not offer innovative eco credentials that are surely what would be in keeping with such a site. The Zoo gardens contain many listed and historic buildings which must be retained and made available for the community. I do not object to building on the site per se, more the extreme building that is proposed. I feel it is essential to maintain the gardens as a public amenity for the community.	12-Mar-23
808.	O	I object to this application and I am very upset that the proposal has been put forward. The Zoo gardens have been in operation for 186 years and survived countless challenges and changes. They are a fundamental part of Bristol, a hugely loved public amenity and site of historical value. The proposal will result in the loss of this. The business case for the move is not justified. I cannot see that alternatives have been properly explored and the case has not been made that the zoo cannot remain at the current site, evolving to meet the new challenges. I am also very concerned about the loss of green space and well established trees. The loss of so many trees, many decades old, and their replanting with small trees which will take many years to grow to the same age, is not sufficient given the climate and biodiversity challenges Bristol faces.	13-Mar-23
809.	O	For generations of Bristolians, and visitors to the city, Bristol Zoo Gardens has been a much loved and hugely valuable recreational and educational resource, and has become a place of incalculable historic importance. Turning this unique heritage site into a luxury housing development will destroy its cultural value to the local community, and to the city at large. I urge you to reject the current planning application, and to ensure that any future development of the site respects and preserves its history and heritage.	13-Mar-23
810.	O	Bristol Zoo has been open to the public for recreation for 186 years. It an act of vandalism to close it. The proposed buildings are far too big and will detrimentally affect the historic walled estate. The zoo could continue in some form. The housing is for the wealthy , we need access for all. The trees and gardens will be damaged . We need more access to open spaces and nature not less. Generations have met at the zoo , benefitting from the uplifting historic buildings , gardens , lakes and animals. The premises should be safeguarded for the residents of Bristol . The zoo should think again as should the planners . Our children and grandchildren need safe outdoor spaces , please do not allow this tragic mistake.	13-Mar-23
811.	O	The zoo gardens are an important and valuable asset to Bristol and should be retained for the public to enjoy.	13-Mar-23

812.	O	<p>The zoo has been such a key part of Bristol for so long, it's such a travesty to potentially see it go. The zoo holds such high community value to the people of Bristol - we have friends who were married there, I know of people's family who have their ashes scattered there. Have a city centre asset that people can walk or get the bus / public transport to is a massive boon. We do not need another expanded site off a motorway junction that necessitates getting in your car to get to it. It is such a haven away from bustling city life - the gardens are simply a joy to walk around. This loss of landscape, wildlife and trees is heart-breaking, particularly in the world we currently live in. Surely if ever there a time to prioritise green credentials and making the best use out of an existing asset, it is now? The Zoo is listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space - let's keep it this way. I understand there are a number of listed buildings on site, I imagine most of which will become inaccessible to the public. It is not clear to me why the zoo needs to change its use or purpose - surely there are better, greener and more community-minded ways of making changes? I think the zoo should keep animals there but focus on the smaller ones such as reptiles, butterflies, meerkats, etc. From what I have seen of the plans, the buildings look too big and do not complement the amazing buildings near the zoo site.</p>	13-Mar-23
813.	O	<p>The site has significant historical value and it's future as a viable Zoo has not been explored or even proved to be insufficient. London, or any other city with such a valuable asset, would never allow such a fate to befall their beloved zoo. This is not what the public want, this is not in the best interests of Clifton or the wider community and represents a huge loss to Bristolians and everyone that has ever enjoyed time here. Children learn so much from Zoos and given the state of our planet and the need to teach children about the wider effects humans are having on animals and their habitats this will be a huge loss to future generations and the planet long term. Zoo's are hugely important assets and Bristol is missing a real opportunity to maintain and create a zoo that can do so much good to our understanding and appreciation of the natural world. 186 years should not be disregarded and destroyed in favour of fancy housing. Fancy housing can be built anywhere in the city, there are derelict sites available elsewhere. Please Save Bristol Zoo!!!</p>	13-Mar-23
814.	O	<p>I have several objections to this application. 1) The loss of communal value and green urban space. 2) Harm to the several listed buildings on the site which will not be accesible to the public if the application is approved. 3) The need for a change has not been proven. The business case is not clear and alternatives have not been considered. 4) The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings.</p>	14-Mar-23

815.	O	<p>I object to the proposed redevelopment of Bristol Zoo Gardens, which is an 'irreplaceable resource that should be conserved in a manner appropriate to its significance so that it can be enjoyed for its contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations' as current national primary planning guidance in paragraph 189 states. and should not be turned into exclusive luxury gated housing. For 186 years it has been an immensely valuable cultural, educational, social and economic asset to the City of Bristol and is, being the fifth oldest zoo in the world, of historic importance, with a proven track record of conservation success having helped save over 175 species from extinction. The loss of communal value as a venue for weddings and the scattering of ashes in the now threatened herbaceous border, and of course the successive generations of visitors. The proposed change of use and loss of character of the Listed buildings and the reduction of Public access to the gardens is not fitting with the Zoo's listing as a 'Local Historic Park and Garden and important Open Space' The limited public access to a relatively small space compared with recently, together with the cost of maintenance will be funded by residents with predictable objections potentially leading to the existing permissive right being modified or withdrawn completely. 162 mature trees (42.5%) of them will be removed with others threatened by future building works. The need for change is unproven, although visitor numbers were down (500,000 pre Covid) they compare favourably with other zoos (eg Dublin) and are higher than any other Bristol attractions (eg We the Curious 250,000). Only together with the Wild Place does the Zoo reach it's target number of 800,000, the Wild Place attracting fewer numbers, and incidentally being far less accessible by public transport leading to increased traffic and surprisingly, because of development limitations, being little larger than the city site. The overall design as the proposed buildings are very out of scale and character with the surrounding buildings in what is after all a conservation area. This is not a contribution to the demand for affordable homes that Bristol needs, but will be nothing more than luxury apartments with any affordable housing percentage argued down to nothing by the developers. The Zoo has had an income of over £10m with a peak of £13.6m as recently 2018, as well as financial reserves and substantial capital assets, there is no financial ruin. The strategic Plan to 2025, which can be found online, was always to keep operating two successful and complimentary sites. Whilst the charity has a duty to operate viably and realise maximum value for any assets, value does not have to mean only financial but also ethical and social. There are alternative uses of the site that would benefit not just the proposed residents but the wider community, as suggested by Save Bristol Zoo Gardens, https://savebristolzoogardens.org/vision and they should be explored in a public consultation. In the name of the immortal Johnny Morris and Animal Magic please reject this plan.</p>	14-Mar-23
------	---	--	-----------

816.	O	I would like to object to the proposed development of the Bristol Zoo site for the following reasons: As well as providing a zoo for some species that have not been catered for by the Wild Place Project, the site provides a significant amenity for local people and draws in significant crowds. It is a long standing zoo and the proposal represents a loss of communal value and a heritage site. The case for a need to change has yet to be proven - and there are a number of attractive possibilities for the site, including keeping a zoological facility. This is an important green site that should remain accessible to the wider public and local residents. The proposal will involve a significant loss of landscape. The design of the proposed buildings are not in keeping with the area and will degrade the aesthetic building composition that prevails in this historic and important area.	14-Mar-23
817.	O	Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	15-Mar-23

818.	O	I first visited Bristol Zoological Gardens in the early 1960's. This historic, heritage and cultural facility would be lost to the people of Bristol, both locally and entire city. Similarly to the wider local community who love Bristol Zoological Gardens and its location and history. Also the families of generations where ashes of deceased relatives are scattered at the site. The site is a valuable green space of peace and tranquility for thousands of people who benefit when mental health issues and other health and emotional issues are affecting their well-being. The damage that the proposals would cause to listed buildings and gates is unjustified and no longer accessible to the people of Bristol. There is no evidence to support or suggest that the zoo cannot continue as a viable Bristol public site. The proposal, with its planned buildings being "out of scale" to the site and for the benefit of the vast majority of Bristolians, does not complement the nearby houses and college. The loss of landscape, mature and important trees, and obvious environmental damage, the term vandalism comes to mind, would be unforgiveable, both to present population and generations to come.	15-Mar-23
819.	O	Clifton is a historic district and conservation area that must protect its special status in Bristol. Allowing this monolithic, high-rise development, would be totally out of keeping with the local area and truly detrimental to hits historic status. Clifton is a tourist destination that brings an important economy to the city through its visitors. Allowing building such as this to be built will undermine the area. For decades Bristol Zoo has been one of Bristol's most iconic landmarks and all alternatives on how we can retain this historic attraction - a pride of Bristol - must be given time to be further explored. At present, it is not been proven that the zoo cannot profitably continue as a public site. Time must be given to look at viable alternative options for the development of the site, which will benefit the whole city. On these grounds I strongly object to any planning being granted to this proposal.	15-Mar-23

820.	O	Harm to overall historic interest and significance of site. The fact that the Zoo has been there so long being of heritage value in itself. Loss of Communal Value. What it means to the people of Bristol, the generations that have visited, weddings held, ashes scattered, loss of valuable green urban space. Harm to listed buildings. There are a number of listed buildings and gates on the site. All the buildings will be turned into apartments, changed and inaccessible to the public. Unjustified harm. As well as the public loss, this change of use and the social and material harm that results is completely unjustified. Need for change of use not proven. It hasn't been proven that the Zoo cannot continue as a public site, the business case isn't clear and alternatives have not been explored. Loss of public amenity. While a green space is planned for the site, in similar cases these have become privatised and gated off. This is a real possibility here. Overall design. The buildings proposed are way out of scale with the surrounding buildings and do not complement the houses or college buildings nearby. They will form a huge continuous block along the road. Loss of landscape. Almost half the trees will go and many more may be damaged. The public green space will be much smaller. It's listed as a local Historic Park & Garden and an Important Open Space.	16-Mar-23
821.	O	This site is listed for a reason. If we ignore listed buildings then what is the point in having them? We need to preserve our heritage and stop ignoring it to make money. The site has been a beautiful setting for many years, used by so many families. A rarely seen asset in a busy city. Remember it was known as Zoological Gardens! It wasn't always just about the animals. It was a beautiful place to visit. The thought of killing established trees that have been alive longer than any of us is heartbreaking and just by replacing with small ones will not compensate for the green you are losing. Think of the environment. Think of the air. Think of the people of Bristol who rely on the space for tranquility and wellbeing.	16-Mar-23

822.	O	I object to the planning application for the following reasons: It is clear that the groundswell of public opinion in the area around the zoo is predominately against the planning application as it stands at the moment. The Zoo is a historic landmark site and tourist attraction in Bristol and should be kept as a Zoo or something quite similar that can be visited and enjoyed by the people of Bristol and around. At a time when we want people to use their cars less, why move the Zoo to a place out of town that is difficult for people with children to access, when the existing site is in Bristol and has good public transport links by train from nearby Clifton Down Station and 2 bus routes. It seems pretty clear that management at Bristol Zoo made little effort to develop their business plan and evolve and revise that plan to make Bristol Zoo a thriving entity. Instead of respecting the 160 year history of the zoo, they have sold out and taken the easy option to make money, sell the site for housing. By giving them planning permission to change the use we are rewarding them for their negligence and lack of vision. As a local resident who grew up near the Zoo it is clear that the plans as they stand will make Bristol worse! If I was in the planning committee I would refuse the application for housing, which would reduce the value of the site which could then be bought by a charity to be run as a public amenity for the people of Bristol.	17-Mar-23
823.	O	The proposed development of the zoo site is a massive disproportionate intrusion into a conservation area. The people of Bristol who have built up this valuable heritage for future generations did not do so in order for it to be turned into private profit. The zoo has been a cultural and educational feature of the city. It may have to adapt to present conditions but not this way which would cause detriment to the character of the locality and disadvantage to the community.	20-Mar-23
824.	O	My name is Arne Ringner and in 2004 I purchased The Clifton Swimming Baths that at the time were written off as a public asset and was lined up for housing. Today the Baths are known as Clifton Lido and is a formidable community space. From all over Bristol people gather here to swim, eat and socialise. The place is class less and loved by the many. It's a public, civil and self supporting arena where anyone can hang around. These public places are rare and should be 'sacrosanctly' preserved. Many people have approached me saying thank you for giving them a place to just be , or sadly having a place to spend their last few months alive. The Zoo falls into exactly this territory. It's a public space and we absolutely cannot risk losing any more. To replace a revered public space with private 'luxury' housing is infantile.	20-Mar-23
825.	O	I object to this beautiful zoo that has existed in Bristol for many many years bringing children and families such joy and interest. The zoo also brings profit with visitors all around the world learning about all the animal species here. We do not need any more property built here as thus means more people, more traffic, congestion and added pollution that already exists in this city. Protect this so it brings history, learning, profit and interest	22-Mar-23

826.	O	Having examined the plans and elevations of the proposed buildings on the zoo site, I wish to object strongly to the proposals. Short of a skyscraper or a warehouse, it is hard to imagine anything more incongruous with the surrounding buildings and landscapes in this lovely part of our city.	22-Mar-23
827.	O	As someone born and bred in Bristol nearly 80 years ago the Zoo & its gardens were a joy and delight and an education as I grew up. Now more recently I have had the pleasure of sharing my love of the Zoo with my grandchildren. It's development into scientific research has delighted me and with our dwindling wildlife globally, it is critical that such research continues and educates people as to the parlous state of our planet. The site of the Zoo most definitely fits the bill for this, so it is essential that it remains in public use - for the enjoyment of the glorious gardens as well as well as the science. It would therefore be the jewel in the crown for Bristol's 'green' credentials and a historic haven of peace and beauty for the city's citizens.	23-Mar-23
828.	O	Much as I treasure the heritage of this city that our evolving Zoological Gardens has represented to it over these past 70 years since my childhood, I am looking forward to the flagship it can be for us all and future generations to equip and inspire in the challenges which lie ahead. I am utterly convinced that if the Trustees of the BZGs had considered picking up the baton on Bristol Green City of Europe 2015 and running with a fresh and dynamic plan for BZG 2025, as a centre of learning Green Literacy through sponsored installations, innovations and experiences of sustainability, visitors would come from near and far. Such a vision would preserve its historic trees and beautiful gardens while the heritage buildings can be imaginatively re-purposed. Hospitality, products and services can all demonstrate ethical sustainability Green business, trades and remarkable technologies can demonstrate a future proof planet. A prime goto resource for cutting edge sustainable development with programmes around the world. As a centre of learning: whether the focus is on protecting our precious soil as well as species diversity, add low carbon and low polluting ways of working, travelling, dwelling, eating, buying; even learning how to care for domestic pets before buying! It would be a centre for learning to think globally and acting locally on all the above. The Planning Committee have a huge responsibility in considering this application which if approved, would be irreversible and tragic. If you are in any doubt at all - please postpone the decision until other possibilities can be proposed.	24-Mar-23

829.	O	<p>Upon finding out more about the circumstances surrounding Bristol Zoo's closure, I have become very concerned that the city is about to lose an important and unique piece of its history and a resource that will otherwise be incredibly valuable for future generations. Development of luxury housing in its place will provide a lucrative opportunity for the Zoo owners and the developers but will likely leave Bristol city much worse off. There does not seem to have been enough work done to prove the change in use of the site is justified. To be specific on other impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There will be significant, if not total, harm to the historic significance of the site. - There will also be significant impact to the established landscape of the site, particularly trees. - The public will lose an important educational and entertainment attraction. - Bristol will lose an important part of its identity. <p>Given the above concerns, I strongly object to this applicaiton for planning.</p>	26-Mar-23
830.	R		31-Mar-23
831.	R		31-Mar-23
832.	O	<p>My objections are to the buildings along perimeter of the development. While I appreciate that some effort has been made to reference the character of neighbouring buildings, the proposed buildings are far too tall and jarringly homogeneous. This looks out of place and contrasts (unpleasantly) with the mixture of buildings, light, and trees in the surrounding streets.</p>	01-Apr-23
833.	O	<p>I would like to object to the granting of planning permission on the following grounds: One. This is an historic heritage site, which needs to be preserved in itself, but is also potentially of much wider commercial interest to the city, if alternative public uses are allowed to proceed Two. The planning application refers to major demolition of buildings. The demolition of historic buildings should require a public enquiry. Three. The proposed cutting down of half of the trees on the site is completely out of step with the need to preserve natural habitats. Four. Housing development should take place on brownfield sites wherever possible.</p>	01-Apr-23
834.	O	<p>As a Clifton resident I write to object not to the principle of housing development but to the design and massing. The decision to build only on the sites of existing structures has had the unfortunate effect of forcing unacceptably massive structures onto the boundaries which are those most visible to the public on a daily basis, towering over Northcote and Guthrie roads and presenting to walkers on the Downs with an uninterrupted block of pale render, quite inappropriate to this historic area of our city. The scale and lack of quality of finish have clearly been designed to achieve the maximum financial gain. The application should be rejected and applicants be advised to look at alternative ways to reduce the scale on the boundaries, replace render with the vernacular stone of the neighbourhood and create visual gaps in the boundary structures. The result of the decision made by the committee will last well into the 22nd Century.</p>	06-Apr-23

835.	O	<p>The historic environment is a precious and irreplaceable resource from which a large section of the population derives enjoyment, instruction and inspiration. Set within the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area, the zoo is a rich multi-layered heritage site with its exclusive urban presence, its curated and managed exotic character and its distinctive listed buildings. Unless it is fully understood, and appropriately protected its collective significance and intrinsic character will be lost forever. The zoo enclosure is a conspicuous component of a diverse urban scene known locally, regionally and globally. Within an extraordinary surrounding landscape, it expresses contemporary and past information. Understanding this heritage underpins the stewardship of the place as a whole and presents opportunities which are yet to be purposefully explored. The intrinsic value of this unique asset set within the rich and diverse Conservation Area must not be underestimated. To a large extent its value is derived from its isolation behind tall stone walls which enclose an exotic wonderland of nature, novelty and human ingenuity. It brings together aspects of the natural world, of plants, trees, animals, birds, ecology, science, art and architecture. As a destination the zoo contains an ambience of beauty, distinctiveness, and infrastructure which entertains and delights, and offers an environment for research, and is part of life's rich pattern. To impose housing and vehicular access undermines its significance and the very nature of the historic heritage amenity. Any interventions must be minimal and subservient and "preserve or enhance" the intrinsic character and unique identity of the site.</p>	11-Apr-23
836.	O	<p>Bristol Zoo Gardens has been an asset to the Bristol community for nearly 200 years. The gardens are irreplaceable in terms of what grows there and the green space is vital for health and happiness - where this is in increasingly short supply in urban areas. The gardens should be preserved for benefit of the community and could be made to work as a recreational space, and/or for events, concerts, and sporting activities. If permission is granted for this ugly and overbearing development - this will all be lost (along with many mature trees). The promise to preserve access to some of the old gardens is an empty one and would be almost impossible to preserve and protect. The idea of cars being parked on this space terrible. Please reject the application and save this amenity for us all.</p>	13-Apr-23
837.	O	<p>There was talk from the current owners of this site becoming a conservation hub for Bristol, which would be more in keeping with the founders wishes and serve the people of Bristol more fully. I see no mention of development in that direction.</p>	15-Apr-23

END OF DOCUMENT