

# Amendment Sheet

26 April 2023

## Item 1: 22/02737/F - Bristol Zoo Gardens Guthrie Road Bristol BS8 3HA

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
N/A	<p><b>Comments Received</b></p> <p>Following the publication of the Committee Report, the following comments have been received in respect of the planning application (ref. 22/02737/F).</p> <p><i>1. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 17.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I am saddened to see this historic site being turned into unaffordable housing. The current site is an open space for all residents of Bristol and beyond. Handing it over to property developers to turn it into high-end residential flats makes no sense. PLEASE reconsider</p> <p><i>2. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 18/04/23</p> <p>Comment: The uploading to the planning portal of BCC's Urban Design Group comments dated 02/03/2023 presents significant new information material to the determination of the planning application. The Urban Design Group advises that the impact on the Clifton College listed buildings (designated as a Landmark of City-wide importance in the Clifton and Hotwells CA Appraisal) from The Close (View 4) will be slight. However, no-one has evaluated proposed housing development from the very public viewpoints of, - the visual gap on Worcester Road (immediately west of 6 Worcester Road) where Voi scooters are parked (opposite Clifton Cathedral) which is perhaps 5-7m higher than the centre of the Close where View 4 is modelled from; and - the public plaza to Clifton Cathedral - elevated at least 5m above Worcester Road street level (ie circa 10m to 12m above The Close). Both viewpoints provide a prominent and well used view across the Close to the College buildings. If the impact is 'slight' from down at the level of the Close, then the impact from Worcester Road and Clifton Cathedral public space is likely to be severe. Clifton College listed buildings will be diminished and shrouded by overbearing development when read from these popular viewpoints. The planned housing at the Zoo is likely to have a substantial / severe visual and heritage impact upon the setting of the listed buildings and the Conservation Area. Determination of the planning application should be put on hold pending a detailed assessment with photomontages to properly assess the impact on the townscape and heritage from these prominent public viewpoints and all other long and medium range viewpoints. Failing to do so renders the planning determination unsafe and fails to address the Council's legal duties under the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act</p> <p><i>3. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 18.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I strongly object for the following reasons:</p> <p>Bristol Zoo Gardens is of extreme importance to Bristol. The historical interest, the generations of families which have visited, historical moments and its fame for being</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>there for so many years as a long running Zoo. It means so much to the people of Bristol and this has been severely underestimated and undervalued. This is demonstrated by the large amounts of visitors to the Zoo in the final months. The site is home to many listed buildings and trees. The Bristol public deserve to not lose access to this important environmental site. There is no certainty or guarantee that the whole site will not be privatised. Plus loss of habitat to wildlife which use the trees and loss of treasured, unique, including listed trees in a green space in the city. The actual design of the proposed buildings are totally out of sync with the surrounding area, the existing gardens site and the neighbouring properties. The buildings will completely overshadow the surrounding roads and the site itself. The current site and buildings contain so much historic charm. The surrounding buildings are characterful, beautiful, the period architecture is wonderful in the area and the Zoo has charming unique buildings. The proposed buildings are completely opposite and will ruin the charm of that area. They are huge and will completely dominate the local roads. Plus the need for change of use has not been proven. Alternatives have not been explored. The closure of the Zoo and the proposal means harm to historical interest, loss of communal value, harm to listed buildings and trees, loss of green space, loss of public amenity and unjustified harm as the change of use and change to site is completely unjustified, finally harm to the surrounding area and the neighbouring properties</p> <p><i>4. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 19.04.23</p> <p>Comment: The loss of this great Bristolian institution could be lessened by using the space to enhance the lives of the people living in the city and visiting. Turning it into unaffordable homes would only serve a few, and it seems that the people who benefit the most would be the ones profiting from this plan. The Council should prioritize the desires and will of the people of the city and not the wealthy few.</p> <p><i>5. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 19.04.23</p> <p>Comment: Maintaining the gardens ought to be the absolute priority of the council. The obligation of the council is to provide the best services and environment for the residents of the city, indiscriminately. A community gardens is the most accurate fulfilment of the agreement between the public and the bodies which it elects as its representation. The proposed housing and parking will in reality, let's face it, serve a very privileged minority of bristolians. Creating profit for private business should not be the council's responsibility. A public green space which honours the legacy of Bristol Zoo is fitting in that it celebrates the great history of the city, whilst growing it's community values. Please reconsider, for the sake of all bristolians.</p> <p><i>6. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 20.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I too am sad that the zoo has closed. I also agree with Katy Grant and Paula O'Rourke that the number of houses should be limited and genuinely affordable and that the green spaces should be in community hands.</p> <p><i>7. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 20.04.23</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Comment: The site has been a wonderful zoo and valuable green space for the use of the community and visitors. It was still economically viable and very educational. It is a scandal that it has been closed and only a few animals moved to the The Wild Place. Most animals have had to be found a new home away from the Bristol area. The proposed change to residential use with high rise buildings nearly all round the perimeter and without long term community control of the green space and trees is not acceptable and not in keeping with this conservation area.</p> <p><i>8. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 21.04.23</p> <p>Comment: There are too many houses and this will cause issues for local schools and doctors. This amount of house and parking in an already very busy local Area will be worsen. There should be a right of way through the gardens established and protected and not doing so is so wrong. Otherwise access in a few years will only be for those who live there not the wider community as the plans claim. There are far to many tree being removed and the green spaces not protected witch is detrimental to wildlife and to the green city bristol wants to be. This is a very large development in a conservation area and many local have had much smaller development with a lot less historical impact turned down I feel strongly that all development should be held to the same standards in the conservation area do that it protected for the future generations. The house numbers need to be reduced to not cause strain on local facilities parking/ traffic/ schools/doctors In the planning document and contract There need to be more put on to protect and gift the green spaces to the community locally. I would also argue that the not enough though about sustainable transport and this cuch as cargo bike storage space or even link to safe bike lanes.</p> <p><i>9. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 23.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I object to the proposed development. The development is out of proportion with the surroundings and is not in keeping with nearby houses or college buildings. There will be an enormous loss of landscape. The listed Historic Park and Garden will be much reduced in size. This is unjustified harm. It has not been proven that the zoo cannot continue as a public site. The business case is far from clear. Alternatives have not been given proper consideration. Listed buildings will be damaged. There is a huge loss of heritage and communal value, as well as the unnecessary loss of a tremendous public amenity.</p> <p><i>10. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 23.04.23</p> <p>Comment: The Zoo has moved but the gardens should 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 not in relation to the existing buildings and the location of the site. This application should be refused at this stage in order that alternative uses for the site can be fully explored before any decision is taken. It is an important part of Bristol's history and heritage and everyone wants a suitable use of the site to become a tribute to what was achieved while the Zoo was there [gardens and trees] as well as after the Zoo moved out.</p> <p><i>11. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i></p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Date: 23.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I think more time needs to be taken to discuss and explore this issue. At a time when green spaces and plants are in short supply, it seems to me as much time as possible needs to be given to this. The Zoo Gardens are a possible location for plant research. Also, this is a historic site that deserves to be protected and preserved. It is also a recognised landmark and attraction in Bristol. Just because the animals have thankfully been moved does not have to mean the site should be basically destroyed--as the present plan would.</p> <p><i>12. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 23.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I object to the proposed development. The application for the main site plan is completely unsuitable and will be a long-term disastrous degradation of this conservation area for short-term financial gain. The plans contravene Bristol City Council's own Conservation and the Historic Environment Policy, the buildings are overpowering, much too tall, unimaginative to say the least and completely out of keeping with the charm of the surroundings. This conservation area is particularly historic, important and irreplaceable. The gardens are unique and long established containing many valuable trees and plants, and under these plans have no proper long-term protection. The zoo was always extremely popular with its residents and the many, many visitors and tourists who arrived there daily (the number of people now using the number 8 bus has fallen dramatically). The reasons presented for the necessity of selling the zoo were dubious in the first place and the proposed development entirely unsuitable. There has been no convincing evidence that this drastic change of use is necessary - visitor numbers were rising again post-pandemic. Bristol Council should consider whether it wants to be party to such destruction</p> <p><i>13. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: This proposal stinks like a month old fish. Having failed to make a success of the zoo after 200 years the custodians have sold out to developers instead of trying to continue the fine history of the zoo. Shame on you!! You have gone for the cash and perhaps will be satiated in your comfy beds that you did your best. You sure didn't. I am totally disgusted. SHAME ON YOU. Sleep well if you can.</p> <p><i>14. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: Objection in the strongest terms to an unsympathetic scheme to turn a wonderful Bristol heritage into a shockingly inappropriate housing estate. Consider the alternatives to restore the zoo to a zoo or botanical garden for future Bristolians to enjoy. Look again at the mismanagement of the zoo over recent years. Do not be responsible for allowing this happen.</p> <p><i>15. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: This is a beautiful site that contributes to the environment by providing clean air and open space. Building a large number of buildings on the site will</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>destroy this health benefit. We are supposed to be protecting the environment, not destroying it. Turn it into a botanic garden for the benefit of all.</p> <p>16. Customer objects to the Planning Application Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I object in full to the above planning application which will have an overall negative effect on Bristol on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It contravenes both policy in the Bristol Local Plan and in Bristol City Council's Local Plan Review of November 2022, particularly parts of chapters 5 (Affordable Housing), 6 (Net Zero &amp; Climate), 7 (Biodiversity &amp; nature Recovery) and 10 (Design).</li> <li>2. It contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on biodiversity (natural environment guidance on brownfield land of environmental value [Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 8-003-20190721] and Green Infrastructure [Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 8-004-20190721 &amp; Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 8-005-20190721, revised July 2019]) climate change and CO2 reduction.</li> <li>3. Serious loss and harm to Bristol's Economy - the Wild Place Project proposed as an alternative to Bristol Zoo Gardens is in South Gloucestershire and not within the Bristol City Council area. The consequences for the city by closing such an iconic major attraction means a serious loss of income to Bristol's economy which the Bristol Zoo and Zoo Gardens has provided for generations over almost two centuries at the Clifton site. As an added attraction also it is close to Brunel's iconic suspension bridge which has become the symbol of Bristol.</li> <li>4. Spurious and disingenuous accounting figures have been used as a justification for closing the zoo. The Zoo has maintained that it was losing money, as a justification for selling the site, giving as an example 2021 when it says it lost over £1m. That year it did, but it was the year when the Zoo had to close by law due to the covid pandemic, so that year it was inevitable that it lost money. The Charity Commission's figures on its website clearly show that Bristol Zoo was not in annual financial deficit and had not lost money in any of the recent years except 2021, yet this pandemic year is the precise year's figures the zoo is trying to use to justify selling the site.</li> <li>5. Since the Zoo Trustees consider that finance is a major problem, serious questions must be asked about the financial management of Bristol Zoo Gardens. If alleged financial deficit was their concern, why on earth did the Zoo trustees close the Zoo at the beginning of September 2022? Nothing has happened on the Clifton site since then, yet some animals and the staff to care for them continue to remain on the site 8 months later at a huge negative cost and financial loss to the Zoo, when the Zoo could easily have remained open to the public and making money for it. It makes no financial sense at all. Also, the new café &amp; restaurant called The Hide was built brandnew only just a few years ago, yet under the Zoo's proposals it is now to be demolished, meaning that a huge amount of money in building it was wasted, thus showing the Zoo's financial judgment to have been woefully lacking. Similar comments could be made about other recent improvements on the site.</li> <li>6. Loss of Amenity to Bristol City. Bristol Zoo and its gardens have been a major attraction and welfare benefit for generations of Bristolians. It has provided a calm, recreational and educational space for Bristol's citizens and its children. Schools too</li> </ol>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>have used the Zoo as such for generations as part of learning and teaching children about animals and the wider world. The Clifton Zoo is easily accessible from the city centre by bus which stops right outside the main gates, reducing the need for car use and so reducing the impact on CO2 emissions and climate change. Let us not forget that Bristol was the first place in the country to declare a climate emergency...</p> <p>7. Loss of Heritage. The applicant's own heritage report states: 4.4.2 Highest significance "The zoological gardens site is unusual in that the element of highest heritage significance is arguably its communal value, rather than its architectural, archaeological or historic interest. The site's near-two hundred year association with family days out, childhood adventure, and special activities and events is of huge significance both to the people of the City of Bristol and the nearby area, but also to visitors from far further afield".</p> <p>8. Proposed demolition of parts of listed buildings, including the aquarium buildings and the total demolition of the gorilla in enclosures incorporated the iconic Giraffe House are unacceptable and undermine their listed building designation.</p> <p>9. The Victorian Society's report concludes that: The NPPF is clear that it is desirable to 'sustain and enhance' the significance of heritage assets (para 190a), and that 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation' (para 199). Furthermore, 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). The amended proposals do not ensure this, and the Victorian Society maintains its objection to the proposals.</p> <p>10. Damage to an area of conservation. The Clifton site is in an area of considerable architectural importance and the area is a conservation area. Creating new buildings such as proposed will have an overall negative effect on the architectural ambience and amenity of the area. In particular, the creation of high rise blocks of flats goes against the general low level of older buildings in the immediate vicinity. Neighbouring properties in particular will suffer from a negative aspect to their immediate surroundings if this proposal is allowed to proceed.</p> <p>11. Environmental Damage. There are negative effects with this application's proposals: Bristol Zoo Gardens has been nurtured for almost two hundred years, and has become a haven for various rare and unusual trees and plants. Some of these will be lost altogether, and those which will be moved may not survive transplantation. The Gardens themselves have won awards and their layout will be lost forever.</p> <p>12. Considerable space in the proposed development will be allocated to car parking and to car use, directly contravening national and local policy on reducing CO2 emissions and reducing impacts on climate change. The site and surrounding area will suffer increasing car congestion and atmospheric pollution due to the number of residences which will be built, and have a negative effect on air quality. Bristol has recently introduced a clean air zone. Increased car provision and use within the city is directly contradictory to the clean air policy of the city council. The idea that some of what are now footpaths within the Zoo Gardens site should become shared with cars sends the wrong message on climate change as well as posing risks to pedestrians' personal safety. The area of green recreational space available to the public will be considerably reduced, to public detriment. There is also no guarantee</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>that the reduced green space which does remain open to the public in this development will remain open in the future. Experience shows that once a public site is sold off and becomes private land, sooner or later the public will be stopped from being able to use it as a public space. Many people who formerly would have travelled to the Clifton site by bus will not come to the site in future. If they wish to see animals, they will have to travel a considerable distance to elsewhere and will have to travel by car to the detriment of the environment.</p> <p>13. Bristol Citizens' Health and Welfare. We have long known that open green space, unencumbered by vehicles is beneficial to people's health and well being, particularly their mental health. This is true even more so when people are also able to be in contact with animals. Loss of the Zoo and gardens will therefore negatively impact on Bristol citizens' health and welfare. In its conclusion, the council officers' report to this committee states: "Taking the policies of the development plan as a whole, overall, it is concluded that the proposal is not in accordance with the Development plan".</p> <p>NOTES</p> <p>1: The proposed development does not in reality provide the opportunity for Affordable Housing. The council's own Housing Delivery Team states that its normal proposal in the rich area of Clifton ward where Bristol Zoo Gardens is sited, "The site falls within Clifton ward, which is in Inner West Bristol. In accordance with policy BCS17 the site is required to deliver 40% affordable housing" - in other words 40% of any development in Clifton ward should be affordable housing; but the council has inexplicably halved that to only 20% on the basis that "the site is eligible to make use of the 'Threshold' approach to BCS17 added by the AHPN that applies to the Inner East and West areas". This exemption is clearly intended to apply to the poorer areas of the East of Bristol's inner city and the poorer part of the West of Bristol's inner city - it is quite clearly not meant to include the richer part of West Bristol's inner city (i.e. Clifton ward) which is where accommodation to both rent and buy is the most expensive in the whole city, and indeed in the whole South West urban region. Therefore the council is in effect breaching its own rules in requiring only 20% affordable housing on this site..</p> <p>2: National planning policy guidance on the Natural Environment states that: "Some previously developed or 'brownfield' land is of high environmental value, providing habitats for protected or priority species and other environmental and amenity benefits. When allocating land for development or determining a planning application, the biodiversity or geodiversity value of the land and its environmental sensitivity will need to be taken into account so that any harm can be avoided, mitigated or compensated for in a way which is appropriate given the site's identified value". (Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 8-003-20190721). It also states: "Green infrastructure is a natural capital asset that provides multiple benefits, at a range of scales. For communities, these benefits can include enhanced wellbeing, outdoor recreation and access, enhanced biodiversity and landscapes, food and energy production, urban cooling, and the management of flood risk. These benefits are also known as ecosystem services" (Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 8-005- 20190721)</p> <p>Clearly the Bristol Zoo Gardens site falls within these descriptions, and the proposed development will severely reduce the existing area of the site for public access and restrict its public use. Over time, experience shows also that such access as remained if the development were completed would further be eroded. Given that the Zoo Gardens has been a public access site for almost 200 years, this is no small</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>consideration. Mitigation elsewhere cannot compensate for such a precious and historic public resource</p> <p><i>17. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>I would like to submit a comment on the proposed development of the Bristol Zoo Gardens site above.</p> <p>As you will almost certainly be aware, Bristol has a serious shortage of affordable housing. Most young people in the city will not be able to afford their own properties.</p> <p>I would like to object to this development as it will use an historic site with a rich history and turn it into what will become a series of luxury, unaffordable residential units, with absolutely no benefit to the residents of Bristol as a whole.</p> <p>It will not address the constant housing crises and will only provide a rich profit to a small number of wealthy individuals at the expense of Bristol Zoo's legacy and to the detriment of the city. It is deeply saddening that some individuals are even contemplating desecrating this historical site in this way.</p> <p>The individuals planning this development will inevitably claim that it will provide affordable housing and community sites that all can enjoy. However, as history has shown us, this will never be the case in the end. The properties will be owned by private landlords or as "investments", depriving the very people that could possibly benefit from this project. As such, this must not be allowed to happen.</p> <p>There is one single reason why I could fathom this to be in any way a positive situation for Bristol. That would be that the properties are social housing that are prohibited from being sold to private individuals.</p> <p>Because this application does not fulfil this criterion, it must be permanently blocked.</p> <p><i>18. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: This is simply not a good idea. The zoo should remain an amenity for all of Bristol. If it is turned into 196 mostly very expensive homes it will not be good for outsiders or those who live there. How could you even think of allowing nearly half the trees on the site to be removed?? I strongly object to this plan</p> <p><i>19. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: 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</p>



Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>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 &amp; Garden and an Important Open Space</p> <p><i>20. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I object to the change of historic site and buildings which are part of Bristols heritage and landscape along with the damage and or destruction of many of the established trees. As a listed park and green space in the city. It's ironic that a whole are like this can be decimated for profit yet a one tree under a preservation order can't even be trimmed more than 25%. We don't need hundreds of new flats in the area.</p> <p><i>21. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: The gardens should be kept as open space with open access. If this development is allowed sooner or later the public will be excluded. The grounds and some of the buildings are of historic interest and a variety of possible uses have been suggested. Development of multi-storey dwellings should be refused.</p> <p><i>22. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I strongly object the the planning of 196 houses going up on the Bristol Zoo Gardens site on the following grounds:</p> <p>(1) This would wipe out an historical green space landmark site which something that Bristol City Council should not take lightly: Bristol Zoo Gardens is listed as a local Historic Park &amp; Garden and an Important Open Space. All 12 Acres of space should be kept as a walled garden green space for nature. Squandering this historical site which has served millions of visitors during the 180+ year history into a site that only serves several hundred people is short sighted and deplorable.</p> <p>(2) The damage or extermination of many established trees for the building of hard standing for cars and houses would leave even less space for nature: None of the trees should be felled. Every tree counts - our planet needs each every established tree to live not be destroyed. Not only will these trees no longer be there to give homes to nature and absorb co2 but co2 will be released when they are felled thus harming the planet which each tree that is cut down.</p> <p>(3) Clifton is an historic area of conservation and the proposed houses will not fit with the historic area. The new building designs are a poor effort to fit in with the graceful existing historic architecture. The existing Bristol Zoo Gardens historical building should not be destroyed.</p> <p>(4) It will put more pressure on parking for amenities such as doctors surgeries on Pembroke Road, Residential parking and the use of the gym and other activities at Clifton College and businesses in that area. 196 homes means at least 196 extra cars using the locality on a daily basis. Though the homes will likely provide parking</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>there are usually to few parking spaces for new homes and then visitors will mean that the surrounding on street parking spaces will be in even greater demand.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>If the site must be built on and something so special should be lost then it must only be to replace it with something of enviromental importance. It should be at least 50% rather than 20% affordable homes and the homes should be passive houses which are truly energy efficient, comfortable, affordable and ecological. There should be less dwellings and hard standing and more joined up space in one place that is green, with trees and ponds for nature</p> <p><i>23. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I am writing to support the efforts of the Save Bristol Zoo Gardens Campaign to avoid a new housing estate of 196 residential units with all the associated hard paving for driveways and car parking. I feel the site should be kept open as a botanical garden. These gardens are an important site both historically and botanically. I worked as a gardener at the Zoo in the 1970s and was involved with naming and labelling the trees and shrubs. Many of which are a great botanical interest. These should be kept for future generations to learn from and enjoy</p> <p><i>24. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I strongly object to the proposal to build residential units on this historic site thereby denying all the citizens of Bristol and beyond the opportunity to enjoy and benefit from these beautiful gardens as they have been able to do for the past 186 years. It has been one of Bristol's very important assets and visitor attractions and has one of the UK's most important collections of plants. I think it should remain as a botanic garden at the very least and additional uses which would supplement the enjoyment of the gardens by all citizens should be explored. Planning permission for housing should be refused while alternative, imaginative options are considered. We are all aware of climate change, the importance of biodiversity and green spaces etc.etc. Bristol as the only Green Capital city in the UK surely cannot allow this important green site to be concreted over and ruined forever.</p> <p><i>25. Customer supports the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I support Bristol Zoo Gardens's application for housing on the former zoo site in Clifton. My reasons are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bristol Zoo is an important international conservation body whose efforts we need to support. The best way to further those aims is to permit the housing at Clifton so that the Zoo gets good value for the site. It is vital that the zoo has the funds to develop its newer site at Hollywood both to make a visitor attraction that Bristol would otherwise lack and to develop its income stream for further conservation work.</li> <li>2. A new botanical garden at Clifton would be a distraction from the present successful and popular University Botanic Garden in Stoke Bishop. I cannot believe there is justification in having two botanical gardens barely a mile apart. Botanical research and education are desirable but both are already competently undertaken at Stoke Bishop. The wider animal and insect conservation and education that the</li> </ol>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Zoo can supply offer a greater variety in both educational opportunity and diversity in the all-important conservation efforts that our world needs.</p> <p>3. The proposed plan for the zoo site is open, allows plenty of garden and park-like spaces. It will be important to work out who after completion will be responsible for garden and pond maintenance.</p> <p>4. I see no point in criticising the designs of the individual buildings as whichever developer eventually gets the contract will offer something different.</p> <p><i>26. Customer supports the Planning Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: Although I live Clifton, I am one of those very much in favour of the redevelopment of the zoological grounds and car park. Bristol is in desperate need of more homes. This is unarguable. And it is surely grossly unfair that people living in other areas of Bristol should continually have their all too few remaining open spaces bult upon for housing, when Clifton, which has a much lower density of houses/residents, seems to again manage to avoid 'doing its bit'. House prices in Bristol are said to be some of the highest in Britain, and indeed according to a recent article in a national newspaper have shown among the highest increase over the past few years. We need more houses and flats. It's as simple as that. So, I was delighted to read that the Bristol planners have recommended that the scheme should go ahead. I just hope that the councillors who will shortly be voting on this will think of those desperately needing places to live and vote accordingly.</p> <p><i>27. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 25.04.23</p> <p>Comment: The initial amazement I felt on learning that Bristol Zoo would close its historic site - and sell off the vital part of itself to property developers - has not abated one bit. In fact it has grown. That an almost 200-year-old insitution, popular till the end, could close without masses of public and vocal dissent would be a mystery if there were not the simple explanation that the announcement occurred at the height of the Covid pandemic. This was a time when people were hardly allowed out of their houses, and we all understood that the world had changed. Under such circumstances, it was relatively easy to persauade shareholders and the public that the Zoo's future was in jeopardy without drastic action. But closer inspection of the Zoo's own finances, and dark mutterings from shareholders, employees and trustees, revealed that the Zoo's finances were in good shape and this was a plan concocted by a tiny group. After life returned pretty much to normal post-pandemic, many people have reflected on their acceptance of the closure. Many are convinced that the site was, and could be again, a viable concern as a beautiful natural space, with or without animals - and if with housing, then with very much less than what is proposed. A privately operated charity is of course free to reorganize its operations within the law. Yet even if one accepts that the Zoo has every right to sell off its historic site, and one assumes that process was handled entirely properly within the organization, then the Zoo has no right whatsoever to expect the city of Bristol to grant any particular planning permission. The viability of the Zoo's business plan is of absolutely no relevance to the citizens of Bristol. Our elected Councillors are charged with protecting the city's heritage and its open spaces. They have considerable power to delay allowing any development that has a high risk of turning out inappropriately, a power that I very much hope they exercise on April 26th, opting</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>instead to reject at this time. Delay means alternative plans will have time to mature. Delay gives backers of these plans time to secure funds. Delay means the Zoo itself can moderate its plans in the light of public opinion. All these possibilities can only be to the benefit of Bristol. I therefore urge the Councillors to act as responsible city custodians and reject the planning application.</p> <p><i>28. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 25.04.23</p> <p>Comment: I would like to submit a comment on the proposed development of the Bristol Zoo Gardens site above. As you will almost certainly be aware, Bristol has a serious shortage of affordable housing. Most young people in the city will not be able to afford their own properties. I would like to object to this development as it will use an historic site with a rich history and turn it into what will become a series of luxury, unaffordable residential units, with absolutely no benefit to the residents of Bristol as a whole. It will not address the constant housing crises and will only provide a rich profit to a small number of wealthy individuals at the expense of Bristol Zoo's legacy and to the detriment of the city. It is deeply saddening that some individuals are even contemplating desecrating this historical site in this way. The individuals planning this development will inevitably claim that it will provide affordable housing and community sites that all can enjoy. However, as history has shown us, this will never be the case in the end. The properties will be owned by private landlords or as "investments", depriving the very people that could possibly benefit from this project. As such, this must not be allowed to happen. There is one single reason why I could fathom this to be in any way a positive situation for Bristol. That would be that the properties are social housing that are prohibited from being sold to private individuals. Because this application does not fulfil this criterion, it must be permanently blocked.</p> <p><i>29. Customer objects to the Planning Application</i> Date: 25.04.23</p> <p>I'm aggrieved and appalled by the plans to replace Bristol Zoo with ugly housing which will ruin the Heritage site it is. The whole manner of the closing of the zoo was far from above board and the loud call by Bristol residents to potentially rescue the zoo should be heard. The board who brought things to this point, destroying one of the world's oldest zoos although it was running at a profit, need to be immediately curtailed in their actions.</p> <p>I spent my formative years in Clifton, and now live in BS2. Partly due to easy access to a zoo throughout my formative years, I am now very interested both in animals, and in zoos and their preservation network.</p> <p>The zoo has progressed over the decades. It has created more space for each animal, with the larger animals moved out. It still retained large queues on Summer and what I am not surprised to learn from people who have had access to the zoo's accounts, a profit outwith lockdowns.</p> <p>It's an integral part of a world network of conservation zoos. It seems surprising that someone has been allowed, in such a short period of time, to ship out all the animals to other zoos around Britain and come up with plans to sell the land for private housing.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>I've been in property all my adult life and I would confidently predict the development would be for units sold at a high end budget. Furthermore, most will be used or rented out on short term lets. And the letting will be on the basis of views which its existence has helped ruin for everyone else and for being in an area now degraded by the needless loss it represents.</p> <p>The harm done to Bristol by such a change is hard to understate. It has removed the sort of cultural asset which helps to keep cities on the map. It has also removed a key tourist attraction. It has downgraded the character of Bristol for people potentially coming here with families. And it has taken a key learning asset away from children growing up here.</p> <p>And what such a replacement would do for the environment is outrageous. There is a growing awareness in Bristol that biodiversity is preserved by a network diverse green spaces lying across the city. Insects in the countryside are increasingly killed off by pesticides, leaving green corridors across the city performing a large function for the country's biodiversity. Bristol zoo was a great green space, replete with diverse trees and wildlife crossing Bristol. I have often visited it in recent years just to experience this space, alongside many other species. Plans to concrete this over for cars, and pollard away obstructive trees are ruinous.</p> <p>And what its loss is simply doing to individuals is also unjustifiable. The present team selling off the zoo haven't known it half as long as the zoo's wider range of stakeholders. These have been part of supporting, sharing and advertising the zoo over its past decades. My parents who have lived in Clifton for a long time are devastated by the loss. In general, the loss of green spaces forever, with their diversity and meaning, to housing developers is simply sad. Likewise, the inability to hand it on the future generations is grievous.</p> <p>When I was younger, there was wide publicity that London Zoo was at the brink of financial failure. A period of time was put aside for publicity, fund-raising and reconfiguring some of its setup. It kept going, as the public outcry and attention it received enabled it to do so.</p> <p>By contrast Bristol zoo was put out of action as quickly as possibly by someone with a clear objective to do so. Inaccurate information was put about so that people wouldn't know what to say or do to keep it going. And investigation has shown that the site has been profitable outside of lockdown. It has only been recently that people have got together to share information, offer to fund a renewal and try to save what is there. The zoo almost circumvented this by the abrupt nature of its closure.</p> <p>The heritage of the two zoos also bears comparison. London Zoo in 1825. Bristol Zoo 10 years later, and said to be the 5th oldest in the world. If Bristol Council are going to allow the zoo to be written off, present and future generations will be asking difficult questions about the voices guiding Bristol.</p> <p>I would call for an immediate stoppage to any plans to grant any planning permission for change of use of the zoo site. This should be followed by acknowledgment that Bristol zoo grounds are an important official Heritage site of Bristol. Then for Bristol Council to take special measures to protect them.</p>

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
	<p>Then for an investigation into what happened, and into the misinformation and incorrect practices used which brought it to the point of it being emptied of animals. And following this should be potential prosecutions with the objectives both of jail time to deter such criminals passing out misinformation and lies to sell off Bristol's heritage in the future, and of recovering some of the irrecoverable financial loss of the sabotage so far.</p> <p>Then comes the hard work of rebuilding the zoo network of Bristol back up. But the sooner the needed measures start, the quicker and less painful the work will be.</p> <p><b>Officer Response to Comments Received</b></p> <p>As highlighted within received comments (18/04/23), views of the cricket pitch and Clifton College's listed buildings are available from public viewpoints on Worcester Road, predominantly from the Clifton Cathedral's elevated public plaza, and the gap adjacent to no. 6 Worcester Road. These views are not identified as important views by the Clifton and Hotwells Conservation Area Appraisal. It is acknowledged that views from these positions provides glimpsed views of the Clifton College's heritage assets, but the most important views to their historic significance are those from College Road and the cricket pitch itself, which have been discussed and assessed within the Committee Report. Any views of the proposal from the Worcester Road and Clifton Cathedral's elevated plaza would be negligible, and not harmful to the affected heritage assets, including the Conservation Area. This assessment has been confirmed by the Urban Design Team.</p> <p>Other comments have reiterated concerns expressed in previous comments which are addressed comprehensively within the Committee Report. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding the principle of the development, including its Important Open Space designation, community facilities, and potential to accommodate housing are addressed in Key Issue A (page 84 onwards).</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the proposal's impact on heritage assets are addressed thoroughly in Key Issue B (page 97 onwards).</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the impact on the landscape, including existing trees, are discussed in Key Issue C (page 117 onwards).</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the proposal's quality of urban design are discussed in Key Issue D (page 126 onwards).</li> <li>• Concern expressed regarding the proposal's impact on neighbours are addressed in Key Issue E (page 133 onwards).</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the affordability of the houses proposed are addressed in Key Issue F (page 145 onwards).</li> <li>• Concerns regarding highway safety and transport are discussed in Key Issue G (page 147 onwards).</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the proposal's sustainable design credentials are discussed within Key Issue H (page 152 onwards).</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the proposal's impact on wildlife and nature conservation are considered in Key Issue I (page 155 onwards).</li> <li>• Key Issue L (page 163 onwards) considers the overall planning balance, and explains the recommendation.</li> </ul>

## Item 1: 22/02889/LA - Bristol Zoo Gardens Guthrie Road Bristol BS8 3HA

Page no.	Amendment/additional information
N/A	<p><b>Comments Received</b></p> <p>Following the publication of the Committee Report, the following comments have been received in respect of the planning application (ref. 22/02889/LA).</p> <p><i>1. Customer objects to the Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: The proposed demolition of parts of listed buildings, including the aquarium buildings and the total demolition of the gorilla in enclosures incorporated in the iconic Giraffe House are unacceptable and undermine their listed building designation. It is noted that the aquarium was not surveyed, so a proper assessment of the aquarium/bear pit listed building has not been made. I therefore object to this proposed development on the additional ground that proper process has not been followed here. The Victorian Society's report concludes that: The NPPF is clear that it is desirable to 'sustain and enhance' the significance of heritage assets (para 190a), and that 'great weight should be given to the asset's conservation' (para 199). Furthermore, 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). The amended proposals do not ensure this, and the Victorian Society maintains its objection to the proposals. The creation of a railing instead of the original door to the Monkey House changes its aspect and is against the spirit of this Grade II Listed Building.</p> <p><i>2. Customer objects to the Application</i> Date: 24.04.23</p> <p>Comment: My first home was in Stoke Bishop just over the Downs from the Zoo, starting in 1937. One of my and my late sister's great treats was to visit the Zoo, to enjoy the gardens and get to know the animals. I strongly object to the current plans and sale of the site on the grounds that the Zoo Trustees have a duty to entrust the historic garden for perpetual use and enjoyment by my erstwhile fellow citizens of Bristol. The historic buildings could be used for first class environmental studies in conjunction with the Universities. This important site in a prime location should not be asset stripped in order to provide an out of town visitor attraction at Hollywood Towers, the Cribbs Causeway site. My further objection is that, whilst the treatment of animals is rightly very different from what it was in the 1930's, the sheer difficulty for the majority of inhabitants of the City and County of Bristol in reaching Cribbs Causeway will deter many of them from visiting the new site, especially from the southern parts of the area. The traffic - particularly in the summer months - will be affected by the nearby conjunction of Motorways, and indeed of the shoppers visiting The Mall. I understand parking (in the historic grounds of the new site) will also be a factor, unless visitors can be bussed in from site specific reserved parking in The Mall. This application is ill thought out as to the consequences to the Citizens of Bristol (for whom the Zoo site in Clifton was given in perpetuity), and to the likely availability to them of access to the new site.</p>

<b>Page no.</b>	<b>Amendment/additional information</b>
	<p><b>Officer Response to Comments Received</b></p> <p>These comments have reiterated concerns expressed in previous comments which are addressed comprehensively within the Committee Report.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the proposal's impact on listed buildings are addressed in the Committee Report (pages 756 – 757).</p> <p>As is explained on page 754 of the Committee Report, matters raised by members of the public and other contributors that do not relate to the proposal's impact on the special architectural or historical interest of the six listed buildings this application concerns, are not relevant to this application's assessment, but are assessed as part of the full planning application (ref. 22/02737/F).</p>

## **Item 2: - The Vassall Centre Gill Avenue Bristol BS16 2QQ**

<b>Page no.</b>	<b>Amendment/addition-al information</b>
2	Paragraph added – Pre-application consultation.
41	Section 106 changed to Unilateral Undertaking.
48	Section 106 agreement changed to Unilateral Undertaking.
55	Financial contribution figures corrected in Unilateral Undertaking.
76	Condition 17 – Car club reviewed instead of submitted.
84	Condition 30 – Car Club omitted. Condition numbers amended to reflect.
94	Condition 50 – Car Club omitted. (Duplicate).