

**List of People Requesting to Speak – Public Participation – DC B Committee –
5pm on Thursday 13th July 2023 for Questions, 12pm on Tuesday 18th July
2023 for Statements**

A – Novers Hill

QA1 – Tony Pitt (4 Supplementary Questions permitted)

A3 - Mark Ashdown

A8 – Michelle Ruse

A24 – Norman Gilliam

A29 – Julia Victor

A30 – Danica Priest

A43 – Nasim Dumont-Namin

A48 – Sue Chubb

A66 – Alex Dibble

A68 – Councillor Zoe Goodman

A78 – Tony Pitt

QUESTIONS – A1 Tony Pitt

1. Q: Allocation BSA1114 is for housing and business, and was also suggested as this by the Knowle West Regeneration Framework. What is the process for ignoring this dual allocation and why has the allocation not been brought forward as both?

A: The Local Planning Authority have been asked to assess a planning application. The applicant's application site does include land that forms both the allocation BSA114 and BSA1108 (part). These allocations have not been ignored, they are key material consideration in the determination of this application.

2. Q: The hedgerow along Novers Hill (the road) is a protected Town and Village Green. This doesn't appear to be mentioned in the planning report. What is the process to swap land as suggested? Does this involve public consultation? Have you pursued this swap with the relevant departments in the central government?

A: The process for swapping Town and Village Green land would involve public consultations. There is no requirement to undertake work on this as part of the consideration of this planning application.

3. Q: The developer design was amended but not re-consulted. Does this fit with the agreement for consultation under the Knowle West Regeneration Framework?

A: Following the receipt of amended plans on , a further round of consultation was undertaken on 1st March 2023. Everyone who was consulted when the application was received and who commented on the 2021 proposals, was reconsulted in 2023.

4. Q: Can you explain when the boundary of the Special Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) was changed from the whole of the slopes to a thinner sliver across the slopes? Who needed to be involved in that decision? Who was involved? And why does the council's own mapping still show the whole hillside as SNCI?

<https://maps.bristol.gov.uk/pinpoint/?service=localinfo&maptype=js&layer=Neighbouring+authorities;Sites+of+Nature+Conservation+Interest&extent=4986.347472694935&x=358305.9436118872&y=169799.33959867916>

A: In 2014 some areas within sites of nature conservation interest were allocated for development through the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan. That statutory local plan shows those areas as site allocations; they are subject to local plan Policy SA1 and to the development considerations set out in the Site Allocations Information Annex. The development considerations deal with any required mitigation and compensation for the impact on nature conservation.

Many thanks
Tony Pitt

12th July, 2023

STATEMENT NUMBER A1

Dear Bristol City Council,

Letter of Objection to Application for Development: 21/05164/F
Site address: Land On The West Side Of Novers Hill Bristol

I am writing to object to application 21/05164/F for four reasons:

(1) The application proposes development on the Pigeonhouse stream and adjacent meadows SNCI, designated since the 1980s. Although the site was allocated for housing in the 2014 Local Plan, the SNCI designation was not removed, consequently it is still a material consideration, triggering the application of DM19, also a material consideration.

While in the *Brislington Meadows* appeal decided that the structural allocation should take primacy, there were multiple errors in the report. The first was that it was not accurate that the site “used to be part” of the Brislington Meadows SNCI. BCC has repeatedly confirmed that the site was not de-designated as an SNCI, so the site still was an SNCI. Secondly, the Inspector wrote that it was “unclear whether or not the majority of the appeal site is still, technically, subject to the SNCI designation”. This is not unclear. In the absence of being de-designated, the site is still subject to the SNCI designation as it was never removed, on ecological grounds, by the LSP. Thirdly, the Inspector states that the SNCI status “must have included consideration of the SNCI where it overlaps with Policy BSA1201”. The Local Plan Inspector’s report makes no mention of this consideration. The reference in footnote 34 which the Inspector sites at that point makes no mention of the SNCI.¹

In practice, the Inspector’s decision in *Brislington Meadows* rests on an unsubstantiated assertion that “Policy BSA1201 of the SADMP is the site specific allocation and therefore must take primacy.” This is contrary to s38(5) PCPA 2004, which states that contemporaneous competing policies should be balanced. No authority has been provided to support this reading of the planning law framework, and I believe it to be erroneous. While it is certainly for decision-makers, and any Inspector, to balance material considerations, with the possibility that the housing allocation might “trump” ecological considerations in the process, this balancing allocation should be undertaken carefully and rigorously, without assuming the primacy of the structural allocation without legal or planning policy support.

Despite these errors, BCC declined to seek a judicial review of the *Brislington Meadows* decision and local people could not afford to do so. There are good reasons why it has not been possible to challenge the *Brislington Meadows* decision. However, it should not be accepted uncritically, accepting the mistaken analysis without comment.

¹ Footnote 34 refers 3.4.1 of the Allocations and Designations Process document for the Submission Version (July 2013) of the SADMP. This provides a summary of SNCIs. The paragraph does not mention *Brislington Meadows*, indeed. The 2014 Inspector report’s mention of *Brislington Meadows* includes the words: “It is a site of no overriding environmental quality”, which was clearly wrong given the SNCI designation.

(2) Each application should be considered on its merits. It is not the case that merely due to the outcome in *Brislington Meadows* that ecological concerns are always insufficient “in principle”. *Land at Novers Hill* consists of a different ecosystem, including Priority Habitat Lowland Meadow and Lowland Calcareous Grass and invertebrates. These factors have to be carefully assessed and in this case, given the proposed destruction, the application should not be supported. This remains a balancing exercise. NPPF para 174 indicates that planning decisions should minimise the impacts on biodiversity. BCC should also consider NPPF para 180a, which states that:

“if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused”.

While SNCIs are not defined as habitat sites in the NPPF, they are “biodiversity”. *Land at Novers Hill* is a designated SNCI site and remains governed by the provisions of the NPPF & the DEFRA 2006 *Local Sites* guidance. Its biodiversity should not be subjected to “significant harm”, per NPPF para 180a.

(3) The SNCI problem has arisen as a consequence of a BCC error during the 2013-14 where the Council mistakenly thought that it had the power to de-designate SNCI sites for housing, which it did not. *Land at Novers Hill* is yet another SNCI site, mostly in more economically-deprived parts of the city, allocated for housing in 2014. The SNCI protection and planning law processes were apparently not adequately understood, with planners and then elected officials making decisions that adversely affected some of the poorest people in the city.

It is time to be honest about the errors that were made (and the local plan map should be rectified, while it still can be – this is distinct from the local plan itself. The plan cannot be changed, the map can be. If you would like to see legal authority on this point, please do get in touch).

Land at Novers Hill is facing the same destruction as eight other sites, also designated as SNCIs but allocated for housing in 2014.

1. BC1 BSA1110 - *The Hangar Site and Filwood Park, north of Hengrove Way.*
2. BC16 BSA1201 - *Land at Broom Hill, Brislington.*
3. BC49 BSA1305 - *Land to the north-west of Vale Lane, Bedminster Down.*
4. BC54 BSA1124 - *Kingswear Road, Torpoint Road and Haldon Close.*
5. BC64 BSA1205 - *Wicklea and adjacent land, St Anne's / Broom Hill, nr Brislington.*
6. BC80 BSA1114 – *Land at Novers Hill, adjacent to industrial units.*
7. BC80 BSA1119 – *Land to east of Hartcliffe Way, south of the Waste Depot.*
8. BC108 BSA0402 - *Bonnington Walk former allotments site, Lockleaze.*

The planning law framework has been misunderstood. BCC could not – and have not – de-designated SNCIs. This was always clear from DEFRA 2006 and is now – finally – accepted. What is apparently not widely understood yet is that the SNCI designation has consequences, as do the underlying ecological conditions. It is insufficient to say that the housing allocation negates this – where is the support for this proposition, other than the Inspector’s decision in

Brislington Meadows, predicated in part on BCC's own arguments, again without legal support?

The proposed destruction of trees and habitat at *Land at Novers Hill* is not balanced by the contribution of new housing to the city. Brownfield sites should be found. The primary reason this site is proposed for development now is the 2014 plan. Until BCC uncovers the errors that were made at this time and/or brings in the emerging local plan at speed, these sites remain vulnerable to destruction. This has implications both for Bristol's commitment to the Ecological Emergency and also to the provision of nature and green space for people in the city who lack vehicles to access nature elsewhere (the census reveals that nearly 28% of people living in Filwood have no access to a car or van). Given the lack of reliable and affordable buses in Bristol, which rarely facilitate access to green spaces, how are people in challenging economic circumstances supposed to maintain access with nature, which we know is critical for health and wellbeing?

(4) I also object on the basis of the proposed parking spaces that exceed the Council's own guidance and lack of cycling provision.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Antonia Layard".

Antonia Layard

STATEMENT NUMBER A2

Dear Sirs,

I am writing to object to the proposed development of 157 new homes on the Western Slopes, near Knowle West. I have lived in the area for many years and have seen firsthand the impact that traffic, air pollution, and a lack of local services have had on the community.

I recently sold my house on Headley Lane due to my fear of what will become of the Western Slopes if this development is approved. The traffic in the morning already goes from Parson St Crossroads all the way up to Novers Lane, and this will only get worse with more traffic. I've just checked and "The only other air monitoring station that recorded an average of over 50µg/m³ was in South Bristol. All five of the monitoring stations located around the Parson Street gyratory recorded illegal levels of air pollution from vehicles, but the one on Bedminster Road closest to Parson Street school recorded 51.365 µg/m³." This is a serious health hazard, especially for children.

The 28 locations across Bristol where air pollution is illegal

In addition, there are not enough spaces at the local schools, GPs, or dentists. The site is also behind a recycling centre that is open 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. This will create noise and pollution that will make it even more difficult for people to live in the area.

I urge you to reject this proposal. The Western Slopes is a beautiful green space that should be protected, not developed. I have seen foxes, deer, red kites, Peregrine falcons, rabbits, bats, badgers, newts and all manner of wildlife on the slopes. There are many other brownfield sites in Bristol that could be used for housing instead.

In conclusion, the area is already at capacity. The transport infrastructure isn't there, the medical and education infrastructure isn't there. The location isn't suitable for housing being near a recycling centre. The wildlife will be irreversibly damaged!

There really isn't a positive reason for the development to go ahead!

Adam Wells



STATEMENT NUMBER A3

21/05164/F | *Erection of 157 no. dwellings (MAJOR).* | *Land On The West Side Of Novers Hill Bristol*

Whilst we endorse the officer's recommendation that this application be refused, it is disappointing that they have ignored our detailed comments referenced below. The following further matters are material to your consideration of this application and strengthen the grounds of refusal:

1. The development site is a **Valuable Urban Landscape** as defined in [SADMP DM17](#). This states that: '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 development proposals are not 'ancillary to the open space use' and so are not permitted. See our [07 November 2021](#) comments.
2. The whole of the development site (not just the narrow corridor shown on the [Local Plan Policies map](#), which is incorrectly drawn) is within the **Pigeonhouse Stream and adjacent meadows SNCI**. This was confirmed by the Local Plan Team Manager, when they responded to our Fol, [Deregistration of the SNCI at land on the west side of Novers Hill, Bristol \(21/05164/F\)](#): 'As previously discussed, there has not been a change to the SNCI information as shown on the Pinpoint system [[Pinpoint - Environment and planning](#)]. As has been explained in previous correspondence the 2014 local plan allocated the land referred to for development and so, in terms of the statutory local plan, parts of the SNCI are allocated for development. As there has been no change, there is no information to provide regarding "deregistration". Information about the local plan and SNCIs is in the public domain, as previously advised.' SADMP DM19 states that: 'Development which would have a harmful impact on the nature conservation value of a Site of Nature Conservation Interest will not be permitted.' This covers the whole site. See our [10 November 2022](#) and [10 March 2023](#) comments.
3. The hedgerow running along Novers Hill forms part of Novers Hill Common and so is protected under [Core Strategy](#) policies BCS9 & BCS22. It may not be developed without the permission of the Secretary of State.
4. The hedgerow is also an Important Hedgerow as defined by the [Hedgerow Regulations 1997](#).
5. The applicant has used a redundant version of the Biodiversity Net Gain Metric (BNG 2.0) which has now been superseded by three subsequent iterations, the current one being BNG 4.0. Furthermore, their habitat data was full of anomalies. See our [25 October 2021](#) comments.
6. However, the applicant now accepts that the development proposals will result in the net loss of **46.34%** biodiversity which will need to be delivered offsite. They state that 'this will comprise the purchase of biodiversity credits from the biodiversity gain site. The security of the biodiversity credits will be secured through a planning obligation which will be in place prior to commencement of development.' This is not enough. At best, their proposal is a hope without any certainty. They are obliged to set out its detailed proposals before the application is approved so that the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) requirement to '... identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity'¹ is met. They have failed to secure any measurable gains. See our [7 February 2022](#) comments.
7. NPPF, Paragraph 180 a) states that 'if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission

¹ paragraph 179 b)



Statement to DCC B - Wednesday 19 July 2023

should be refused.' The applicant has failed to do this, and so the application must be refused.

Bristol Tree Forum
14 July 2023

STATEMENT NUMBER A4

Dear ladies and gentlemen

I am a resident in the area near Novers Hill. The green spaces in the area are a heaven for wildlife and should be preserved and protected, especially as the need for wildlife corridors is getting more recognised.

I object to any building happening at Novers slopes and any of the green spaces surrounding it. I recognise the need for human housing, but not if it means more destruction of habitat (housing) for other than human life forms. Surely more houses can be build on brown sides / places that are already concreted over, without the need to destroy a thriving habitat.

Kind regards

Birgit Muller

STATEMENT NUMBER A6

To whom it may concern,

Again the people of South Bristol find themselves fighting against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there, given the new recycling centre which is great but has added traffic to the area already. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to cause total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already has one of the worst air pollution rates of any school in the UK. Please do not kill those children!

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours faithfully

Lorraine Fairbanks

STATEMENT NUMBER A7

To whom it may concern,

I would like to join others in condemning the proposal to build on the Western Slopes and I am unhappy with again needing to fight against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollution levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to cause total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours Sincerely,

Ben Swinson

STATEMENT NUMBER A8

Good afternoon,

I am contacting you to raise my concerns about the proposed housing development on Novers Hill/Northern slopes.

I live immediately next to the woodland on Haldon Close. I object to the proposal on both environmental and health issues.

The woodlands are extensive with native flora and fauna including badgers, foxes, bats, slow worms, many different types of bird life including blue tits, chaffinches, Jays, wood pigeons and even buzzards and many others. Insect life is also crucial including dragonflies, damsonflies, demoiselle, multiples of bees and wasps and butterflies. All of these creatures visit my gardens (which back on to the woods). I am particularly worried about the bats as these are protected species under threat. They feed on the insects in my garden and I watch them avidly.

The loss of this woodland will be a disaster for both local people and for Bristol generally.

The other issue is that there was previously a pre-fab development complex on this site. Meaning that when these buildings were demolished decades ago and were left to re-wild because of the concerns around asbestos in the ground from the prefabricated buildings which had been torn down. Any development will mean disturbing this topsoil. This must be considered a health issue for local people. The development will be a disaster. This is one of few places where we can still hear owls every evening. Children can play out safely as there's no traffic and the community as a whole enjoy the clean air and walk or move around in a green environment. CAZ has compromised this as the charges start at Coronation Road as people are using this area to access Bristol to avoid the congestion charges.

The children and young people in this area all benefit from the wonderful green spaces on the slopes and Novers Hill. To build on this would be an act of environmental vandalism. I have counted multiple species of butterflies, bees, dragonflies etc. These species depend on the long-term provision of woodland meadows, grasses and water sources. We have otters living in Crock Bottom which is along this wildlife corridor. They are also under threat. This proposal must be stopped.

Yours sincerely

Michelle Ruse

STATEMENT NUMBER A9

Why oh why do I find myself writing yet another objection to the building of houses on the area known as the Western Slopes. There are countless perfectly good reasons NOT to build there but they are being completely ignored. The current planning committee should unanimously reject any plans to build there now and in the future. This area is loved and cared for by the local community of which I belong and should therefore stay as it is. This small piece of natural beauty should not be destroyed but enjoyed.

Regards

S Harvey

STATEMENT NUMBER A10

To whom it may concern,

Again the people of South Bristol find themselves fighting against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to caus total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours Sincerely,

Hannah Griffiths

STATEMENT NUMBER A11

To whom it may concern,

I am raising my objection to the application to build housing on this site.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and is not suitable for development.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site reduces pollution levels for the traffic on Hartcliffe way.

Access from Novers Hill would be a problem, especially for services, as the site is so steep it will be problematic for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe Way would add to congestion that is already a problem there. The large number of houses proposed would also generate a large number of vehicle movements and cause gridlock in the St John's Lane area and increase vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

This development would lead to the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace - and have a disastrous effect on associated wildlife. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups.

The U.K. is one of the most mature-depleted countries in the world. We need to protect the few habitats we have left.

I urge the planning committee to reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours sincerely,

Clare Stevens

STATEMENT NUMBER A12

To the planning application meeting team,

Again we, the people of South Bristol find ourselves fighting against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site, The western slopes, Novers Hill.

For many reasons this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollution levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site. Novers hill is narrow and would not be able to be made wider due to the ancient hedgerow. It would be dangerous and unsafe.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there, particularly to the newly routed metrobus.

The large number of houses proposed will also produce huge vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers, as well as the existing residents.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution, there is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups and a current huge wildlife population, including otters.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours Sincerely,

Shareena Marshall

Novers hill Resident

STATEMENT NUMBER A13

The lack of infrastructure in South Bristol cannot support the hundreds of new dwellings already built in the area with many more in the pipeline.

The councils priority should be on providing secondary school places not on adding to the problem of over population in this area.

The Western Slopes is a valuable open green space supporting wildlife including birds of prey, and garden birds many of which are in decline.

The plan to make the entrance and exit to the development on Novers Hill is ludicrous, it is a quiet road bordered by trees and hedgerows which will be destroyed, and will add to the pollution in the area.

I beg the council to turn down this unnecessary and unwanted plan.

Sylvia Hughes

STATEMENT NUMBER A14

To whom it may concern,

Again the people of South Bristol find themselves fighting against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to caus total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of developement.

Yours Sincerely,

Karen Jest

STATEMENT NUMBER A15

To whom it may concern

I would like to put forward my objection to the proposed building on the Novers Hill site.

I note this is a greenfield site and it forms part of a wildlife corridor with Crox Bottom.

There are several mature trees and a range of wildlife here.

Please reconsider this unacceptable proposal.

Yours Faithfully

Claire Shute (local Resident)

STATEMENT NUMBER A16

Hello

I have previously objected to this development and feel I should email yet again as this need to stop now and not allow any further applications in this lane. I live on Novers Hill and it is not about me losing my view etc but it is about losing the habitat for the wildlife that is there. The land is not suitable for These dwellings either and the extra traffic it would create so close to busy roads now like the Hartcliffe Way etc would have a detrimental effect on CO2 gases and people's health.

The original objections to this application should also be key as they included one from Chris Packham and key environmental organisations.

Please do the right things and end this nonsense!

Sincerely

Dave Cridge

Novers Hill Resident

STATEMENT NUMBER A17

Dear Sir / madam

Here is my statement which I wish to contribute to the committee meeting deciding this application on Wednesday 19th July.

The Council's own planning officers have recommended that this application be refused. Please would the committee accept this recommendation and once and for all protect this site from development. The access to the proposed development requires making Novers Hill a one way street which is not viable and will be dangerous for all users of the road. There are also issues about bin lorries not being able to access the site. The affordable homes section of the development is to act as a sound barrier, the socially-housed residents being used as human shields in their homes to reduce the noise levels from the nearby recycling centre reaching the market rate housing. How can it be ethical and acceptable to use lower income people in this way, putting them in houses with non-opening windows? That's Dickensian!

Please, Bristol City Council, act wisely. Not all that long ago you voted unanimously to protect Bristol's green spaces from development. Since then, we have had the utter disaster of Brislington Meadows being lost to development, and the ongoing fiasco of incompetence and lack of leadership in relation to protecting Yew Tree Farm. Bristol says it is a green city which has declared an Ecological Emergency. Please stop this damaging proposal which will impact especially on a less affluent part of the city. The only people who want this proposal to go ahead are Lovells shareholders. Not local residents, not concerned residents of other parts of Bristol like myself, not your own planning officers and not the many many other species who cannot speak up for themselves but who have long called this beautiful site home.

Please reject this application.

Yours faithfully

Catherine Robson

STATEMENT NUMBER A18

The Green party has called for a new charter based on building the Right Homes in the Right Place at the Right Price. I support this and therefore oppose development on the Western Slopes as it meets none of these objectives.

Lovell have shown utter incompetence throughout with a succession of rejected, under-surveyed and poorly researched applications. They demonstrate a shocking disregard for the occupants of the social housing, using them as a sound barrier for the more affluent house owners. How can we now expect them to change their ways and build affordable, quality housing for local people.

This is quite obviously not the right place. The transport plan is flawed and dangerous, the development is next to a recycling centre on one of South Bristol's increasingly scarce areas of grassland, rich in ecological diversity and a vital wildlife corridor - acting as a vital balance to the expanding urban environment to its north.

We should pressure developers to make good on all their existing brownfield commitments first before losing more ecological diversity to corporations interested only in their bottom line. I completely oppose this development.

STATEMENT NUMBER A19

Dear Bristol City Council

While I recognise housing is desperately needed, I feel that building on the Novers Hill Slopes will be counter intuitive to the gorgeous green space this offers to many. It hosts horses, many wildlife species and many established trees which are essential for mental health.

The affordable homes that the company purport rarely come to fruition, it's just what they need to put down on the paperwork to get approval.

The noise and extra traffic impact for Novers and the Hartcliffe Way will be devastating.

PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS BEAUTIFUL GREEN SPACE TO BE USED FOR ANYTHING OTHER THAN IT IS NOW!

Yours faithfully

Rachael Wilson

STATEMENT NUMBER A20

To whom it may concern

I have to raise my objection in the strongest possible terms, to the proposed development of the above site.

This is a greenfield site and should stay that way. Build houses on land already used for this purpose (brownfield).

It would be a travesty for Bristol, and more specifically, south Bristol, to lose this valuable Greenspace.

This area houses much wildlife, and also is a green lung for this area.

Also, the amount of extra traffic all of these proposed houses would cause, would be too much for this area, specifically, Novers Hill, Novers Lane, Parson Street and Hartcliffe way. At least 400 more cars would cause gridlock. Novers hill especially, would be much more dangerous.

Also, the extra strain on the existing infrastructure (such as schools, doctors surgeries and the like).

Please Bristol council, as I thought we were living in a green city, leave the green spaces & the wildlife alone.

I urge you to reconsider this unrealistic proposal and refuse it once and for all.

Yours,

John Davey

STATEMENT NUMBER A21

Re:

Application No. 21/05164/F: Land On The West Side Of Novers Hill Bristol.

I write to you with deep concern that you are about to make an irreversible error of judgement in granting planning permission for the above-mentioned site.

Of "Primary importance" to protect our biodiversity in your actions is fundamental to your position in decision making yet we already see attempts at undermining the protection this important site has. Removing the SNCI for this site will make a mockery of the system and not only damage this site but set a precedent for all other Sites of Nature Conservation Interest. There is no "Plan B" for our wildlife, the hundreds of years of established ecological systems cannot be replaced for hundreds of years, it's underground too. Important microorganisms and fungi mycelium work with plants to provide an additional 30%+ soil carbon efficiency. This cannot be replaced and effects the air that we all breath.

The goal should be to increase connectivity to this site for all wildlife some of which cannot even bridge gaps in hedges. Where is wildlife supposed to live if we undermine the protection of the few fragments left?

Please, I ask you: do not grant permission to build on this important site.

Kind regards,

Simon Harding.

STATEMENT NUMBER A22

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to object in the strongest way to the above proposed development of the Western slopes.

As you are aware, this is a greenfield site and should never be built on for anything. Please only build on brownfield sites.

Bristol has always prided itself on being a green city, or has that changed?

This proposed development will cause much greater traffic in this local area with another 800 cars etc.

The local services are barely able to cope with the existing amount of people.

Please, also think about the wildlife on the site at the moment, where are they to go, or don't you care?

Being almost in the country, with the views was the thing that attracted us to this area almost 40 years ago.

Lastly, remember that you (the planners) will be judged in the future for what happens here, now.

Bristol does not want this, nor do the local people, and the development should be REFUSED.

Tracey Davey

STATEMENT NUMBER A23

Hello,

I would like to register my objection to the housing development application on the Western Slopes and Novers Hill.

Aside from it being too steep and aside from the "affordable housing" section being a cynical joke my objection is overwhelmingly for the following reason:

Too much green land and nature has been destroyed by us already.

No more green land should be lost.

Build on brownfield and sites that have already been taken from nature.

Build up a bit.

I know it's more expensive but it is possible and imperative.

We need more homes but we don't have to destroy any more nature to do it.

Yours sincerely,

Alec Jennings

Bristol (south)

STATEMENT NUMBER A24

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please see below, my statement regarding the above planning application:

I was born in Knowle West nearly 80 years ago. I played on the slopes as a child. The slopes are a haven for wildlife and this is and should have absolutely been, a material planning consideration. There are lots of native trees and wildflowers. Why would you want to spoil this? Build on brownfield first. There are so many sites along the Hartcliffe Way that could be put to better use, if the council bothered to understand the area and us locals. Please leave the slopes alone!

Thank you

Norman Gilliam



Manor Woods Valley Group - A25

In Response to Planning Application – Ref 21/05164/F - Land on the West Side of Novers Hill, Bristol

This response is framed in the context of four published Strategy Documents:

One City Plan – third iteration – 2021 (ref 1)

“It describes the product of our city’s commitment to come together to agree on and work towards the future we want for Bristol to 2050 and the steps we need to take to achieve it”

One City Ecological Emergency Strategy – September 2020 (ref 2)

“Bristol was the first UK city to declare an Ecological Emergency. This is our city’s opportunity to come together and take positive action for nature while tackling some of our biggest challenges.”

West of England Nature Partnership (WENP) Nature Recovery Network – July 2021 (ref 3)

“To reverse the declines in biodiversity and realise nature’s recovery at scale, we need to work together and on the landscape-scale to embed the Lawton principles of Bigger, Better, More and Joined Up into our policies and strategies. This means protecting and enhancing our existing natural habitats, but also making them bigger, creating new areas of species-rich habitat, and, critically, ensuring they join up to create functional and resilient ecological networks that enable nature and people to thrive.”

**Bristol City Council Ecological Emergency Action Plan 2021 -2025 –
September 2021(ref 4) – includes much repetition of the One City Ecology
Emergency Strategy (ref 2)**

“As an organisation, Bristol City Council is committed to addressing the ecological emergency, with a wide range of work going on within the council, with partners and with residents, to help meet the One City Ecological Emergency Strategy goals by 2030.”

Manor Woods Valley Group's Position

The Manor Woods Valley Group (MWVG) responds to local, and potentially more distant, development proposals and planning applications that could have any appreciable impact (negative or positive) on local, and potentially wider, ecology and biodiversity. We test developments against the criteria and targets for the preservation and improvement of the natural environment contained in the three strategy documents.

This document lays out statements contained in the aforementioned strategy documents, especially those that we have highlighted, against which we test proposals and/or applications. As these statements are drawn from environment related strategy documents prepared or sponsored by Bristol City Council (BCC), this means that we test proposals/applications against the Council's own stated aims and policies.

We challenge and require, using the words and phrases contained in the strategies, Council officers and elected representatives, to justify why the proposed development should over-ride the aims and desired outcomes of the environment related strategy documents. We will question the worth of the Council's contribution to, and stated support for, these strategies if their decision-making processes and outcomes is contrary to the environmental elements of these strategies.

As a principle, we reject any suggestion that site planning designations contained in the local plan of 2014 over-ride the aims, conclusions and measures proposed in the strategy documents. The latter post-date the local plan and highlight the immediacy of the environmental issues that we face in the city and beyond. These issues were not as well understood or appreciated at the time the local plan was published.

Referencing the four strategy documents in this document does not preclude MWVG referencing other BCC or third-party strategy documents or querying other aspects of the application, for example the scope and/or veracity of supporting survey data and/or interpretation of same. A second response describes our reservations with regards to the ecological assessment associated with this application.

Statements Contained in the Strategy Documents

The Issues Identified in the Documents:

Nature is in decline globally, nationally and within the West of England, threatening our health, prosperity and security. The need to act is urgent, as recognised by declarations of ecological emergencies in the West of England. To reverse the decline and deliver nature's recovery, we need to work to Lawton's Principles and create bigger, better, more and joined-up habitats. (ref 3)

Bristol has already suffered major losses in wildlife. In urban areas, housing developments, commercial building and roads have replaced and fragmented wildlife habitats. We have tidied away the places where wildlife used to live, we have paved over our front gardens and filled up the holes in our buildings where birds used to nest. These losses matter to all of us because of the crucial role that wildlife and ecosystems

play in supporting life on earth...we need to change the way we're interacting with nature, because what we're doing now isn't working. (ref 2).

We don't have the luxury to delay any longer, time is running out fast. (ref 2) "2021 must be the year to change gear and put the world on track. We need to move from death to health; from disaster to reconstruction; from despair to hope; from business as usual to transformation. The Sustainable Development Goals are more important now than ever." - Antonio Guterres, Secretary-General of the United Nations (ref 1)

Development has been a significant driver of loss of wildlife in urban areas, with buildings, roads and other transport routes contributing to the destruction and fragmentation of habitats. We need to ensure that we're learning lessons from the past and building new houses and transport links that put back lost habitats and wildlife corridors. (ref 2)

With the West of England Combined Authority (WECA) and the West of England councils having each declared a Climate Emergency, the strategy is now more relevant than ever ensuring that our network of multifunctional urban and rural green space responds to the climate and ecological emergency. (ref 3)

The Solutions proposed in the documents:

To reverse the declines in biodiversity and realise nature's recovery at scale, we need to work together and, on the landscape-scale to embed the Lawton principles of Bigger, Better, More and Joined Up into our policies and strategies. This means protecting and enhancing our existing natural habitats, but also making them bigger, creating new areas of species-rich habitat, and, critically, ensuring they join up to create functional and resilient ecological networks that enable nature and people to thrive. (ref 3)

Government's 25 Year Environment Plan published in January 2018 includes a commitment to "develop a Nature Recovery Network to protect and restore wildlife, and provide opportunities to re-introduce species that we have lost from our countryside." (ref 3)

If we are to halt the decline of wildlife and start to restore nature's abundance, we need to stop destroying wildlife habitats... (and) ... ensure that remaining habitats are protected, connected and restored. We need to tackle the twin threats of climate and ecological breakdown to save our planet for people and wildlife. Fortunately, it's not too late to act and we know the solutions, but we need to act now. We need to make the next ten years a decade of transformation, to make Bristol a haven for wildlife by 2030 ... (and to) restore the natural systems on which we depend. (We need to) reduce our city's ecological footprint. (ref 2) ... we will ... protect and enhance green spaces ... (ref 1)

WENP has led the development of a vision for a Nature Recovery Network (NRN) in the West of England as a joined up network of marine and terrestrial habitats where nature and people can thrive. (ref 3)

Key drivers - Legislation and strategies informing the Ecological Emergency Action Plan: **West of England (WoE) Nature Recovery Network**; WoE Green Infrastructure Strategy; WoE BNG Guidance and Implementation Plan; WoE Natural Capital Account Environment Agency (EA); WoE Tree and Woodland Strategy; West of England Spatial Development Strategy (ref 4)

“**From today**, we will work together as a city to **ensure that 30% of Bristol’s land is managed for nature**. We will create space for nature, and unite to find new, fair and inclusive ways to reduce and eliminate the threats to habitats and wildlife. Together we will take action for nature so that both people and wildlife can benefit.” (ref 1 & 2) The Environment Board aims to accelerate Bristol’s response to the climate and ecological emergencies (ref 1)

... **all remaining green spaces** are now a **vital refuge for pollinators and other wildlife**. ...we need to: Protect remaining wildlife habitats and care for them better. Work together to provide more habitat for wildlife throughout the city ... (and) Ensure that new developments adopt the highest standards of design, working with nature to provide positive benefits to people and wildlife.... (ref 2)

Bristol City Council has an important role to play in contributing to the goals of the One City Ecological Strategy and the One City Climate Strategy. This Ecological Emergency Action Plan seeks to **put nature at the heart of decision-making in the council**, to deliver a healthier city for people and wildlife that will be carbon neutral and climate resilient by 2030. This Action Plan is a council-wide programme of activities to deliver on the ambitions of the One City Ecological Emergency Strategy and relevant aspects of the One City Climate Strategy (ref. 4)

Ensure all developments, including strategic projects, within the West of England deliver a net gain in biodiversity and stringent standards for resource efficiency
Bristol City Council is working with neighbouring authorities to ensure that net gain is achieved across the West of England Combined Authority area. ... we know **we need greener developments that retain and integrate habitats and green space and incorporate new green roofs, living walls and amenity spaces**. We need to make sure we’re making space for nature, in existing houses, offices and highways. (ref 2)

... we also need to **replace some of the lost nesting and resting places that our buildings used to provide** through the addition of features such as bird boxes, swift chimneys and bat bricks.

To meet these goals we must ... **take significant action on the environment**. We are not alone in this challenge, and we will build on the work of many others around the globe. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) will help us to put social inclusion and **environmental sustainability at the heart of recovery planning**, and this strategy is aligned with, and will be measured against the SDGs. ... (ref 1)

2020’s lockdown restrictions resulted in many experienced **a new connection with and reliance upon the local environment**. However, these were not achieved through voluntary choices and we have been working with the Economy and Skills Board to ensure that the One City Economic Recovery and Renewal Strategy has the climate and ecological emergencies at its heart in order to achieve **long-term and sustainable**

transformation. We aim to ensure that the global recognition Bristol has earned for its work to become more sustainable to date is matched by its efforts to achieve a green and fair recovery from COVID-19. (ref 1)

Bristol City Council has a key role to play in the delivery of the One City Ecological Emergency Strategy, as it owns or manages over a third of land (including developed land) across the city, and has statutory environmental duties and obligations. These relate to the protection of habitat and wildlife that are set out in European conventions, national legislation and national, sub-regional and local policy. (ref 4)

The Results if the proposals in the documents come to fruition:

...**the benefits of protecting natural spaces outweigh the costs at least five to one.** (ref 2)

(Post-Covid) ...Our overarching priorities are: ... to **increase the city's resilience and environmental sustainability** ... (ref 1) ... (The) pandemic has shown us the **importance of nature in Bristol and the interconnectedness of our ecosystem.**

(In 2021) ... Citywide activity launched to engage citizens on **pathways to achieving Bristol's 2030 climate and ecological goals..** Ensure community and business led nature-based solutions are delivering multiple benefits e.g. **improving habitats** and reduce flooding and pollution across the West of England.

(By) 2024 ... **Wildlife-friendly food growing areas have been established in every ward in the city,** using regenerative approaches to replenish the soil and manage water.

(By) 2028 ... There has been **a sustained increase in public engagement with biodiversity,** with conservation volunteering and pro-environmental behaviours widespread.

(by) **2030 ... 30% of land in the city is managed for nature ...**

(By) **2033 ... Bristol is supporting a wider range of wildlife,** with the return of species such as pine marten, red kite and beavers

(By) **2034 ...20% of food consumed in the city comes from sustainable producers in the city region**

(By) **2035 ... Tree canopy cover has increased by a 25% since 2018**

(By) 2036 ... **Bristol's inclusive approach to tackling the climate and ecological emergencies is recognised as world-leading.** Bristol's urban biodiversity and habitats are a key highlight of the city's tourism industry.

(By) 2037 ... There is a **significant increase in the number of urban farmers and volume of urban food produced** for local markets and communities. The long-term **decline in the number of bees and pollinating insects has been reversed** following identification and protection of key populations and habitats. **As a result of measures taken to**

address the climate and ecological emergencies, health outcomes have improved in every ward.

(By) 2038 ... 100% of all suitable council owned land is now used for local food production.

(By) 2039 ... food shops, including supermarkets, are stocked with local food to reduce food miles and improve local food resilience. 'Nature is important for our existence and we need it to help manage our physical and mental health as well as our wellbeing.' - Birdgirl (Mya-Rose Craig)

(By) 2041 ... Everyone has access to excellent quality green space within a 10-minute walk from their home.

(By) 2044 ,, The abundance of wildlife has doubled compared to 2018 levels.

(By) 2045 ... Tree canopy cover has doubled since 2018.

(By) 2047 ... Bristol's ecological habitats and biodiversity are at levels never seen before in the city and amongst the best for any urban environment globally.

(By) 2049 ... 50% of land across the Bristol city region is managed for the benefit of wildlife and Bristol is playing an active role in wildlife management across the South West. It's 2050 and Bristol is a sustainable city, with a low impact on our planet and a healthy environment for all. Across the city ... tree canopy provides shade, and the birdsong is lively. ... Bristol has become a ... nature rich and climate resilient city Bristol will have an abundance of wildlife, all people will benefit from healthy natural environment. (ref 1)

In Conclusion:

For the aforementioned reasons MWVG fails to see how permitting development of greenfield Land on the West Side of Novers Hill will contribute to solving the issues identified, the solutions proposed and the outcomes desired, in the four strategy documents referred to. Indeed, permitting development of the site would contribute to the issues, and be directly contrary to the solutions and outcomes, contained in the strategy documents.

Peter Loy-Hancocks BSc(Hons) former MCIEEM
For and on behalf of Manor Woods Valley Group

STATEMENT NUMBER A26

to whom it may concern,

I would like to express my disappointment and anger re the application to build houses on this important green space known as Western Slopes which is an important site for wildlife and a recreational space for local residents for exercise and mental wellbeing. I am also concerned at the felling of a large number of mature trees and hedgerows, which although the developer intends to replace with saplings which will take about 30 years to mature!

The most worrying aspect of this development is the steepness of the Slopes and according to reports the unstable aspect of the area I also recall Mr.Mayor promising that nNO green spaces would be used in future as there are many brownfield sites that could be utilized.

Therefore, I strongly object to this application.

A concerned Bristolian.

M.Hepper{Mrs}

STATEMENT NUMBER A27

I dont want the trees and bushes cut dow because your telling us we cant drive cars because of causing bad air, but the trees and bushes help to keep the air clean.

But why does that want you to remove the trees and bushes to build houses when the loss of the meadow will cause even more pollution.The trees and the bushes are good for all the wild life in the area so why do you want to spoil that building new houses.Due to the site being on the hill and not good road access how will residents be able to gain access to their property.There is also no shops in the area.

Leave Novers Hill alone. the view we have from our house is wonderful we dont want it spoiled.

SAVE OUR SLOPES.

STATEMENT NUMBER A28

To whom it may concern.

I would like to register my objection to the proposed Novers Hill development.

The site is part of a green corridor and has a lot of wildlife. I've seen otters, kingfisher, buzzards, foxes and much more.

I was driving back from the recycling and reuse centre recently and thinking how lovely it was to have such a nice green avenue to the Imperial Retail Park.

There has been so much building in Bristol recently and South Bristol services such as GP, dentist etc are overwhelmed as it is. There does not seem to be any thought to include any additional infrastructure. Also the pandemic proved how important areas of green space are important.

This is a steep site that is not ideal for building and more tarmac, concrete etc will mean more run off to the lower areas. Surely there are more suitable areas on which to build than a valuable wildlife space designated SNCI.

The Northern Slopes Initiative describes the area as "A nature reserve for the health and wellbeing of people and wildlife. They are a nature reserve where people and wildlife can thrive." Would the new housing benefit people already living in the area (many have lived in the area all their lives) as much as the nature?.

I think it would be a travesty to build on this area, what with all the additional proposed building on the old airfield and would add additional strains to the already overwhelmed infrastructure of the wider area.

Kind regards
Elaine Beck

STATEMENT NUMBER A29

Statement from The Friends of the Western Slopes Novers Hill Julia Victor

This was never about stopping housing. This was about making sure that where we are building, is the right place, with the right infrastructure, with a positive impact on the local community. Novers Hill is not this place. It is one of the steepest hillsides in Bristol; the old road to Dundry. A piece of our past so prominent, that it can be seen from the Suspension Bridge. In planning terms, a prominent green hillside. Indeed, that is why they fight to build here, because of the views that will make a few very rich and the poor suffer, yet again, from losing a treasured green space. If only we were the posh NIMBYS we've heard so much about.

If only the Hartcliffe Way were a high street, like the developers claimed; if only the bus stopped closer so we don't have to walk for over a mile; if only the gradient of Novers Hill wasn't so dangerously steep that those using a wheelchair or a pram could walk it on a daily basis; if only there wasn't so much soil being removed that it will cause the entire hillside to become unstable; if only the recycling centre, ETM waste metal crusher and industrial sites weren't so noisy that some new homes will be used as sound barrier (the social housing by the way). If only the windows in these proposed new homes could find a quiet time to be open. If only Novers Hill became one-way and caused a bottle neck on surrounding roads and collisions with cyclists, coming out from behind an ancient hedgerow with Town and Village Green status. If only the hundreds of native Hawthorns on the Site of Nature Conservation that is Novers Hill could be simply chopped down and never replaced, in a time of ecological declarations and clean air zones. If only the long-established badger sett would simply get filled in and the Horseshoe Bats and the meadow go somewhere else. To Nailsea perhaps, away from Bristol completely.

By refusing this application, you will be stopping this utterly ridiculous proposal and making sure none of the above blights the people and wildlife of South Bristol ever again.

Local people have fought to protect Novers Hill for decades - with the first development proposal in 1965. Refused, by the way, on grounds of transport and access issues and damage to wildlife. And here we are today, with history repeating itself. We are angry, disappointed and exhausted. But we keep fighting for Novers Hill because we know we are right. This site isn't deliverable. This site isn't suitable for housing. This site is for the next generation to learn about nature, a place for rare wildlife to thrive amongst an increasing urban landscape; a place that supports the city's clean air and place that the city can be proud of. The Environment Agency, Avon Wildlife Trust, The RSPB and Chris Packham agree too. Yes, Novers Hill, that Site of Nature Conservation, along the Hartcliffe Way, between little Knowle West and Bishopsworth, where the horses have grazed for centuries. And before you say, well, where do we build? On the old brownfield school site on Novers Lane, that's where. A housing design has already been chosen for that, leaving our lowland calcareous grassland, native woodland and Pigeonhouse Stream and its otter population, well-alone.

You have the chance now to make sure that the 737 objections - an unprecedented number for a site in South Bristol - get heard today. This transcends political lines. Fifty eight years of tears end now, let's save our slopes once and for all.

Introduction:

This objection highlights numerous material planning considerations that demonstrate the significant harm that would result from the proposed development. According to planning legislation, an application should not be accepted if there are material considerations indicating otherwise. This objection is supported by facts and evidence, including references to Bristol City Council planning portal and government policies, ensuring its validity and strength against potential scrutiny from planning inspectors.

Ecology:

1. **Unacceptable Ecological Harm:** Experts agree that the proposed development will cause irreparable harm to a nationally rare habitat (Calcareous grassland) and disrupt a vital wildlife corridor. This site is home to 11 out of the 18 UK bat species including the rare Greater Horseshoe Bat. This is remarkable for an urban green space and should be protected as a nature reserve.

Sources: Avon Wildlife Trust, Bristol City Council ecologists, Environment Agency, Chris Packham.

2. **Ecological surveys are insufficient and outdated:** The government policy states that applications without the appropriate ecological surveys must be refused. This is because you need to consider the full impact of the proposal on protected species before you can grant planning permission.

Sources: CIEEM, Natural England

3. **Failure to Meet Biodiversity Net Gain:** The development fails to meet the required 10% biodiversity net gain, even with the use of an outdated metric. Furthermore, the applicant has not identified a suitable Bristol site to offset the biodiversity loss.

Sources: Bristol City Council Ecological Emergency Action Plan, Avon Wildlife Trust, government guidelines.

4. **Damage to Protected Ancient Hedgerow:** The access roads planned for the development would damage a protected ancient hedgerow, impacting the connectivity of the wildlife corridor.

Sources: Hedgerows Regulations Act 1997, expert opinions.

5. **No Appropriate Offsetting:** The applicant plans to offset the biodiversity loss using a private landowner in Nailsea, North Somerset. This is effectively stealing nature from a deprived area of Bristol and transferring it to a wealthy landowner in a different county.

Sources: Applicants documents.

Health and Safety:

6. **Objection from Transport Development Management:** The Transport Development Management has raised substantial objections to the proposed development and referred to the applicants report as 'Wholly misleading'. There are unavoidable safety issues with the proposed cycle path and making Novers Hill one way.

Sources: Bristol City Council planning portal TDM objection.

7. **Inadequate Sound Mitigation for Affordable Flats:** The proposed development requires alternative ventilation for affordable flats due to their use as sound barriers for market rate housing.

Sources: Planning documents, sound survey.

8. **Surface Water and Drainage Concerns:** The proposed development raises serious concerns about surface water and drainage management.

Source: Planning Portal- Flood Risk Officer comments

Local Policy Constraints:

9. **Town & Village Green Status:** Novers Common holds Town & Village Green status, requiring deregulation for the proposed access roads.

Sources: Government regulations.

10. **Historical Planning Decisions:** The site has a long history of planning refusals, including multiple appeals, spanning at least 60 years.

Sources: Previous planning decisions, appeals.

Other Concerns:

11. **Incorrect Information in Planning Documents:** The applicant's planning documents contain several instances of incorrect information, which raises concerns about the accuracy and reliability of their claims.

Sources: Planning documents.

12. **Viability Issues:** The proposed development faces viability issues that may lead to the applicant backing out of their affordable housing obligation.

Sources: The applicant has backed out of their s106 agreements before in Telford

Conclusion:

Based on the numerous material planning considerations outlined above, it is evident that the proposed development does not align with local and national planning policies. The potential harm caused by this development significantly outweighs any potential housing benefits. It is imperative that this application is rejected to preserve the ecological integrity, protect local policy constraints, ensure health and safety, and address other valid concerns. We must prioritize the long-term well-being of our community and environment.

STATEMENT NUMBER A31

As confirmed by the Avon Wildlife Trust, this is a VITAL WILDLIFE CORRIDOR.

"Avon Wildlife Trust recognises Bristol's Western Slopes as a vital wildlife corridor, and stands with those people calling it to be protected from development.

This area, located on the slopes between Novers Hill and Hartcliffe Way, is a particularly important habitat for a wide variety of birds, mammals and rare wildflowers. We recognise that there is considerable concern from local residents that it may be vulnerable to development, and we echo their calls for it to be protected."

<https://www.avonwildlifetrust.org.uk/news/support-bristols-green-spaces>

The ecological survey carried out by Ethos Environmental Planning shows that the slopes are home to wildlife including badgers and many species of bats, including rare horseshoe bats.

<https://novershillconsultation.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/Novers-Hill-draft-ecological-assessment-with-location-of-badger-sett-redacted.pdf>

There is no excuse for building on this green space when there are brownfield sites available, especially in a city that claims to be sustainable and wants to be net zero. This proposed development is completely at odds with the One City Ecological Emergency Strategy and One City Climate Strategy. The Council continuing to approve such proposed developments undermines its stance and makes the strategies look like all words and no actions. How can the Council wilfully act in opposition to its own strategies? The Council's reputation is only one thing that would be damaged should this development go ahead.

Most concerning is the proposed damage to a biodiverse wildlife habitat which has a wealth of species, including protected ones. It is an invaluable wildlife corridor which is a treasure so close to the city centre. It is so important to local residents who care deeply about preserving and enjoying the local flora and fauna. We the local residents are taking environmental concerns much more seriously than the Council - shame on you! Please show us we can still have some faith that BCC will act in the best interests of Bristol's residents and Bristol's physical space. Our confidence is rapidly dwindling.

STATEMENT NUMBER A32

To whom it may concern,

I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to you as a concerned resident of South Bristol regarding a pressing matter that has ignited strong opposition within our community. We are once again faced with the imminent threat of an inappropriate development proposal on an unsuitable site, and we implore your urgent attention and support.

At the heart of our argument lies the intrinsic value of the greenfield site in question. This precious parcel of land, proven time and again to be an SNCI (Site of Nature Conservation Interest), is not merely a stretch of grass but a cherished sanctuary that nurtures both biodiversity and the well-being of our local ecosystem. Its destruction and vandalism through construction would be an irreparable loss to our community and the environment at large.

One of our primary concerns revolves around access to the proposed development site. The steep incline and challenging topography make it nearly impossible for essential services, such as bin lorries and emergency vehicles, to navigate the area effectively if access is limited to Novers Hill alone. We foresee significant logistical challenges and potential delays in providing crucial services to the community as a result. Additionally, considering Hartcliffe Way as an access route would exacerbate the already severe congestion issues plaguing the area, which we believe would be an ill-advised and unsustainable solution.

Moreover, the potential ramifications of this development on traffic congestion and pollution levels are deeply troubling. The proposed large number of houses would inevitably lead to a surge in vehicle movements, causing complete gridlock in the already strained St. John's Lane vicinity. This, in turn, would expose the surrounding areas, including the esteemed Parson Street Primary School, to alarming levels of vehicle pollution. As responsible stewards of our community's well-being, we must not allow such risks to compromise the health and safety of our children and residents.

Equally concerning is the ecological impact of this development. Over 500 mature trees, each standing as a testament to nature's resilience, would face a grim fate. These majestic guardians not only provide a habitat for countless species but also act as a crucial shield against pollution, absorbing harmful substances and purifying our air. The loss of such a significant number of trees would leave a void that, despite reforestation efforts, would take decades to restore, never quite attaining the same splendour and environmental benefits.

Lastly, we cannot overlook the profound emotional significance this site holds for our community. The slopes are cherished by residents who seek solace in their tranquil walks and provide a gathering place for local running groups. These activities not only promote physical health but also contribute to the mental well-being of our community members. Disrupting this natural haven would undoubtedly have far-reaching implications on the collective spirit and vitality of South Bristol.

In light of the overwhelming evidence and the united voice of our community, I implore you to take decisive action and firmly reject any plans to build on these slopes. By doing so, you would not only safeguard the natural beauty and ecological balance of our region but also protect the health, safety, and well-being of the residents and future generations of South Bristol.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. We eagerly await your positive response and support in preserving the integrity of our cherished greenfield site.

Yours sincerely

Luke Collins

STATEMENT NUMBER A33

Please refuse the application to build houses on Novers Hill. This is an important home for wildlife that must be protected. I work on Novers Hill Trading Estate and know from experience that there are already congestion issues on Novers Hill, and the current plans do not alleviate these serious access problems. I know that there are no bus stops close by and the pavements are too narrow. People will be reliant on their cars, which will put even more pressure on the area. Parson Street school already suffers from bad air pollution.

It is also an area of deprivation and building expensive homes there will not benefit local people, because they won't be affordable. This is not the right kind of housing and not the right site, and must therefore be rejected!

Yours Sincerely,

Kim & Frank Drozd

STATEMENT NUMBER A34

I object to the Western Slopes/Novers Hill application because:

- a) It will result in a net biodiversity loss of 46%. What council which truly represents the best interests of the majority would sanction such loss in one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world?
- b) It will cut into ancient hedgerow
- c) It will result in the loss of wildlife corridors e.g for the 11 species of UK bats in that area
- d) It will remove precious carbon-sink grasslands
- e) It is a site of National Conservation Importance/Interest
- f) It demonstrates socially unacceptable contempt for those who may take up the affordable housing element, siting those scetions next to a recycling centre, and using the affordable housing as a sound barrier for the wealthier section of the development.

It is another cynical, destructive, short term money making chimera for the few to benefit from – mostly the developer. Please deny approval.

Thank you

Yours faithfully

Deborah O'Reilly

STATEMENT NUMBER A35

The evidence provided by relevant organisations, experts, and local citizens alike is so overwhelming, so compelling, and so incontrovertible that to argue against it is akin to King Canute trying to stop the incoming tide. That alone should be enough for this ill-considered and opportunistic planning application to be thrown out.

I'm not going to add much more. Other more knowledgeable people, including my fellow Slopers and various expert bodies, have expressed their concerns far better than I could. I will just say this. We have recently seen, with the shocking reversal of the Broadwalk Shopping Centre decision, how bad choices can be made in the face of all the evidence. It makes people cynical about whether or not councillors will make planning decisions in the best interests of their local communities. Please restore some of that faith by actually listening to the evidence and getting this decision right for the people and wildlife of South Bristol and beyond. **REJECT** this weaselly, nasty little planning application and save the Western Slopes in all its lovely wild glory for future generations of Bristolians to appreciate.

Fran Whitlock

Novers Park Drive

STATEMENT NUMBER A36

Please reject the application for Novers Hill, for the following reasons.

- 1) Planning approval has been refused on this site five times previously, and the reasons for the refusal have not been addressed by the current application. It has previously been refused on the grounds of irreparable damage to wildlife; the negative affect of development on the prominent hillside; the sustainability and access of the site and the overall benefits of development being outweighed by the reasons for it not being built. These issues are even more relevant today.
- 2) A major concern with this application is the increase in road traffic and pollution it will bring, particularly with the proposed road change. The area around Parson Street Primary School is already one of most polluted areas in Bristol. This is not just about the 200 or so new cars, but the fact that the one-way system will force many more existing vehicles onto Bedminster Road, Parson Street and the Hartcliffe Way, affecting the primary school and other local people. There are too few shops and employment opportunities in this area. Most local people travel elsewhere for these things. The proposed development will be heavy reliance on car use, which will make problems in the area worse. There is no public transport on Novers Hill, with the nearest bus stop being over 800 metres away and only accessible up a very steep hill. The developer has not alleviated this in its transport plan. This is probably because this site is totally unsuitable for housing.
- 3) The site is too steep; no amount of adjustments to the gradients will make this development workable. Wheel-chair users will find it difficult to use the site, so it will not meet equalities standards. Bristol Waste have commented that they will find it difficult to access and service the site. The retaining walls are far too high. Crash barriers on new build sites in 2023 shows that this was a poor design from the very beginning.
- 4) The developer's proposal does not provide enough affordable homes. Most local people will not be able to afford these homes and will instead see even more of their much-loved green space taken from them. It will not benefit the local community. The CPRE have stated that up to 30,000 homes could be built in Bristol on brown field sites, so this site should not even be considered for housing. There is an old brownfield school site just to the east of Novers Hill (Bellstone Walk) that will have 50% affordable homes built and will make up for the inadequate amount offered up by Lovell for the privately owned site (which is greenfield and ecologically rich).
- 5) Novers Hill is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) and a vital part of the Malago Wildlife Corridor. The SNCI status has been recently re-asserted by Bristol City Council. The Bristol Local Plan 2014 states that the site "is of city-wide importance to nature conservation". Bristol City Council's own Nature Conservation team has stated that if this site is used for housing "most of the habitat affected could not be recreated elsewhere within a reasonable timescale, there is no potential for appropriate mitigation, and the integrity of the Wildlife Network will be severely undermined". Novers Hill is also identified by the West of England Nature Partnership as being part of a "nature recovery network" encompassing "strategic grassland" and "woodland opportunities". BCC has itself endorsed this wildlife network strategy as part of the Forest of Avon action plan.
- 6) The golden motion to protect our vital green space passed at full Council, with not a single Councillor voting to oppose it. Novers Hill was specifically mentioned in this motion as one

of the sites that must be protected. Nothing has changed at Council to change this. The ecological crisis declared by Bristol City Council obviously still exists.

- 7) The proposed Wildlife corridor is much too small. The development will not maintain the integrity and connectivity of the wildlife network. Too many habitat units will be lost, with a large net loss of biodiversity on this SNCI. Policy 2.19.15 of Site Allocations and Development Management Policies states that “Sites of Nature Conservation collectively represent the city’s critical stock of natural capacity. In some areas of Bristol, SNCIs offer people their only valuable contact with wildlife. Therefore, development proposals which would harm the nature conservation value of an SNCI will not be permitted”. This point alone should be enough reason to stop this application – the meadow, woodland and hedges are part of the SNCI and will be harmed by development.
- 8) The ecological survey commissioned by the developer is now hopelessly out-of-date. There has been significant change to the meadows and other parts of the SNCI, given that the horses were removed in June 2021 and the previously overgrazed areas were growing abundantly now. Otters have since been confirmed as using adjacent Pigeonhouse stream. The RSPB launched their annual bird watch from Novers Hill and recorded lots of birdlife - egrets, sparrowhawks, and many others. Peregrine Falcons have also been spotted flying over Novers Hill very recently. The developer has had plenty of time to commission a new survey, the fact that they have not is another reason why this application should be rejected. Even the original survey failed to carry out an invertebrate and winter bird survey. A key finding in the ecology report was the presence of Greater & Lesser Horseshoe bats on Novers Hill. These are rare species that are in decline in the UK. The developer has claimed that they have left enough of a bat tree corridor to allow them to continue their commute through the site, but I think this misses the point. These bats require meadows to do their foraging, not woodland. It is these valuable meadows that Lovell is planning to bulldoze. What is more, the updated proposal would see even more woodland and hedges removed, and the developer has failed to acknowledge the impact of street lighting on the new roads on a supposedly dark bat corridor.
- 9) The ecological mitigation measures suggested by the developer are inadequate, with the mitigation site proposed being in Nailsea (not even in Bristol, adjacent or nearby). I am also very concerned that the BNG metric is also out of date, and version 3.0 has not been adopted. The developer has been given ample time to address this but has failed to do so.
- 10) In the Site Allocation and Development Management policies, DM17 2.17.3, the entirety of Novers Hill is classed as “prominent green hillside”. It states that “proposals which would harm important features such as green hillsides, promontories, ridges, valleys, gorges, areas of substantial tree cover and distinctive manmade landscapes will not be permitted”. Any development on Novers Hill would harm the important feature of Novers Hill being a green hillside and therefore directly go against this policy. This point alone should be enough to stop this development. The landscape and visual impact assessments offered by Lovell are very misleading; the houses are drawn too small (not in scale with surroundings), and they also do not show the new roads or the huge retaining walls!

In summary, this planning application is wholly inappropriate for Novers Hill. There are very serious access and transport issues, and building here will damage the environment, the wildlife network and the health of local people.

STATEMENT NUMBER A37

Statement for Committee B - Novers Hill (Objection)

I hereby OBJECT to the planning proposal for the reasons given below that have been further detailed and highlighted by many other objectors:

- Unacceptable ecological harm including irreparable destruction to ancient hedgerows and a devastating impact on a valuable wildlife corridor.
- Concerns raised about transport connectivity.
- Drainage concerns
- Landslip concerns
- The instances of incorrect information in the applicants' planning documents. This issue raises serious concerns about the accuracy and reliability of their claims.
- This valuable site has a long history of planning refusals and there are genuine reasons for this.

The evidence provided by experts, local people and relevant organisations against this planning proposal is so overwhelming and compelling.

Please refuse this planning proposal in alignment with the passed Golden Motion of September 2021 to Protect the Green Belt and Bristol's green spaces.

Thank you

Martyn Cordey

STATEMENT NUMBER A38

As a resident of Novers Hill, I object to the planning application to build hundreds of houses on this greenfield site.

All the reports have stated this is an unsuitable site with Bristol's own transport officer calls Lovell's report 'wholly misleading'. We cannot rely on Lovell's reports as they are completely misleading.

My most pressing concern is the use of their 'affordable' housing being used as a sound buffer for the 'unaffordable' housing for those of us who live in Knowle. It states that these houses will not be able to open their windows as sound levels would be too high!

If it is now ok to build as we please on greenfield sites, then take your development up to Clifton and build on their green spaces.

Please reconsider this unrealistic proposal.

Thank you,

Rachael Hosey

STATEMENT NUMBER A39

DCB should follow officer recommendations and refuse this application.

Like the officers, I am concerned about the site being so steep it is unsuitable for the designs being put forward. We need to encourage people to use active travel wherever possible, but sadly this development would do the opposite of that.

The way the affordable housing on the site is laid out deeply concerns me and I hope troubles members of the committee too. Putting them as a 'noise barrier' between the industrial sites and the non-affordable homes is no way to build a cohesive community.

We have a number of developments coming to south Bristol, include Goram Homes project to build homes on the former school at the top of the Western Slopes. Goram's application is still at an early stage but it looks like a development that will benefit the community and address our city's housing need – this application will not.

In line with the council's ecological emergency, we also need to balance the need for housing with the need for ecologically important greenfield sites.

To summarise: my concerns are the affordable housing being used as a 'noise barrier'; the application encouraging car use, polluting our air and adding to congestion; and the loss of ecologically important greenspace. Members of the committee should vote against this application.

STATEMENT NUMBER A40

As a resident of the hill there are many reasons why I object to this proposal. I understand there is a great need for houses but Novers Hill is a steep slope, which will make building rather difficult. The road is already busy and unsafe with no pavement which means People are already taking risks walking up and down the hill and that's before it gets busier with the extra traffic. The houses will greatly increase the number of people and clearly it's an accident waiting to happen.

From our house we see birds of prey hovering waiting to find their dinner, we see bats gliding across the sky at dusk, we know there are badgers and hedgehogs and all sorts of British Wildlife that is sadly in decline mostly due to loss of habitat. This is our time to start putting this right and a loss of a green corridor would be immense for this area.

Lucy Goddard.

STATEMENT NUMBER A41

To whom it may concern, I wish to voice my objection against the proposal to built 100+ homes on the Western Slopes on Novers Hill.

Amongst the many MANY reasons why, I want to start with asking, why can't this be left as a home for the hundreds of different species of animals living there? We have bats (some very rare types) birds of prey, foxes, badgers, possibly Otters, and who knows what else may be living in some of these very rare untouched nature reserves. Not to even mention all the valuable trees we would lose. These things can't simply move elsewhere, they will die! The hedgerows are ANCIENT. There are possibly prehistoric remains here. So so much to be valued and kept.

I have lived here for nearly 15 years now, and the amount of green space we have lost to housing is VAST, we only get once chance at this life, and if any of you have ever watched the Lorax, or Wall-E although they are childrens films, they are warnings as to what will happen if we build and build and build.

Novers Hill itself is an incredibly dangerous road. For anyone who walks it, will know, when it rains it is a complete river. How will it manage with all the green grass gone to soak some of it up? The drains are blocked continuously, how will they manage with 150 new houses to supply? Novers hill is currently used as a rat run, trying to cross safely at the bottom is hazardous. Imagine crossing it with 150+ MORE cars using the road to access their new homes. Which leads onto pollution, Parson street is one of the most polluted air quality areas ever. Can you imagine how much worse it will be without the western slopes?

I and many others, feel that the western slopes is a completely inappropriate place to build homes.

Yours sincerely

Rachel, resident of Novers Hill.

STATEMENT NUMBER A42

To whom it may concern

I would like to put forward my objection to the proposed building on the Novel's Hill site.

I note this is a greenfield site and therefore very inappropriate to propose to build on a site proven as an SNCI (which should also therefore now be designated) it is also a very steep hill and totally unsuitable for the purpose of housing, this will inevitably cause issues further down the line as has happened in other areas.

There are several mature trees here that cannot be 'replaced' for you can never plant another 30yr old tree!

This being an area of nature is also imperative to the wildlife that lives within it, where are they expected to relocate to??

And the fact that this is used as an area for local people to use for recreation purposes, to promote health and wellbeing.

Please reconsider this unrealistic proposal.

Yours Faithfully

Trudy Deller

STATEMENT NUMBER A43

Re: Application no's. 21/05164/F

Site address: Land On The West Side Of Novers Hill, Bristol

Proposal: Erection of 144 no. dwellings, including 43 no. Affordable housing units (30%), along with two no. access points from Novers Hill, the provision of play facilities and public open space with associated works. (MAJOR).

I am writing this statement to object to the above planning application and urge the committee to reject the application on the grounds highlighted below:

- 1- The land is extremely valuable to the environment and local residents. The importance of the old trees, birds and wildlife population is known to everyone. They are essential for human life, and as the 5th Green city in the UK, Bristol City Council has an obligation to protect them for us and the future generation.
- 2- The land has valuable and irreplaceable trees and ancient hedgerows; their loss will impact the environment that cannot be repaired.
- 3- The planning committee must consider ecological losses when making this critical decision. The planning request should be rejected based on the ecological and environmental impact that the loss of this site will bring to Bristol. The pollution building 144 houses will impose on South Bristol, and the environment must not be ignored.
- 4- The traffic is already unmanageable and disruptive on Hartcliffe Way and Airport Road due to the area's lack of appropriate transport and excessive planning permissions, including the BoKlok on Brook Airport Road. The area cannot handle any more traffic. Bristol City Council cannot bring the clean air zone to the town centre and then approve planning permission which brings excessive air and noise pollution to one of the deprived areas in Bristol and puts residents' health and well-being at risk. This includes children and older people.

Bristol was named the European Green Capital in 2015; it was the first city in the country to declare a climate emergency in November 2018, when it also set a goal to achieve net zero emissions by 2030. However, researchers at the city's university said last year that the target is unlikely to be met without significant changes to the transport network. Net zero means no longer adding to the total amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Bringing more cars, cutting the trees and destroying nature would prevent Bristol from achieving the net zero. This is what is called a recipe for disaster.

Rejecting this planning application will be one significant step towards achieving the net zero emissions by 2030. Another crucial step towards it would be to make the entire Western Slope a Nature Conservation Site. This will stop any further attempts to destroy this precious land once and for all.

Kind regards

Nasim Dumont-Namin

STATEMENT NUMBER A44

To whom it may concern,

I wish to voice my objections to the building of houses on the Western Slopes and the devastation of the natural habitat that would occur because of it.

The loss of the trees and the habitat would be significant to the wildlife, but also a great loss to the people of the area and Bristol more widely. The communities surrounding the Slopes may not be the most affluent in the city, but they are still entitled to look upon something beautiful each day and breathe a little fresh air.

I live on the hillside opposite and I can hear the noise each morning from the new recycling centre on Hartcliffe Way. The idea to build homes next to it is comical. I understand that we need houses and homes, but people have to be able to live in them comfortably and peacefully. The placement of some of the affordable houses directly adjacent to the recycling centre seems cynical.

I look forward to a sensible conclusion.

Yours faithfully,

Sean Julian

STATEMENT NUMBER A45

I Parvaneh Taghinejadnamini would like to ask the committee to reject the planning application submitted to build on the Land On The West Side Of Novers Hill Bristol.

This planning application offers 30% affordable housing. The affordable housing in this project, in fact, will be acting as a buffer to protect the remaining unaffordable houses that only the minority can afford buying them. This is discrimination against less privileged people and shows how irresponsible the developer is. They simply can not be trusted.

The ecological damage building on this site imposes on the environment is irreplaceable.

More traffic in the area brings more air pollution, which impacts the health of the local residents.

For the above reasons mentioned, I request that the committee reject the planning application.

Kind regards,

Parvaneh Taghinejadnamini

STATEMENT NUMBER A46

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to reinforce my objection to the Lovells planning application on the Western Slopes/Novers Hill.

I am a resident on Novers Hill and the planning application has some major flaws which would affect local residents as well as the wider South Bristol community.

I wholeheartedly agree with the Case Officers decision to recommend the application for refusal.

The transport plan for the whole site is poorly thought out to the point of being dangerous. Bin lorries would struggle to navigate the site and also deal with the gradients. Access to local bus stops exceeds the minimum requirement of a 10 min walk from all points of the development.

The changes to the topography of the site required to build, would not only would result in massive irreversible change to the natural landscape but again, questions would have to be made of the quality of the build and the risks of subsidence.

The Western Slopes is a unique wildlife corridor linking Crox Bottom, Manor Woods valley and the Northern Slopes. Building across this ecologically diverse site would have a severe impact on the natural environment

A future vision for the site would be for it to become the Novers Nature Reserve. One of the richest ecological sites in Bristol for one of the most economically deprived areas of the city.

Kind regards, Ed Cheney

To whom it may concern

Although not a Bristol resident myself I see the same thing happening wherever I go, high quality agricultural and amenity land + irreplaceable and richly biodiverse habitat being sacrificed for the sake of highly questionable and poorly thought through developments.

Whilst I appreciate that people have to have somewhere to live and the need for new housing is acute (or so we are told) the NOVERS HILL SITE is not the place for this.

The Western Slopes are a vast area of ecological importance to Bristol and are part of a wider wildlife and biodiversity corridor which includes The Northern Slopes, Crox Bottom and Manor Woods. If this housing development goes ahead then it will irreparably damage and fragment the connectivity of this vital habitat.

From my understanding of the issues involved many of the local residents are also against development taking place in this area for the reason that they just don't think it's a suitable place for more housing in the context of the already established and pre - existing community and that it will just place far too much pressure on local roads, infrastructure and other services.

It is for these reasons that I wish to object to the development of this area of land and think that an alternative site should be found somewhere else which will have less of an impact both on irreplaceable biodiversity and habitat and also on the community which holds this in such high regard.

Yours sincerely

David Jesse.

Dear Council Members,

As a local resident living near Parson Street the Western Slopes, Novers Hill, is my local green area.

The local community values and cares for this beautiful green space, which is an ecologically important site for it's biodiversity and as a green corridor, important both for people and wildlife in our area.

As a proven SNCI loved by the local community and as an important refuge for wildlife, this green space must be protected from development both now and in the future.

Any development on this site especially at the scale proposed would cause significant harm and disturbance. The site is a nationally rare habitat, a calcareous grassland, home to 11 of the 18 bat species found in the U.K. It is also an important site for biodiversity, being home to foxes, birds of prey, deer, butterflies, songbirds, and more recently, otters have also been present in the local area. The site also has ancient hedgerow and mature trees which will be destroyed by this development.

The local community loves this precious green space which urgently needs full protection from an inappropriate development of this kind.

I don't know of any single local resident who believes this development should go ahead or supports it in any way. It is considered an ill thought out development, on steep land not suited for house building and causing safety issues, with how any such houses will be accessed from the surrounding roads also causing more congestion and air pollution.

The quality of the housing is also questionable, with concerns over whether some houses will even be able to open their windows due to noise.

The proposed development conflicts with the long term well being and safety of the local community, the environment and wildlife present. I believe that even the Council's planning officers are recommending this development be refused as a result of numerous concerns.

The Planning Committee should reject plans to build on this green site both now and in the future. This housing development does not fall in place with either local or national planning policies and there are surely other sites where such a development would be far more appropriate.

In a time when it has never been more important to protect and restore nature, as a Green City we should be restoring more green sites not destroying existing ones.

I implore the committee to reject this wholly unsuitable and harmful development which is going forward despite the numerous concerns and objections of local people living in an economically deprived area of Bristol, who love and value this important green space for so many reasons.

Yours sincerely,

Sue Chubb

To whom it may concern,

I am a local resident living in Bedminster and I wish to strongly object to the proposed housing development on Novers Hill.

I believe that this special, local green space should be preserved as it is and not built upon, as it is an important wildlife habitat and is used for recreation by local people who care deeply about the Western Slopes. I understand that this site is also home to many species, in particular bats.

I am surprised that at a time of biodiversity crisis it has been proposed to develop this steep site for housing. If this goes ahead it will destroy much of the site, its wildlife, trees and plants and will also add to the congestion and air pollution in the local area. Parson St is already an air pollution hotspot in Bristol and more houses nearby can only add to this problem.

There must be other better sites for housing other than building on a steep, green space, much valued by the people who live in South Bristol.

Please reject the Lovell planning application to build here.

With best wishes,

Matthew Feltham

Dear Sir/Madam

The applicant has made a number of statements about the ecology which are patently and demonstrably untrue.

Quite apart from the unnecessary destruction of a vital green space, the transport proposed is completely against Bristol Councils own policies.

It is important that the council reject this application, not just on transport grounds but to ALSO recognise there is NO mitigation for the destruction of the ecology. The untruths of the applicant MUST be on record to prevent a subsequent application needing only to address (currently insurmountable) transport issues.

I implore the council to wholly reject this application.

Yours sincerely
Judith Brant

Dear Sirs/Madams,

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed development on the above mentioned location in South Bristol.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be ruined and destroyed by building on it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low. It is well known that the area is home to a wide variety of wildlife and building on the area would result in the loss of much-needed habitat.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe Way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to cause total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours Sincerely,

Alistair Hardy

Whilst I intended for my objection to be based on facts I find in writing this that my objection is a personal and emotive one. Four generations of my family have lived in Headley Park and since the 60's we have witnessed the changing cityscape from the viewpoint of our familial home on St. Peter's Rise. When we heard of the planning application to build on the Nover's we were deeply concerned that again we would have to witness the city taking over what little we have left of our green landscape. The ecological impact of this proposed development cannot be ignored as has been highlighted by many experts and quite frankly the proposal to offset the biodiversity loss miles away in Nailsea is insulting and laughable. I grew up watching the buzzards fly over the slopes as I imagine many before me have and I hope many more will do so in the future. I implore you to stop this development from going ahead and instead consider that this site should be protected and preserved.

Jessica Hall

Dear Sirs/Madams,

I am writing to express my objection to the proposed development on the above mentioned location in South Bristol.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be ruined and destroyed by building on it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low. It is well known that the area is home to a wide variety of wildlife and building on the area would result in the loss of much-needed habitat.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe Way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to cause total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution.

With regards to our climate becoming warmer, countries currently dealing with heatwaves have found that cities with green areas cope better. Surely as we are in a climate crisis, removing "the green lungs" of South Bristol would surely be a disaster.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours Sincerely,

Joanna Hardy

Dear Development Control

Re Application no: 21/05164/F

Site address: Land On The West Side Of Novers Hill Bristol

Public Forum Statement in Objection to the planning application to build 144 homes on the West side of Novers Hill (aka Western Slopes)

I am a local resident in Knowle West, near the top of the Western Slopes, and regularly cycle and drive via Novers Hill.

The Western Slopes is a much valued green space, and is incredibly important ecologically for its biodiversity and as a green corridor, essential for people and for wildlife in our area. The need to protect such spaces was of course recognised via the Bristol City Council Climate and Ecological Emergency declarations, as was as in the Sept 2021 BCC vote to protect our Green spaces and build on Brownfield instead. The BCC Corporate Strategy 2022-27 states (in Ecological Recovery): "We need to learn lessons from the past and we must put back lost habitats and wildlife corridors, guided by data on how to support nature recovery networks". Surely the first lesson to learn is not to destroy such areas in the first place!

The Western Slopes / Novers Hill provides key ecological and environmental benefits, including:

- unique meadow grassland (along with significant amounts of scrub and trees)
- wildlife habitat and natural food supply for protected species such as rare horseshoe bats and badgers living there
- storm water drainage and natural flood protection
- absorbing carbon dioxide and other pollutants, helping to reduce climate change and local air pollution (noting nearby Parson Street School already has one of the highest levels in the city, above WHO limits)
- buffering Novers Hill residents from noise pollution from the busy Hartcliffe Way

These reasons alone should be enough for the Development Control Committee to reject plans to build on this green site. In addition though, there are many more reasons for rejection:

Transport

There will be significant negative impact of the one-way system, esp given the industrial estate at the bottom on Novers Hill - large trucks go there, and then back down the hill afterwards, as the road at the bottom of the hill is sufficiently wide for 2 way traffic, but with this new one-way plan the trucks will all have to go all the way round Novers Hill generating a significant increase in heavy traffic and air pollution, including past the local primary school (Greenfields E-ACT Academy). This is in addition to the impact caused by all existing cars being diverted round the proposed one-way, and of course the increase to be generated by the cars brought in from 144 new dwellings.

Also, there is no suitable bus stop to town within easy walking distance of this part of Novers Hill, so a significant increase in car usage is inevitable.

Community facilities / infrastructure

This planning request is yet another of multiple new applications for housing in Knowle West and surrounds. When taken together with existing applications and major recent new builds in South Bristol (plus multiple smaller builds in Knowle West itself), the cumulative impact on the local community is significant. There has been no investment in local infrastructure or community facilities to support this influx of planned / proposed new housing.

Novers Common Town & Village Green (TVG) status

Novers Common is a well established local TVG area, including the ancient hedgerow going up Novers Hill, all going back hundreds of years. Parts of this are also under threat from this development. Yes, there is some mitigation proposed but not of equal size or value, and the Planning Officer's report only notes that this *could* happen as details are still being worked out - hardly reassuring that there is a plan in place to ensure sufficient mitigation would happen.

Housing quality and quantity

It is often said that "Bristol needs housing" as the excuse for such developments. There is of course significant truth to this. But what Bristol, and especially Knowle West, really needs is truly affordable social housing (preferably Council housing) and this development is not focused on that. Some may be "affordable" using the formal definition, but this is not actually affordable for most people, and the vast majority of this development is for maximum profit at "unaffordable" prices. In short, it offers no benefit to local people, only loss of assets we already have.

In summary, I ask the Development Control committee to reject this proposed development for the reasons above. Bristol City Council should lead the way by firstly rejecting this application to safeguard this important area, and then by removing the whole of the Western Slopes / Novers Hill from the Local Plan and designating it as a local Nature Reserve, with controlled public access, to truly benefit the local community in addition to retaining all the positive and essential biodiversity benefits.

Thank you,
Nick Smith

Land West of Novers Hill

Statement in Support

Development Control Committee B – 19th July 2023

Project name: Land West of Novers Hill, Knowle West
Author: Jonathan Coombs (Pegasus Group on Behalf of Lovell Homes)
Date: 13 July 2023
Project number: P19-0588
Reference: 21/056164/F

Lovell Homes are naturally disappointed with the officer recommendation for refusal.

We have sought to deliver much needed housing upon these allocated sites, including a policy compliant level of affordable homes, which the Committee will know is a rarity in South Bristol.

The scale of the housing challenge facing the Council is formidable, with the city's current housing land supply representing a shortfall of circa 10,000 homes. The emerging Local Plan Review will not address this unmet need with the targeted housing delivery being 1,451 homes a year lower than the Government target, and even 675 homes a year lower than the Council's own assessment of need. The lack of sufficient housing for the city's needs has serious impacts upon Bristol as the Committee will be all too aware. In this context we are disappointed that progression of this allocated site has not been facilitated.

In addition to housing, the scheme would also deliver a new play area and public access to what is currently private land largely screened from Knowle West by the hedgerow to Novers Hill.

The proposal would also provide an alternative route for cyclists and pedestrians, that currently walk in the road along the narrow Novers Hill, which we consider is a real benefit to the community.

We understand that a large number of objectors have concerns about development of this site in principle. However, the site remains allocated for development and the designs have been arrived at following an extensive programme of ecological work that has informed the design.

We acknowledge that the site is steep and this results in the need for engineering interventions, as well as gradients in some locations beyond optimal levels. The scheme design has come about following a robust engineering process to best address the levels of this site. The need for such gradients is a requirement of any development of this site and there are many examples of such gradients across the undulating cityscape of Bristol.

The application followed pre-application engagement submitted in summer 2020 and at each stage of the process we have sought to work collaboratively with officers. In the absence of being able to secure a recommendation for approval from your officers we welcome this matter advancing before you to obtain a decision after years of seeking resolution of the scheme.

Reference: 21/056164/F

[lovell.co.uk](https://www.lovell.co.uk)



INVESTORS
IN PEOPLE

Gold
Until 2020

Lovell is the trading name of Lovell Partnerships Limited
Registered in England No. 2387333
Registered Office: Kent House, 14-17 Market Place, London W1W 8AJ

A MORGAN SINDALL GROUP COMPANY

Dear Person/AI bot,

I would like to add my objection to the proposed development on the Western Slopes (Novers Hill).

Intro:

I grew up just off Novers Lane back in the 1970's, attended Novers Lane Infants School, which is now a 'Meanwhile' site and then onto to Novers Lane Junior's (now Green Fields Academy).

Our Huckleberry days were spent exploring what is now called the 'The Western Slopes', but back then we knew as Farmer Ellis's Fields. These fields were an important open space to the children of this part of the city at the time.

Today, with BCC's commitment to doubling Bristol's tree canopy due to the climate emergency, and all the environmental stuff happening (not forgetting the post Covid realization of the importance of open spaces for mental health) they are more important than ever, to this part of the city and to Bristol as a whole.

As for the planning proposal itself, there are just so many things wrong with this development that it's hard to believe anyone would take these plans seriously.

But, with the recent fandango over the proposed Broadwalk Walk development, and the present lack of trust, that the good people of Bristol now have towards the Development Control Committee. Anything seems possible - rational or not.

Lovell's Plan's:

The developers have been given endless opportunities by BCC to improve on their original plans but the fundamental flaws remain.

Some of these are:

Transport and infrastructure: Providing safe road, cycling, and walking options for people on the proposed housing estate, and other unfortunate users. On all three of these points Lovell's have failed.

Or to quote BCC Transport, 'The submitted travel plan, which aims to increase cycling ...reveals a serious lack of commitment to this'. And 'It is clear that the proposed new share walking & cycling linkage along Novers Hill will generate conflict and therefore fails to meet national design requirements set out by the DfT and insisted on by TDM and BCC's planning committee'.

The Steepness of the proposed site is just as steep as it always was, according to BCC Transport officers, the site is so steep that people living at the bottom of the hill will not be able to safely walk or cycle out of the proposed estate.

Residents would have to drive their cars to leave the estate safely!

Ecological Harm: There will be irreparable harm to a nationally rare habitant (Calcareous grassland). And the lost of the space, and in particular the tree canopy, to the wildlife corridors of this part of the city would be immense.

Bristol Tree Forum, Avon Wildlife Trust, The Friends of the Western Slopes, Chris Packham and many others have made the case for saving this land, and I believe they have won the narrative.

We should also give honourable mentions to:

A proven SNCI, failure to meet Biodiversity Net Gain, no appropriate off setting; Ecological surveys used are out of date, serious concerns about surface water and drainage management, damage to a protected Ancient Hedgerow, conflicts with the long term well being and safety of the local residents. : and finally lets not forget those living in the social housing, placed in the words of the developer to provide a noise 'buffer' from the industrial units for the posh people living in the private housing.

A suggestion so offensive and outrageous that even Karin Smyth woke up and took notice.

Conclusion:

A far better use for this site would be the proposal from The Friends of the Western slopes, the creation of an urban, woodland park – a place for people, nature and wildlife to co-exist.

Yours Sincerely,
Mike McSweeney

What is happening to our green and pleasant land? Recent surveys have shown that the UK is one of the worst countries for wild life depletion in the world. Let's start to reverse this, stop building on the green sanctuaries in our city, let wildlife thrive .

Sheridan Henson

PUBLIC FORUM STATEMENT

BY CLLR KEVIN QUARTLEY

RE NOVERS HILL APPLICATION BY LOVELLS

Dear Fellow Councillors,

Members will be aware how passionately local people value precious 'green lungs' in Bristol - such as the Western Slopes in South Bristol - and it is important that the planners and the Development Control Committees look searchingly at any planning applications which aim to concrete-over for ever land which is vital in combatting the Ecological Emergency which this Council has pledged to confront.

Of course, my Bishopsworth colleague, Cllr Richard Eddy, successfully moved at the Local Plan Working Group last year that the undeveloped Western Slopes- plus Bedminster Down's Yew Tree Farm and Brislington Meadows- be removed for housing purposes from the draft Bristol Local Plan (BLP). The draft BLP is subject to Full Council's approval in October 2023 - although the Brislington Meadows' development Refusal has been less successful at Appeal.

This latter development, in my opinion, makes it all the more important that the Lovells planning application is Refused by this Development Control Committee today.

The three grounds cited - failure to provide adequate transport infrastructure and waste management services; the steepness of the topography making pedestrian and sustainable access up the hill difficult; and damage to the Western Slopes' wildlife and the applicant's failure to mitigate this - utterly undermine this proposal and I urge you to Refuse this planning application.

Finally, Cllr Eddy and I wish to commend one local environmental group, the Friends of Western Slopes, for motivating local people and prompting a fantastic appreciation of wildlife and ecological treasures on these beautiful slopes. Coming out of the Covid pandemic, in a matter of months they went from a new campaign group to having over 1200 numbers. Quite an achievement! And - contrary to what the Mayor's Office arrogantly and inaccurately claims - they're not "Posh NIMBYs" too!

Cllr Kevin Quartley
Conservative City Councillor, Bishopsworth Ward.

To whom it may concern,

The people of South Bristol find themselves fighting against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site.

We cannot allow this destruction of so many trees and a natural habitat for our wildlife.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to cause total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours Sincerely,

Colin Spence

STATEMENT NUMBER A60

I object to the development, the impact on air pollution, and removal of green spaces lack of doctors appointments, dentists will only get worse.

This should not be approved.

Kind regards

Sarah Wintle

STATEMENT NUMBER A61

Good morning,

as a local resident living near Hartcliffe Way, the Western Slopes Novers Hill is my local green area.

I regularly walk past this beautiful green space and see the flora and wildlife: birds, butterflies, damsel flies etc and last week the many horses grazing. This is an important refuge for wildlife, this green space must be protected. Are you aware that it is home to 11 of the 18 bat species, home to foxes, otters, deer, birds of prey?

How can you possibly build on this space? Indeed you are already saturating South Bristol with new builds.

I have also spoken to some of the businesses on Honeyfield Park at the bottom of Hartcliffe Way who seem to be under the impression that 159 properties have already been approved and access will be from this park, I look forward to your comments on this. Is this legal?

Unfortunately I cannot be there tomorrow at the meeting, I pray you do the right thing.

Kind regards

Deb Farrington

STATEMENT NUMBER A62

To whom it may concern,

Again the people of South Bristol find themselves fighting against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to caus total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of developement.

Yours Sincerely,

Louise Matthews

STATEMENT NUMBER A63

Dear Council members,

Please accept my statement regarding the above application.

The above application should be refused for many reasons; transport, access and increased congestion along with the difficult topography are material factors and are evidenced enough to reject planning.

The sheer number of Bristol residents who cherish this wildlife rich site and SNCI demonstrates the importance of our remaining green spaces to wellbeing; the potential loss of trees and green corridors that create connectivity for precious wildlife in this ecological emergency is completely unacceptable.

I urge you to firmly reject this application.

Thank you for reading my statement.

Catherine Withers.

STATEMENT NUMBER A64

I wish to oppose this development in the strongest possible terms.

It is a site of nature and offers working class people a break from the stress of poverty.

Build them in Clifton!

I am emailing about the proposed Novers slopes development. I walk the Northern Slopes regularly and it is a lifeline for many local residents with no gardens of their own to get access to nature, green space and somewhere to exercise.

Please deny the application to build on our green space.

Mel Smith

Please see my statement below, I wish to attend the meeting so please can you add me to your list of speakers.

Many thanks

Committee Meeting Statement

I would like to put forward my objection to the planning application on the Western slopes (Novers Hill)

It is hard to put into words just how foolhardy and outrageous the proposed development of the Westerns slopes is, however the Bristol City Councils' own Transport report does put it quite eloquently, when referring to the developer's proposal, quote on quote 'wholly misleading'. The conclusion of this report is complete refusal of the proposal, something which I whole heartedly agree with.

From a personal standpoint as someone who has grown up in South Bristol my whole life, I find the proposal put forward deeply concerning. For the past 11 years I have had the pleasure of living in a house which backs directly on to the western slopes. A house which has been in my family for generations starting with my great grandparents, who moved in when these houses were first built. We've shared memories of the horses grazing and playing out on the fields straight from the garden gate, something I am still lucky enough to share with my children. For a community that may not have it all, we do have this huge asset, and best of all it's free. A 'prominent hillside' indeed and we are very proud to have it. For the young people in the area who own and tend to the horses and the children who stop along the roadside to take in their majestic beauty, it really is something special and unique. For a lot of local families, the ability to use these spaces and enjoy them recreationally and at no cost is invaluable.

The green landscape in the South has changed dramatically in the last ten years with most areas of green land being redeveloped into housing. Housing is needed ,yes, but pitting it against green land is not the way forward. I am not aware of the current pollution figures, but my very basic understanding is less green land, and more people would equal a higher density of air pollution. To remove anything further would be a public health concern within the community.

In a time where climate change is in everyone's consciousness, Bristol City councils included, we should be laying plans for the future conservation of our city. Putting out the pot plants for the bees in the aftermath of bulldozing their natural habit is not progressive thinking. Trees do not grow over night, we are all aware of this fact, the removal of the trees in this proposal is completely criminal.

Please hear the views of our community and respect our wishes to stop this development.

If lost it can never be replaced or restored.

Local resident

Dear sir/madam

I am writing to strongly object to the proposed development of the Western slopes.

I am sure you are aware but this is a green site that should not be built upon. We have lost so many green spaces and this should not happen here. There is much wildlife that will have nowhere to go if this goes ahead. The proposed development will also overpopulate the area putting all of our local services under even more pressure. The amount of traffic will also increase vastly in such a small area causing more pollution and making the roads busier risking our children when out playing.

The development is ridiculous and you the planner will have a lot to answer for as the people who already live here do NOT want this!!

This development needs to be REFUSED IMMEDIATELY.

Emma Milkins

I urge the committee to follow the officers' recommendation and refuse this application.

There is clearly a need for more housing in Bristol and in particular in improving the diversity of housing in South Bristol. However, this application has many issues that have not been adequately addressed by the applicant.

There are significant issues with transport access and safety.

The site is extremely steep and yet shared paths are proposed on steep inclines for cyclists, pedestrians and wheelchair users, putting the safety of all groups at risk.

There is an overprovision of car parking and an underprovision of cycling parking – it appears that the applicant presumes that most people will use cars in order to get on and off this steep site.

The steep gradients will also result in extensive cut and fill, which potentially undermines the stability of the slopes.

The development of this site will also have a devastating impact on the ecology of the site and the adjoining area. The applicant has not even done some of the work required to show how this will be mitigated.

I sincerely hope the committee votes to refuse this application.

I intend to be in attendance at the meeting and wish to speak.

Councillor Zoe Goodman
Filwood Ward

Good morning

This is a statement of rejection for the planning of housing development on the western slopes, south Bristol.

The development proposed, based on the reports and data gathered, will pose a significant risk to the environmental surroundings having a catastrophic impact on the delicate biodiversity of the land.

Due to the enormous excavation required, impact on nature and the surrounding infrastructure it is wholly irresponsible to allow such development to take place.

Thank you
Shannon

I want to send my statement that I do not want the planning development of Novers Hill to go ahead.

This is such a precious wildlife sanctuary in the heart of Bristol. It is a heaven for wildlife and people alike. Do not rob the community and nature the need of this little area. There are many brown field areas that should and could be developed for housing. We can't keep building on every scrap of ground .

Please please don't pass this planning application, do the right thing and not the money thing.

Caroline Perrington

Good morning

I object to yet another one of our green spaces being sold off to developers.

I understand we need housing, but this is a little nature haven, leave it alone.

There are blocks of flats crumbling in Bristol why don't you put your resources into planning to get those habitable before you start digging up parts of Bristol that don't need to be touched

Dawn Simmonds

To whom it may concern

I would like to strongly object to the proposed building on the Novel's Hill site. This greenfield site provides valuable wildlife habitats. Large areas are open grassland and there is a dense wooded area through the centre of the site. I understand that the central part of the site is designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI), making its retention even more important, when so much of our wildlife habitats are being lost.

There are several mature trees there that cannot just be 'replaced'.

It is used by local people for recreation purposes and to promote health and wellbeing.

It is very steep in places (never a good idea for proposed building sites).

It is currently part of a lovely view from Manor Woods valley.

Please reject this unrealistic proposal.

Finbar Cullen
local resident

To Bristol Council

This is my 2nd objection to the planning proposal for Novers Hill development.

I strongly object for many reason but mainly to the destruction of Novers Hill ecosystem and its wildlife that exist in that area. Green spaces need to be protected even more now, it's good for us and our mental health.

Councils in all areas need to stop building on green fields (green belt) and use brownfield site. The community in this area are clearly passionate about this area. The council need to start listening to the local people and not be pressurised by developers and government .

Do the right thing and save Novers Hill.

Nina Dyke

To whom it may concern,

The people of South Bristol find themselves fighting against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to cause total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups. I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of development.

Yours Sincerely,

Sharon Sexton

STATEMENT NUMBER A75

To whomever this may concern

I do not agree with the plans to build on Novers Hill / Western Slopes.

Here are my reason to object the plans.

Building on such a steep gradient does not seem logical with the amount the ground will need be leveled. This means there will be a lot of destruction to the ground and disruption to the wildlife around, let alone the release of greenhouses that happens when the ground is dig and mutilated in such a way.

The hill is a Greenfield site and requires protection for the thousands of species inhabiting. We enjoy how natural the hill is and it is a space where the community can relax, play and connect to nature. Where will these species go when their habit is torn down and their once home built on? We need to focus on protecting our wildlife and environment so we can extend the longevity of the planet. Without the planet, it will not only be the wildlife struggling to be alive, but us and our children.

It is important that we have natural spaces in South Bristol, where our children can learn and our community can grow. It is important for us to have clean places to play and breathe and live, which will be taken away if you destroy the trees (hundreds of mature trees), hedges, wildflowers. It will completely change the environment and the quality of healthy living.

I see so many issues with access, not only for the public but also with the contractors. Not only is the hill itself a muddy bank, access from Hartcliffe Way just isn't appropriate and will just cause even more congestion than there already is, which is even more pollutions from cars at a standstill for us locals to breathe in. Public transport is limited for residents. The area cannot handle more through traffic which unfortunately Parson St School children, parents and staff are already taking the brunt off, being busy, congested and full of pollution which vegetation on Novers Hill / Western Slopes absorb due to their fantastic qualities of turning gases into oxygen for us.

I think it is completely unethical and logical to build on this Greenland and believe there should be more commitment to building on brownlands around the city. I suggest the planning committee to reject plans to build on this site and find appropriate brownland for this development to be built.

Yours faithfully

Jade Howell

STATEMENT NUMBER A76

Please do not build on this land. It's a valuable and prominent green hillside that nature needs more than greedy developers need money. There are other places to build houses. it also impinges on a site of special interest with potential ancient stones and a spring. But beside that it is entirely wrong to be building on this green space which nature and the community need as a breathing space.

I live nearby and there are owls, slow worms, birds of prey, foxes, badgers and frogs around here. it's a very important space for them to exist.

Please do not build on this land. Do the right thing.

Yours sincerely,

Jo Hickey-Hall

STATEMENT NUMBER A77

I'd like to register my opposition as a resident of Salcombe Rd, Knowle Park BS4 1AB to the proposed development and share my neighbours concerns;

People of South Bristol find themselves fighting against an inappropriate development on an inappropriate site.

It has been shown many times and for many reasons that this green field site should not be destroyed and vandalised by building in it.

Not only has it been proved it is an SNCI but also the site is a lung for the traffic on Hartcliffe way and keeps the pollutions levels low.

Access would be another problem, partly for services, as the site is so steep if access is only from Novers Hill it will be nearly impossible due to the steep profile for bin lorries and emergency vehicles to easily access the site.

Access via Hartcliffe way would be totally inappropriate and only cause even more congestion that is already there. The large number of houses proposed will also generate such a large number of vehicle movements as to caus total grid lock in the St John's Lane area and produce ridiculous vehicle pollution levels to an unacceptable level in and around Parson Street Primary School which already suffers.

Apart from the loss of 500 or more mature trees which could take 20 to 30 years to replace but not in those numbers and the vegetation which all absorb pollution. There is also the mental health issue for those who use the slopes for walks and is also used by local running groups.

I would implore the planning committee to totally reject any plans to build on these slopes and to protect them from any possible future risk of developement.

Yours sincerely

Janet Sanger

STATEMENT NUMBER A78

Since 1965 there have been 8 planning applications refused on this site. Twice a decision has been upheld on appeal.

In Councillor Helen Holland's time as council leader, the Bristol Biodiversity Action Plan was adopted. Page 20 tells us how local people had protected the Novers from development.

How many times does a community need to fight the same battle?

The site is a great wildlife habitat. The council has recently said it will not build on the rest of the slopes due to its ecological richness. The wildlife doesn't stop at an invisible boundary. Avon Wildlife Trust has spoken of the importance of the site.

The application itself is of poor quality. Bristol South MP Karin Smyth has spoken of her concern of the social housing. And it's use as a noise buffer between industrial units along Hartcliffe Way. Indeed, the applicant raised noise concerns for a separate planning application by ETM to recycle concrete.

The whole of the slopes is a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI). Even the contested smaller SNCI in the application will be significantly disturbed. By an access road during construction, a drainage ditch, a path between the two estates and a play area. Also, there is a large retaining bank to hold up the upper estate, construction of this will damage the SNCI.

The ancient, protected hedgerow is a Town and Village Green. It will have two large gaps ripped out for the roads.

The habitat destruction and suggested offset, outside of Bristol, does not present a good option for Bristol's biodiversity.

The road of Novers Hill is narrow and mainly without pavements. This application seems to make safety worse than it currently is. A cycle path and footway crosses two new roads going into the site, tucked behind a hedge. The cycle path rejoins the road of Novers Hill at a steep point.

There's no access by car, cycle or foot through to Hartcliffe Way, and no real attempt to secure one. This means the housing will have no easy access to shops and public transport.

I hope that councillors will continue to work positively together.

You've already achieved the Golden Motion to protect all Bristol's green spaces. Please refuse this application, as it is not a good offer for the local community or the people of Bristol.

References:

- <https://www.bristol.gov.uk/files/documents/786-bbap/file&page=20>
- <https://www.avonwildlifetrust.org.uk/news/support-bristols-green-spaces>
- <https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/anger-social-housing-described-noise-5761189>
- <https://pa.bristol.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QSOH1WDNH6R00>

07 Feb 2022 PEGASUS GROUP – GENERAL

- <https://maps.bristol.gov.uk/pinpoint/?service=localinfo&maptype=js&layer=Neighbouring+authorities;Sites+of+Nature+Conservation+Interest&extent=5557.848615697236&x=358203.07337707875&y=169571.21539254434> Site of Nature Conservation Interest covering the whole slopes on council map.