

**AGENDA ITEM NO: 5****DEVELOPMENT CONTROL  
(SOUTH AND EAST) COMMITTEE****25<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2007****STATEMENTS/PETITIONS**

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO.</b>	<b>APPLICATIONS</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>
1.	07/00433/F - Wedlocks Public House Bower Ashton Terrace Bristol BS3 2LE Demolition of vacant building and construction of 18 no.1- bedroom flats, 1 no. 2- bedroom flat, 1 no. commercial unit and undercroft car parking.	Ian Beckey, 35 Dunkirk Road, Fishponds, BS16 3DL	<b>1</b>
1.	As above	Mike Adams, On behalf of Bristol City Supporters Trust	<b>2</b>
1.	As above	Cllr Charles Bolton Green Party	<b>3</b>
1.	As above	Woodward Hambly Webb Ltd Dyrham Lodge 16 Clifton Park Clifton BS8 3BY	<b>4</b>

AGENDA ITEM NO.	APPLICATIONS	NAME	NUMBER
2.	07/00476/F - Former ITO Factory Lydstep Terrace Bristol BS3 1DR Mixed use development consisting of cafe/ restaurant, business use on ground floor/ mezzanine and first floor. Two floors of private residential on first and second floors (residential 23 Units).	Satyen Joshi Property Development Manager, on behalf of the applicant	<b>5</b>
2.	As above	Mr. and Mrs J. Viner Melville House 63 Kingston Road Southville BS3 1DS	<b>6</b>
2.	As above	Jennifer Wallace 65 Kingston Road Southville Bristol BS3 1DS	<b>7</b>
2.	As above	Mr and Mrs Pedley 41 Kingston Rd Southville BS3 1DS	<b>8</b>
2.	As above	Elizabeth Brown, 55 Kingston Road, Bristol BS3 1DS	<b>9</b>
3.	06/05425/F - Land To The Rear of 117 Coronation Road (fronting Allington Road) Bristol BS3 1AZ Erection of one two storey house fronting Allington Road	Nicola Woodhall 36 Allington Road Bristol BS3 1PT	<b>10</b>
3.	As above	M&E Turner 116 Coronation Road Southville BS3 1AZ	<b>11</b>

<b>AGENDA ITEM NO.</b>	<b>APPLICATIONS</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>
3.	As above	Mrs S. Marshall 112 Coronation Road Southville BS3 1AZ	<b>12</b>

The grounds for refusal in the Officer's report predominantly relate to the scale and design of the proposed building and to transport and highway safety issues. I agree with these and will not comment further. However the report does not object to either the loss of the building or its change of use – but I do for the reasons of Wedlock's heritage, viability as a public house and its architectural character.

### **Football heritage**

The report says, '... the historical significance of the pub use in this location to Bristol City Football Club has no bearing on the proposed change of use in planning terms' (p7 para 1). However I must point out that in 1900 Wedlock's was built as The Star, two clubs merged to form Bristol City FC and Billy Wedlock first joined the club. Ashton Gate became the regular home ground in 1901. Billy Wedlock was to win 26 England caps and is arguably Bristol's greatest ever player. He played in the 1909 FA Cup Final – the only one reached by a Bristol Club. One stand in Ashton Gate is named after him today. His memory endures because he was born in North Street, Bedminster and when he retired in 1921, he became landlord of The Star opposite the ground, remaining in close contact with the fans. He did not leave The Star until 1964, one year before his death. He was a player for 21 years and a licensee for 43 years – a total of 64 years association with Bristol City fans. There is unlikely to be a comparable heritage associated with another sports club or building in Bristol, certainly not for Bristol City FC.

### **Change of Use**

I oppose the change of use because I have strong reasons to think the current use is both viable. George Ferguson is experienced in the pub trade, owning the Tobacco Factory and one of the owners of Bristol Beer Factory. He put in a bid to buy Wedlock's for virtually the same sum as the building was eventually sold – in order to reopen Wedlock's as a pub. Clearly he does not think it is unviable.

I attended a meeting organised by Bristol City Supporters Trust of local people and organisations to discuss the application. George Ferguson was present along with the Friends of Greville Smyth Park, residents of Bower Ashton Terrace adjoining Wedlock's and local councillors. In the discussion a vision emerged - Wedlock's is adjacent to Greville Smyth Park and it could diversify into a restaurant/café serving the park. Subsequently, virtually all the organisations using the park and all four Bristol City councillors for Southville and Bedminster have declared their support for this vision (appendix). Well over 1,000 signatures on a petition to 'Save Wedlock's'

have been collected. This vision further enhances Wedlock's viability in its current use.

### **Architectural merit and the alternative of suitable conversion**

The Officer's report says, '... given its architectural and locational prominence [it] is considered to be a landmark building' (p10 para 1). It also says, 'whilst the loss of the building would be regrettable, and the Local Planning Authority would prefer to see the building retained and converted because of its attractive historical appearance (*and expressed this view prior to the submission of the application*), there exist no powers through which to require this' (p7 penultimate para).

Bristol Civic Society says, 'the Society regrets that this public house is closed. The building has an attractive appearance, of its time, and is of historical importance (Bristol City FC) and architectural interest. We would like to see this building retained, ideally as a pub, but converted if necessary. The proposals seem entirely out of character with the area.'

My submission to this committee therefore is to refuse the proposed change of use. To quote the report again, 'the design statement considers that the scale of the existing spaces within the building and of the façade is not of appropriate proportions and thus feasible sub division is not economically achievable. This is a typical problem of converting buildings of this size and scale, which in their original design and layout do not make efficient use of space. Whilst this is considered a significant concern, it is unlikely to be insurmountable, and has been overcome on other similar sites in the city eg, The Plough Inn, Bedminster Down Road; The Fox Inn, Windmill Hill' (p8 section 2 para 2). It continues, 'the applicant should therefore be encouraged to give serious consideration to the conversion and extension of the existing building, even if it were only economically feasible to retain the ornate frontage' (p9 (D) para 1).

### **Conclusion**

Demolition of Wedlock's would destroy a building of cultural and historical interest and would miss the opportunity to create a community enterprise of great value alongside the park. I call on committee members to respond to the overwhelming hopes of local residents and community groups as well as football supporters and refuse the application.

Wedlock's is at the heart of the Ashton community and has been for over a century. The pub is hugely significant to Bristol City supporters, not just because of its proximity to Ashton Gate, which was built around the same time, but also because for many years the landlord was Billy Wedlock, one of Bristol's greatest ever players. 'Fatty', as he was known, is one of a small number of Bristol City players to have represented England and is the Club's most capped player. It is in his honour that the pub is now named.

Bristol City Supporters Trust was established some eighteen months ago with three core objectives: representing the fans, working to restore and extend links between the Club and the local community and fundraising to purchase shares in the Club.

The Trust has been working alongside local residents, local groups and other organisations to develop an alternative vision for Wedlock's, one that will not only retain the existing building and current use, but will also extend this to take better advantage of its location adjacent to the park and provide additional community facilities.

The reasons for our opposition are in outline:

1. **Change of use and community value** The current use is both viable and valuable and we are confident that given the right opportunity the building would not remain derelict and indeed could provide a substantial resource for the local community.
2. **Character and history of building** We believe that with sympathetic renovation and maintenance for a wider community use, Wedlock's would serve as a focal point and landmark building for this end of Ashton Road.
3. **Over-intensive development** The scale and nature of development is extreme and is an over-intensive development of what is a relatively small site.
4. **Design** The Mediterranean style of the block of flats, whilst making a statement and potentially providing a focal point, is completely inappropriate in the context of the site and compared to nearby buildings and open spaces.
5. **Parking** We believe the development will exacerbate current traffic circulation problems and will lead to increased parking difficulties for residents in the local area.

The planning application is asking for permission to demolish a building that has existed for more than 100 years and a public house that has significant and unique history in the community.

In our view the proposed development destroys a site of historic, cultural and social significance, misses an opportunity to create a place of genuine community value, and is seriously flawed in concept and planned execution.

We call on Committee members to recognise the overwhelming view of the local community, residents, local groups and football supporters and refuse the application.

We have a petition signed by over 1,000 people in opposition to this application.

**Mike Adams on behalf of BCST**

### Wedlock's - Community Vision

Wedlock's, initially The Star, has been a pub in Ashton Gate since 1900. Its historical interest lies in its close relationship with, and very close proximity to, Bristol City Football Club. Between 1921 and the mid 1960s the pub was managed by 'Fatty' Wedlock and his family. Billy Wedlock is arguably the most significant player in Bristol football history, both Rovers and City, being capped for England 26 times. This is more than any other Bristol based player.

#### What is our vision?

- A restored and well run pub with strong links to the football traditions of the area. The pub could also provide a community function room and be the base for the Supporters' Trust, possibly housing a museum of Bristol City FC's and area history. As well as providing meeting space for BCST, the refurbished building would offer meeting space for other community groups. There is a shortage of community meeting space in Ashton Gate.
- The Trust, many of whose members live in South Bristol, would have an on-going interest in the pub either through working with a supportive, but independent, management or acquiring the building themselves and organizing it as a community enterprise.
- Historically, the building has faced onto Ashton Road and looked towards the football ground. Its back has been firmly towards Greville Smyth Park. We would seek to change this by making the building look in both directions; this would offer new services to the park, principally a café for park users. Given the size of Greville Smyth Park, it is perhaps surprising that a café does not yet exist. There are cafes and pubs nearby, but they are outside the park and across a busy road.
- A well run café would attract additional visitors to the park, including families. It would also support sports and other events, offer passive surveillance and thus reduce anti-social behaviour.
- There are no toilet facilities directly in the park. The BCC toilet block next door to Wedlock's is currently being refurbished following a campaign to prevent closure in 2005. Although its future may be assured in the short run, it may well again be a candidate for closure in the future. The role of Wedlock's pub/café and this block should be considered together, not least to reduce fouling in the park.

#### The following organizations and individuals support this vision

- Friends of Greville Smyth Park
- Residents of Bower Ashton Terrace
- Southville Community Development Association
- Greville Smyth Tennis Club

- Ashton Gate Out of School Care
- Bristol Rovers Supporters Club
- Cllr Charlie Bolton, Southville Ward
- Cllr Linda Salter, Southville Ward
- Cllr Mark Bradshaw, Bedminster Ward
- Cllr Peter Crispin, Bedminster Ward
- Ashton Boys Football Club
- Bristol City Football Club
- Bristol City Supporters Trust

**Statement by Bristol City Supporters Trust (BCST)  
South & East Area Planning Committee – 25 April 2007  
Application to demolish Wedlock's and replace with flats**

**Application 07/00433/F, Wedlock's Public House  
Planning Committee 25 April 2007**

**3**

I write to express my support for the campaign led by Bristol City supporters trust over the proposed development of Wedlocks pub. I believe that the pub has significant potential as a way of enhancing the use of and complimenting Greville Smythe Park.

I understand that there may be significant problems before this can be realised, but would be desperately disappointed to see this opportunity lost to the community for ever.

Furthermore, as with many of the developments taking place in the Southville ward at the present time, I am concerned at the pace and scale of change to the area, and have considerable doubts that the building of nearly all 1 bedroom flats is appropriate.

I am aware that residents have raised concerns over the levels of parking provision, in an area which is already short of spare parking space.

Finally, and this has no relevance to the application, I would like to make you aware that the developer has reported me to the Standards Board over comments I made about him on my blog. I mention this, because I would prefer you to find out from me than from any other source.

Charlie Bolton  
Green Party Councillor  
Southville

**WEDLOCKS PUBLIC HOUSE, BOWER ASHTON TERRACE,  
BRISTOL, BS3 2LE**

**APPLICATION NO: 07/00433/F**

**Key Items for Statement to Planning Committee**

- History of vacancy and reason for development
- Reason for replacement of building
- Appropriateness of residential scheme
- Appropriateness of Design approach in context
- Present reasoning for scale and form of building proposed.

To be presented by Mr Brian Woodward RIBA

Woodward Hambly Webb Ltd  
Dyrham Lodge  
16 Clifton Park  
Clifton  
Bristol  
BS8 3BY

STATEMENT FOR COMMITTEE MEETING BY APPLICANT  
(Chest Properties Limited)

**Application No : 07/00476/F/C**  
**Former ITO FACTORY – LYDSTEP TERRACE**  
**20 April 2007**

- This application seeks to bring back into life an unlisted, derelict 'brownfield' industrial type building (unused since 2003).
- Our design proposes a vibrant and engaging mixed use scheme that is predominantly commercial use (reflecting the buildings previous use)
- A healthy mix of small business units, a range of flats and a café/restaurant will feature
- It will revitalize a tired looking part of Southville prone to graffiti, vandalism and theft by fostering natural surveillance
- It is a sustainable design promoting many positive green features including transport, efficient energy and recycling.
- High quality and recyclable materials have been specified to create architecture of excellence.
- A unilateral agreement is in place that will provide for £56,624 for the improvement of Dame Emily Park and Lydstep Terrace. A £12,420 contribution towards the set up of a car club for future residents and £10,580 towards the improvement of public transport links in the area would counterbalance the zero allocation for parking in the building. An additional £2,400 is to be spent on consequential traffic and highway measures.
- The submitted plans have been developed via a series of extensive pre-application consultations with the Planning authority/Highways Department and Southville community/residents/local councillors.

- Proposal meets Bristol Local Plan policies and Government Planning law (eg PPS3).
- Scheme has developed over time in response to public consultation and feedback from Bristol City Council Planning Department.

## **SPECIFIC ISSUES**

### **1) PARKING**

- Given the highly sustainable transport location of this site, our vision for this building is to attract occupiers who shun cars in favour of public and greener modes of transport. This is achievable given the close proximity to the city centre and nearby transport links. The design makes provision for a large cycle store.
- In early pre-application discussions with the Highways department and the Planning authority, we highlighted that we were trying to achieve optimum use of the existing building. Placing parking within the building would have resulted in a loss in the active frontage at ground floor level. It would have lacked engagement with Dame Emily Park and offered no passive surveillance.
- Knocking the building down in favour of a purpose built solution which incorporated parking was not ideal and it would have resulted in major upheaval for neighbours.
- Also, if we left the building in its current industrial use (which would not require planning permission) we would not have to provide for parking inside as there was none anyway.

- The Highways Department acknowledged that most of the parking outside our site was occupied by city commuters and left vacant in the evenings and weekends. (See enclosed pictures)
- The problem of parking around Kingston Road is not something that can be attributed to our site. It is actually an issue that affects Bristol in general and is exacerbated by many households owning 2-3 cars.
- Our consultation with local residents and councilors shows that a resident parking scheme is perhaps the best solution all around. We strongly urge the Council to implement this scheme as it offers a win-win scenario on many fronts.

## **2) REAR ELEVATION TREATMENT**

- The existing roof needs to be replaced because of its substandard nature and the existence of asbestos in parts of it. This creates the opportunity to form a better design that maximizes the efficiency of space within the building.
- The overall height of the new roof remains the same as that of the existing roof. The new roof is made up of a barrel type roof at the front and a flat roof dormer type structure at the back, which is set lower than the roof at the front.
- Inside the new back roof, the existing ceiling level (which now becomes the new floor level for the flats inside the roof), has been dropped by approximately 600mm, so that the new back roof

starts at a lower point compared to the existing roof.

- We have also ensured that the shape of the roof at the 'Morley Road end' follows a similar line to the existing hipped roof so that residents of Morley Road do not suffer overbearing.
- Precedents in the immediate area have been set that allow the ridge height to be raised considerably (notably the Temple Works factory on Morley Road). We have not sought to follow these principles.
- Shadow diagrams have been provided at various times during the day at various points in the year. These show no material difference between the shadows cast by the existing and the proposed buildings.

The main rear elevation is made of white render and cedar cladding that will enhance the overall sense of space and light to Kingston Road compared to the existing dull red brick façade.

## **SUMMARY**

Our proposed plans are the best of what we can achieve in the conversion of the existing building. Clearly the existing building comes with its constraints and we have strived to work around these and come up with a design that will subscribe to the needs of as many stakeholders as possible.

When viewed as a complete package, the overall positive gain that will be achieved by this development is profound and we humbly ask the committee to endorse this application.

APPENDIX (Pictures showing the site on a typical evening/weekend setting)



weekend example 1



weekend example 2



Evening examples

Mr. and Mrs. J. Viner  
Melville House  
63 Kingston Road  
Southville  
Bristol  
BS3 1DS  
Tel: 0117 9498933

Tuesday, 24 April 2007

**Ref: 07/ 00476/F**

F.A.O. Democratic Services Team

**Please could the following Statement be read in our absence at the meeting dated 25<sup>th</sup> April 2007.**

**We have read the Conditions on page 28 of the Officer's Report. Please could condition 5 be clarified to include noise insulation measures to the toilets at the rear of the building and adjacent to the Kingston Road properties.**

5. *Noise Insulation Measures*

*A detailed scheme of noise insulation and or attenuation measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Details of the insulation of the following areas shall be provided;*

- Ground floor A3 Café use and the first floor residential accommodation.*
- Ground floor B1 use and first floor residential accommodation.*
- First floor B1 use and first floor/second floor residential accommodation.*

*The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and be permanently retained thereafter.*

*Reason - In the interests of the residential amenity of nearby properties.*

**Please could condition 8 be clarified to include details of extraction/ventilation system for the toilets.**

8. *SC36 Details of Extract/Ventilation System - Not Shown*  
*The development hereby permitted shall not take place until details of the means of ventilation for the extraction and dispersal of cooking smells/fumes, including details of its method of construction, odour control measures, noise levels, its appearance and finish have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved scheme shall be installed before the use hereby permitted commences unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter shall be permanently retained.*

*Reason: SR28 - These details need careful consideration and formal approval and to safeguard the amenity of adjoining properties and to protect the general environment.*

Thank you for your attention.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. and Mrs. J. Viner

STATEMENT FOR COMMITTEE MEETING 25 APRIL 2007  
APPLICATION NUMBER 07/00476/F

Jennifer Wallace  
65 Kingston Road  
Southville  
Bristol  
BS3 1DS

Having read the planning officer's report I'd like to make the following points:

As a resident of Kingston Road whose property backs onto the proposed development I think it is important to acknowledge that some of us are actually in favour of this application being approved.

I personally do not feel the proposed plans will compromise my property - in fact I think they will enhance it.

The developer has openly canvassed and considered residents opinions and I am happy that my comments have been listened to when any revisions to the plans have been made.

I feel the proposed roof and rear structure have been cleverly designed and would be far more attractive than the current asbestos and red brick.

I also have no concerns regarding shadowing of my property - I actually think the proposed white render will brighten my rear aspect.

With regard local parking this is not a new problem - as a resident of Southville in the 1980's there was a problem with commuter parking then and sadly this issue has not been addressed in the interim years. Our only hope today is for residents parking and that is not something this planning application can address.

I understand that for many people change is difficult but why would anyone want this site to stay as it is?

Please approve this application so the building can be re-used, refurbished and put to good use, then we can all look forward to meeting for a coffee in the cafe/bar.

41 Kingston Rd.  
Southville,  
Bristol BS3 1DS  
24<sup>th</sup> April '07

Application No: 07/00476/F  
Former ITO Factory,  
Lydstep Terrace,  
Southville,  
Bristol

Dear Sir/Madam,

The new owners of the above-named building are currently applying for full planning permission. We wish to strongly object to certain aspects of this application:

1. Changes to Rear of the Building: Our property is situated 3.8 metres to the rear of the ITO factory. The factory itself is already an overbearing structure which dominates our vista and cuts out the majority of light reaching our property Winter and Summer.
2. The developer proposes to replace the existing roof with a second residential floor which will extend towards Kingston Road properties by approximately six metres. This change will greatly increase the overbearing nature of the building. In effect, it will change the entire apex of the building: moving shadows significantly further onto our properties and blocking out considerably more light.  
(NB See plan attached.)  
This, coupled with the proposed protruding window extensions on the first floor, will effectively *move* the existing first floor rear wall one metre closer to Kingston Road properties. Also, the addition of the proposed second floor will increase the *height* of the existing first floor rear wall by three metres. More shadow will be thrown by the building and there will be greater loss of light. This, again, will further increase the overbearing nature of the building. (Again see plan attached.)
3. Asbestos: As the roof is mainly made of asbestos, we have serious concerns re its handling / removal in relation to health and safety, especially for us residents in close

proximity. We have a one and a half year old child and also have a new three week old baby; our tiny garden is their only play space. We do not want them exposed to any asbestos dust. What absolute safeguards will be put in place and monitored?

Whilst we appreciate that the building needs to be renewed, this should not be to the detriment of us local residents or our environment.

Yours sincerely,

David & Emer Pedley & family.

**Statement to the Development Control Committee 25.04.07**  
**Ref application no. 07/00476/F, Former ITO Building, Lydstep**  
**Terrace**

**From: Elizabeth Brown, 55 Kingston Road, Bristol BS3 1DS**

My husband and I own and reside at 55 Kingston Road.

We were shocked and disappointed to read that the Case Officer, Mrs Julie Seaton, has recommended that planning permission be granted for Chest Properties to go ahead with this development as it stands, in spite of the fact that 30 objections were received from local residents.

Although my husband and I support the redevelopment of brownfield sites, we do not believe that this should be at the expense of what Mrs Seaton describes as the 'amenity' and we would describe as the quality of life, of local residents. You already know that there is a great voice of opposition to this proposal amongst our neighbours on Kingston Road. I can tell you from conversations that I had with some of those neighbours on Monday night that there is a considerable amount of anger and distress about these plans.

If Mrs Seaton had cared to accept the invitation from at least two of my neighbours to come and look at the current aspect of the property from our very small back gardens I am convinced she would have come to understand just what an impact the proposed second floor will have on our homes. Indeed we fail to see how Mrs Seaton could have come to the "balanced view" she mentions in her report without accepting such an invitation from those who complained, and the impression this leaves is that our objections have not been given proper consideration. The new building will tower over us. It will create an intimidating sense of enclosure and cast a shadow over our homes and gardens. The shadow diagrams submitted represent the two extremes of the summer and winter solstice. They do not take into account the loss of light we will suffer at different times throughout the year, as the sun struggles to peer over the new roof.

I do not like to make value judgements about people, but I am sorry to say that my overall impression of this development is that it is motivated by greed. There seems to be no other explanation for squashing so many small flats into one building, then neatly skirting the issue of affordable housing by promising to give £56,000 towards sustainable transport and improvements to recreational space. Is this honestly the best use of the site? Who is the market for the smaller flats at the rear without proper windows and with no outdoor space? I expect that the answer is that they will become buy-to-let properties and that this whole development will do nothing more than to fill the pockets of the

developers and of the career landlords of Bristol. A development that truly is designed to maximise the benefit to the community (of which all those who objected are a part) would focus less on squeezing every last square metre out of this site, and on the developer's bottom line, with scant regard for the impact this will have.

I urge the Committee to reject this application unless the second floor is removed. It will be an unjustifiable blight on our homes. Isn't it enough that we will potentially have to endure the risky removal of the asbestos roof and 18 months of noise and disturbance from a massive building site? Isn't it enough that the struggle for parking spaces on our street will increase as new residents arrive, regardless of any half-hearted attempt to control commuter parking? And isn't enough that we will have to put up with the sounds and smells of perhaps 35 new people, not to mention the café and business units, less than 10 metres away from our own kitchen sinks? Must we lose our sunlight as well as the peace of our own homes? Please don't do this. This development will be a thorn in everyone's side if we cannot agree a compromise. Let's have some justice for the residents.

Site address: 06/05425/F Land to the rear of 117 Coronation Road fronting Allington Road Bristol BS3 1AZ

I wish to reinforce the following points submitted previously in objection to the above development:

The development is not sympathetic to the area (the photos of new builds in the planning application are of Bristol docks, not visible from Allington Road and the other side of the river). The 'rich modelling' that will arise due further development of this row of garages, in my opinion, means 'hotch potch' i.e. it will be an unappealing jumble of sizes, shapes and style.

There will be increased pressure on parking in an area already reaching breaking point. It is currently practically impossible to park near your own house during the daytime due to commuter parking. The provision of bicycle storage does not guarantee the owners will not have a car or cars. The provision of one parking space outside the development will not help if the owners have two cars, as is the case with most modern families.

There will be additional pressure on parking and much disruption during the actual development. We have recently experienced the disruption due to the conversion of 32A Allington Road (which was a small conversion and not a large new build). For the duration of the development there were at least two vans belonging to the builders working on site parked in the street all day. This is in addition to skips and deliveries. The builders also showed lack of respect for neighbouring properties by, for example, taking kerbside boxes and using them as rubble containers.

There is now another development taking place at the rear of 107 Allington Road which has lead to additional builders vans and noise disruption and which is in fact, distracting me from writing this statement!

With 117 being a new build, obviously the disruption, pollution etc will be greater. It seems that Allington Road, a family residential area, is being asked to pick up the social cost for developments to the back of Coronation Road.

Allington Road is being turned into a building site and the residents are paying the price, while receiving no benefit.

Nicola Woodhall  
36 Allington Road  
Bristol BS3 1PT  
0117 953 1469

Objection – application 06/05425/F  
Mr and Mrs Turner – 116 Coronation Road

*M & E Turner*  
*116 Coronation Road*  
*Southville*  
*Bristol*  
*BS3 1AZ*



**Statement for planning meeting – Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> April**

18<sup>th</sup> April 2007

Re: Planning Application 06/05425/F

Proposal to build a two-storey house in what was the back garden of 117 Coronation Road.

The proposal to develop a terrace of houses in the back gardens of the houses in this section of Coronation Road is one that will have a detrimental impact on the local area. These houses are large family houses that, for their location, have reasonable sized gardens. If the gardens are lost the properties would inevitably be split into flats, as they would no longer be desirable for large families, and dwellings such as these would consequently become even scarcer. The loss of green space and the loss of properties appropriate for families close to the centre of Bristol would be irreversible.

The proposed development in the garden of the neighbouring property to ours will have a considerable impact on us. The revised design clearly acknowledges the detrimental impact that this building will have on us and although we appreciate that the architect has reduced the overall size of the building and the amount of windows facing into our property the fact remains that this development will cause considerable loss of sunlight and overshadowing to our house and garden and a tremendous loss of privacy (especially into the children's bedrooms and the study area where they do their school work). The proposed building will enormously reduce the outlook at the rear of our house and will result in a very considerable sense of enclosure.

We moved into this house because we wanted a family house with a garden that was not overlooked and would provide a pleasant environment for our children to play and grow up in. We have no intention of selling our garden for development and no wish to see a terrace emerge in Allington Road (as neither do the residents opposite). Our neighbour on the other side of us (115 Coronation Road) has recently died, and the

Objection – application 06/05425/F  
Mr and Mrs Turner – 116 Coronation Road

future of this property is still unclear. If a house is built in the garden of 117 then there is a strong likelihood that this precedent will lead to a similar development in the garden of 115. A logical consequence follows that it is highly likely that our garden will be walled in on either side and our children will have a garden that resembles an alley way to play in.

We would like to make clear that even though the latest plans acknowledge the detrimental impact of building a house in what was a garden and some aspects of the design have been modified, it is clearly not possible to build a decent sized dwelling in this plot without a huge negative impact on us, our neighbours and the people living in Allington Road. Consequently we are strongly opposed to this proposal and would like to see the development refused planning permission.

Liz and Mike Turner  
116 Coronation Road

C/017 - SC/06/0542S/F.

Statement from Mrs Susan Marshall.

I plead with the Planning Committee to refuse permission for the proposed house to be erected. Its construction will be deleterious to the inhabitants of Allington Rd (Camden Rd to Islington Rd section) & to the inhabitants of the neighbouring houses in Coronatia Rd.

Allington Rd comprises neat & tidy Victorian & Edwardian terraces, clearly & simply showing its history as part of Southville. The proposed design is too high, & by its almost industrial style & use of materials will stick out like a sore thumb. There is no way it will ever blend in or harmonise with existing properties, & instead of enhancing the look of the road, will just be distasteful to look at every day.

The height of the design also causes problems for neighbouring houses & gardens. It will greatly reduce privacy to the back of Coronatia Rd houses, & remove privacy from their gardens. Also it will turn pleasant & sunny gardens, so suitable for families, into dull & mainly sunless areas.

It seems unfair that so many people will have their lives touched by this one house, either by having the harmonious effect of the road spoiled by such an ugly design, which we would have to see every day, & by having the use & pleasure of the backing houses & gardens so greatly diminished.