

**From:** .  
**To:** [Bristol Local Plan](#)  
**Subject:** Old Market Quarter Neighbourhood Development Plan - consultation  
**Date:** 22 March 2015 22:49:40

---

Hello

I have had a look through the documents for the subject above. I am happy with and fully supportive of this.

However, I would like to make some comments, in case you have reason to consider modifying the main document (Old Market Quarter Neighbourhood Development Plan). These are as follows:

#### Policy B2

RE the bullet-point over height of a new building, Old Market's architecture includes some buildings which are nicely dominant in their height. The Palace Hotel, Central Hall, Coach & Horses (Bragg's Lane), Holy Trinity Church, Crown Tavern (Lawford's Gate) and 77-85 West Street are a few such examples. For a new one to be erected immediately adjacent and matching in height could spoil heritage and character of the original one. To protect the dominance of such landmarks, may I propose an additional bullet-point be included, to the effect of:

"Any new building between one dominant in height and neighbouring ones less so, should blend in height with the height of the latter."

#### Policy B4

For the restoration of heritage assets in need of attention as indicated in Appendix 3, may an further bullet-point would be worth considering? I am thinking of words to the effect of:

"If one of the buildings mentioned in Appendix 3, a commitment to restore it as the appendix details (or further - particularly if deterioration has increased), should be conditional of any approval."

I do not know if a condition can be laid down in a policy, but would assume so. Such enhancements would I feel, be following policies BCS22 ("Conservation and the Historic Environment") and DM31 ("Heritage Assets").

#### Appendix 2

One of the photographs on page 18 indicates an aim to be rid of street clutter. With section 6.2 "Signage and Advertising", could an additional paragraph be included, to prevent signs such as those of estate agents' (and equivalent) causing excess clutter? Such protruding signs for properties which are closed, vacant, for sale or due for re-leasing can tend to cause an over-population of signs in contrast to the ongoing traders'. These can conceal the current businesses' from being seen, leading to a fall in trade. An excess in the population of estate agents' signs can also indicate a high street to be less active in business than it is. Any signs not relating to the trade of any commercial unit should be required to be laid flat against the shopfront. Particular places in mind include Old Market Street, West Street, Lawford's Gate and Stapleton Road. The same restriction should apply to dwellings such as flats - in commercial areas at least.

### Appendix 3

Is there a way this can be future-proofed, to allow further needs of restoration to be added and other buildings to be added, should any places deteriorate further?

I hope my comments do not sound offensive to the people who appear to have worked very hard in putting the plan together. I am just suggesting some points which may help to make the document more watertight in protecting the heritage and businesses of this area. It is only in recent years I have come to realise what the area has to offer and appreciate its heritage and facilities. The revival of some of its pubs in recent years proves the area can thrive!

Regards

Tim Belsten