
To THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

Ref S62A/2024/0072

Application No` 24/04484/PINS

Proposal Self build and other works

Site Address 8 Druid Stoke Avenue Bristol BS9 1DD

Dear Sir or Madam,

We wish to object to the above planning application as owners of one of the properties adversely affected by the proposal.

The grounds for our objection follow.

1. The proposed building is substantially worse than the previous application (24/00564/F), which was rejected on 09-05-24, with proposed greater adverse effects on more properties.
2. Many of those refusal criteria apply also to this proposal, notably paragraphs 1, 3 and 4 of the Reasons for Refusal in the Notice of Decision. Namely:

“(1) The proposed dwelling by virtue of its siting, scale, form, footprint, height and massing would represent a cramped, intensive and incongruous form of development in the backland setting... The proposals represent overdevelopment of the site and are thus contrary to guidance contained within National Policy Planning Framework (2003) and Policy BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) of the adopted Bristol Core strategy (2011) or policies DM21 (Development of Private Gardens) DM26 (Local Character and Distinctiveness) DM27 (Layout and Format) DM29 (Designs of New Buildings) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (July 2014).

“(3) The proposed development by virtue of its scale, bulk, form, massing, height, design, layout and siting in close proximity to neighbouring properties would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on those properties (including private external amenity spaces) and would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure, overshadowing, loss of light and outlook to the detriment of the amenity of occupiers of those properties. The development would also result in harmful levels of direct and perceived overlooking of habitable room windows and external amenity space of neighbouring properties to the detriment of the amenity and privacy of the occupiers of those properties. As such the development would be contrary to National Policy Planning Framework (2003) and Policy BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) of the adopted Bristol Core strategy (2011) and policies DM27 (Layout and Format) DM29 (Design of New Buildings) of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014).

“(4) The proposed development would result in the loss of features which contribute to nature conservation (hedgerow) and fail to provide evidence of acceptable net gains for biodiversity. The Application is therefore contrary to the National Policy Planning Framework (2003) and Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan (2014) DM19 (Development and Nature Conservation”.

3. The proposed house would be too close to existing dwellings and lines of sight from the new property would ruin the privacy of existing dwellings, thereby interfering with their owners' Right to 'the peaceful enjoyment of their possessions' (Human Rights Act, 1998).

4. The proposed dwelling is two stories above ground plus a pitched roof; considerably more intrusive than the rejected building, which was a single story above ground.
5. The proposed dwelling also has a considerably larger 'footprint' than the previously rejected building, that of a luxury dwelling.
6. The proposed siting adversely affects more properties than the rejected proposal.
7. The location of any proposed garages are unclear in the plans, but would represent further objectionable intrusion to the existing dwellings, however located.
8. The size of the building would intrude on the light entry and views enjoyed by a number of the adjoining properties.
9. The plans submitted lack clarity on the provision of amenity and service connections to the street from this problematic low-lying plot.
10. The Notice of Decision of the previously rejected proposal notes that "the proposed development is contrary to the Development Plan as set out in the officer report." This proposed development will also be contrary to that Development Plan, if judged impartially.
11. The proposers made no objection to the rejection findings of the previous application; presumably they had no grounds to contest that refusal, many of the arguments for which hold true for the present proposal.
12. Neither no8 nor the proposed luxury property represent a significant increase in the provision of *affordable* family accommodation in the area, as claimed in the application overview.

Thank you for your kind consideration in informing us of the planning application on 21-01-25 and in considering these objections.

Yours sincerely,

Rev. Dr IA & Mrs FM Bailey


