

**From:** George Swindale [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 09 March 2025 17:52  
**To:** Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Representation - Planning Application 25/10551/PINS

Dear Planning Inspectorate

**Representation: Planning Application 25/10551/PINS // Reference Number S62A/2025/0079 // 515 - 517 Stockwood Road, Brislington, Bristol BS4 5LR**

I wish to register an objection to the planning application 25/10551/PINS on the grounds that it poses an unacceptable risk to life and disregards the Freeholders' failure to meet their legal and moral obligations at Orchard House.

I am and have been a [REDACTED] since 2018. It is an understatement to say that I, and the other Leaseholders have, and continue to go through, a period of emotional and financial hardship as a direct result of the Freeholder's irresponsibility.

There have been numerous failings of the Freeholder under various company names to address fire safety standards at Orchard House, which has already picked up media attention and continues to do so, including the Bristol Cable

[REDACTED], BBC  
and Sky News  
[REDACTED]

To summarise the timeline of key events:

- May 2021 - Leaseholders paid for a preliminary desk-based review for sign off under the EWS1 form. Signing of the EWS1 could not be completed under Option A due to the combustibles and unknown materials identified. The report determined that an intrusive physical inspection would be required.
- April 2023 - Leaseholders paid for an intrusive EWS1 Option B survey. The result of the assessment was a B2 rating which meant there was an inadequate standard of fire safety, and remedial work/interim measures were required.
- December 2023 - Orchard House was one of the very first blocks in the country to secure a First Tier Property Tribunal (FTT) Remediation Order (CH1/00HB/2023/0007). The judgement ruled the Freeholder must complete remediation works by 12 June 2024.
- March 2025 (today) - Despite a legally-binding court order, the Freeholder has ignored its legal duty to act. They have remained absent and silent throughout.

The fact is this: Orchard House is unsafe. The Leaseholders and the Freeholder have known of the safety defects since the intrusive survey in 2023. The Freeholder has actively avoided communication with all relevant authorities - including Bristol City

Council, Avon Fire, Homes England, [REDACTED] Leaseholders and the managing agent - whilst continuing to collect ground rent.

The managing agent, which acts under instruction of the Freeholder, is unable to apply to the Cladding safety scheme because the Freeholder is considered the sole 'responsible party'. Leaseholders are unable to apply for the scheme for the same reason. Leaseholders therefore remain unable to take any steps towards remediation. Ultimately this means Leaseholders are, in many cases, unable to sell, remortgage or move forwards with their lives due to the building's unsafe status.

The Freeholder's attitude towards accountability has been demonstrably non-existent. They owe a duty of care for its Leaseholders (and residents). Despite this, the Freeholder has been pushing forwards with further development proposals since 2021, whilst not fulfilling their duty of care responsibilities to Orchard House.

Adding a neighbouring property onto a B2 rated building is a significant risk to life and must not be considered. Allowing this application would inevitably invite many pointed and bruising questions from the media and public in years to come.

In summary, it seems obvious that the Freeholder should not be permitted to have applications granted whilst they ignore their obligations and commitments, both moral and legal, to Orchard House. Their blatant disregard towards accountability should dictate that they are not granted the opportunity to endanger the physical safety and livelihoods of future Bristol residents.

Regards  
George Swindale