

From: Jonathan Williams [REDACTED]

Sent: 01 June 2025 15:42

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: S62A/2025/0101 - 7 Belvedere Road, Redland, Bristol, BS6 7JG

Dear Sirs

I write in reference to the above application. This applicant has had previous applications to Bristol City Council ("BCC") refused over the last few years, mainly on the grounds of road safety and traffic management, but there are wider concerns with the application that also need to be addressed.

The application would increase the bed capacity of Glenview from 40 to 52 beds but does not make it clear that this is one of three care homes on the same side of the street. Meadowcare, which is in the same ownership as Glenview (Meadowcare is the lead CQC registration), has 34 beds, and Belvedere Lodge has a further 20 beds. At present the one side of Belvedere Road, a narrow suburb road, has got almost 100 beds already, and the existing care homes dominate that side of the road. There are supported living flats in Redland Road, yards from the applicant site, and a supported living house with 15 flats in The Glen (Freeways Trust).

This creates significant traffic movements and contributes to a serious parking problem in the area. Belvedere Road, Blenheim Road, and The Glen form three sides of a block and are immediately outside and adjacent to the Redland residents' parking zone ("RPZ"); the 4th side, Redland Road is inside the RPZ.

The traffic movements and parking issues in the area are due to a combination of movements to and from the various care and supported living facilities, commuter parking during the day to avoid parking charges (we are blessed with a good bus route into the centre of town), teacher parking from the large primary school in the next street, and car movements from the homes. These will only get worse if bed numbers increase.

There is no off-road parking for any of the care homes, and delivery lorries, ambulances, taxis etc frequently block the roads because there is nowhere to pull out of traffic. The applicant that ambulances can be parked in the centre of the road for 1-3 hours. There is no privacy or dignity for residents being transferred to ambulances - they come out of the front door into an ambulance in the street. Residents of the homes who have died are similarly moved on a gurney to private ambulances in the middle of the road.

Cars park up to, and sometimes over the edge of, junctions, and when the road is blocked you have no choice but to reverse round tight, blind bends, and sometimes into traffic. The tight parking, poor pavements and frequently blocked dropped kerbs force mobility scooters, pushchairs and wheelchairs into the road for several dozen yards at a time. There is a lot of primary school foot-traffic at school start and finish times, and the traffic congestion and parking problems are exacerbated by traffic movements from the homes, which go on throughout the day. Last year my own car, parked outside my house, was driven into with significant damage caused by another car taking the turning from Belvedere Road into The Glen too fast, and having to take evasive action to avoid another car coming towards him.

The applicant's previous application to BCC was refused largely on the grounds of traffic management and parking problems, being seen as making a bad situation worse, and with no credible proposals for alleviation. This application is largely unchanged from the previous one, albeit

that the additional bed count is reduced by 2 from 14 to 12; it is hard to see that this will make a material difference.

The applicant has put in a detailed traffic plan to try to rebut the previous grounds for refusal. This plan is flawed on several grounds. The detail of these flaws are cited in a much more comprehensive reply to this application, which I have read and I support. The main flaws in the applicant's survey are that the applicant has not followed BCC methodology for such surveys, looking at parking availability over a greater area than permitted; that he failed to calculate the real available spaces correctly, and that a large number of the reported available spaces are outside the permitted count area. The overall effect is to drastically underplay the parking problems in the area. As I say, I would refer you to the other responses providing much more specific detail on the ongoing parking problems here.

Note also that an earlier application (2021) to convert No 7 into 8 flats with rear extensions was also refused mainly on the grounds of traffic and parking problems it would cause.

A few years ago, the applicant carried out a similar extension to the Glenview home (No 8 & 9 Belvedere Road), into which No.7 is to be incorporated. That construction also involved hollowing out the basement, in the same manner as he plans to do here. This is a significant concern for the other residents of the area. Last time, this work closed Belvedere Road for about 18 months, far longer than was originally planned. The plans for the lower ground floor show proposed excavation, permitted under application 18/03500/F. The applicant states that this work has already been started. However, the application in 2018 to enlarge the basement flat in No. 7 was made after an application in 2017 to convert No 7 into a care home extension was withdrawn. The BCC planning portal no longer shows the comments on application 18/03500/F but my recollection was that many of the comments expressed the concern that this application to extend the basement was simply a step towards a later care home extension application, and the planning officer's report explicitly states that consideration could only be given to the application as presented: i.e. as an extension to a residential flat. **The officer's report, which I have attached to this email**, makes it clear that approval is only granted for use as a residential apartment. I would ask that the assumption of granted consent to doing this work be reviewed very closely, because it was not granted as part of a care home conversion, but as an improvement to existing flats.

Given the excessive noise, dust and inconvenience caused by the last basement excavation he carried out, as well as the risk of subsidence damage posed to the adjacent properties, I would ask that the excavation be refused. I would also note that there has been no external visible evidence of this excavation work actually starting and I would ask that the Inspectors review carefully whether in fact the original application to excavate the basement has lapsed through non-fulfilment. The residents in the area queried this with BCC Building Control in 2022, to establish if sufficient work had been done to prevent the original consent to excavate from lapsing (ref: BCC PEC 21/30487/MINOR), and we received the response that any future planning applications could reference the planning enforcement history on that application.

Finally, the area is well served by schools, shops, bus routes into town and other amenities. No.7, if retained as three good-sized flats provides much needed housing in an area in high demand. It would be a shame to lose more residential housing to a care home where the residents are never seen and rarely leave the building. A significant majority of all the residential care beds in Redland are in this very small area, and the continued expansion of this business and the bed numbers will further harm the residential nature of the area.

I would also ask that you hold a public hearing on this application so that detailed representations might be made in person

Thank you

Jonathan Williams

[REDACTED]