

From: Samantha Mant [REDACTED]

Sent: 03 June 2025 13:45

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major

<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: OBJECTION: Planning Reference S62A/2025/0101 7 Belvedere Road, Bristol BS6 7JG

To Whom It May Concern,

I write to register my strong objection to the latest planning application submitted in reference to 7 Belvedere Road, Bristol BS6 7JG. This is the fourth such application by the same developer in recent years, and—like the previous three—this proposal is substantively unchanged. It remains entirely unsuitable, and I urge the Planning Inspectorate to reject it once again.

1. Vexatious Resubmission and Procedural Abuse

This application is a barely altered version of its predecessors. The reduction in bed numbers from 14 to 12 is a minor cosmetic adjustment that does nothing to address the reasons for past refusals. The Planning Inspectorate has already ruled on this matter multiple times, most recently on 9 January 2023 (APP/Z0116/W/22/3299847), citing significant harm to highway safety and congestion.

The repeated submissions—with minimal change—appear to be a deliberate tactic to wear down opposition. We are informed the applicant has stated he will continue to submit applications regardless of outcome. This is, by definition, vexatious and a misuse of the planning system. I respectfully urge the Inspectorate to send a strong signal that such tactics will not be tolerated.

2. Highway Safety, Parking Pressure and Access Obstruction

The situation on Belvedere Road and surrounding streets has deteriorated, not improved. There has been no material change in highway conditions since the last refusal. In fact, disruption from the existing care homes has only intensified.

We are frequently and repeatedly disturbed by ambulance activity, often during the night, associated with the care homes. Flashing emergency lights shining directly into our bedroom, slamming vehicle doors, and loud exchanges between attending personnel are common occurrences. This is not occasional—it is routine. For example, on 10 May, Glenview was attended by an ambulance in the morning, and later that night, at 23:34, two ambulances remained on site for an extended period. These incidents are symptomatic of an ongoing reliance on emergency services, which suggests that the homes are not staffed with sufficiently skilled or resourced personnel to manage their residents' needs effectively. This pushes an unacceptable burden onto public services—and onto us, the neighbours who live with the noise, disruption, and loss of peace and privacy.



Example 10 May 2025 23.34

Example: 3 June 2025 – commercial window washing company trailing across the road to Glenview, plus RD Johns blocking 2 driveways while delivering food to Glenview, plus a grey (E3) electricians van blocking driveway of No13 as no other parking spaces.

Neighbour [REDACTED] has conducted rigorous, policy-compliant parking surveys that thoroughly discredit the applicant's misleading data. As my neighbours have described in their letters, parking on Belvedere Road is under immense pressure at all times of day due to the excessive demand generated by multiple large care homes on a narrow residential street. Particularly concerning is the persistent illegal and dangerous parking across the dropped kerbs at both ends of the street—kerbs that are relied upon by older residents using wheelchairs and by parents with prams and small children. These obstructions not only impede access but severely compromise visibility and manoeuvrability at junctions, directly impacting street safety.

Evidence of the unbearable overuse of these roads is the very high number of parking tickets issued on this street compared to any of its comparable neighbouring streets. I made a FOI request and received the following figures. And these do not reflect the much higher number of times that these offences were reported, as our phone records

	2022	2023	2024
Belvedere Road	59	66	54
The Glen	6	5	2
Blenheim Road	14	3	8
Clay Pit Road	24	8	18

Neighbour [REDACTED] photographic compendium of resident images, provides vivid and undeniable evidence of the daily disruption we face—perhaps the most powerful visual account of the chaos caused.

[REDACTED] has documented the daily traffic movements linked to Glenview dementia home alone. These are not isolated incidents—they represent a systemic, ongoing problem. And they account for just one third of the impact, given that two additional care homes operate on the same street.

Contrary to the applicant's claims, care home staffing will have to increase with the 12 new beds, as dictated by dependency-led staffing models. These shifts occur outside standard public transport windows, making car use inevitable. And we note the unhelpful but understandable behaviour of staff members, holding spaces for each other and switching over vehicles, further restricting any normal ebb and flow of parking for residents.

In 2022 the Planning Inspector rightly cited Policy BCS10 and Policies DM2 and DM23 as grounds for refusal due to dangerous on-street parking and congestion. Nothing has changed.

In addition to the long-standing issues, it is critical that officers are fully aware of the impending large-scale development at the site of the old St Christophers school, on the opposite side of Belvedere Road and The Glen. Even if that project includes well-intentioned parking plans, it is undeniable that it will introduce additional vehicles, movements, and pressure on local infrastructure. This context cannot be ignored. Any decision on the Glenview application must be made in full recognition of the cumulative and escalating impact that this new development will bring to the street.

We note that these objections are not isolated. The Bristol Civic Society, our local councillors, the Westbury Park Residents Group, and our appointed planning consultant all share deep concerns about this application. Their support is based on evidence and experience, and the consultant's detailed analysis outlines multiple grounds on which this application should rightly be refused.

3. Overconcentration of Institutional Use

The development also continues to contravene Policy DM2's restrictions on over-concentration of specialist housing in a single location, further eroding the diversity and cohesion of the local residential community.

If approved, 6 of the 11 properties on one side of Belvedere Road would be care homes, the vast majority of which will be for dementia residents, who are unable to access or benefit from any of the excellent local services. These operate round-the-clock, generating a disproportionate volume of commercial activity on a narrow residential street. Glenview and Meadowcare currently accommodate 94 residents between them, and Belvedere Lodge—another care home on the same side of the street—adds a further 20 beds. That brings the total number of care home residents on this short stretch of Belvedere Road to at least 114.

In contrast, there are only 21 homes on the entire street, with fewer than 100 residents in standard accommodation. In other words, institutional occupancy already exceeds residential occupancy—and this application seeks to widen that gap even further.

This level of saturation undermines the intended balance of a mixed residential area. It displaces long-term residents and deters new families from moving in. We are already seeing this effect play out, as families have started leaving the street due to the loss of amenity, the increase in disruption, and the erosion of a stable residential community. This is not what mixed-use planning is meant to support. The proposed intensification would tip the balance beyond repair.

4. Loss of Valuable Residential Housing

Policy BCS5, which underpins Bristol's strategic housing objectives, calls for the protection and delivery of a balanced mix of housing types. This includes family-sized homes—particularly in established residential areas such as this. The proposal directly contradicts that objective, as it converts rare, generously sized flats into institutional accommodation. Similarly, Policy BCS21, which supports high-quality urban design, is

undermined by the imposition of a large-scale institutional use in a street designed for residential cohesion and amenity.

No. 7 currently comprises three generously sized flats, in a location with excellent transport, school and community access. These are precisely the kinds of homes Bristol needs to retain. Their loss to an institution where residents are largely invisible and isolated represents a hollowing-out of the residential character of Redland. Policy BCS18 supports the protection and retention of diverse housing stock, and this application runs counter to that aim.

5. Quality of Care and Site Unsuitability

Policy DM30, which governs alterations to existing buildings, requires that development proposals respect the character and architectural integrity of buildings—particularly in sensitive locations like Conservation Areas. This scheme fails that test. It also falls short under Policy BCS23, which sets out the need for sustainable design and construction. The application makes no credible attempt to minimise its environmental impact, manage servicing demands, or mitigate traffic congestion.

Glenview is already rated “Requires Improvement” by the Care Quality Commission across safety, effectiveness and leadership. The claim that additional beds will not require more staff defies both logic and CQC guidance.

The site’s layout is completely unfit for purpose: no off-street parking, no proper service entrance, limited waste storage, and no usable outside space for residents.

Clinical waste bins are unsecured and accessible from the street, often overflowing, in contravention of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. These practices constitute not just aesthetic blight but a potential breach of statutory responsibilities around waste containment and public health. This is evidenced by surgical gloves and other detritus found littering the street.



Example: 20 May 2025, 09.30am

6. Disruption to Daily Life and Mental Wellbeing

Beyond the visible and audible disruptions, this proposal also fails to address its broader impact on public health—contravening Policy DM14, which requires that the health impacts of development be assessed and mitigated. The cumulative toll on sleep, mental health, and day-to-day quality of life for neighbours is simply disregarded.

Ambulance visits in the early hours, shift-change noise, idling diesel engines, and blocked driveways are a daily reality. These disturbances directly affect our sleep, our work, and our ability to live peacefully in our homes. The mental toll of these constant invasions should not be underestimated. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, para 130) requires developments to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users—this scheme clearly fails to meet that standard.

It is also inappropriate that care home staff from Glenview should take their smoking breaks across the road sitting on the wall of the MoD houses in particular number 17. This is in full view of the various children that live on this road, including those at number 16 and 19. Photo evidence is available on request.

7. Planning History and Conservation Area Context

This application also raises significant concerns in relation to the historic character of the area and its long term preservation.

The applicant asserts in the Historical document that this development will enhance the appearance of the building and preserve its place in the conservation area. The applicant's claim that the development will enhance the building's appearance is flatly contradicted by past experience. Photographic evidence shows how, since works began on Glenview, the frontage has become starkly commercialised—with intrusive ramps, extensive bin storage, and industrial-scale servicing directly on the street. In addition, recent works to the stonework at the front of the house (presumably to improve its looks for this process) were carried out using methodology which is known to cause long-term damage to the fabric of the building. Significant areas of the stonework, windows, and doors at No. 7 had deteriorated due to years of neglect. When I spoke with the contractor during recent repair works, I was told that instead of using appropriate materials—such as like-for-like Bath stone or breathable lime mortar—the developer instructed the use of Portland Cement, fully aware this would accelerate long-term damage but this method was cheaper. The façade was then covered in impermeable vinyl paint which will further accelerate deterioration of the structure of the building. These shortcuts show a fundamental disregard for the fabric of the building and for the conservation principles that are essential in a protected area.



August 2008 – with owner residents in flats



October 2023 – under ownership of Meadowcare (please the good condition of other frontages in the street)

Furthermore, the 2018 consent for basement excavation at No. 7 was granted solely for residential enhancement. There is no justification for repurposing that permission for institutional expansion. No visible work has begun, and this should be considered lapsed.

It is of considerable concern that both No 10 Belvedere and various MoD houses over the road have all suffered substantial damage to their structure, so extreme that at least 2 MoD houses are now considered unsafe and have not been re-tenanted due to the original basement excavation works done by the applicant, which were far in excess of any original planning permissions. Yet another demonstration of the contempt and manipulation that applicant has for the planning process.

8. Request for Public Hearing

Given the scale of objection and level of community impact, I formally request a public hearing so that residents may present their views directly.

Conclusion

This application is not new. It is the latest attempt to repackage a previously rejected scheme, using discredited data and unverifiable staffing claims. The proposal will worsen traffic and parking, intensify commercial use in a residential street, erode housing stock, and degrade quality of life for residents.

It remains in breach of multiple local and national planning policies, including Policies BCS10, BCS18, DM2, and DM23, as well as national guidance under the NPPF. It also contravenes Policies BCS5, BCS21, BCS23, DM14, and DM30. I urge you to reject it resoundingly.

I would appreciate an acknowledgement of receipt of this email. Thank you.

Yours faithfully,
Samantha Mant

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Samantha Mant.