

**From:** Paul Rawlings [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 03 June 2025 16:34

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

**Subject:** Objection to Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2025/0101 for 7 Belvedere Road.

**Objection to Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2025/0101 for 7 Belvedere Road. Change of use from three residential flats (use class C3) to a 12 bedroom extension to an existing nursing home (use class C2), including demolition and replacement of rear extension and external alterations.**

My name is Dr Paul Rawlings and I have lived [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] I strongly object to the planning application for the 12-bed extension to the Glenview Dementia Home and the consequent loss of residential housing. I believe that the grounds for refusing this planning application include: the detrimental effect on highway safety, increased noise and disruption in a residential area, and the change of character to the road.

The applicant has previously made several applications to convert the flats at number 7 to an extension to the Glenview Dementia Home, initially for 17 extra beds, then 14, then 12 and now 12 again but this time without a request for 2 servicing bays on the road. In each case the application has been rejected by BCC and on appeal by the planning inspectorate. The principal grounds for rejecting the previous applications have centred on issues of highway safety. To overcome this the applicant has claimed that the parking situation has improved since the last application and has submitted an extremely flawed and hence invalid parking survey to support this. I can assure you that the situation has not improved from when the last application was made and planning consent should again be refused on these grounds alone. The true parking situation and the errors in the applicant's survey have been very clearly set out in the objection email from [REDACTED] and also from **Planning Consultants Evans Jones** and I fully agree with and support their analysis.

One change that the applicant has made from the last application is to claim that there will no longer be a need for additional staff to look after the extra residents. Their previous application (22/01529/F) which was also for a 12-bedroom extension, required an increase in staffing levels with 2 further staff between 8.00 and 14.00 and one further staff between 14.00 and 20.00. It was also stated in this earlier application that two car spaces would be needed at change over times. The applicant has not given any evidence as to why they would no longer require the additional staff and it is frankly inconceivable that they could expand the number of beds by 30% without an increase in staff, so I believe this claim should be ignored. Beyond this there will of course be further impacts on parking, highway safety, noise and disruption from the additional visitors, delivery drivers, ambulances, doctors and maintenance teams required by the extra residents.

**Highway Safety** - The planning inspector stated in the decision letter dated 30th January 2023 relating to application (22/01529/F) *"Therefore, for the reasons given above, the proposal would result in additional demand for parking, exacerbating the existing problems. This would risk further vehicles blocking footways and dropped kerbs, causing some pedestrians, particularly those with buggies or in wheelchairs, to use the carriageway itself. This would result in conflict with moving vehicles and risk the highway safety of road users. The additional demand would also result in further congestion and blockage of driveways, causing greater inconvenience and conflict for residents. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety and congestion, having regard to on-street parking availability in the locality. I attach significant weight to this harm. As such, for the reasons given above, the proposal would be contrary to policies DM2 and DM23 of the Bristol Local Plan Site Allocations*

*and Development Management Policies (SADM), adopted July 2014, and policy BCS10 of the Bristol Development Framework Core Strategy, adopted June 2011 (the Core Strategy)."*

I can assure you that parking in the area surrounding Glenview is just as bad as it has ever been. There are regular issues with people parking in dangerous positions at the road junctions and across driveways due to the lack of parking spaces and this causes a significant risk to cyclists and pedestrians. These issues have been highlighted in photographs from the local residents and catalogued in her objection email by [REDACTED]. This problem is further evidenced by the number of PCNs issued in the 4 roads surrounding Glenview at over 80 per year, a very significant number – see [REDACTED] objection email.

**Noise and Disruption** - There are frequent disruptions from delivery vehicles, ambulances, doctors' cars, hearses, refuse vehicles and maintenance vans which block the road at all hours of the day and night. When the road is blocked in this manner I frequently witness people having to reverse the length of the road and onto the main road at one end of Belvedere Road or around a tight bend into the Glen at the other. Both manoeuvres being difficult and dangerous and increasing the risk to pedestrians and other road users

I am often prevented from getting my car out of my drive, significantly delaying me leaving home and often leading to very stressful situations. In the period from May 16th to May 29th our driveway, which has a dropped curb, was blocked on 63 occasions and 53 of these were due to vehicles associated with Glenview. Please see the objection email from [REDACTED] where this is reported in greater detail.

In addition to the highway safety issues there will also be more noise from the extra residents, carers and visitors. As Glenview is a dementia home there are several residents who cry out at the top of their voices for long periods of time for support from the staff, evidently due to their confused condition. While I have every sympathy for the individuals and the staff, adding to the number of residents can only make this situation worse and very distressing for all of us that live nearby. Significant noise and disruption happen every morning and evening when the shift handover takes place, with staff standing around and talking loudly in the road and staff family members sitting in their cars with windows open playing music. None of which adds to the peace and character of a residential road and will increase with the number of residents.

**Change of Character to the Road** - There are currently 3 nursing homes in the road – Belvedere Lodge (20 beds), Meadowcare Home (34 beds) and Glenview Nursing Home (40 beds) – all are registered separately with the CQC. All are residential nursing homes for patients with dementia. They currently occupy 5 out of 11 buildings on one side of Belvedere Road. The proposed extension would result in 6 of the 11 buildings being occupied by nursing homes, with a total of 106 beds. This would lead to an even greater over-concentration of nursing homes in just one small road, and a loss of affordable housing for young families which I consider to be detrimental to the neighbourhood and should not be made any worse by allowing the expansion of Glenview.

Please support the views of myself and the local residents who are already significantly negatively impacted by the operation of the three nursing homes in Belvedere Road and refuse this application to extend the number of beds at Glenview.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Regards

Dr Paul Rawlings

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]