



Decision Notice and Statement of Reasons

Site visit made on 9 June 2025

By Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

A person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2025

Application Reference: S62A/2025/0101

Site address: 7 Belvedere Road, Westbury Park, Bristol BS6 7JG.

- The application is made under section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - The site is located within the administrative area of Bristol City Council.
 - The application dated 14 April 2025 is made by J Baryah (Meadowcare Homes Limited) and was validated on 29 April 2025.
 - The development proposed is 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.
-

Decision

1. Planning permission is refused for the development described above, for the following reasons:
 - 1) The proposed development would include no off-road parking facilities for cars, delivery/collection vehicles or ambulances. As such, it would lead to additional street parking in an area where there is already a high demand for roadside parking. Parking associated with the development would exacerbate congestion, prejudice highway safety and not ensure the provision of safe streets. Consequently, it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. In these regards, the development would be contrary to policy BCS10 of the Bristol Core Strategy adopted 2011 and policies DM2 and DM23 of the Bristol Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan adopted 2014.

Statement of Reasons

Procedural matters

2. Section 62A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) allows for applications to be made directly to the Planning Inspectorate where a Council has been designated by the Secretary of State. Bristol City Council (BCC) has been designated for non-major applications since 6 March 2024.

3. Consultation undertaken on the planning application subject to this decision allowed for responses by 4 June 2025. BCC has submitted a statement explaining why it considers planning permission should not be granted. Also, representations have been received from local residents and other interested parties. I carried out a site visit on 9 June 2025. My observations and all the representations have been considered in reaching my decision.
4. A completed and signed version of a unilateral undertaking pursuant to section 106 of the Act (the UU) has been submitted by the applicant since the application was validated. This UU is similar to a draft version that has been available to interested parties to view through the consultation exercise. Therefore, no injustice would be caused to any party by taking the UU into account.

Main Issues

5. Having regard to the application, the consultation responses and my observations, I consider the main issues are:
 - the effect of parking associated with the development on highway safety, congestion and the character and appearance of the area;
 - whether the development would be in an acceptable location;
 - its effect on housing mix and choice of housing;
 - the development's effect on the character and appearance of the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of The Downs Conservation Area (the CA);
 - the effect on living conditions at nearby residences; and
 - if any harm is identified in respect of the above issues, whether any other considerations indicate that planning permission should be granted.

Reasons

Planning History and Background

6. This application follows on from a previous planning application for the change of use of the application property (No 7) to a 12 bedroom extension to the 40 bedroom nursing home at 8 to 9 Belvedere Road (hereafter referred to simply as Glenview). An appeal against the Council's failure to determine this previous application (reference number APP/Z0116/W/22/3299847 and hereafter referred to as the previous appeal) was dismissed and planning permission refused on 30 January 2023. The Inspector in that case concluded the proposal would have a harmful effect on highway safety and congestion having regard to on-street parking availability in the locality. They also found the adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) when read as a whole.
7. I am also referred to a planning permission granted on 4 December 2024 by the Council for a replacement rear extension and various works and external alterations to No 7 (Council reference number 24/03733). Also,

prior to the previous appeal, No 7 was the subject of planning applications proposing the change of use to a 17 bedroom extension and a 14 bedroom extension to Glenview. Both of these applications were refused planning permission by the Council and dismissed on appeal.

Planning Policy Context.

8. The development plan for the area consists of the Bristol Core Strategy adopted 2011 (the CS) and the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies Local Plan adopted 2014 (the LP). A new local plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. However, neither the Council nor the applicant refers to policies from the emerging local plan in support of their cases. As they are still under examination, the policies of the new local plan may change before it is finally adopted. Therefore, I attach very limited weight to its policies in my assessment.

Parking– the existing situation.

9. No 7 lies on an urban, residential street. Neither the application site nor Glenview provide any off-road parking facilities. Unrestricted kerbside parking is allowed on most parts and on both sides of Belvedere Road as well as on other nearby streets such as The Glen and Blenheim Road. Many properties in the locality have no private parking facilities although there are several that benefit from off-road spaces served by dropped kerbs.
10. The applicant states that demand for kerbside parking is high on Belvedere Road and on The Glen (paragraphs 3.2.4 and 3.2.6 of the Staff Travel Plan). This is consistent with comments from the Inspector for the previous appeal that on-street parking in the area is at a premium. The representations from local residents describe a situation whereby roadside parking spaces are often hard to find and when vacated they become quickly re-occupied. These comments reflect my own observations of parking on Belvedere Road, The Glen and Blenheim Road on a Monday morning. Parking has a strong influence on the character and appearance of area so as to detract from the visual qualities of the street scene.
11. The applicant has carried out on-street parking surveys. It is claimed these have been carried out in accordance with BCC's parking survey methodology document. However, interested parties have pointed out that stretches of the highway more than 150m away from No 7 when measured along the roads have been included. Also, it would seem the surveys have treated parts of the local roads within the first 10m of a road junction or within visibility splays as potential parking spaces. As such, the surveys have not been carried out fully in accordance with BCC's guidance.
12. The technical report on the parking surveys compares the number of cars actually parked on a street to a maximum capacity based on the lengths of the roads where parking could occur without obstruction to dropped kerbs. Such an approach seems to accord with BCC's suggested methodology. However, it does not account for situations where longer vehicles are parked or when parking is spaced out with an inefficient use of kerb space. On my visit, I saw several such situations. Therefore, I am unconvinced the

applicant's parking surveys provide a realistic assessment of parking capacity on local streets.

13. Alternative parking surveys have been carried out by a local resident that found either none or very few free roadside parking spaces within 150m walking distance of the application site. This reflects my observations of very limited free roadside space on local streets. The level of street parking will of course fluctuate. However, from my own experience and the information before me, it would seem the application site is in an area where there is a very high demand for street parking.
14. The applicant refers to the potential for parking capacity to increase if measures to prevent long term parking of caravans on Clay Pit Road are implemented. However, there is little information before me on the likelihood of such restrictions being implemented and so they fail to affect by views on parking stress in the local area.
15. The applicant's Transport Statement (TS) provides an overview on how Glenview currently operates and the associated level of parking by staff, visitors and deliveries. This shows that trips to and from Glenview are made by a variety of modes of transport including taxi, cycle, walking and public transport. Even so, it is evident that a proportion of staff and visitors' trips to Glenview are by car. As no private parking exist, it is fair to assume that staff and visitors to Glenview contribute to the parking stress in the area.

The effect of parking on local streets.

16. Representations including photographs from interested parties illustrate how inappropriate parking on local roads can lead to the obstruction of vehicular accesses onto private properties. This causes inconvenience to residents and may also result in drivers waiting in the public highway for the obstructing vehicle to be moved. Also, submitted photographs reinforce my own observations of parking close to the junctions of Belvedere Road and Westbury Park/Redland Road as well as Belvedere Road and The Glen. Even when clear of double yellow lines, such parking can obstruct dropped kerbs and so hinder the movement of pedestrians. Furthermore, I saw how parking can restrict visibility when entering or leaving these junctions.
17. Belvedere Road and The Glen are both 2 way streets. However, the parking on both sides of these roads prevents vehicles from passing each other on long stretches. At the time of my visit the streets were lightly trafficked but nonetheless I saw situations where vehicles either had to wait at the junctions at either end of Belvedere Road or reverse to allow on-coming traffic to pass. Such situations could cause driver uncertainty and delay, particularly for those unaccustomed to the local streets.
18. The submissions from interested parties highlight times when vehicles, including ambulances and delivery vehicles, have stopped in the middle of Belvedere Road due to the lack of convenient kerbside parking. Indeed, on my visit I saw a van in the middle of Belvedere Road for a short time whilst its driver delivered a parcel to a nearby house. This sort of situation stops the free flow of traffic. Also, it may lead to drivers reversing on the highway

back towards the junctions at either end of the road, particularly if forced to wait for any significant period of time.

19. Interested parties highlight how the high demand for street parking causes drivers to travel in a loop around Belvedere Road, The Glen and Blenheim Road searching for a space to park. This increases the chance of vehicles meeting on the local roads and the risk of drivers needing to approach and leave junctions where visibility is obstructed by parked vehicles.
20. Personal injury accident data has been provided by the applicant that shows no incidences on Belvedere Road. Nonetheless, for the above reasons I find the level of roadside parking in the vicinity of No 7 currently causes a nuisance and prejudices highway safety.

The effects of the development on parking and highway safety.

21. LP policy DM23 expects development to provide an appropriate level of safe and useable parking having regard to parking standards, the parking management regime and the level of accessibility by walking, cycling and public transport. Also, it should provide appropriate servicing and loading facilities. LP policy DM2 states proposals for shared housing will not be permitted where they would harm residential amenity or the character of an area through levels of on-street parking that cannot be accommodated or regulated through parking control measures. This policy is relevant to my assessment as its justification explains that shared housing includes housing for older people.
22. A Parking Standards Schedule is included as Appendix 2 of the LP. This states that the car parking standards (the Standards) represent a maximum provision rather than a minimum requirement. However, they provide a useful guide on the level of parking that different types of development will generate. I note that residents of the nursing home extension would not be car owners. However, it is fair to expect that some visitors, staff and those carrying out deliveries or collections would travel by car, van or lorry. Also, the nature of the proposal means it is likely that health professionals including those in ambulances would need to visit.
23. The Standards indicate the 3 existing flats within No 7 would generate demand for 4 parking spaces. The Standards for nursing homes includes 1 car parking space for visitors per 3 bed spaces, suggesting the 12 bedroom extension would also generate a demand for 4 spaces by visitors ($12/3 = 4$). The applicant has carried out a survey that counts the number of visitors to Glenview over a week. In light of this, it is suggested the actual parking demand from visitors would be 1 space per 5 bedrooms. However, I am unconvinced that the findings of this survey provides robust evidence to depart from the Standards as there would be no control over the timings and duration of visits or how visitors travel to and from the proposed development. Therefore, I consider the parking demand from visitors to the proposed nursing home extension would be about the same as that from the existing flats.

24. In addition, the Standards for nursing homes indicate a demand for staff parking, based on 1 space per 3 full time duty staff. Glenview currently employs up to a maximum of 34 staff members. However, these work in shifts and table 4.10 of the TS indicates that there is a maximum of 18 staff at Glenview at any one time. This staffing level equates to a parking demand of 6 parking spaces based on the Standards ($18/3=6$) which is generally consistent with the findings of the applicant's survey of staff travel habits.
25. According to the TS, no additional members of staff would need to be hired to provide care for the 12 residents of the proposed development. However, this is at odds with comments made in the Inspector's decision for the previous appeal that a similar development would generate further demand for parking from additional visitors and staff members. Moreover, whilst it may not be the applicant's intention to increase the total number of employees, the proposal may lead to more staff being present at Glenview and the proposed development at any one time compared to the existing situation. Paragraph 4.2 of the TS explains that staffing levels can be subject to change due to the levels of dependency amongst residents. With this in mind, it is fair to assume that 12 additional residents is likely to increase the need for care staff presence. It is fair to assume the demand for parking would increase if the development would require more staff to be on the site at any one time.
26. The Standards also state that development will be expected to show how servicing will be undertaken and that at least one bay for ambulances, minibuses and general servicing should be provided. No such bay is proposed. The TS describes how over a typical week there are 4 deliveries and collections in connection with Glenview with each staying for about 5 minutes. There is no alternative but for these vehicles to park in the road and it is fair to expect drivers to want to stop as near to Glenview as possible. Given the local parking stress, I expect such parking would cause an obstruction from time to time.
27. There is merit to the applicant's claims that the proposal would not result in extra delivery or collections to and from the site as it would be served in the same manner as Glenview. However, it would seem likely that deliveries and collections would take longer as the extra residents would generate a need for more goods to be delivered and taken away. Therefore, the potential ill-effects of delivery/collection vehicle parking would last slightly longer compared to the current situation. The fact that Glenview and other properties on Belvedere Road already generate delivery vehicles and associated obstructive parking does not justify allowing a development that would exacerbate the problem.
28. Also, it is fair to assume the development would increase the likelihood of ambulances visiting Belvedere Road due to the greater number of residents in need of care. Ambulance drivers would want to park as close as possible to No 7 and I envisage such parking could cause an obstruction given the levels of parking on local streets.

29. In summary, I consider the proposed development would attract more vehicular trips to and from No 7 compared to the existing situation. TRICS information provided in the TS suggest that any increase in journeys would be fairly modest. Even so, such trips would increase the level of street parking associated with the application site compared to the existing situation.

Proposed mitigation measures in respect of parking.

30. A Staff Travel Plan (STP) has been submitted with the application that sets out measures that would be implemented to reduce car journeys and to encourage staff from travelling to and from the site by public transport, cycling or walking. The UU requires the payment of monies to BCC towards the management and auditing of the STP.
31. The development would include the provision of cycle stands to promote cycling. Also, No 7 is within an urban area and fairly near to bus services. Therefore, there is good opportunity for staff to walk or travel by public transport. However, information within the TS demonstrates that many of the existing staff at Glenview already cycle, walk or travel by bus to get to and from work. The staff who travel by car are in a minority but nonetheless they add to the local parking stress. It is fair to assume these people would already be aware of the range of travel options to and from Belvedere Road and yet they still use private car. Therefore, I am unconvinced the STP measures would have any meaningful effect on their travel habits and it is reasonable to envisage that there would be staff working at the proposed development who would park on the street.
32. The applicant has also provided a Servicing Management Plan (SMP) that sets out measures intended to control the timings of deliveries and collections and associated parking. However, the SMP includes phrases such as "all collection/delivery vehicles....will be discouraged from stopping temporarily within the carriageway" and "Meadowcare Homes will seek to arrange for collection/delivery vehicles to be redirected to avoid congestion that may otherwise occur" (my emphasis added). Such statements are uncertain and imprecise and so it would be unreasonable to impose a planning condition that requires compliance with the SMP having regard to the tests of conditions as set out in paragraph 57 of the Framework. Furthermore, I agree with the view of the Inspector for the previous appeal that, in reality, the extent of control over third party deliveries and collection would be limited. In any case, such management measures would not guarantee a suitable parking space for delivery/collection vehicle drivers when they arrive.
33. For these reasons, I consider the measures suggested by the applicant would have no meaningful effect on the extent of parking associated with Glenview and the proposed development.

Conclusion on the effects of parking associated with the development.

34. Belvedere Road, The Glen and Blenheim Road experience high parking stress for significant periods of time. Unfortunately, this leads to

obstructive parking with subsequent ill-effects on pedestrian movement, traffic flow and visibility of the highway. Even if not causing an obstruction, the level of parking reduces the amount of carriageway for moving traffic. This causes a form of congestion with drivers waiting at junctions or reversing to allow vehicles to pass. As such, street parking in the area undermines highway safety and adversely affects the visual qualities and character of local roads.

35. The proposal would remove the demand for street parking as a result of the existing flats. However, the development would include no off-road parking or servicing bays and so car trips by visitors and staff as well as visits by drivers of delivery/collection vehicles and ambulances would exacerbate the parking stress in the area. The suggested measures to reduce and mitigate parking effects would not address my concerns.
36. Therefore, I conclude parking associated with the development would have unacceptable effects in terms of exacerbating congestion and prejudicing highway safety. In these regards, it would conflict with CS policy BCS10 and LP policy DM23. Amongst other things, these look for development to be located to ensure the provision of safe streets and to include an appropriate level of parking. As a result, parking associated with the development would have a harmful effect on the character of local streets and so in these respects the proposal would conflict with LP policy DM2.

Location of the development.

37. The proposed nursing home accommodation would be within a built up area. Also, it would represent the re-use of an existing building in a fairly accessible area with a choice of travel options. In these regards, the location of the development would be acceptable as it would accord with CS policies BCS5, BCS10, BCS12 and BCS20.

Effect on housing mix.

38. As well as Glenview, there are 2 other nursing homes on the same side of Belvedere Road. The development would add a further property to the group of residential care homes. However, the proposal would affect a single property in a largely residential area. When considering the range of dwellings in Belvedere Road and the other nearby streets, the proposed change of use would have an insignificant effect on the choice of housing in the area. BCC advise there is a high proportion of flats within the locality and so the loss of the existing units would be acceptable. Also, LP policy DM2 is generally supportive of housing for older persons provided they are in locations close to facilities and public transport routes.
39. Therefore, I conclude the proposal would have an acceptable effect on housing mix. In these regards it would accord with CS policy BCS18 and LP policy DM2.

Effect on character and appearance of the area.

40. I have already found that parking generated by the development would be harmful to the character of the area. However, the proposed change of use

would reflect the residential nature of the street. Also, only minor extensions and alterations are proposed that would affect the external appearance of No 7. Most of the changes would be to the rear and so only viewable from adjacent properties. In any event, the alterations would be in keeping with the style and form of the building and the locality.

41. The property lies within the CA, which covers an area of open space and nearby streets. No 7 is similar to most other properties on Belvedere Road in that it is from the Victorian period and retains original features of architectural interest. As such, it contributes to the significance and visual qualities of the CA. The proposed alterations to the front would be seen from the street but they would be fairly minor changes that would not unduly detract from the overall appearance of No 7.
42. Therefore, I conclude the development itself (rather than the associated parking) would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Also, it would preserve the character, appearance and significance of the CA. In these regards it would accord with CS policies BCS21 and BCS22 as well as LP policies DM27, DM29, DM30 and DM31. Amongst other things, these policies look for extensions and alterations to respect the host building and for development to reinforce local distinctiveness and safeguard heritage assets such as Conservation Areas. Acceptability of the proposal in these regards is a neutral factor in my overall assessment.

Living conditions at nearby residences.

43. The proposed extensions and alterations would be seen from nearby properties. However, they have been designed so as to avoid any unacceptable loss of light, outlook or privacy to other residences. Concerns are raised over noises emanating from Glenview and how these can affect the tranquility of the area. Even so, I am satisfied the scale of the proposed development would not lead to noise of such a level or nature so as to cause any significant disturbance. Therefore, I conclude the proposal would have an acceptable effect on living conditions at nearby dwellings. In these regards, it would accord with CS policy BCS21 and LP policies DM2, DM29 and DM30 that all seek to ensure development avoids an unacceptable effect on the amenity of adjoining properties.
44. It follows from this conclusion that I consider the development would not infringe upon any person's rights to enjoy their home as laid out in the Human Rights Act 1998. Lack of harm in these respects is a neutral factor in my overall assessment.

Other concerns raised by interested parties.

45. Interested parties have raised concerns to the development on various grounds not covered above. I am satisfied that through the imposition of planning conditions on any planning permission, construction works associated with the development could be managed to avoid significant adverse effects on the surrounding properties or area. Also, conditions could be imposed to ensure waste from the development is stored and

managed appropriately. There is no evidence to indicate the development would unacceptably affect air pollution or that satisfactory drainage could not be provided. These matters do not constitute reasons to refuse planning permission and so they do not affect my overall assessment.

Factors in support of the proposal and planning balance.

46. The latest housing land supply assessment dated June 2021 indicates BCC can demonstrate 3.7 years' supply of housing land. This represents a significant shortfall against the minimum requirement of 5 years' supply set out in the Framework. In such circumstances, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework states that planning permission should be granted unless the adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
47. Like the Inspector for the previous appeal, I find the loss of 3 residential flats but provision of 12 residential care bedrooms would represent a positive contribution to the supply of housing. It is a particular benefit given that BCC does not dispute that there is a significant shortfall of specialist dementia care bed spaces across the city.
48. Carrying out the proposal would generate construction employment and the residents, visitors and staff associated with the development would support local businesses. Also, I consider it likely the proposal would support the employment needs of Glenview and so in these regards it would bring economic benefits.
49. Moreover, the development represents the re-use of an existing building in an urban location that is suitable in principle for residential care accommodation. As such, it gains support from sub-paragraph 124(d) of the Framework. Also, the development would include measures to improve the energy efficiency of No 7 as well as to reduce water consumption. Furthermore, it would include renewable energy generating features. In all of these regards, it would support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and so help meet the challenge of climate change.
50. The application form states the biodiversity gain condition as set out in paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A of the Act would not apply as the proposed development would be subject to the de minimis exemption. I have no reason to disagree. In any event, the applicant claims that a planning condition could be imposed to secure measures to enhance the biodiversity value of the site. However, the scope to increase this value is limited and so this factor attracts little weight in my overall assessment. Nevertheless, the development would have a number of benefits as outlined above.
51. Paragraph 116 of the Framework states that development should only be refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. The proposal would generate a fairly modest increase in street parking. However, the context to No 7 where parking stress is already high means that any extra demand for parking would have a very significant effect on highway safety and the character of the area. I am also mindful that those directly affected by the harmful impacts would include

the residents, staff and visitors to the Glenview and the proposed development.

52. As such, the harm in respect of parking is the overriding factor. This harm significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the proposal when having regard to the policies of the Framework as a whole. Therefore, the presumption in favour of granting planning permission set out under paragraph 11(d) of the Framework does not apply.
53. I have considered whether planning conditions could be imposed to address my concerns with the proposal. However, I am unconvinced that reasonable and enforceable planning conditions would overcome or otherwise outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

54. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are insufficient reasons to grant planning permission contrary to development plan policies. Therefore, I conclude that planning permission should be refused.

Jonathan Edwards

Inspector and Appointed Person

Informatives:

- i. In determining this application the Planning Inspectorate, on behalf of the Secretary of State, has worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner. In doing so the Planning Inspectorate gave clear advice of the expectation and requirements for the submission of documents and information and ensured consultation responses were published in good time and gave clear deadlines for submissions. However, the development is not acceptable and modest changes or additional information would not overcome the issues so that the proposal would accord with the development plan. In such circumstances it would have been inappropriate to work with the applicant to find solutions to the problems during the application process.
- ii. The decision of the appointed person (acting on behalf of the Secretary of State) on an application under section 62A of the Act is final, which means there is no right to appeal. An application to the High Court under s288(1) of the Act is the only way in which the decision made on an application under Section 62A can be challenged. An application must be made within 6 weeks of the date of the decision.
- iii. These notes are provided for guidance only. A person who thinks they may have grounds for challenging this decision is advised to seek legal advice before taking any action. If you require advice on the process for making any challenge you should contact the Administrative Court Office at the Royal Courts of Justice, Strand, London WC2A 2LL (0207 947 6655) or follow this link: <https://www.gov.uk/courts-tribunals/planning-court>