

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 December 2025 16:53
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Planning application - S62A/2025/0137 - 72-74 Gloucester Road, Bristol, BS7 8BF - Objection

Subject: Formal and Strong Objection to Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2025/0137 - 72-74 Gloucester Road, Bristol, BS7 8BF

Dear Section 62A Applications Team,

We wish to formally object to the planning application referenced S62A/2025/0137 for the partial change of use and extension at 72-74 Gloucester Road, Bristol, BS7 8BF.

Having lived in [REDACTED], [REDACTED]
[REDACTED], we would like to share some thoughts about the nature of the road.

It has always been a family-orientated street. Although there are a couple of houses which are arranged as pairs of flats, and a few more are rented to professional people, the overwhelming feeling is of a family nature of owner-occupiers.

We are used to occasional noise from the businesses on the Gloucester Road, and also of the students coming home from nights out who live further on from the top of the road to the west. The street is a busy road with people parking for an hour or two to visit the shops and have a coffee with their friends. This is partly possible because local residents use their cars to go to work elsewhere in the morning and return in the evening. This kind of parking is vital to the livelihood of the Gloucester Road retailers, and without this the reality is that many would go out of business.

The nature of the proposed development is completely alien to what we have become accustomed to, and represents an unwelcome addition to the street, as detailed in the points below. The occupants will be completely transient residents who will have absolutely no interest in the area. They will not add anything to the neighbourhood and merely use it as a convenient stopping point.

The Planning Supporting Statement says:

6.2 ...*the proposal represents an excellent opportunity to create residential accommodation for a specific user for which there is a need.*

This “need” has not been identified.

Overdevelopment of site

Until relevantly recently the premises was occupied by one of the major high street banks and as such was an asset to the community, especially the shopkeepers in the area. Whilst it is acceptable that the ground floor remains a commercial venture, the current occupants detract from the “Gloucester Road Town Centre” as they service a business that has little if any local interest. If the proposal had been for, say, a new NHS dental clinic, then the local approval would have probably been unanimous.

The number of proposed apartments is completely unrealistic. If the proposal was for one or possibly two flats (preferably rented to families) then that would have been much more acceptable. But nine apartments is merely milking the available space for a very commercial venture, which will only profit the owners and nobody else.

Traffic and parking – the developers are being very disingenuous here.

Their traffic survey (conveniently done before the planning application – you wonder why?) is full of inconsistencies/mistakes/lies/?

Proposal may reduce overall daytime parking demand due to the reduction in the commercial floor area. This is rubbish – hardly anybody actually works there, and they will still park a minimum of 4 vehicles in the area, even though they would no longer have a car park in which they park 2 vehicles.

The Transport Statement states that there are currently 62 vehicle movements per day associated with the commercial use of the building, and suggests that there would only be 22 vehicle movements per day after development, giving a “fall back” of 40 potential vehicle movements. In reality there is no evidence of anything like 62 vehicle movements at present unless you are counting people who stop on the double yellow lines to pop to the shops (the

real shops, that is) and not to the Building Energy Experts (the current commercial tenants). However, Building Energy Experts do park two vehicles on the hardstanding to the rear of the property, and regularly park several vehicles on the street. Sometimes their vehicles are left in the road overnight, don't move for several days and are parked up over the whole weekend. In all likelihood they will still park the same number of vehicles after development, thereby ensuring an additional two vehicles who no longer have the hardstanding to park on will also be on the street.

From the Transport Statement:

3.5.8 The results demonstrate that there are not any significant levels of spare capacity to accommodate any additional parking demand during the potential peak parking demand period, which is either overnight or late evening when most residents will be likely to be at home. The surveys identify that across the study area that there are only of the order of 4% spare spaces. This implies that the roads are at their practical capacity, which is usually taken as 5% spare capacity.

3.5.9 As such, it is opined, informed by the surveys undertaken in accordance with the City Council's guidance that the lack of regularly available on street parking within a short walk will severely constrain vehicle use to access the site for any element of the proposed redevelopment.

Moreover, TDM is concerned that the existing adopted footway at the junction of Shadwell Road and Gloucester Road is too narrow to support the proposed intensification of use of the site. In particular, the existing crossing facilities offer poor sightlines for pedestrians and encourage high vehicles speeds. ??? Vehicles are coming down a 20mph road, approaching a major road where they have to stop – what high vehicle speeds are these???

The applicant must undertake to narrow the pedestrian crossing distance by constructing a kerb-build-out on either side of the Shadwell

Road junction. This will actually make it more difficult for vehicles to pull out of Shadwell Road and turn left without encroaching on the southbound carriageway of the Gloucester Road, especially for big vans, refuse collectors, etc as even now some of these vehicles' rear wheels go over the pavement to make this turn. Also it stops vehicles being able to turn left whilst waiting for someone else to turn right.

Even with a Travel Plan (which would need enforcement, somehow) there is a very real possibility that there could be an additional 18 cars trying to park from the residents, plus the cleaning staff who would be coming at least twice a week. Where is the provision for this?

Non-car accessibility

From DESIGN, ACCESS AND HERITAGE STATEMENT:

Public transport provision is excellent, with frequent bus services (nos. 11, 12, 19, 73, 74, and 309) operating along Gloucester Road.

The actual bus services operating along Gloucester Road are nos. 17, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76 and 77. This inaccuracy has been corrected in the Transport Statement, although no mention is made of the frequency of each service which is also important (for example there is only one bus an hour to Keynsham, similarly to Whiteladies Road – which would make it a less attractive option for visitors to Bristol University). There is also no shelter or seating at the southbound bus stop outside the Co-op.

Fire hazards

There would be nine separate kitchen areas, all of which are potential fire hazards, and as there is no onsite concierge, then there is no-one to ensure that all occupants are out of the building should a fire start.

There would be a communal cycle storage area with a “*bike-dock system which is gas-assisted and so is user-friendly, even with heavier electric bikes. The space sufficient to allow for 8no. bikes to be stored.*”

So, not even enough bike storage for one per flat. Dangerous to allow electric bike batteries to be charged indoors, especially as the only exit from the apart-hotel is right next to the bike storage.

Nature of occupants

Although this is being proposed as an apart-hotel with conditions on the length of stay which seems to imply professionals or tourists, there is some evidence that at some point the developers are considering/have considered this as student accommodation. The Transport Statement includes:

5.4.7 The parking surveys demonstrate that any residential demand if it could not be constrained could not in fact be accommodated overnight on street within a reasonable walk, and this would be unlikely to be attractive to any student occupier.

...and the Planning Supporting Statement includes:

5.29 Overall, the proposal would create an appropriate level of amenity for the future residents and would provide an acceptable living environment for the proposed student occupiers, in accordance with the relevant Development Plan policies.

Does this mean that the proposal for an apart-hotel is merely a smokescreen to hide what they hope will be converted to student accommodation in the future?

Stephen Greaves & Jennefer Grigg

[REDACTED]