

Amy Spencer  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

23rd December 2025

The Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

**Re: Section 62A Application – S62A/2025/0137**

**Site: 72-74 Gloucester Road, Bristol, BS7 8BF**

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

I am writing to register my objection to the above Section 62A planning application for the change of use to a 9-room apart-hotel (Use Class C1) and associated works. As a local resident, I have serious concerns about the impact this development would have on the character of the Conservation Area, on parking conditions in the surrounding streets, and on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

### **1. Harm to the Character of the Conservation Area**

The application site lies within the Conservation Area, and I am concerned that the proposed development would cause harm to its character and appearance. A key issue is the proposal to fully close the gap between the Gloucester Road building and the adjacent Shadwell Road (which sits outside the Conservation Area).

Currently, the existing extension within this gap is notably lower in height and set further back from the street frontage than Shadwell Road. While the existing structure may not be aesthetically distinguished, its modest scale and recessed position provide important visual respite between two substantial built-up frontages. This breathing space is a characteristic feature of the streetscape and contributes positively to the setting of the area.

The gap currently serves as a transitional element between the Gloucester Road building (which is within the Conservation Area and therefore subject to protection) and the end of Shadwell Road. Filling this gap with a structure that aligns more closely with the street frontage would fundamentally alter the relationship between these two building forms and diminish the legibility of the historic streetscape.

I submit that the proposed development fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and relevant policies concerning heritage assets.

## **2. Inadequate Parking Provision and Exacerbation of Existing Conditions**

The application proposes zero car parking provision for the 9-room apart-hotel. This raises significant concerns about the impact on an area that already experiences considerable parking stress.

Crucially, the development would not only fail to provide any parking for the new use, but would also result in the removal of two existing parking spaces that currently serve the commercial premises on site. Bristol City Council's parking standards for C1 hotel use specify 1 space per bedroom (<https://parkingstandards.co.uk/Standard/Bristol%20-%202015-07-01.pdf>). For a 9-room apart-hotel, this would indicate a standard provision of 9 parking spaces. The applicant's assertion that zero parking provision "is consistent with the City Council's parking standards" is therefore demonstrably incorrect.

The applicant's own Transport Statement includes a parking survey which confirms that there is no spare parking capacity in the vicinity. Despite this finding, the applicant has provided no credible evidence to demonstrate that a zero-parking development in this location would realistically generate no parking demand. The site is not in the city centre, nor is it adjacent to a major transport hub. It is unrealistic to assume that all guests of an apart-hotel will arrive by train or coach and travel onwards by public transport, particularly given the nature of apart-hotel accommodation which often caters to extended stays and business visitors who may well arrive by car.

In the absence of robust evidence to justify a departure from the Council's parking standards, the proposal would inevitably exacerbate existing on-street parking pressures to the significant detriment of existing residents.

## **3. Noise and Disturbance to Neighbouring Residents**

The proposed apart-hotel use would introduce a fundamentally different pattern of activity compared to either the existing commercial use or a residential conversion. I am concerned that this would result in unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance to neighbouring properties.

Apart-hotels, by their nature, accommodate a transient population of guests who have no long-term stake in maintaining good relations with neighbours. Unlike permanent residents, guests are less likely to be mindful of noise levels and the impact of their behaviour on those living nearby. The constant turnover of occupants, with arrivals and departures occurring throughout the day and potentially at unsociable hours, would generate a level of comings and goings that is materially different from a settled residential community or a daytime office use.

Furthermore, apart-hotel accommodation often attracts guests visiting for leisure purposes, including hen and stag parties, birthday celebrations, and similar gatherings. While these uses may be entirely legitimate, they can generate significant noise nuisance for adjacent residents, particularly during evenings and weekends.

The servicing requirements of an apart-hotel should also be considered. Regular cleaning, laundry collection and delivery, waste collection, and maintenance visits

would all generate additional activity and vehicle movements in a predominantly residential area.

I submit that insufficient consideration has been given to the impact of the proposed use on the amenity of neighbouring residents, contrary to policies that seek to protect residential amenity from unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance.

### **Conclusion**

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate refuse this application. The proposal would cause harm to the character and setting of the Conservation Area through the inappropriate infilling of the gap between the Gloucester Road building and Shadwell Road; would result in unacceptable parking impacts through the complete absence of parking provision combined with the loss of existing spaces; and would give rise to unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this objection and keep me informed of the progress of this application.

Yours faithfully,

Dr Amy Spencer