

Rosie Wallace-Hadrill

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Re: Section 62A Application – S62A/2025/0137 72-74 Gloucester Road, Bristol, BS7 8BF

To Whom it May Concern,

I wish to object to the above application for a 9-room apart-hotel. Having reviewed the proposals, I believe this development would be harmful to our neighbourhood for several reasons which I set out below. The site falls within a Conservation Area, which means there is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance its character. I am concerned that this proposal fails to meet that test.

At present, there is a gap between the main Gloucester Road building and the neighbouring Shadwell Road. The existing structure in this space sits lower and further back than the terrace, which creates a sense of separation between two quite different building types. It does provide a visual break in what would otherwise be a continuous wall of development along the street. The proposed works would effectively eliminate this gap. I think this would be detrimental to the streetscape. Removing this space would make the area feel more cramped and would obscure the distinction between the Conservation Area building and the row of terraced houses beyond. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay special attention to preserving the character of Conservation Areas. I do not believe this scheme achieves that.

Parking is already extremely difficult on the surrounding streets. The applicant has submitted a parking survey which actually confirms this as it shows there is virtually no spare capacity in the area. Yet despite this evidence, they propose to provide no parking whatsoever for the apart-hotel. The development would also remove two parking spaces currently used by the existing business on the site.

I have looked at Bristol City Council's parking standards, and they clearly state that hotels should provide one parking space per bedroom. That would mean nine spaces for this development, not zero. The applicant claims their proposal is "consistent" with these standards, but I cannot see how that can possibly be correct. The applicant suggests the development will be entirely car-free, but they have not provided any real evidence to support this. This is not a city centre location with excellent public transport links, such as a major train station. It is a suburban site where visitors would naturally expect to drive. The idea that every single guest will arrive without a car seems wholly unrealistic.

I am also worried about the impact an apart-hotel would have on those of us who live nearby. This type of accommodation attracts short-stay visitors who come and go at all hours. Unlike permanent residents or office workers, these guests have no reason to be considerate of their neighbours as they are only staying for a night or two and will never see us again. Apart-hotels are often used for celebrations and group

bookings, including birthday parties, hen dos, and the like. While I have nothing against people enjoying themselves, this kind of use can generate significant noise, particularly in the evenings and at weekends. There would also be regular disruption from servicing, including cleaning staff, laundry vans, deliveries, and waste collection. All of this adds up to a much more intensive use than either the current commercial premises or normal residential flats.

I believe this application should be refused. It would harm the Conservation Area by closing the gap between the Gloucester Road building and Shadwell Road; it would worsen an already severe parking situation without providing any evidence that zero parking is appropriate; and it would bring noise and disturbance to a residential area that is ill-suited to this type of transient use.

Yours,

Rosie Wallace-Hadrill