

**From:** [Toby Child](#)  
**To:** [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)  
**Subject:** Castle House Development  
**Date:** 16 January 2026 13:00:43

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

[Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sir or Madam,

Dear Sir or Madam, I am writing to object to the proposed development at Brentry Avenue, Bristol (Castle House), on the grounds of inadequate car parking provision and the resulting adverse impact on existing residents. I am a local resident living directly opposite the proposed development and I am particularly concerned about the cumulative pressure this scheme would place on already severely constrained parking in the area. Especially in the context of other developments which have been granted planning at Barrow Road and on Sarah Street. Although the application appears to assume low car ownership, this does not reflect the reality of Bristol households. Census and transport data show that approximately three-quarters of households in Bristol have access to at least one car. Even in urban areas, car ownership remains common, particularly for working households, families, carers, and those with mobility or employment needs. It is therefore unrealistic to assume that the proposed dwellings would be largely car-free. There is currently no permit for residents on Brentry Road and Sarah Street. Residents already struggle to find spots. In my case, I have legal access to a designated space within a residents' car park located opposite the application site. This parking space is included within my house deeds and is essential to my household. However, this residents' car park is not enforced by the council. As a result, it is already frequently used by non-residents, leaving legitimate residents unable to park in spaces they legally own or are entitled to use. The addition of further households nearby, without adequate on-site parking, would significantly worsen this problem and would almost certainly lead to increased informal and unauthorised use of the residents' car park. The development therefore risks displacing parking demand onto infrastructure that is: \* already at capacity, \* privately allocated through property deeds, and \* not protected by enforcement. This would directly harm existing residents' ability to access their homes and legally assigned parking spaces. It would also increase conflict between residents, reduce residential amenity, and undermine the purpose of designated off-street parking provision. This application must be considered in the context of the other developments on Sarah Street and Barrow Road. As a culminating negative outcome is likely in the neighbourhood. National and local planning policy requires development to be appropriate to its context and to avoid causing unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity. In this case, the lack of realistic parking provision fails to reflect local conditions and places the burden of the development onto existing residents who have no capacity to absorb it. I therefore request that the application be refused, or at the very least that it be required to provide sufficient on-site parking or secured, enforceable parking arrangements that do not negatively impact existing residents and their legally protected parking spaces. Thank you for considering my objection. Yours faithfully, [Your Name] [Your Address] Sent from Outlook for Android

I am writing to object to the proposed development at Brentry Avenue, Bristol (Castle House), on the grounds of inadequate car parking provision and the resulting adverse impact on existing residents.

I am a local resident living directly opposite the proposed development and I am particularly concerned about the cumulative pressure this scheme would place on already severely constrained parking in the area. **Especially in the context of other**

**developments which have been granted planning at Barrow Road and on Sarah Street.**

Although the application appears to assume low car ownership, this does not reflect the reality of Bristol households. Census and transport data show that approximately three-quarters of households in Bristol have access to at least one car. Even in urban areas, car ownership remains common, particularly for working households, families, carers, and those with mobility or employment needs. It is therefore unrealistic to assume that the proposed dwellings would be largely car-free.

There is currently no permit for residents on Bretry Road and Sarah Street. Residents already struggle to find spots. In my case, I have legal access to a designated space within a residents' car park located opposite the application site. This parking space is included within my house deeds and is essential to my household.

However, this residents' car park is **not enforced by the council**. As a result, it is already frequently used by non-residents, leaving legitimate residents unable to park in spaces they legally own or are entitled to use. The addition of further households nearby, without adequate on-site parking, would significantly worsen this problem and would almost certainly lead to increased informal and unauthorised use of the residents' car park.

The development therefore risks displacing parking demand onto infrastructure that is:

- \* already at capacity,
- \* privately allocated through property deeds, and
- \* not protected by enforcement.

This would directly harm existing residents' ability to access their homes and legally assigned parking spaces. It would also increase conflict between residents, reduce residential amenity, and undermine the purpose of designated off-street parking provision.

**This application must be considered in the context of the other developments on Sarah Street and Barrow Road. As a culminating negative outcome is likely in the neighbourhood.**

National and local planning policy requires development to be appropriate to its context and to avoid causing unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity. In this case, the lack of realistic parking provision fails to reflect local conditions and places

the burden of the development onto existing residents who have no capacity to absorb it.

I therefore request that the application be refused, or at the very least that it be required to provide sufficient on-site parking or secured, enforceable parking arrangements that do not negatively impact existing residents and their legally protected parking spaces.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,

Tobias Child



Sent from [Outlook for Android](#)