

From: Polly Rowe [REDACTED]

Sent: 13 January 2026 15:41

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Comments on S62A/2025/0139 - Castle House

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing regarding planning application S62A/2025/0139 - Castle House, Brentry Avenue, BS5 0DL

I'm the owner of [REDACTED], and I object to the above proposal on the points listed below.

1. Privacy

- I bought this property due to its quiet private garden space, which we use often throughout the year for fire gatherings, dining, bird-watching etc.
- The outside space is made up of two areas: the garden that originally came with the house, which is ground level, and the adjoining slice of land which was bought from Castle House. This section is a raised patio area housing the firepit, a punchbag, a birdbox, and a trellis/planter in warmer months.
- The proposed windows opening onto this part of my garden would be an unacceptable invasion of privacy - i.e. the adjoining bedrooms in Flat 1 & Flat 4.
- *(In any case, the windows proposed in the current design mockups do not open enough for someone to escape through, which I believe may be a fire hazard.)*
- The adjoining bedroom in Flat 1 will also potentially suffer from lack of daylight & sunlight due to proposed privacy glass, as well as the aforementioned items in that part of the garden.
- Also regarding the adjoining bedroom in Flat 1: With the raised patio in the garden, 1.7m will not be tall enough for privacy - neither from the proposed bedroom, nor from my garden.
- All the windows on the Gaunts Ham side of Flats 1 & 4 (circled in Pink in 'Image 1' attached) will result in unacceptable overlooking & loss of privacy - not just the ones suggested in the mock-up. All the glass circled in the image overlooks & affects the privacy of the garden.
- The plan to remove & rebuild the adjoining walls will turn our garden into an exposed building site. Being in the garden will be out of the question, but the kitchen will also be overlooked by building-works.
- Another note here is the discrepancy on the mock-ups of where my garden starts and finishes, as can be seen ringed in Pink in 'Image 2' attached. In this image, the mockup artist has added a fence halfway through my garden, making it seem like the old stone wall and slice of land belong to the development site. They do not.

2. Noise & Disturbance

- The plan to remove & rebuild the adjoining walls will turn our garden into an exposed building site. Being in the garden will be out of the question, but the entire home will be affected by the noise, dust, debris, and everything else that goes hand-in-hand with building sites.
- I also am unsure how this can be done while ensuring the heritage wall at the end of my garden is left intact and protected.
- Already, vibrations from the demolition in preparation for the Sarah Street flats have been felt from within this property, and that is a significant distance further away than this proposed development. I have concerns about not only the intrusion of noise and vibrations to our peace, but also the safety of my property with such significant work being undertaken so close - part of which will affect party walls.
- Currently, we hear very little from the neighbouring building, and it has been this way since purchasing the property in [REDACTED]. These plans will increase noise heard from within my property, as well as local street noise with an increase in cars, traffic, and people.
- This development would affect residents' well-being in [REDACTED] (and possibly others) - particularly of those who suffer from asthma, stress, and/or work from home.

3. Parking & Traffic

- The street is already very full & difficult to park on due to it being a cul-de-sac, and people using it for free parking when catching trains from Lawrence Hill for work etc.
- Waste & recycling collections often get missed due to too many cars being parked, making manoeuvring the trucks impossible.
- 9 new flats are already in the process of being built on Sarah Street. If this application also goes ahead, it would total 17 new homes on our small street. The new homes would mean a 44% increase in housing, but with 0% increase in available car parking spaces. *(There are currently a total of 39 houses across Sarah Street, Tenby Street, and Bentry Avenue.)*
- Point 3.8 of the survey done by Highgate Transportation: "Applying the council's adopted parking standards would result in a maximum of 12 off-street car-parking spaces."
- Point 3.12 from the same survey "The proposed development could result up to 5 cars..."
- One could expect roughly the same (if not slightly more) from the development underway on Sarah Street, meaning an expected minimum of 10 extra cars being brought to the street.
- "Advising future residents that the development is car free" does not hold enough weight or guarantee, and unacceptable levels of additional parking would be required.
- If this building is to be developed, then providing sufficient car parking should be made a requirement.

4. Impact on local amenities (separate to parking & privacy)

- Our local GP practice is already oversubscribed, let alone with the new flats being built on Sarah Street, along with the massive development due on Barrow Road.

I propose that a better use of the site would be office/work spaces, encouraging use of public transport to & from work, and lowering some of the privacy/parking/noise issues listed above. See 'Retaining Employment Land' image attached.

According to policies DM30, DM27, and BCS21 in the Bristol Local Plan, extensions and alterations to existing buildings will be expected to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and existing development. Due to the above reasons, this application would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of existing occupants of both [REDACTED], and Brentry Avenue, Sarah Street, and Tenby Street at large.

For these reasons it is hoped that the Planning Authority can support the objection to this proposal and not grant planning permission.

Polly Rowe

[REDACTED]





Retaining Employment Land

4.8.17 Retaining valuable employment land is an important part of the council's strategy. It helps to maintain the city's diverse economic base by ensuring a wide variety of business spaces of different types, sizes, quality and cost. The built-up nature of the city means that it is very difficult to physically replace employment sites which are re-developed for alternative uses. Employment land provides continued enterprise and employment opportunities across the city, especially for business start-ups and in those parts of Bristol experiencing persistently high levels of socio-economic deprivation. The approach can help to provide employment close to where people live and so helps reduce the need to travel, especially by car. The city's Principal Industrial and Warehousing Areas represent Bristol's essential core provision of industrial and warehousing land. Retaining these strategically important areas will help the city meet the latent and future demand for industrial and warehousing development.

Policy Delivery

The Site Allocations & Development Management DPD will identify the Principal Industrial and Warehousing Areas to be retained for industrial and warehousing uses. They will be identified based on the recommendations and criteria of the Employment Land Study and other relevant site-specific evidence.

The Bristol Central Area Action Plan will also identify and safeguard employment land.

The approach to valuable employment land outside of the Principal Industrial and Warehousing Areas will be set out in a criteria-based policy in the Site Allocations & Development Management DPD.