

PLANNING REF : 251618
PROPERTY ADDRESS : Flat 3 5 Old School Close
: Bristol
: BS6 7EB
SUBMITTED BY : Mrs Louise Catherine Allen
DATE SUBMITTED : 09/08/2025

COMMENTS:

My mother lives at 240 Reading Road and I wish to object to this application on the following grounds.

Access and parking.

Internal access to the site: the lane leading to the proposed site involves a very narrow s-bend. The applicants own large vehicle tracking indicates the difficulty of manoeuvring a "large" car. However there are many popular models bigger than this and even smaller cars will have difficulty gaining access. The access would therefore appear hazardous and will lead to damage to neighbouring boundaries including the garage of 240.

Access from the lane onto the A339: the access lane is single track with no passing places. Any attempt to enter the lane from the A329 while another vehicle is trying to exit would lead to gridlock with no safe place to reverse nor park. Even if all residents agreed an informal plan, visitors and delivery drivers would not know this and the situation will inevitably arise whereby vehicles reverse over the cycle path and onto the busy A329 posing a significant safety hazard. The lane is not owned by the applicant who only has right of access and therefore not in a position to exercise any rights over the lane.

The plan indicates parking for two cars however it would appear that there would be inadequate space for at least one of the cars to open the door. Furthermore, visitors to the proposed property would have nowhere to park nor turn. This optimistic arrangement would likely result in other ad-hoc parking arrangements meaning increased movement of vehicles with the attendant nuisance for neighbours and indiscriminate parking by visitors with the likelihood of vehicles reversing onto the A329 or trying to use other properties for manoeuvring.

It is not clear where the electric vehicle charge point would be located to permit access to this facility and maintain adequate parking provision.

There would be inadequate space for the parking of vehicles for people with impaired mobility as currently shown on the proposed plans.

Drainage.

The proposed development does not provide adequate evidence of sufficient drainage capacity. A calculation is provided with no explanation of the results or the basis for the calculation with the effects of the development included. It does not appear to take into consideration any local effects noted by neighbours in other letters sent to the Council regarding surface water which I agree with. The proposed development will occupy approximately one third of the remaining area of land if the paved patio area is included, to be

drained by soakaways. There does not appear to be any confirmation or explanation that the drainage details shown on the design drawing correlate with the calculation results and that there would be no adverse impact on neighbouring properties. The drainage design drawing indicates a 5m offset line for the proposed building but ignores the nearby neighbouring building which would have the soakaways adjacent to its foundations posing a severe and wholly unacceptable risk and would contravene building regulations.

There is no reference to any acknowledgement from Thames Water that the property may be connected to the drains, nor is there any evidence that the private section of drainage serving 240 would be adversely impacted.

Loss of light and overbearing impact.

The proposed development is approximately 2.5m from the boundary to 240, and approximately 7m in height. This space is currently garden. It will block the afternoon/evening sun resulting in considerable loss of enjoyment of the conservatory and garden. The conservatory will almost certainly be colder in the evening resulting in higher heating bills or loss of use. The size of the proposed property will occupy the greater part of the eastern boundary meaning the current clear sky views will be vastly reduced.

The proposal constitutes a clear overdevelopment of the site and is out of scale and character with the area and would negatively affect the setting enjoyed by all the neighbouring properties.

Overlooking.

Whilst the design and access statement mentions partially obscured glazing to the front, the proposed rooflight windows elsewhere would have clear views directly over the neighbouring properties from a very short distance. These windows would look directly into the garden, main bedroom, conservatory and lounge of 240 with a serious negative impact on privacy and residential amenity. Furthermore, I consider the proposed glazing to the north east elevation to be unsatisfactory and would not afford adequate privacy for neighbouring properties.

Noise.

The proposed development will replace a garden and therefore there will be a detriment to the enjoyment of neighbouring properties by the increase in noise from a three-bedroom household.

Environment.

The development proposal uses an air source heat pump to provide environmentally friendly heating. However the plans also show a chimney. If this was used for any fossil fuel burning appliance now or in the future, the air quality would be degraded.

Construction.

Access to the site is wholly unsuitable for vehicles associated with construction. The large vehicle tracking indicates the impossibility of getting lorries onto the site, therefore it will not be possible to bring materials on-site nor remove waste (including bulk from ations etc) and therefore the situation would arise where delivery vehicles/ trade vehicles etc will obstruct the access driveway to 240, possibly for significant periods of time. No consideration whatsoever has been given to this. The inadequate access will result in vehicles reversing over the cycleway onto the main A339 presenting considerable hazard. Further risks would be presented to the occupants of 240 with access prevented for emergency vehicles or other visitors.

The proposed development will be in close proximity to 240 and no consideration has been given to noise, dust, vibration, excavation and materials handling in a relatively confined space, and the risk of damage to neighbouring properties, not least the garage and boundary to 240.

The above raises serious questions about the feasibility and safety of site access during construction, and this has not been given any consideration by the applicant. There would be a considerable loss of amenity to neighbouring properties.

Historical precedent.

The applicant states that there are no known previous applications however an application was submitted many years prior to the applicants time and rejected by the planning authority.

For the reasons detailed above, I urge the Council to refuse this application on the grounds of highway safety, unsuitable access, lack of suitability for construction access, overdevelopment, lack of demonstrable drainage provision which could cause harm to neighbouring building foundations and serious adverse impact on the amenity of not just 240 but all neighbouring properties.