Feedback on Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept Statement.

Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Comments Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; C Averis, BS16 1LR</td>
<td>Following the public meeting at Frenchay village hall on September 3 and a tour of the site, I would like to make a few observations about the proposal to redevelop the site of Frenchay Hospital in the light of the concept statement drawn up for the hospital trust by GVA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The first observation concerns the sheer size of the proposed development and the threat it holds for the entire Frenchay area which, I would contend, has not been treated well by planners and developers in the past and which could be teetering on the brink of considerable damage. As someone who knew Frenchay almost 60 years ago I would suggest that there has been very little development of quality in the area and that estates like Penn Drive and Malmins are, in fact, poor architecture redeemed only by the amount of green space around them. Were another 550 dwellings to be jammed into the hospital site and the area developed without sensitively, then my view is that the ambiance of the area will be tilted beyond redemption.

2. How do you keep the "green" feel of the village? Not by eating into what grass there is and that means keeping what woodland and grassland there is and thinking again about the positioning of any school. GVA obviously has to squeeze every penny possible out of the site, but surely its suggestions for the positioning of the new school are somewhat myopic. The obvious answer is to leave the grass and woodlands bordering the site intact and place the school in the middle of the development, helping create that mix of buildings which so characterises the rest of the area. Not for one moment am I hoping to see much "Frenchay" - pennant - stone used in the overall development, but it would be nice to see the new school echo its predecessor on the Common.

3. With that in mind, it is also important to consider the mix of architecture on the site. The whisper is that Stoke Park is regarded as a useful guide; I could not disagree more. A recent drive around the area suggests it is the worst kind of faux architecture; without a style of its own and aping something from another age. The number of estate agents' boards, for sale and for let signs, suggests considerable numbers are less than happy living there and I can understand why. The building are cheek by jowl with precious little room to swing a cat and the lines of wheelie bins suggests there is not even room to store the waste of modern living. Frenchay deserves better, possibly an architecture competition to get the best for such an important project.

4. It's also important that, after suffering for a long time, Frenchay should get something out of its previously one-sided relationship with the NHS. For a decade or more, Frenchay Hospital has been a bad neighbour, making money or saving it
at the village's expense. Almost every road bounding the hospital suffers from the blight caused by the hospital staff and patients being charged to park within the grounds. With the hospital's move should come an end of ranks of roadside parking and the restoration of the vistas that were once Frenchay. And that means more than adequate parking for however many dwellings are eventually agreed and a lot more than necessary to cope with those hospital units that remain. The limits should not be drawn to fine lines to save the odd bob or two.

5. Traffic problems. Find a sensible solution to the previous point and you help with this one, but the flow of traffic through Frenchay will remain a problem and deserves considerable thought. I worked in London for 30-plus years and the oddity was that the worst part of getting to the City was getting out of Frenchay. Upon the traffic leading out to the ring road, then the M4 depended my getting to the office in EC1 on time and anyone who believes the problem is going to be reduced by development is living in cloud cuckoo land. It doesn't work that way; traffic always increases rather than decrease unless money (tolls/congestion charges) are involved and someone is going to have to think the problem through.

6. Likewise drainage. I'm hearing that drainage from the site is considered adequate and that good old gravity will continue to do the job. Well, as someone who lives in the bottom of the village and at the foot of three hills, I know otherwise. It takes precious little rain before Frenchay Hill puddles up and the situation, like the traffic problem, will only get worse if the idea is to muddle through. There was once a fashion for reservoirs to retain surface water until it could be release gradually; is that such a difficult remedy? One or two could even help create that better ambiance and might come in handy in times of draught.

Finally, I would like to stress that while I have voiced many objections - and have many more that are unsaid - to what GVA intends in its mission statement, I am not stupid enough to think they will go away and that the hospital will not want all it can in cash-strapped times. The government is unlikely to be sympathetic to anything other than a sensible scheme, but I would suggest that wringing a milk cow’s neck is rarely the way to get the greatest reward.

Mix a few very expensive properties with decent gardens in among the social housing, think good rather than utility, and you might be surprised at the value put on a spot which is charming, good to live in, handy for Bristol and London and doesn't deserve to be spoiled. And you would be following precedent; Frenchay half a dozen manor houses scattered among lesser properties and looks better for it.

Finally, and I'd like an answer to this point (my email is mike.averis@guardian.co.uk) I would like to consult a friend, Professor Alan Jago, professor of town planning and recently retired as Pro Vice Chancellor at the University of Westminster. His view, I know, would be worthwhile, but he has been away and it might be a few weeks yet before I can contact him. When I do, would you be open to hearing his views, even if they arrive after the September 14 deadline?

---

2. M & V Baker
BS16 1NQ

We reject the Concept Statement especially in regard to the following:

1. DENSITY
550 units are far too many if the character of Frenchay is not to be destroyed. In particular:

a. the existing Conservation Area and the trees with a Preservation Order must be respected. These restrictions are there for a reason i.e. to preserve the character of this special area. It follows that the school should be located elsewhere on the site. This would reduce the area available for housing.

b. 550 units with an extra 1300+ residents would more than double the population of Frenchay. This cannot happen without due regard for the needs of this much enlarged community. These needs have not been fully assessed. Proper provision would also reduce the area available for housing. It is not good enough to pack the site with houses and think about these things later.

c. It is clear that the density would be even greater with the development of Frenchay Park House into apartments. This development cannot be treated separately and ignored when planning, road usage or community needs are assessed. These dwellings should not be additional to the number of units included in the Concept statement.

2. TRAFFIC FLOW

a. Frenchay is already subject to serious traffic congestion especially in the rush hours with people travelling from the whole area to work and accessing the M32, M4, Ring Road and other major sites like UWE. With say 1000+ additional residents taking to the roads at rush hours, this congestion will increase. Whilst there will be compensating reductions due to fewer hospital workers and visitors, their trips are phased throughout the day. The peak will only get worse.

b. A major problem in Frenchay is the practice of hospital workers parking on Frenchay common and adjacent roads. This is especially hazardous during busy times with volumes of traffic moving in each direction. Can we be assured that the new Community Hospital will have sufficient parking for staff and visitors - and that they will not be discouraged from using it by charges?

3. COMMUNITY

Our village hall is already in use most of the time and our school is full. We have no shops, surgery, playground, sports facilities. Apart from the school, the Concept Statement does not show what facilities will be provided or where they will be.

3. G Brookman
Homestead Gardens

I am aware that the tree boundary screen behind numbers 18 to 22 Homestead Gardens is negligible and agree with my neighbours that the screen from future development be extended to the same depth behind these properties as the Northern tree boundary screen.

Having attended the meeting at Frenchay Village Hall recently and also having being supplied with a copy of a FAQs regarding the above statement I would like to make the following observations:-

Re Question 4
I think it would be a great loss to remove the whole of the North East woodlands. This has been a nature reserve for many years and has an established wild nature habitat. Aesthetically it would be also appropriate to retain it for the benefit of the new community and help to retain the beauty of the village.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Re Question 6 and 9 and 10</strong></td>
<td>It is my opinion that the density of the development is far too high. I am sure that if financial gains are the intention then an equal return could be achieved by building houses more in the keeping with the quality of existing Frenchay houses and with more space around each and therefore more in keeping with the fine village we have. I do of course agree that provision should be made for the elderly but this could be done tastefully, and again in the vernacular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Re Question 12 b</strong></td>
<td>The siting of the new primary school should in my opinion be within easy reach of Frenchay Common with a view of the church with access from the Clic Cottage entrance gate. Ideally, as Bob Woodward suggested at the meeting, the end of that road opposite the junction with Lime Avenue would be the obvious position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **4. M Blake**  
Frenchay Park Road | My wife and I attended the meeting in the Village Hall on 3rd September and I now write to voice our main concerns regarding the housing proposed for this prime site.  
As the answer to question 7 on the FAQs sheet made clear, discussion of densities that exist currently in Frenchay may not be helpful. The point is that new development in and around the village have taken place over time whereas the sheer scale and time-frame of building 550 homes in the locality can only have an adverse impact on the feeling of space that residents now enjoy. However, the development is going ahead come what may, so the concern is to try to ensure that what is built is of high quality, spacious and in keeping with the surroundings.  
This, we feel, is the problem, as virtually all large developments of the last ten to fifteen years have produced built environments that are claustrophobic and characterless, with detached houses barely detached, narrow roads not wide enough to accommodate emergency services as well as the inevitable parked vehicles and a bleak uniformity that is dispiriting. One does not have to go far to find examples; Stoke Park has ‘Georgian style’ homes of a type, I understand, proposed to front the Lime Avenue but are a pastiche of the real thing that we have here in Frenchay. This magnificent site surely deserves better from our architects and planners than poky dwellings, lacking in storage and outside private space, and crammed together in the pursuit of greater profit for the developers. This is our greatest concern that Frenchay will end up with another run-of-the-mill estate at its heart, in Frenchay but not of it. |
| **5. J Breslin**  
BS16 1NG | **Housing Density and Style.**  
Earlier this year the number of dwellings was put at approx. 350 while now the figure being used throughout the document seems to be 550.  
I disagree that the site can cope with this number of dwellings and looking at the example pictures on page 30 and page 31 it appears that this is going to be very high density housing estate with very limited facilities for each house with regards to car parking and individual personal space.  
Such housing schemes may be cheaper and easier to build but it would make more sense in the long term to provide good quality housing where people will want to live and remain, and not an estate where they are crammed in together in conditions that do not encourage people to stay.  
Why not provide gardens for people who will live here and adequate car parking space. Most household these days have at
least two cars and from the example pictures I can see then there will be little provision for them. You only need to look at how inadequate most new housing developments are by visiting Stoke Park, off Stoke Lane near UWE.

**Facilities in the Development**

On page 17 of the document it is stated that a previous study found that there is no need for a GP surgery, although a future need ‘may arise’.

Well if there are going to be 350 to 550 new houses then there will obviously be a need for a GP surgery. Many people in Frenchay now have to travel to Fishponds to their doctor, which involves a car journey or getting 2 buses, which is not ideal for people who need to visit a doctor because they are ill. Another 1000 people, assuming that there would be approx. 2 people per household, will create a definite need for a GP surgery.

It has also apparently been decided that there will be no local shops or similar amenities in the development.

Again I think that it would be mistake to omit such facilities. Local facilities would help to make the new development a more sustainable and pleasant place to live instead of making everyone dependent on their cars, and adding to the existing traffic problems.

When Bradley Stoke was originally built local facilities were missed out and this created lots of problems for residents living there surrounded by acres of housing and nothing else.

If this development is created as in the Concept Document then there will be very little integration with the village, instead they will exist as two very separate entities.

**Traffic and Transport**

While the removal of the hospital will remove some of the traffic, this will be replaced by cars belonging to residents of the new development. I would estimate that 550 dwellings will also be accompanied by twice that number of cars.

From observing other new housing developments that have been constructed over recent years there will not be enough car parking provision.

This number of new houses will create a traffic surge in the mornings and evening, particularly as the major employer in the area will have disappeared causing a lot of people to have to commute to work elsewhere.

Have any meetings taken place with the bus companies to provide a better and more frequent bus service from Frenchay along Frenchay Park Road? Such an increase in the local population will surely warrant a better bus service than we already have.

**Location of New School**

Frenchay Church of England Primary School has been an outstanding asset to the village of Frenchay for many years and if it is decided to build a new school then it should be in the best location for the village, the pupils and the Church. It is of course a C of E school and it is important to retain its proximity to the church near the current centre of Frenchay. It is stated on page 17 that a school “could assist in the integration of the communities” and “often acts as a focal point for communities”.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>the car parking area to the north of Frenchay Park House would be an ideal location as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• it is in a central position of the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• includes playing fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• would connect well with the Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• would integrate better with the original village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• would provide a safe environment for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• it a safe distance from main roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>adjacent to the Museum.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is <strong>not</strong> a suitable site for the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• this is Conservation Land and should not be built on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• it is too far from the centre of Frenchay and would be out on the periphery of the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• would be too far from the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• would be too close to a busy road – Frenchay Park Road and Begbrook Park are very busy and congested roads. This traffic will not disappear when the hospital closes as most traffic is passing through from the Cleeve Hill direction or from Hambrook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It has already been noted that the junction of Begbrook Park and Frenchay Park Road is quite dangerous and not the best place for a school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>entrance of Hospital Site on Frenchay Park Road.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• It is not very clear where this is but again this would be very close to a main road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too far from the centre of Frenchay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>at the end of Lime Tree Avenue opposite Beckspool Road entrance</th>
<th>This would be a good location as it :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is close to the centre of the village and church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is easily accessible from Beckspool Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides a safe environment for children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Option</th>
<th>Stables Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously it was mentioned that the Stables Block close to Frenchay Park House could be utilised to create a new school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
building. This does not appear to feature in the Concept statement now but it would be an ideal opportunity for Frenchay to have an outstanding and unique building which would be in character with the rest of Frenchay and more in line with its long history.

This location would be

- Closer to Frenchay and the church
- In a safe environment away from main roads
- Close to possible playing fields
- It would be far better to use this Grade 2 Listed Building for something positive for the community than to let it stagnate and decay as may well happen
- This would also tie in with Section 4.6 “The prominent Georgian structures and landscapes characterize the area and this is recognized as important to protect and enhance.”

Utilities and Drainage

Section 4.5 suggests that the current foul water drainage capacity is adequate for the future development, “although new drains will be constructed on site”.

This is inconsistent. They are either adequate or they are not.

Section 5.5 on Page 19 describes how the drainage will flow southward along Frenchay Park Road into a tributary of the River Frome 300m from the site.

This survey was taken “on 28th October 2011 in fine weather”.

Since this time we have had one of the wettest years on record and we are forecast to have many more such periods of extreme weather so a survey during a dry period is not very useful or indicative of the future.

Also the drainage running along Begbrook Park towards Frenchay Park Road is very prone to blockages and the drains have filled up and overflowed on a number of occasions in the last 10 years, causing the residents to call out professional services to fix the problem.

Another inconsistency in the Concept statement:

In Section 4.6 page 14 it states “The site is located in a broad and undulating valley”

Yet later in Section 5.5, page 19 it states “the site is not at risk of flooding, since it is built on a gentle dome topped hill.”

The Development Site cannot be in a valley and on a hill.

I suggest that more research is done into this Drainage issue in the future, perhaps during a period of wet weather.

Other Concerns and Inconsistencies

- Existing Hospital Boundaries, discussed on page 17, are currently in a very poor state of repair.
How will this boundary be maintained in the future and who will have this responsibility?

- It has been said that the Tennis Courts will be relocated. Where will they be relocated to? These Tennis Courts could be a major asset for the future in Frenchay.
- The area south of Lime Tree Avenue is often used by a Cricket Club. Has there been any consultation with this club?
- The trees in the Hospital site are an outstanding asset for the village, not just along the northern boundary but also in the area north of Beckspool Road and close to Frenchay Park House, with large Cedar and other trees.
- As already stated above the area south of Lime Tree Avenue north of Begbrook Park and Beckspool Road is part of Frenchay Conservation Land and should not be built on either for houses or a school.

6. J.A.G. Bonner
BS16 1LP

As a resident of Cliff Court Drive, Frenchay, for 40 years, I have observed with concern, particularly in recent years, the way that developments within the Hospital have impacted adversely on the village. For example, the disgraceful policy of allowing staff to invade daily, all roads and car parking spaces throughout the village and its environs, despite assurances to the contrary given by the Chief Exec at the time parking fees were introduced.

We are now faced with a potential invasion of 550 new families in properties which will change forever the character of Frenchay. I understand the need to develop the site but surely we are entitled to preserve what little bit of conservation area we already enjoy plus the woodland areas? I therefore wish to concentrate my comments on this aspect of the plan:

1. **The existing conservation areas are sacrosanct and should be ring fenced with absolutely no exceptions.** This automatically rules out the so called "Gateway Development" whatever that is. How can you consult on a plan which doesn't explain what is in it? The Concept Statement is just not credible if it fails to communicate.

2. School Option 2 should be ruled out for the same reason - it is unnecessary and totally inappropriate to use conservation land for this purpose when there is such a huge amount of alternative land elsewhere on the site.

3. School option 1 is also unsatisfactory because it impacts adversely and unnecessarily on existing green space land.

4. The logical place for the School is at the site of the Day Care Centre, with access along Lime Tree Avenue from the existing roundabout. I can see no logic in any access to the new site being needed via Clic Cottage so this entrance should be closed in the interests of keeping traffic away from the Common and the Village.

5. Access to all the new housing and facilities should be restricted to Frenchay Park Road. This at least would preserve some element of advantage to the village by restricting vehicular movement.

6. **I would like to suggest a Key Performance Indicator of paramount importance for the project.** Quantify the existing total unrestricted access green space area on site i.e. the conservation areas, the woodland, plus other green spaces etc. Express this total as a percentage of the total site area. The KPI would then be to improve on this percentage by a significant amount under the Plan. If you could commit to this KPI and also agree to preserve existing conservation areas, then I believe the result could be regarded as a fair outcome.
|    | Mrs Blackburn  
|    | BS16 2SZ  
| 7. | 1. Why has the initial figure of 350-400 dwellings increased to 550.  
|    | 2. Traffic will impact on the already busy infrastructure  
|    | 3. Plans at meeting were unclear.  
|    | 4. Seek details of type of housing proposed  
|    | 5. Section 106 should provide improved public transport along Frenchay Common for old and new residents. Existing public transport is non-existent. Opportunity to improve.  
|    | 6. Resident for over 30 years – love area and hope others will respect it.  
|    | G & J Collard  
|    | BS16 1LQ  
| 8. | We would like to take an opportunity to have our feelings noted.  
|    | We live on the Bristol Road and despite our proximity to the hospital we feel that we have never been consulted correctly – we feel that decisions have been taken and we only get told after the event. The most recent being ‘in amongst the 500 houses (that we suspect you don’t want) on which site would you like the school?’  
|    | We have no recollection of a consultation about the hospital closure; we were brought in at the ‘save the hospital’ stage. We attended various meetings and those who opposed the closure did a sterling job – but to no avail. The closure was inevitable.  
|    | One of the reasons for selecting Southmead to be developed was given as ‘easier to recruit staff’! Does this appear to consider patient care?  
|    | The number of homes has increased weekly and on the local TV last week it said the land will be sold to the highest bidder – so much for the concerns of the residents.  
|    | There are numerous concerns – over and above those we have, but these are main ones:  
|    | The loss of a South Glos Hospital is ludicrous, this is the expanding area and we will have to travel miles along congested roads to get to Southmead. Many S Glos residents will die on the journey I suspect. I met a Yate resident who fell in her garden and waited 3 hours for an ambulance!  
|    | We will be adding many more residents (to go alongside all the other developments – eg those around The Mall, behind Hewlett Packard, Yate and Chipping Sodbury) all sharing the same roads and hospital.  
|    | Frenchay is/was a village which has been changed in recent years by its proximity to the Motorways and Ring Roads – the roads cannot cope. The hospital cars have created problems, but this, I feel, will be nothing compared with the heavy plant used to develop the site and the additional cars the housing will bring – some 750 extra. Traffic in Frenchay changes from speeding when the opportunity exists to total snarl-up at peak times. Our road is the main road to the hospital, it is narrow, cannot be widened and already presents a serious risk when I try to emerge from my drive – during the building stage this will become a nightmare with lorries and the inevitable mud. On completion, the additional cars will bring a similar risk but a
different circumstance.

Facilities – I’m not sure what health facilities will exist, but I’ve been told that no Doctors’ surgery is planned – our own surgery, in Christchurch, seems unable to cope with the current numbers – having phone calls answered and getting appointments is a time consuming business and one often has to wait some weeks for a non-urgent appointment. All surgeries are the same – a large influx of people requires extra services.

Community facilities – I define these as a shop, a museum and a village hall. The shop is inadequate and, frankly, doesn’t satisfy the needs – so a trip in the car to the supermarkets is inevitable. The village hall meets a need but is nothing compared to that of Emmersons Green, for example.

The density of the housing is not in keeping with the rest of the area and will have a profound effect on the whole of Frenchay. The building will, of course, remove many of the woodlands that exist, this will turn Frenchay from Village to Urban Sprawl.

We are horrified what our Politicians/ council/ North Bristol Health Trust has foisted upon us- Frenchay Hospital was paid for from the public purse, the council officers are paid for by the public. I know of nobody who agrees with anything that has been agreed by these public bodies and yet we are unable to resist these developments. And we have the audacity to tell the world about democracy!

9. K Cepek
Grange Park
Frenchay

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed development of the Frenchay Hospital site detailed in the Concept Statement; I am very alarmed at the number of houses being proposed and the resulting erosion of the green spaces currently maintained on the Frenchay Hospital site which is in character with the setting in and around Frenchay Village.

I strongly believe it would be a terrible shame to allow such a large development on such a beautiful site which has the potential to be developed aesthetically, in keeping with the surrounding area which accommodates an array of scenic countryside, well appreciated and used by local residents.

I would be grateful if my comments could be considered when decisions are made about the development of the Frenchay Hospital site.

10. M Clark
BS16 1MT

You don’t mention any social amenities or a GP (which the scale of the development you say is unlikely to justify – and yet we are to have another 550 houses. The number of houses plus a larger school will only increase traffic on my road and Frenchay in general, so destroying our peace once again.
I already have a pre-school business in the Village hall opposite me – am I to have a school at the back of my garden within shouting distance as well.
Look to your plans again

11. T Clark
BS16 1PE

Thank you for making time to attend the Frenchay Village Hall meeting last week and to hear first-hand some of the views expressed. I have broadly followed your requested six items of feedback on the NBNHST Concept Statement.
1. Clarity – I feel that the document is clear on development principles proposed for the site.
2. Principles - I understand the need for the site to be redeveloped for residential purposes. I feel that the need to add to the existing Frenchay community infrastructure to provide fit for purpose facilities for the expanded community is also a key principle. The finalisation of a fit for purpose site for the primary school is a critical factor.

3. Surveys – I am not sure that I am convinced by the traffic studies. Current issues are with the southerly approach to Hambrook lights at peak morning time, with cars queuing on Begbrook Road and the Bristol Road. I believe that this is not predominantly hospital related traffic and will worsen with an increase in commuting residents.

4. Consultation – I believe that GVA and NBHT have done a reasonable job of allowing residents to express their views and taking some generally held ones in to account in the Concept Statement, given the wide ranging and at times emotional and extreme views of some.

5. Specific comments and general comments on the document with paragraph and page numbers from the document where applicable to make clear where I strongly agree or disagree with a point and any change that I wish the Council to consider:

P17 – 5 Integration with the village – See detailed point below.

P22 – 6.6 Open Spaces – “children and young people play” – I am not clear what this means and am concerned that young people’s activities and community buildings have not been adequately identified and safeguarded.

P26 7.4 – “providing community uses that allow movement of people across the boundary” is good sentiment, but the on-site school, community hospital and the informal green spaces are the only facilities that would encourage movement in to the site for the existing community.

P28-29 – Proposed Gateway Development – I am not clear what this is and how it is different from residential area.

Frenchay has a village hall, a church, a school and a pub. These provide a “centre”. It has a small convenience store and the shop and petrol station. I disregard the Harvester. The residential development provides the opportunity to upgrade the existing community facilities and amenities including activities for young people and youths. The site and scale of these will be part of integrating the communities (current and new) and in combating future anti-social behaviour (and related SGC costs) as well as enhancing the standard of living for all.

It is well serviced locally for car drivers in relation to high cost/large scale facilities – secondary schools, supermarkets, swimming pools and leisure centres. It is not well serviced for local community activities – youth centre, multipurpose modern hall, play grounds, café, 24 hour convenience store.

I believe that an additional new on-site multipurpose community hall to complement the existing village hall would be beneficial. To be supplementary, rather than duplicatory it should have safe access and parking, incorporate a youth centre room, with children’s playground and an adventure playground. It would also be great to have a skate park/bmx facility for young people though I understand how important the design is to ensure these are positively utilised rather than negative focus points.

I think two complementary community facilities one on-site and one off-site with different offerings would encourage the existing and new communities to more frequently cross the site boundary.

If the school is located on-site, then SGC need to be open and honest about the future of the Malmains Drive site.
than additional housing, it would be well suited to being retained in two parts as a dog walking area and developed as
children’s and adventure playground if it was not feasible to include these in the new development.

Having previously lived for 12 years in Bradley Stoke, (from 1999) I have seen the impact of residential developments
being constructed in advance of community facilities. I know that many hundreds of thousands of pounds has been spent
investigating and surveying young people’s activity needs in Bradley Stoke and perhaps some of this information could be
accessed to inform the needs of the expected new community residents who I suspect may have a lower average age than
the current community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12.</th>
<th>S Connelly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good Afternoon Mike,</strong></td>
<td><strong>Please find below my comments / views on the Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept statement. The content below covers 2 areas:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key points or questions to raise from content in Proposal paper.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - **Overview Section** – What does ‘To reach confirmation in principle with SGC on the optimum approach and
management of the constraints to deliver an effective master plan.’ What are the constraints, and who do the
constraints relate to – the developers scope?? | |
| - **Overview Section** - I appreciate that further analysis is required but it would be useful to get more clarity on
projected housing volumes and how the number has increased significantly from 350 – 550 dwellings. | |
| - **Overview Section** - Frenchay Park House is out of scope of this concept paper, but this must be kept in scope for
the overall plans for this site as it could increase the already inflated proposed number of dwellings on the site
considerably exacerbating all the problems linked to over building of residential properties on the site. If it is out of
scope why is continuously mentioned and referred to in the concept paper – echoes disjointed approach. | |
| - **Overview Section** Can we have more information on the companies who undertook the surveys and
investigations, and can some of these be undertaken by independent bodies to truly ratify the findings. How
confident can we be in the results of the ecological survey if elements like TPO’s have been ‘missed’ by experts? | |
| - **Section 1.2** What is the purpose of section 1.2 in context that outlines existing facilities? Is it to project the view
that there are sporting / community facilities within the immediate area which negates the need for provision of such
facilities within any development leaving greater scope for increased number of dwellings? What it does highlight is
the lack of amenities in the vicinity for an additional 550 dwellings. A ‘Small Local convenience store’ which is
wholly inappropriate. The facilities listed (tennis courts, outdoor swimming pool and Cricket ground are not open to
the public). | |
| - **P12/13** 2.5 hectares have been earmarked for health and social care provision with these proposals currently being |
further developed by the new clinical commissioning grp for South Gloucestershire. Concept paper also makes reference to master plan including the Brain Injury Rehab Unit, The Burden Centre and Frenchay Museum but does not outline these buildings ‘space’ requirements and how this feeds into the overall calculation of available development space. In addition who is representing the BIRU in terms of these plans and the impact on them? P16 mentions parking – what scale of parking does these sections need.

- **P13** What is the ‘Core Strategy’ that sets out a vision for the northern fringe? What job opportunities near to the proposed site are available for 550 new dwellings?

- **P14 /18 /19** Can a request be made for independent surveys to be made in terms of the Ecological Survey, Contamination report, Arboriculture survey, Utilisation and Drainage and Historic, Landscape and Visual assessment. Language used is flaky in some instances – ‘some levels of deterioration’, ‘it is not anticipated’, ‘is likely to be provided’, ‘makes no suggestion’ ‘moderate risk’, ‘reduces the likelihood that bats. Can the reports be more decisive and informative?

- **P15** Do all views on this consultation paper feed into the ‘Statement of Community involvement’ which will accompany any future outline planning application?

- **P16** Draft policy CS16 refers to density making an ‘efficient use of land’ is this applicable to all types of land and its surroundings? Would argue that the immediate surrounding land and infrastructure is not able to support such a policy.

- **P16** A detailed travel assessment and plan of impact on surrounding highways should be undertaken prior to any submission of planning applications.

- **P17** When were previous studies undertaken by the PCT.? If the density is in excess of 500 dwellings then a new GP Surgery will be required. Did the study by PCT canvass views from local GP surgeries such as the one in Downend – there is already an element of healthcare it would be logical to incorporate a new GP surgery.

- **P17** – Makes reference to open space provision, allotments, informal play space and formal sports provision. Again greater detail about scale required. Statements such as ‘A significant amount of open space will be retained, enhanced and the accessibility to space improved’ need fleshing out with projected coverage.

- A new school is a must, otherwise the people that live in the new dwellings will never integrate into the community (which contradicts the aims of the Core strategy on P12.

- **P16** makes reference to H2 policy (SGC Local Plan) which requires development to deliver a min of 30 units per hectare – what comprises a unit. Density figures in section 8.1 make reference to number of dwellings per hectare. This disjointed approach makes it difficult to understand where the drive for density comes from. Is it due to directives from SGC or the greed of the trust / developers.
- **P18 Section 5.0 Managing Constraints** – constraints depending on point of view.

- **P19 (Section 5.4 Trees)** makes reference to removal of trees and replanting of trees, what value is there in removing mature, potentially historic trees and replanting new trees to act as ‘screens’? Reference to further work to assess TPO’s must be a priority to fully understand the scale of development without compromising conservation principles / guidelines.

- **P19 Access.** Can more detail about time, date, duration, location, scale and number of traffic surveys be provided. What proportion of the 960 two way movements can be attributed to the Hospital site? Has a weekend survey been carried out to establish if a high proportion of the traffic on the routes are commuters or hospital staff / visitors? How is the conclusion that future traffic movements post development would be ‘well below’ existing movements. (P20). As a commuter that rides to work my observation is that a large volume of the traffic are commuters using the Frenchay road network to access the Ring road, motorway network or the City Centre via Stapleton Road. Building 550 dwellings on a site whereby core amenities such as shops, doctors, schools and places of work need to be travelled to by car will not reduce the significant traffic volumes and congestion on the site. Also the number of cars that park on the roads surrounding the common and National Trust land is individuals who work in the surrounding care homes should not be underestimated. As a consequence these people need to be considered when making statements that parking related issues will be reduced.

- **P23 – School recommendation.** Development of a new school is paramount. The existing school is not sufficient to meet current demands yet with the addition of children generated through the building of 550 new dwellings.

- **6.8 Employment Opportunities (P23)** – Have local businesses been engaged to get scale of employment opportunities. Lack of opportunities will exacerbate issues related to insufficient road infrastructure.

- **7.6 Vision Statement (p26)** – Makes reference to high quality integrated redevelopment – once plans are agreed who polices this and ensures that all structures are at the proposed ‘high quality’ across all the 550 dwellings. The cost of meeting this will need to be met by a developer who will be looking to maximise profit.

- **P28 Section 8.0** – Based on the premise that minimum requirement of 30 units per hectare actually relates to dwellings (not clear in paper) then some high level analysis indicates that circa 67% of proposed housing development is 50% above the minimum SGC requirements which clearly outlines that the Trust / Developers are looking to maximise the opportunity without considering the ramifications of such scale.

- **P28 Section 8.0** – Based on the proposed density of development and SCG assumption of 2.28 people per dwelling this would result in roughly 1330 ‘new’ people living in Frenchay and the current amenities and road infrastructure is not fit for purpose to cope with this additional volume of people or meet their requirements / expectations.

- A more sensible approach would be to either reduce the density of all the development types to the minimum
requirement or increase the Suburban Residential areas which in effect will reduce density and the volume of people living on the site.

- **P28 Section 8.0** – Decision on the proposed Health Care services cannot be taken independently of the wider site redevelopment as decisions on the need for a new GP Surgery are intrinsically linked to the number of dwellings constructed on the site. The larger the number of dwellings the greater need for a GP surgery (and other health / community related facilities) and potentially more land earmarked then the 2.5 hectares currently in scope.

**General Views on the Development.**

- Do South Gloucestershire Council need to have 550 houses built in such a picturesque, scenic area in light of other significant developments taken place within a 5 mile radius such as the building of 2,200 houses at Charlton Hays and 900 houses at Cheswick Village.

- As with many people in the Frenchay area I believe the proposed number of dwellings is too high as the surrounding area does not have the core amenities (private or community) to meet the needs of an additional 1300 people. Integration is a key strategy of the concept paper however the individuals that move to the development will never integrate with the existing Frenchay and wider communities if there is no link to do so. **It is essential that community facilities (2 Form school, Community centre, play areas, allotments, sports facilities etc) and those that are central to any community (GP surgery) are fully considered and given equal importance in any development. There is also a need to consider children / teens between the ages of 10 – 18 and to make sure that facilities are in place which reduces the risk of anti social behaviour. I also believe that the current road infrastructure is not adequate to deal with such an influx of people.**

- Where does the development ‘stop’ - what will the long term legacy of this development be. In reality the provision of services and amenities within the immediate surrounding area is wholly inadequate to deal with the scale of development proposed, however, this issue will only become a reality when the development is completed and people have moved in and realize that very few ‘amenities’ are in walking distance. From here there will be a clamour for additional development of the surrounding land for shops etc. Post development how long will it be before there is further development on private farm land or DRG Stapleton’s football pitch to meet this demand for amenities / services that has not been met in the proposed development and Frenchay just joins the urban sprawl.

- Frenchay and its surrounding area is an individual, beautiful, peaceful location which enhances South Gloucestershire. It would be a shame to lose this tranquil location through not fully considering the wider implications and impact of building such a significant amount of dwellings on a site. Have all options for the site been fully considered which could generate significant funds for the Trust but also maintain the beauty of this ‘rural’ location in a bustling city. Other options that maybe worth considering include
  
  o Approaching St Monica’s Trust to see if they would be interested in the land to build a similar development.
for retired people as constructed in Westbury on Trym.

- Use the majority of the land for community and Sports facilities that could be used by the whole of South Gloucestershire.
- Maintain it as a site which promotes the historic elements and leaves a ‘green’ footprint and legacy for the future.

| 13. | J Chandler  
BS16 1PJ | Concept Statement should:  
Conform total number of houses to be built  
Include the number of parking spaces  
Concept Statement is too vague  
Does not take account of local residents’ views  
550 dwellings – over development –  
- will impact on existing residents amenity  
- 1200 residents will impact on peak hour traffic.  
- Insufficient community facilities – anti-social behaviour  
- Village hall too small  
- No medical centre to meet the needs of residents  
- Need social facility and GP Surgery and possibly a chemist  
- Retain the MS Centre to complement Bradley Stoke  
- Retain MacMillan Building  
- Include farm shop for local produce – and create local jobs  
- School location options should address road safety  
- Object to encroachment into Conservation Area  
- Object to Encroachment into Nature Reserve  
- Conservation area to be properly identified and protected.  
- English Heritage or National Trust should advise on development to preserve historic integrity |
| 14. | P Dennis  
BS16 1LP. |
|---|---|
| I have a number of concerns regarding the GVA proposals as outlined in their Draft Concept Statement. Principally I have 3 main issues of concern:-  
1. The density of the proposed development.  
2. The apparent indifference to traffic congestion.  
3. The destruction of open spaces and trees.  
All of the above link into each other and other issues.  
It is currently unclear how many dwellings there are in Frenchay. Published figures vary from 683 (as per the Parish Plan) to 1100 (homes to which Frenchay News is delivered). I understand the variance is to do with housing adjoined to Frenchay (South Glos) which are technically in Bristol, but they are geographically and in every other sense, part of the Frenchay community who use the roads, school, churches, village hall, pub and all other amenities. If one adds the Frenchay community figure of 1100 homes to the GVA's proposed 550 new homes, a total of 1783 is achieved. With a population density of approximately 2.4 persons per dwelling that is a total population of 3960 persons. There is nothing in the Draft Concept Statement to indicate what infrastructure is proposed to cope with this level of population. Local roads are unable to cope efficiently now with persons commuting either into the City or attempting to access the outer ring road and motorway network. The number of man hours lost and the amount of pollution being created must be colossal and the GVA proposal for such a high total population increase will only compound the issues. The existing village hall which acts as a social hub for the village would be unable to cope with the demands of nearly 4,000 people, yet the GVA's proposals offer no suggestion as to how community facilities could be improved. Either a new Village Hall or Community Centre with sufficient parking is required as part of the new development. There is mention of a GP Surgery "if there is a demonstrated need for additional primary care capacity". |
Focusing solely upon the proposed ‘new’ residents to Frenchay is likely to skew any decision on a new GP surgery. Look at it this way. Surely GVA are not expecting nearly 4000 people, when sick, to fight the increased traffic to drive to a doctor’s in another part of the county or into the City?

An alternative would be to rely upon a patchy bus service which would have to battle the more densely packed local roads instigated by GVA proposals.

As far as I am aware no traffic count data has been made available to the public. This should be done in order to show true and expected traffic flows.

I now list some GVA adjectives used in relation to existing trees on the site (taken from the Draft Concept Statement July 2012 - FAQ document :-

- Removed, limited life expectancy, felling, thinning, translocation, relocation, re-provision, woodland area removed, key trees protected. All this really means is getting rid of as many inconvenient obstacles as possible so only a few ‘key trees’ are left. They can then sell the maximum amount of land for development.

- There is absolutely nothing encouraging from GVA i.e. ‘retain as many trees as possible’, build in sympathy with existing trees and landscape’, ‘enhance attractive parkland’. This would be great news for the North Bristol NHS Trust, but we all know trees are good for us and the GVA proposals would cause environmental damage and affect the quality of life for people in the area.

- Incidentally, a speaker at the FAQ meeting at Frenchay Village Hall on 3.09. 2012 stated that a survey of the lime trees in Lime Tree Avenue in 2009 described the trees as ‘mid life’ as they live for 500 years! We were also told that someone with forethought some 10 years or so ago planted some lime trees at the bottom end of the site near the museum, just in case any established lime trees required replacing.

The message for GVA must be "HANDS OFF ALL TREES".

A simple solution is available which solves many of the issues and that is build less houses, so that the roads are less choked, trees need not be put at risk which leads to more open spaces and there is less demand upon amenities and more room for new ones.

I would ask that South Gloucestershire Council places quality of life at the top of the list of objectives in relation to these draft proposals and not allow GVA to ruin a community in the interest of making as much money as possible for the North Bristol NHS Trust. Frenchay is unique, please keep it that way.

---

As a resident of Frenchay I wish to comment and express my deep concern over the current proposals to develop the Hospital site. Frenchay village is unique both in its position and in its history, a history which has had great influence upon its character and visual aspect, being heavily influenced by its Quaker and similar associations resulting in some outstanding examples of architecture and endowment of magnificent green spaces.

Therefore to plan to overdevelop the site, with 550 dwellings, and in the process ignore important matters such as aesthetics, which has been such a apparent influence for good in the historic development of the village, is in my opinion, a pandering to the myopic value of money, without any consideration for its consequences, now or in the future.

W.S.Denman.
The attitude of trying to force too many homes onto the development site must result in a devalued area with little or no thought for such items as shops, areas where children can safely play, and a community centre.

Further, the apparent lack of garages must lead to parking on both sides of the proposed roads, with the possible consequences of difficulty of access for emergency and service vehicles. Whilst accepting that hospital traffic will reduce, inevitably there will be many additions to the already congested peak flows as people leave their homes for work or to take children to school. The roads currently, cannot easily accommodate the traffic flows they were never intended to handle, to add to the problem will inevitably cause much frustration and increase in blood pressure.

As a resident of Cedar Hall I note the corridor of land running behind the garages on the left hand side as you enter the Hall grounds and the allotments. To use this corridor for vehicle access is an almost certain guarantee of an accident and should never be countenanced for this purpose.

---

16. Mr & Mrs Endley
BS16 1LP

As a resident of Frenchay, a parent and a local GP I would like to express my concerns about the Draft Concept Statement of the Re-development of the Frenchay Hospital Site.

I fully understand why the two main hospitals in North Bristol Trust are being amalgamated into one site at Southmead and I support the need for more housing in the country as a whole and in my local area. However, there seem to be significant issues that have not been addressed in the Draft Concept. Unless these are dealt with at any early stage there is a real risk that this excellent opportunity to allow Frenchay Village to enlarge and improve could be mishandled. The old village with the new development if managed correctly could enhance the area & thereby keep it desirable for future generations. Poor decision making at this stage could have a detrimental & irreversible impact.

I apologise in advance for the length of this letter but I wanted to give detail to all the points raised. In summary however my concerns are with respect to:

- Housing
- Transport
- Community infrastructure
- Green space & conservation

**Housing Density**

There seems to have been a worrying increase in the number of new dwellings planned for the site from 370 to 450 and now at least 550. At best this indicates a degree of speculation rather than logistical planning.

I fully understand the need for NBT and GVA Grimly to maximise profit from the re-development at this time of austerity. There is also a nationwide need for new housing. However if these houses are built in a short period of time it will have a massive negative impact for transport links, green spaces, community infrastructure and on the school. This will affect generations to come.

The design of the new buildings must be in sympathy with the rest of the village & built with sustainability in mind.

Has there been any research as to whether this number of homes are needed & will sell? There are massive new housing
projects currently in Filton on the old airport site & in Frampton Cotterell. I also believe that many of the new homes in the Bristol Dockside new developments remain unoccupied.

Have other building plans been considered e.g. sheltered housing, offices etc.

**Transport**

We have an invaluable opportunity to improve all areas of transport to improve safety, travel times & the environment that must not be missed

**Cars**

Currently at rush hour in the morning & evening in term time there are huge queues to access the ring road. Obviously there will be a great decrease in staff due to the closure of the acute hospital. As hospital staff work mainly on shifts I cannot see how this decrease will equal the number of new journeys that will need to be made in & out of the new development at rush hour. If we assume in this modern world that there are at least 2 workers per household, this would mean as extra 1100 vehicles on the road. I understand a “transport assessment” has been carried out; it is unreasonable that the findings of this & the way in which it were carried out have not been shared with the community.

I wonder if it has been considered to build a new road to link to the M32 directly so cars do not get bottle necked on the ring road itself & the access roads?

**Cycle Tracks**

Bristol is a “cycle city” which should be applauded and over recent years there has been a great improvement in the cycle paths available around Bristol & South Gloucestershire. We are very lucky that we have the Bristol - Bath Cycle track so close to our homes, however, links to it & other safe tracks are very limited. Please can an increase in safe cycle tracks be considered in the plan?

**Footpaths**

Please ensure there is an increase in safe paths available to the community on the new site that link with those in the existing village to allow safe walking around the village.

**Vehicle speed limit**

The 30mph speed limit is frequently ignored by current traffic and my daughter & I have had several near misses on walking to school by inconsiderate drivers. There is also an inadequate number of warning signs about school children crossing around the common. The situation could be much worse with an increase in traffic for the area. I believe the areas close to the school, village hall & around the common should be 20mph.

**Buses**

There is a very limited bus service to the village. There is a huge scope to improve access by bus to shops, GP surgeries, the station & places of work. Cost of bus fare must be considered as well as bus routes & frequency of service. If this were done well it alone would enable dramatic reduction in use of cars, traffic congestion & help the environment.

**Community Infrastructure**

**Shops**

At present there is one small local shop on the edge of Frenchay and another in the petrol station. The post office & general stores closed years ago. With a huge increase in number of residents it would be invaluable to either allow these shops to enlarge or build new shops ideally with a post office as part of the re-development. If these facilities were available people
would use them without having to travel & also create a natural meeting point.

Recreational spaces
We are lucky in Frenchay as we have the common. Within the new development there needs to be space allocated for recreational space so the common is not misused. I understand that there are already concerns from some local residents that the common is not being kept as well as it once was. I know from personal experience as I walk across it most days that there is frequently litter left & burn marks from BBQs. Ideally recreational spaces should be built along the same timescale as the houses. Play areas or parks for young & older children should be built, perhaps making use of the swimming pool which already exists. The outside heated pool currently run by Frenchay Hospital Social Club could be run as a community pool to be used by local residents & the school on a subscription basis. If this is done well it will provide an excellent legacy for the next generation & help reduce the risk of anti-social behaviour.

Places of worship
The church & chapels should remain as other focal meeting points for people & good pathways need to me maintained to them.

Public Houses
The White Lion Pub already exists.

Village Hall
There is already a village hall in Frenchay which is well used by the community. Access to it is poor as it is off a very busy road. It accommodates many community groups and Frenchay Pre-school. If the plan is to build family dwellings there will be an increase in the number of pre-school age children to the area & provision for this increase in numbers needs to be discussed with the management of the Hall & its users. It may be that some money will need to be provided by the re-development plan to help provide better access to the hall, extensions etc.

Primary School
A school is often seen as the heart of a community. The present school is centrally positioned & a very happy place. However, it is very old and over crowded. The plans for rebuilding it have been delayed & abandoned many times over the years. This is an ideal opportunity to set this right.

The redevelopment of the Frenchay hospital site must include a space for a school that will accommodate the children who are currently attending Frenchay Church of England Primary School and allow for increased numbers depending on the number of dwellings finally proposed. There needs to be sufficient land set aside to provide a playing field for sports & sufficient playground space. The site chosen should allow the school to remain central in the expanded village with good, safe access for walking, cycling so that car use can be minimised, but sufficient space for cars to allow drop off & pick up of the children if needed. The final plans for this must be made in conjunction with the school and board of governors.

GP
There was a GP branch surgery in Frenchay but this closed several years ago. Most residents are now registered at surgeries in Downend & Fishponds. With Government plans aiming for only large surgeries in the future it is unlikely a new surgery could be built. However perhaps some space in the new community hospital could be offered to the local GP Practices so they can offer an outlying service to residents even if each surgery did this just 1 day per week. There are elderly, ill Frenchay residents who currently have to travel to their GP by taking 2 buses each way to visit their GP.
Green Space, trees & conservation areas

On the current site there are several areas that are designated conservation areas or have preservation orders. These must be protected.

The Lyme Tree Avenue has sapling trees already planted for the future. There are many ancient & old trees that must not be felled. There is a wooded conservation area that must be protected. I believe there are plans to cut down & reduce these areas. I strongly believe the new development must allow these to remain.

There are two grade II listed buildings on the site. The Manor House is outside the development plan; the Stable block is within it. Both these buildings have been allowed to fall into a state of disrepair by NBT, please help preserve them even for re-development into flats. Do not allow them to degenerate further so they are finally only fit to be demolished.

I expect you will get several letters of a similar nature & I hope you are able to implement as many ideas from the current residents as possible.

17. Mrs R. Edmond

Please find below, my comments on the Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept Statement July 2012.

1. **Clarity** – do you feel that the document is clear on development principles proposed for the site?
   
   Yes I feel the document as a whole is clear on development principles. I would argue whether the statement made on page 26, para 7.6 Vision statement, that the development principles fully reflect the vision statement, is true. Whether the development principles (contained with the document) can be achieved within that vision statement (or vice versa) is questionable.

2. **Principles** - Do you agree that the site should be redeveloped broadly as described in the draft concept statement, i.e. for mainly residential development?
   
   Yes in principle I agree that the site should be developed broadly as described in the draft concept statement.

3. **Surveys** – do you consider that all key features of the site have been adequately identified and safeguarded in shaping the proposals?
   
   No. Whilst there is suggestion of a traffic survey on page 19, there is no mention of this with the relevant section of the Draft Concept Statement on Page 14. I query this as when I raised the question at the public exhibition as to whether a traffic survey had been completed and availability of the results for public viewing, the response was too vague.

   I strongly challenge the assumptions made as a result of the traffic survey and more specifically the traffic generation forecasts. It was suggested at the public exhibition that much of the traffic issues surrounding the area; notably from Beckspool Road meeting the mini roundabout, and queues at Hambrock traffic lights are associated with the traffic movement associated with the hospital site and that these will reduce once the site was developed. I cannot support this view. There is a regional problem associated with the traffic volumes and this will not disappear once the hospital closes. On the basis of 550 new properties and a not unreasonable assumption of 1.5 cars per household (and hence an additional 825 vehicles generated within the proposed development) I struggle...
to see where figures of 608 and 402 for am and pm flows, respectively (Page 20), have been derived from. As an aside I do not understanding why evening flows will be significantly less. As this development appears to be laid out as a professionals and family orientated residential development, I would suggest that the predicted flows are not entirely correct and more individuals who leave in the morning peak will also be returning in the peak. Add into this calculation, morning and afternoon school drops offs by parents (a portion of whom will then commute on to work; it would be highly impractical for them to use the proposed Bristol Fringe P&R ride service) and visitors and employees to the Health and Social Care Centre, and the assumed forecast traffic volumes would appear highly inadequate. This leads on to the question of the proposed location of the school which I will address below.

With reference to the drainage survey Page 14 (paragraph 4.5), I would like to understand whether the survey extended to determining whether the tributary some 300m from the hospital site (Page 19 paragraph 5.5) has the required capacity to take the additional load (outfalling from the new, conventional gravity drained system, connecting to the existing WW 800mm dia. sewer) and what the potential impacts could be of such an increase in flow velocities and volumes i.e. erosion of stream bank, and any required potential remediation measures. A further minor point but, whilst I accept the statement that SUDS will be incorporated within the development in with PPS documents, on the basis that the preceding paragraph states the ground is not suitable for infiltration, I am a little confused; the site is located on the Pennant Sandstone

4. Consultation – Do you consider that the consultation process in developing the proposals has been generally satisfactory?
Yes. Whether the key concerns of the local community are being fully addressed within amendments to the plans remains to be seen. I would suggest both myself and much of the community share these concerns.

5. Specific comments on the document. Please use paragraph and page numbers from the document to make clear where you strongly agree or disagree with a point and any change that you would wish the Council to consider.

Housing density/ number of proposed residential units – The suggestion in the vision statement (Page 26 paragraph 7.6) and throughout the Draft Concept Statement (i.e. Page 26 paragraph 7.2) that the aim is to incorporate the new development within the existing community, and then indicate within the same Concept Statement that the proposed number of units will be over double that of the existing village, are incompatible. It would appear that the “optimum approach” referred to on Page 2 Overview is referring to the land value sale as a result of maximum unit sales.

The number of residential units directly relates to my concern over traffic volumes and peak flows, as discussed above.

Given the ongoing development within the SGC boundary on the former Filton airfield and the proposed development around Harry Stoke and UWE, I would like to seek clarification on current housing demand and associated employment opportunities in the region (both SGC and Bristol) and whether these are compatible.

Please clarify why there is a requirement within the SGC Local Plan under policy H2 that a development is to deliver a minimum of 30 units per hectare (Page 16 bullet point 1 to Issue Number 1). Why? Who sets this level?
Who in the public domain had the right/opportunity to challenge this as part of a policy when it was developed?

**Location and Size of the School** – I struggle to understand why, when there is advice from SGC that the development would require a ½ to 1 form entry primary school and the Trust is evaluating the opportunity for a compliant 1 from entry, that SGC request the provision is made for the expansion to a 2 form school. The statement acknowledges that this exceeds the requirement. Why should this need to exceed the requirement? Should we be expecting more development and community expansion in the future? Please can you clarify the statement “but takes a holistic approach to community provision”.

I strongly oppose the location of the proposed school to the south of Lime Tree Avenue. If located on the open space land to the south of the Lime Tree Avenue, not only does it encroach on development within the Conservation Area (no reference of this made within Page 17 point 7), it will remove significant public access to green open space; a contradiction of the vision statement and other proposals within the Draft Concept Statement (i.e. Page 17 point 6 Loss of Green Open Space). I would again raise my concern over traffic flows around Beckspool Road towards the mini roundabout. I can well imagine parents trying to drop children off on the roadside, allowing easy pedestrian access for children from the mini roundabout entrance through to the school, without having to leave the general traffic flow and thus avoiding delays in trying to rejoin the traffic flow at the junction on Beckspool Road. I view this as a major safety issue which has been overlooked.

**Trees** – please can you clarify what appears to be a contradiction? Partial removal of tree is proposed in the north eastern section of the site with a “management strategy” for those to remain (Page 19 paragraph 5.4 Trees). However, on Page 23/24 (paragraph 6.9) the proposal is “to remove the whole of the north eastern woodland”. Please can you also clarify (Page 23, paragraph 6.9) “the proposed option to replant one side of Lime Tree Avenue and translocate the semi mature trees on the south side of the avenue to create the new double sided avenue for the future”. Is the Lime Tree Avenue not already double sided, and if so which trees are being translocated on the south side of the avenue.

Will the public/community have opportunity to view/challenge the updated TPO survey results?

6. **Are there any other issues that you wish to raise with the site development or draft concept statement?**

Please clarify why a traffic calming scheme is only proposed within the Village Residential Area (Page 31). I am alarmed by this for obvious fairly obvious reasons; there are two other medium to high density residential areas proposed on the site and it does not appear that this issue has been well thought out for the rest of the development.

I look forward to hearing your response to these and the other comments received within the future revised/updated Statements and Development Plans.

---

**18. Mr R. Edmunds**  
BS16 1NQ

I have read and agree with my wife’s letter (below) regarding this matter. However, I wish to make the following additional points:

1. **Traffic**
   - The accuracy of data regarding existing traffic movements around the site must be ensured. Only with
accurate data can the effect of the development be properly assessed alongside the retained hospital/medical facilities.

- Inappropriate assumptions about vehicle ownership and likely travel patterns must be avoided. The proximity of the village of Frenchay to both the City of Bristol and the motorway network means that it is an ideal location for those who regularly travel by car on journeys which are unlikely ever to be adequately served by public transport, even if it is enhanced in anticipation of the development.

- Great care is needed in approving this development to avoid creating a traffic problem as it seems highly improbable that the surrounding roads can be improved in a way that would solve that problem. While a wait and see approach may be appropriate elsewhere, it would be wholly wrong here, and decisions should err on the cautious side. As the Council has already recognised in its Local Plan, development must not have "unacceptable ... transportation effects" (Policy H2, page 226)

2. **Density**

- It is difficult properly to understand the densities being proposed for the site from the Draft Concept Statement, which implies that those responsible for it are themselves unsure what they should be.

- Frenchay has a mix of residents but the predominant group is families. In considering the density and nature of development on this site, regard should be had to the current mix and a density selected that retains the family orientation of the village as a whole. Small housing units aimed at single people or couples without children should be no more than a small minority; the remainder should be a mix of houses to attract families at different stages.

- While the exact nature of the dwellings is no doubt a matter for a later stage of the planning process, the Supplementary Planning Document (SDP) for the Frenchay Conservation Area recognises that density, location and design are interlinked concerns when seeking to protect the "important views and setting of the listed buildings and Conservation Area" (page 13, first principle). While not all of the hospital site lies within the conservation area, its proximity demands that the impact of the development be carefully considered. It would seem that it would be appropriate for development of this site to be at the minimum density as laid down by the Local Plan and not any higher.

- Development that occurs piecemeal naturally varies; as the SDP notes, Frenchay has an "attractive mix" giving it a "distinctive architectural character" (page 5). The SDP already acknowledges that any development of this land must avoid being in conflict with the character of the conservation area ("New development ... needs to be in scale and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area": page 7). Simply allowing the creation of a modern housing estate (street after street of essentially similar buildings) would be totally at odds with that aim.

- The separation of the North Bristol Healthcare Trust (NBHT) Headquarters building from this Concept Statement appears to me to be completely wrong. Decisions should not be taken for the proposed site without including any future housing use for the NBHT HQ site; the overall effect of both on the village should be taken into account now. The SDP (page 13, seventh principle) specifically recognises the need to manage what happens with the redevelopment of this property or development of the surrounding land.
Separation of the areas into two distinct developments is likely to inhibit the ability to do so.

3. **Community**
   - While the hospital site has a defined boundary, the manner of the development must ensure that it is not a separate area but fully integrated into Frenchay village. Consideration needs to be given to the density of traffic using the road across the common and the extent to which this could be a division.
   - It is undeniable that Frenchay has grown over the years, as evidenced by the mix of its housing stock, both styles and ages. However, the important point here is that this has happened gradually over the years and not suddenly as the result of a single major development, certainly nothing of the size now contemplated. Whatever number of housing units is eventually determined to be appropriate for the hospital site will represent a significant percentage increase on the existing total. Allowing that to happen in a short period would create major issues for the ability of the existing village to bond with the new residents yet there is no reason to think that small scale development over a longer period would not be absorbed in the same way as it has in the past. Careful thought should be given to setting a limit on the number of units that can be developed each year and the local population should be consulted on this specific point.
   - The Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, December 2011 (SHLAA), identifies the net developable area for the hospital site as 450 units. In the context of the 21,400 units identified as available or likely to become available for housing in South Gloucestershire, and the annual requirement for less than 1,500 units across the Council's area, a low site density and gradual development would appear unlikely to have a significant negative effect overall on the provision of new housing in South Gloucestershire.

4. **General**
   - Without seeking to reopen the debate about where the new hospital should be sited, it is clear that certain financial assumptions will have been made in reaching that decision about the value to NBHT of the Frenchay site. It is essential that achieving that assumed value is not allowed to be a driver of the decision making process and that what is approved for development is what is right for the village of Frenchay, whether or not that meets the NBHT's aims.

If any aspect of these comments is not clear, please let me know and I shall be pleased to clarify them.

| 19. | C Edmunds  
The Newlands  
Frenchay  
Bristol |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As a resident of Frenchay I write to express my concern about the Concept Statement for the hospital site. My main concern is the total number of dwellings - far too many to be in keeping with the area which needs to be protected for future generations. I feel privileged to live here and would like to think that more residents can benefit if there is reasonable development but the number proposed would destroy the &quot;village&quot; ambience. The knock on effects in my view are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• increased traffic in an already too congested area and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• pressure on already overstretched facilities - i.e., school and village hall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Particular points I would like to raise are:

1. Parking needs to be adequate for residents and visitors of the new site. Even a small unit of housing is likely to have two vehicles. Parking also needs to be addressed for the remaining hospital/medical facilities and whatever happens to the HQ building. It is totally unacceptable that patients, workers and visitors would have to park outside the site because of too few spaces and free parking would go a long way to addressing this.

2. Positioning the school on conservation land is wrong - this land needs to be kept as local open space.

3. Further investigation is needed regarding the trees on the site so that as many as possible can be saved, especially those with preservation orders and those planted as memorials.

4. No consideration seems to have been given to the MacMillan Centre. This is a valuable resource which needs to be retained. Also, there are other buildings, such as the Barbara Russell unit, where local residents have been actively involved in the recent past in fundraising for their construction. Surely a new use can be found for what the community has helped to create?

5. There is no mention how public transport is to be improved. This needs to be done before building otherwise people cannot be expected to consider using it and will have to drive. As previously suggested, rush hours (in fact much longer than an hour) are already causing major problems in and around the village.

I trust that careful consideration will be given to these comments in considering how the Frenchay Hospital site development is allowed to progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. A Elkan Coronation Road Downend BS16 5SN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below are my comments on the Frenchay Hospital Redevelopment Concept Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Increased area population;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowhere in the report is there mention of the existing population to be affected; but from the Ring Road to Blackberry Hill, and from Frenchay Park Road to the R. Frome, I suggest some 400 houses?. So the 550 proposed houses would swamp the area and existing facilities; all that is proposed is a small school would support the extra population, and nothing else!.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Design Standards:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area around Frenchay Common is the most historic part of the affected locality. Fortunately along Beckspool Road, it is masked from any insensitive design on the hospital site by--- working east from the mini-roundabout-- dense trees and bushes (to be thinned), then a tall vertical slat fence, and finally a high stone wall with The Cedars behind it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However this doesn't excuse the suggested housing designs pp30-33 to “echo” the existing historic detail; these are typical British answers to such a design challenge viz. a bit “olde worlde” with crude copies of historic detail, yet still retaining a slick modern interior with all the electronic gizmos of the 21stC! This is typical British architectural schizophrenia, laughed at by Danes, Germans, Swedes, Dutch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevertheless in the late 20thC a few schemes were produced in or adjacent to Conservation Areas which were modern, and have well stood the test of time: for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o In Dinas Powys, S Glamorgan, “The Mount”, designed by Hird and Brookes in a Scandinavian style in the late 60's/early 70's. Photos of it taken in 2009 can be seen on the Flickr website. Still a classic living well with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 21. | W Edgington  
BS5 7QJ | Please listen and keep Frenchay Hospital  
Hospital serves east Bristol  
Too far to Southmead and cost of taxis/Buses – difficult to drive and park there. |

| 22. | Mr R Fields,  
Pearces Hill,  
Frenchay | Frenchay Hospital Site Development  
Local people have been very interested in the proposals and have put forward many valid comments and concerns.  
This is not all Nimbyism. It is clearly understood that the development will go ahead but people want this to be well thought through.  
With only outline plans it is inevitable that peoples’ concerns are expressed in general terms. Thus questions about the number of dwellings, traffic flow, village centre, integration etc have come to the fore.  
I have spoken to several residents and it seems there are a variety of differing opinions on the proposals but in general there is a lot of opposition.  
The issue for me is not about integration which is being seen in terms of superficial architectural features and providing openings in the stone perimeter wall.  
The issue for me is that the development should be architect led with an overall vision providing quality housing at different cost levels with an emphasis on suitable transport in and out of Bristol and nearby shopping centres so that private car use is not essential.  
The emphasis of the proposals at this stage is to secure the maximum financial return for the land. In order not to spoil the undoubted amenity of the area the local authority needs to set a standard well above the average housing development.  
One company has been entrusted with the task when ideally there should be a competition to produce the optimum plans.  
As a consequence the responsibility lies heavily with the council. |

| 23. | J. Fricker | As a Frenchay resident, and having read the Concept Statement and attended the recent public meeting in the village hall, I would like to take the opportunity to express some concerns I have with the current proposals.  
**Housing Density**  
Whilst the original plan for 350 homes may have been acceptable, the proposed increase to 550 is excessive and not |
appropriate to the rural style of Frenchay village. Such high density must result in small terraced houses squeezed into a small area, mostly without garages simply to maximise profits. Assuming that most home owners today have one car, and many have two, where in the plan will there be parking spaces for 500 to 650 motor vehicles on site, and that is not including spaces for hospital staff and visitors? Can you be certain that there will not be an overflow on to the Common and surrounding roads?

**Traffic Volumes**
As you will know, current traffic volumes on Bristol Road and Frenchay Park Road already create incessant queues particularly at peak commuting times and residents already have considerable difficulty in exiting side roads such as Malmains Drive and Beckspool Road. I accept that vehicle movements connected to the hospital will reduce as key medical functions move across to Southmead, but most of these happen out of peak times. An additional 300 to 400 cars trying to access Bristol Road and Frenchay Park Road will simply cause gridlock. I would be very interested to see the analysis that supports the Statement's claim that there will be a lower number of cars accessing and exiting the site. Most hospital visitors will drive directly to the site and will not add to the early morning queues along Bristol Road heading for the Hambrook Lights. I would suggest that road improvements will be necessary to ease congestion, and should be completed before the houses are built.

**Village Amenities**
An increase in the local population of up to 1,320 extra persons must surely justify improved amenities, and a doctor’s surgery must be a high priority. Most people in Frenchay have to visit surgeries in Downend, Staple Hill or Fishponds and the earliest appointments are often 10 days ahead. Where are an extra 1320 patients going attend for medical advice? Such an increase in the number of residents should also justify a serious relook at a community centre, village shop and even a small library, all of which would satisfy an obvious demand and reduce more traffic movements to neighbouring areas.

**Open Spaces/ Conservation Land**
Frenchay is widely known for it's open green areas which are enjoyed by so many people the whole year through. Within the hospital site there are conservation areas and woodlands which should be retained for the benefit of the new residents, and without which will see overflowing of people on to the Common on evenings and weekends, bringing with it noise and litter problems. I appreciate that Frenchay Common is not for the exclusive use of existing residents, but steps need to be taken to protect it's rural qualities and ensure it is maintained for generations to come.

**Beckspool Road - Access Road**
At the back of the village hall last Monday was a map on display which indicated a vehicular access on to Beckspool Road alongside Cedar Hall garages, possibly leading to/from the allotments. As you may know this exit is on a dangerous bend, and it is difficult to enough to exit from Cedar Hall safely most week days. Surely the SGC Planning Department would not sanction permission for a further access at this point?

Firstly, I think that the consultation period allowed to respond to this Concept Statement, timed to cover August and the first two weeks of September, is wholly inadequate. Many people are away on holiday, and it has given insufficient time for people, and especially organisations, to make a considered response. I would suggest that you extend the consultation period, and perhaps extend it to the end of October, to ensure that everyone who wishes to contribute has the opportunity. However, there is a real need to monitor traffic volumes to Southmead University Hospital and ensure that these are reduced to an acceptable level before building work begins.
period by several months at least to allow a proper consultation to take place.

However, having studied the Concept Statement on the redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital, I am very disappointed at the proposals, and can only conclude that it should be rejected out of hand.

The authors claim to have responded to public feedback at various events that they have hosted, yet they have only adopted from these meetings suggestions from the public that will maximise the development potential. E.g. The public’s unease at their original suggestion of a Community Hub, which it was felt could lead to the closure of the existing Village Hall, or if not, the creation of two communities, the old and the new. By dropping the Community Hub the land freed up can be used to build more houses. All other suggestions that eat into developable land have been ignored.

The single biggest input from the public was the need to retain and safeguard the green spaces (most are in the Conservation Area) that make up a considerable proportion of the site. Originally NBT proposed clearing wooded areas on the northern boundary (to the rear of the even numbers of Malmains Drive) and the north eastern boundary to allow development. However, it was pointed out to them at a public meeting in Frenchay Village Hall on March 28th that these areas are protected by TPO 0678 issued some eighteen months earlier. At a subsequent Winterbourne Parish Council meeting held on 11th June 2012, Jo Davis speaking for GVA and NBT, stated that the TPO would now be respected. However, when you look at the Concept Statement you will see that this undertaking is abandoned, as they propose to ignore TPO 0678 and develop area W2. This 0.8ha area is to be used for “school expansion or residential development”.

This proposal must be vigorously rejected, as the area in question is part of Frenchay Conservation Area, and is a Nature Reserve created by the community with the hospital’s assistance some twenty-five years ago. At the time both South Glos. Council’s predecessor authority, and Wessex Water gave grants to help create this community facility. My own daughter was part of the Frenchay Guide group who created the pond.

I attach for your information a photograph of the sign at one of the entrances to the nature reserve, as well as a copy of NBT’s own leaflet listing the species of trees to be found there.

Similarly, the proposal to site a new school in Frenchay Conservation Area to the south of Lime Tree avenue should be rejected out of hand. Both sites proposed for the new school are using Conservation Area land which is currently public open space. A new site, such as the one proposed by residents where the Day Care Hospital now stands, would protect the green spaces, and allow a dedicated school entrance by Clic Cottage to be employed, greatly enhancing the safety of the school drop off/ pick up process which is a feature of schools today.

All land within the Conservation Area should be sacrosanct.

There is a worrying lack of information on what should happen to the green spaces spared development, and I would suggest that a condition of granting Outline Planning Permission (when it’s applied for), should be the immediate transfer of the freehold of such land to a charitable trust set up with the protection and maintenance of this land its objective, and having South Glos. Council or Winterbourne Parish Council as the trustees.

The Concept Statement makes several references to a “Gateway Development” at the Lime Tree avenue entrance to the site. One is in the Conservation Area south of Lime Tree Avenue, and should be rejected out of hand for the reasons already stated for not siting a school there, and the other is around the Burden Institute. Any such development should
respect that fact that it’s situated right up against a conservation area, and especially the main feature of the Lime Tree avenue. It would be interesting to know why these “Gateway” proposals are so vague… There are many other points in the Concept Statement which give rise to objections, but I believe that the above points are the overriding ones.

On the plus side, the Concept Statement does state that the museum will be retained in it’s present location, so it’s not all bad!

I would suggest that South Glos. Council should reject the this Concept Statement, and ask NBT to think again, this time respecting TPOs and the Conservation Area.

25. Mrs S Fowler

I am writing to object to the concept plans at Frenchay Hospital. I believe that there has not been an effective consultation process with the residents of Frenchay. I feel the North Bristol Healthcare trust have already got plans in place and ‘a deal has already been done’ and they are only playing lip service to South Gloucestershire council. I wish that NBT had been straight with residents from the start. We are not stupid and realise that NBT need to maximise the profits from the sale of the land but for the detriment of the residents of Frenchay.

The proposition of building 550 (or more) houses on the hospital site is ludicrous with far too many houses for this small village. I do not think the ramifications of this has clearly been thought about. (page16 paragraph 1)

I have had experience of new housing estates as my childminder lives in Stoke Park and my experiences there lead me to believe that the houses are crammed in with no or inadequate parking provision for its residents. For example, residents cannot park outside their own houses because the roads are barely wide enough for cars to pass. Many have double yellow lines painted on the road to prohibit parking outside the buildings. Most houses now have at least 2 cars per household (sometimes even more).

Cars are a major problem in the village both with parking and the number of cars that go through the village as a commuter route to UWE, Abbeywood, centre etc. I do not see that with the hospital closing and this number of houses being built how the number of cars on the roads would actually decrease ? (page 16 paragraph 2)

My other issues include :-
- The Primary school. (pages 22 and 23)

As a mother with one child still at Frenchay Primary school I realise the limitations of this Primary school and understand that we desperately need a new Primary school but I feel this is a bit of a carrot to make the proposals more palatable. I do not understand how you are not allowed to build houses on a conservation area but a school is acceptable ?

Why can’t the Barbara Russell children’s ward be converted to a school ? Many people donated a lot of money for the Jack and Jill appeal and it seems criminal to pull that building down as it is only a few years old.
- Community Hospital

Why does the new community hospital have to be built in this place ? Again why are you not reutilising the ‘new build’ hospital buildings that are already there. Again no one has heard our voices of what we want to see as part of our village.

Swimming pool / social club. (page 16 paragraph 3)
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 26. | P Green  
|     | BS16 1LP |

Again here it seems the deal has already been done. If NBT want to leave a legacy for the village why not its own open air swimming pool for the use of all the community. (as has been seen in Portishead what can be achieved). The social club equally could be revitalised and opened up for the whole community as a meeting place.

I generally do not respond to this sort of thing but I feel so strongly regarding this matter that is the reason I have e mailed you.

I was extremely dismayed to learn of the proposal, by the Property Consultants for the NHS Trust at Frenchay, to build 550 homes on the site once the new hospital at Southmead is occupied.

There can be little justification for this excessive number except for the need to maximise the amount of money that can be generated from such development in the short term. I believe a longer term, more pragmatic, approach could be more profitable to the NHS.

At meetings of residents recently there has been general agreement that the NHS were intent on imposing a dense and voluminous accumulation of houses on us which would cause a great disturbance to the hitherto harmonious nature of Frenchay, a village which is quite unique with it’s enviable character and reputation so well earned over years of effort by generations past and present.

The widely expressed view was that the proposal does not deal adequately with the conservation areas within the site, the effect of increased traffic and the disruption to the village life, its community and environment. These aspects appear not to have been given sufficient in-depth analysis.

Many of the residents are robust supporters of the NHS at Frenchay but feel affronted by the proposal. They are gravely concerned that unintended and irreversible consequences could detract from the uniqueness of Frenchay, a precious resource in the Council’s domain.

Several were commenting that they would be prepared to challenge the proposals and this would surely delay and be costly to the NHS if such challenges were numerous and ongoing. One commentator had found the NHS to be unreasonable and unwavering in their intentions.

How much better it would be for all if the NHS were to show some pragmatism here!

At the meetings I attended I felt that the most of the people present understood the need for additional housing and felt a development on the Frenchay site was inevitable. The main thrust of the objections were concerned with the scale and density of it. (The NHS proposal is for a step change increase of 80+% in the number of homes in Frenchay).

I believe that an alternative approach would be more successful and that if the proposed development were to proceed in a stage wise manner it would gain much more support and many of the objections would melt away; besides restoring the good name of the NHS and increasing the funds yielded by the development.

I would suggest that if the houses were built in batches of say 100 to 150 at a time
the step changes in the various facets of the village could be smoothed and absorbed peacefully. The desirability of the site would be enhanced along with the value to a developer and thence to the NHS. Further more at the present time land values are much reduced from their peaks just a few years ago and will surely regain their losses and probably more in a few years time.

“Experts” in this field would not advocate selling off development land at current levels.

The “present worth” sum expected to be raised from the sale of land to a developer for 550 houses soon, would surely be much greater if the same land were to be sold in parcels progressively over coming years (smaller plots command a greater value per dwelling than larger ones).

With Government borrowing rates being low, it makes sense to sell off the land in smaller lots and to borrow the difference in yield required now in order to produce a greater yield in a few years time. The unknown costs associated with a provocative act of ignoring strongly held views of otherwise loyal supporters and protagonists would also be avoided.

---

R Green,
Begbrook Park
Frenchay
Bristol

See original for site plans and school building assessment

1.0 Clarity – do you feel that the document is clear on development principles proposed for the site?

There are clearly some big decisions still to be made but the general aspiration is very clear.

2.0 Principles - Do you agree that the site should be redeveloped broadly as described in the draft concept statement, i.e. for mainly residential development?

For years this site has been talked about being a “health campus” with community hospital and a range of other healthcare type provision with some housing. This switch to majority housing is disappointing.

3.0 Surveys – do you consider that all key features of the site have been adequately identified and safeguarded in shaping the proposals?

No. The “historic gardens” identified in the SPD are clearly being ignored in the proposal to construct a primary school on the site. This open space is all that remains of the Frenchay Park estate and is curtilage of the listed building. Surely the remnants of C18 parkland are as important as the parkland trees which are referred to in the Concept Statement. The SPD Preservation and Enhancement Strategy identify some clear principles in relation to this space which should be referred to and address clearly in this work.

4.0 Consultation – Do you consider that the consultation process in developing the proposals has been generally satisfactory?

The first consultation event at the hospital was very poor with inadequate display of information. Quite simply an under estimate of the number of people who would be interested.

The event held at the Village Hall was better although

While the emerging masterplan may have been displayed somewhere for one evening in September it appears not be in the public domain for anyone who missed that. A site as important as this could really have benefited from
a dedicated consultation website.

5.0 Specific comments on the document

Fig 2 in the Concept Statement shows a large area of housing to the south of the site as being developed post 1980. This is not correct. The area outlined in red below was built in 1930 and I believe the area in blue below was built in the late 40’s.

6.0 Are there any other issues that you wish to raise with the site development or draft concept statement?

The Concept Statement refers to CS16 which no longer stipulate 45 units per hectare. Instead there is a desire to achieve 40 units per hectare but CS16 also states that this should be informed by the character of the local area. GVA’s Presentation in June 2012 showed that the development would be achieving higher densities that then local examples which are typically no more than 30 units per hectare. Using the lower figure would reduce the number of houses on the site by nearly 140 which is not an insignificant difference.

The school location is separate issue but clearly a 2 hectare school site equates to 80 homes at the proposed density. So assuming the governors preferred site is selected for the school and the lower density of housing more in-keeping with the local grain is chosen the overall number of new houses would be more like 350 which is the number previously publicised by NBT prior to this round of consultations.

Formal sports provision: The loss of the cricket pitch would be extremely bad news as this is used regularly through the season by a hospital team and a local team.

Ditto tennis courts which are used by a local club.

A 1 form entry primary school with capacity to expand it to a 2 form entry school if referred to. The Concept Statement is not clear about the key stage years this will cover but Jo Davis previously referred to a 1.5 FE school with 315 pupils. This fits with Appendix 2 of BB99. So using the JMI schools.

See original for Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Pupils Likely site area from (m²) to (m²)</th>
<th>1 FE</th>
<th>1,285.00</th>
<th>9,760.00</th>
<th>10,900.00</th>
<th>1.5 FE</th>
<th>1,757.50</th>
<th>13,540.00</th>
<th>15,100.00</th>
<th>2 FE</th>
<th>2,230.00</th>
<th>17,320.00</th>
<th>19,300.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely gross building (m²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the site areas outlined on the masterplan for the school on the conservation are the footprint drawn has a gross area of 800m² which is clearly smaller than a 1 FE school. What is currently drawn is more like the size of a 1 FE infants only (90 pupils).

CAD drawing showing area measurement of masterplan school footprint of 792m²

1. Masterplan footprint 792 m²
2. 1 FE School
3. 1.5 FE school
4. 2 FE School

This point needs to be clarified as it is quite disingenuous to say it's only single storey (page 23) and represent the school as a small footprint in the corner of the site and make it appear as though there will still be plenty of green open space in the parkland. The reality is never like this once ball stop/security fencing is provided at the school boundary.

The footprint (using the plan shape in the masterplan) for a 1 FE single storey school should look like this:

And for the 1.5 FE school:

And the 2 FE school clearly becomes a significant school building:

- The danger with progressing this suite it that once the principle of developing on the existing green space is tested at outline we will see more substantial and inappropriate development with the reserved matter applications.

- There is an issue of noise with this location as the residents of Begbrook Park will only be separated from the school by 30m. 210-420 small children having a party 3 times a day can generate significant noise in the order of 65dB. This will become a major issue for existing residents working nights or who simply stay at home on weekdays. Quite a difference matter for new residents who consciously move into a house next to an existing school.

- Between the hours of approximately 8am and 9am Beckspool Road and Begbrook Park get very busy with cars travelling towards Frenchay Park Road mostly turning left at what is a very dangerous junction. This would appear to be traffic from Downend / Staple Hill heading towards UWE and not related to the hospital. It is therefore likely to continue after the hospital has closed and possibly get worse if this becomes blocked with parents on the school run.

- The Governors preferred location is a far more sensible location away from busy roads, maintaining a good link to the church and in closer proximity to the bulk of new housing. There is also a substantial stone wall between the site and Cedar Hall that can easily hide an acoustic fence to mitigate noise issues for existing Beckspool Road residents.

As an Architect I am pro development and I hope this outline will be accompanied by a robust Design Code for the new housing that will be enforced by the council. What I am extremely worried about is how this many new homes developed in a very short space of time will impact on the setting of Frenchay. I have yet to see a suburban housing scheme of this scale work successfully using the typologies shown on pages 30-33 without it ending up like quite a standard volume house builder solution.

28. A Gentry
   Riverwood Road
   Frenchay
   Bristol

I am a local resident of Frenchay and have been for the past 14 years.

I would like to express my concern over the above document as presented at the public meeting held at the Frenchay Village Hall yesterday evening September 3rd 2012.

The plan lacked detail and clarity.

The increase in Density of housing from 350 to 550 with no proper guidance as to the type and style of property is very difficult to view without real concern. Developers will obviously try and maximise their potential profits by cramming as many
commercially viable properties with a quick return on profit onto the site as they are able.

An excellent idea in principle was put forward at last nights meeting by one local resident, would it not be possible to allow the construction of sheltered and age restricted property. I would refer Council to the excellent Ashley Court development in Horfield and St Monica’s Trust in Westbury both excellent examples of what will be required in this area in the future. This type of Development would by its very nature make the provision of a GP Practise in the area more viable, pressure on the local Road network would also be less from this type of development.

I believe that the green spaces and woodland should be protected in a formal way, upgrading their conservation status with responsibility for their upkeep made over to parish Council.

I would also like to see a proper survey conducted as regards the impact upon local Highways, the roads are already at the point of gridlock at certain times, how on earth will this development not make matters far worse?

Cleeve Hill is an old and established rat-run, a constant source of amazement to myself is how many near misses occur without serious incident. It appears to me that it will be inevitable that once this development proceeds then some form of further Traffic restriction entering the village from the Direction of Cleevewood shops and over the narrow Road bridge will be required from a Public Safety perspective.

This will put even more pressure upon The Bristol Road Junction and The Bromley heath Roundabout.

On a more general point, I would urge Council to be vigilant and to try and be more Pro active at this relatively early point regarding this Development.

- If you wish to, it is easy to go and see first hand why I am so concerned. You need only visit the new Southmead Hospital Development.
- The Hospital looks likely to be magnificent,
- The local roads are crammed and local residents report that they feel like prisoners in their own homes.
- Contractors and Hospital Workers circle the roads looking for Parking spaces as one local resident put it to me "Like Sharks"
- The Massive, imposing Structure dominates the local area.

Forgive me if I don’t appear to have the same vision as NBHT of what a "LEGACY" might look like.

I write in relation to the Concept Statement for the Frenchay Hospital site.

As a resident of Downend I have serious concerns regarding the volume of traffic which will be created. So far as I am aware there is no proposal to change the existing road network which, in my opinion, is already pushed to capacity. I do not think the effect of the development in Frenchay on the surrounding areas, including Downend, has even been considered from the information I have seen to date.

I live in Downend and work in the Centre of town. Like many, I commute in my car, which takes me approximately 35 minutes each day. I have taken the bus previously, but this takes me at least double the time. Whilst the most direct route
for me to travel to work would involve going down Bromley Heath Road and on to the ring road, I avoid this. The queue on Bromley Heath Road is always very large and, due to the 2+ lane on the ring road, the ring road is effectively single carriageway, rather than dual carriageway. With the hours I work (8:30am to 7/7:30pm) it is not possible for me to car share.

I therefore go the quickest route which involves going past Cleeve Woods, up into Frenchay, across the common, all the way around the hospital site and up to the Hambrook traffic lights (effectively joining the ring road one junction further up). I am by no means the only person that does this - I see many many cars doing just the same thing every day, coming from both Downend and from the Staple Hill/Fishponds directions. If there are, as the figures suggest, to be 550 new homes built on the hospital site, each with one car (if not more), it will seriously impact upon the traffic, not only within Frenchay itself (which is not designed to cope with such an increase in traffic) but also in the surrounding areas. I believe no consideration whatsoever has been given to this.

Whilst I appreciate that there is generally a push towards car sharing and bus transportation, the planning authority must recognise that areas such as Frenchay and Downend are popular with those who drive, either as part of their job or whilst commuting to and from their job; situated right next to the M32 and within easy access of both the M4 and M5, any new housing development would attract those who are keen to access the road network quickly, no matter how many incentives are introduced to encourage the population out of their cars. Downend is already a prime example of this - the 2+ lane on the ring road does not ease traffic by encouraging those who use this road network to car share; car sharing is often not possible (as I state above) and it causes increased congestion, rather than aiding the problem.

I therefore wish to object to the level of homes proposed and consider this should be greatly reduced if Frenchay and the surrounding areas are not to be materially adversely affected in terms of traffic.

I have been a resident of Frenchay for coming up to 43 years and would like to make the following comments on the "Concept Statement" relating to Frenchay Hospital site development.

When considering any proposals I believe it is important that the following points be taken into account and seriously considered.

1. Existing protected green and conservation areas, woodlands and common land should remain as now and not built upon.

2. When considering the allowable density level of any possible housing development the areas indicated in point 1, above, should not be used/considered in any formula used to determine this allowable density figure. i.e. any green or open space deemed necessary for any housing project should be incorporated within that development and any areas outside the building development should not be taken into account.

3. It would be very desirable, to incorporate within any building site development, increased Community facilities to cope with expected local population increase. It would also be an advantage if these increased facilities were available as the building stages proceeded rather than be carried out at the end after all the profitable sections of the development had been completed.

4. Traffic is already a big problem in the Frenchay area and will, I surmise, inevitably increase. A comprehensive study to assess this possible increase in traffic, and its effect, will obviously be needed and steps taken to try and keep the impact of
any increase to a minimum.

5. Finally Frenchay is a fairly unique area and any new buildings should reflect, of course within reason, what is already in existence.

I hope these comments make clear my concerns and that they will be taken into account when the various stages of approvals are gone through.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31.</th>
<th>J L Gardiner BS16 1LW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Object to the proposed development on the following grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• National and Local Authority green space policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing density too great for the available space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase in crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance of green spaces – who will be responsible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Memorial trees and benches should not be moved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic – will still be a problem at all times of day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic – increase in peak hour movements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited access to schools, doctors etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Too many unanswered questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32.</th>
<th>Goodchild</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deeply concerned at:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Closure of hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demolition of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of trees – including memorial trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barbara Russell unit funded form local charity efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic nightmares – now and will increase – especially peak hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pleased Coach House (stables), Frencahy park House, Museum and Clic Cottage are to be kept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Need a GP Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Buildings to be attractive – no tall flats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to comment on the above draft Concept Statement (CS). Before responding to the specific points raised by the Council on its Online Consultations Homepage I would like to make the following general comments:

Firstly, in my view the CS does not contain sufficient or adequate information on many of the development principles referred to in it for the community to reach a considered view on those principles. Nor has this information been provided to the community by GVA as part of the consultation process it has undertaken. Without this information, and the time to properly analyse it and challenge it if appropriate, I do not feel that many of these development principles can be properly considered.

Secondly I feel that the "vision" for the development proposed by the CS has not been fully thought through and is therefore incomplete and one dimensional. The development will significantly change Frenchay and the challenge is to design a development that will integrate into the existing community and enhance it. There has been very little creative consultation with the community about the development and the ideas put forward by the CS are, in my view, very weak. Further discussion of this element of the development is needed. My concern is that, as currently envisaged, the new community will to a large extent simply be “bolted on” to the existing one and the risk is that a real opportunity to create a genuine legacy for the area will be lost.

Having made these general points I will next respond to the Council’s specific points:

1. **Clarity**: As I will hopefully explain later in this note I do not think that the CS is clear on all the relevant development principles for the site and I think that these deficiencies mean that the community is not able to give proper consideration to some of these.

2. **Principles**: I do accept that the site should be redeveloped broadly as a “mainly residential development” but I do not think that adequate consideration has been given to the mix of occupiers on the development including the possibility of an element of retirement/sheltered housing.

3. **Surveys**: I do not feel that all the "key features of the site" have been properly identified and taken into account in "shaping the proposals". In particular as I will explain I do not think that sufficient information has been disclosed to the community for it to have an opportunity to analyse it which means that the community has not been able to give proper consideration to some of the development principles proposed by the CS.

4. **Consultation**: I do not think that the community has been adequately consulted on some elements of the development proposals which has resulted in the CS being inadequately thought through. This is a complex development that will have a significant impact on the existing village, and the area as a whole, and the community needs be given more time, and further opportunities to, work through it's views on a number of key aspects of the scheme.

5. Please see my subsequent detailed comments.

6. Please see my subsequent detailed comments.

For these reasons I do not think that the CS sets out an acceptable or adequate "vision" for the development of the site.
Nor does it address some key development principles of the proposed development. I therefore feel that the CS as drafted should not be accepted by the Council.

My detailed comments on the CS are as follows:

Section 4:

Issue 1-density: The density of the development is a key issue for the community. I am conscious of the requirements of South Gloucestershire Core Strategy to "make efficient use of land" and apply housing density policies "flexibly" but would also point out references in the Core Strategy to "the distinctiveness and heritage of [the] individual communities" of (amongst others) Frenchay which has a "strong and separate identity" (para. 2.9). There is also a reference to one of the purposes of the development strategy for the Bristol North Fringe being to "protect and respect the village identities of...Frenchay" (para.4.8) so I would suggest that density for this development needs to be considered in the context of it's impact on the current Frenchay community.

Furthermore, whilst GVA have obviously engaged a team of development consultants to advise them on the development proposals they have not as yet explained to the community their rationale for proposing a development of 550 units and I for one am not happy forming a view on this until I have received more information from them on the point. In particular I think we need an explanation of how the developable area of the site has been calculated and why they consider the density levels referred to in the CS appropriate to this development.

The layout of the development included in the CS (Fig. 8 Opportunities Plan) shows two options for the location for the new school; option 1 is within the open space along the eastern boundary of the site, currently affected by Tree Preservation orders, and option 2 is within the Conservation Area open space.

Both of these locations extend the development envelope beyond the existing footprint of the developed area of the site thereby maximising the part of the development envelope for residential housing and although I can see that this would maximise density, and land value, there has been inadequate consultation with the community leading up to the decision to limit the possible locations in this way and I will comment further on this issue later.

In terms of density I consider this approach unacceptable without an explanation of, and evidence for, this encroachment and, in principle, I believe the development envelope of the development should not extend beyond the existing footprint of the built on area of the site with these areas remaining undeveloped. I particular any new development within the Conservation Area part of the site should be rigorously examined against the relevant Conservation Area Policy.

Finally, I notice that the Opportunities Plan shows a "possible new gateway development" within the Conservation Area but this does not seem to be mentioned in the "Key Development Areas" section of the CS and no further explanation of it is given. Again there has been no consultation with the community about this development and in my view any new development within the Conservation Area part of the site should be rigorously examined against the relevant Conservation Area Policy.

Issue 2-traffic generation: Residents have significant concerns over the traffic generation from the development and the Council are no doubt aware of the current problems particularly in the context of traffic leaving, or passing through, Frenchay in the morning to access Bristol or the Ring Road. In general terms my concerns are that traffic flow might increase and/or the flow from of the development in the morning will exacerbate the current problems but I am prepared to keep an open mind about this. However although the CS refers to a traffic "analysis" having been carried out, and para. 5.7
refers to "traffic surveys", as far as I'm aware the community have not seen these and therefore have not had an opportunity to analyse them. I therefore cannot see how we can be expected to accept, in principle, at this time, that a development of this density will not result in the current traffic situation getting worse.

Additionally existing public transport links for the site are poor even for the existing community and I cannot see how they will be sufficient to adequately serve the new development. Neither does the CS suggest that alternative infrastructure such as cycle lanes will be provided/improved.

The Government's National Planning Policy Framework emphasises the need for new developments to promote sustainable transport but, aside from the very "woolly" suggestions in para. 7.3 of the CS, it has no suggestions for this. In my view further work needs to be carried out to look into way in which this can be delivered for the new development.

Issue 4-GP surgery: The CS states that the decision not to include a new GP surgery on the development is based on "previous studies by the Primary Care Trust" but there has been no real briefing on these and the decision is not certainly not consistent with the general feeling of the community. Further exploration of this element of the development is needed before we can be expected to reach a considered view on this in principle.

Issue 5-Integration with the village: As I indicated in my introduction, in my view, this is one aspect of the CS that I believe has not been thought through and MUST be considered further at this time. In my view I think that it probably holds the key to the medium/long term success of the development since it represents an opportunity to integrate the existing and new communities, and create a new, vibrant, expanded community. I believe that GVA have made very little effort to lead this discussion which has resulted in the community not being given an opportunity to think through the nature and extent of the community facilities that could, and should, be included in the development.

The new school, healthcare facilities and open spaces will certainly result in local residents "coming together" to some extent but beyond this the development is in desperate need of community facilities that will act as a catalyst for, and provide a service to, the new community and in this respect the development proposed by the CS is, to be frank, woeful.

Further consultation with the community is needed on this issue with a view to producing a true "vision" for the development, and the new community. I am hoping that the Council can play a part in these discussions not only by requiring North Bristol Trust to address this issue in the CS but perhaps by offering suggestions for the type of facilities that would be appropriate for the developments based on similar schemes in the area.

For me possibilities here include a local retail centre (although I admit that the success of these is variable), formal recreational facilities, which the CS refers to as part of the open space proposals but does not elaborate on, and, most significantly, a new village/community centre.

As far as formal recreational spaces are concerned there are already a cricket pitch, tennis courts and allotments on the site and if facilities of this nature were made central to the new development, being re-provided, expanded and improved appropriately, I believe that they could play an important role in the integration of the communities.

However I have come to the conclusion that, perhaps even more important than these facilities, is the need for a new community facility that could include a cafe and rooms for local groups and classes to meet. Although there is already a Village Hall in Frenchay I have real doubts about it's potential to serve the new community even with further investment and in my view options for a new facility need to be considered.
These could include a new purpose built community building forming part of the development or the conversion of an existing building on the site. I believe that the decision not to provide a facility is fundamentally flawed and as far as I'm aware it has been reached without any meaningful consultation with the community.

I realise that this is a significant change to the development proposals, and not one that as yet Frenchay residents have pushed for, but I firmly believe that it must be considered by all parties at this time before the "blue print" for the development is finalised and the opportunity lost to create a genuine legacy for the community.

Issue 6-Green space: I have already mentioned the loss of green space on the development and I'm sure that the Council will receive many comments on this issue from the community. I do not think the Conservation Area should be developed (other than by way of formal recreational areas open for use by the community) and see nothing in the CS to justify this.

As for the suggested encroachment onto the other existing green spaces on the site although the CS refers to an "arboricultural report" (para. 5.4) and a "Tree Survey" (para. 6.9) copies of these have not been provided to the community so in my view we are not able to give this issue proper consideration at this time.

Issue 7- Impact on Conservation Area: To date I do not think that the consultation with the community has properly addressed the possible retention of buildings on the site and the incorporation of these into the development. The CS refers to an "Historic Landscape Assessment and Heritage Statement" and para. 5.2 refers to a "Conservation Audit" and I think that they should be made available to the community so that it has an opportunity to consider them before it is required to reach a decision on the potential demolition of all the buildings on the site.

Para. 5.4-trees: I have already commented that the community has not seen any reports on the proposed loss/changes to trees and why this issue is significant to the development.

Para. 5.7-access: Again I have already commented that the community has not seen any transport surveys for the new development and why this issue is significant to the development.

Para. 6.2- Frenchay Park House and Stable Block: I am concerned that the CS suggests that these buildings are "retained in the interim" with "any future use being subject to a separate planning application and listed building consent". I appreciate that the buildings may continue to be used by the Trust as offices for a period of time but if their medium/long term future is not considered as part of the overall development of the site they could easily become a "white elephant". This is another issue where there has been little, or no, genuine consultation with community with the CS suggesting it as a fait accompli.

Para.6.7-Education: As I have already explained I do not think that the two options proposed by the CS for the new school should be accepted as the ONLY options and I am concerned that they have been proposed primarily because they do not "eat into" the existing developed area of the site but encroach onto open space areas. I am aware that the School Governors are understandably closely involved in this aspect of the development but understand that Option 4 referred to in the CS is still seen as a viable possibility. In the circumstances I cannot see how the CS can be approved until this aspect of the development has been resolved not least because the location of the school will potentially impact on other elements of the development such as density, access and open space.

My other comment on this matter is that I see the Council have requested that "provision is made for expansion land to allow the delivery of a 2 form school" and whilst I am not competent to comment on the need for this expanded school, no discussion has taken place concerning what will happen if the development accommodates this requirement and, in due
course, the expanded school is not required.

Para. 6.9-Trees: See my comments to para. 5.4 above.

Para. 6.10-access: See my comments to para. 5.7 above. Further consultation is needed with the community before a decision on access points for the development can be reached.

Para. 7.0-Vision for the Site: See my comments above. I do not believe that there is a true "vision" for the site or that the community has been given an opportunity to help create this.

8.0-Key development Areas: I appreciate that it is not appropriate for the CS to contain detailed design proposals for the development and that these will be dealt with during the formal planning application stages. However I think the community needs a better idea of the type and mix of the different units within the "character areas" referred to since, to date, we have not seen a meaningful representation of how a development of this nature would look like. The few pictures included in the CS are interesting but we are finding it very hard to visualise how the development will look and for members of the community this "visualisation" is essential to enable us to form a considered view of the development proposals.

34. Dr C Horrocks
BS16 1LP

In response to the above consultation document on Frenchay Hospital Site I wish to say that the views of the school governors on the size and site of the new primary school should be paramount I understand they have put forward another site option for the school not mentioned on the Concept Statement

I gather the need is for a 2 form entry.

As a resident of Frenchay I personally am against the option adjacent to the museum and South of Lime Tree Avenue as this will cover what is planned as a green site

35. J Hays
BS16 1LT

Whilst mourning, but accepting the loss of Frenchay Hospital I can’t help thinking that NB HNS Trust are being enormously greedy in their plans for 550 dwellings, and I can’t help feeling this must be some wildly optimistic opening salvo to the planning dept., who they realise couldn’t possibly grant permission for this huge number, but in the end they might succeed in getting permission for half that number.

I accept the plans for a line of Georgian style housing alongside the Lime Avenue, in place of the US Nissan huts, and maybe altering the current nursing accommodation, Also an area to the north from the current out-patients to the main car park could be available for housing. All these would be acceptable. However one of these areas should accommodate the new school, because it cannot be allowed to encroach upon the conservation area which is currently being used for the helicopter landings. Also, all other conservation areas must at all costs be safeguarded and preserved.

There were also plans at some stage for a community centre, involving a health centre, some old people’s facility, and maybe a community hall. These seem to have disappeared…. Why?

Finally I see that it is a view that an extra 1000 cars from this new “town” will not affect local traffic flow. I’ve no idea how this harebrained opinion ever came to see the light of day, though it was probably conceived for 4.00 a.m. when the roads might well cope - come the rush hour a guaranteed gridlock situation will occur. There might well be less cars parked on the common, but rush hours will be intolerable.

NBT seem uncertain of their requirements as well. A recent report suggested the new Southmead Hospital would have less
beds than are currently available so will be unable to cope with local and area needs, and a lot of the facilities at Frenchay are under private management, so they have to stay. There was a plan to designate Frenchay as a major trauma centre for the Severn region; what would happen to that?

I suggest these plans should be rejected at the first opportunity and the consultants should be told to downgrade their client’s selfish requirements to more manageable proportions.

| 36. | K Helps | I would like inform you of my objection to a large scale housing development on the land of Frenchay Hospital on the following grounds:

1. Increased Traffic Congestion, the GVA draft document has no information on any research of how the increased traffic flow would effect the area.

2. The GVA concept document is thin on facts, information and should not be accepted by the council

3. I would like to see a proposal where the land at Fenchay comprises: a retirement village, care & nursing homes, a school and possible development of approx 200 house. |


And 5.2 Heritage on p.18

Also 6.2 Frenchay Park House & Stable Block on p.22

Leaving the Frenchay Park House and its ancillary structures out of the plan seems to court disaster. Consideration should be given to use for employment facilities or otherwise demolition. A Grade II listed ruin is not wanted here.

Para 5.7 Access on p.19

Pedestrian routes around the site and village need consideration to reduce or eliminate local car use.

Para 6.3 Health & Social Care Centre on p.22

No mention of Extra Care housing leads to confusion as the public don’t need to know who provides each.

Para 6.8 Employment Opportunities on p.23

Many workers (carers, cleaners, gardeners and handymen) travel to this area to work and suitable housing might be attractive to them and help reduce traffic in the area.

Para 7.5 Sustainability p.26

Any reference to issues raised at the South Gloucestershire Environment Forum on Thursday 19 July 2012 are missing.

8.0 Key Development Areas & Principles p.28

It is not clear how much of the area is zero density development?
| 38. | J Holloway | I am the Medical Director of the Frenchay Brain Injury Rehab Centre (see middle of proposed housing!) and a Consultant at NBT working in neurorehab.  
I am not sure if this is the appropriate place to pass comment on the plans, but just in case:  
1) Will there be some form of allowance/curtelage around the FBIRC for patient dignity and allowing them the relative peace they need to rehabilitate?  
2) Is there anyway to protect the patients and their relatives from the construction site that is unlikely to be finished for several years?  
3) Is the area set aside for the health and social care provision large enough for NBT, PCTs, CCGs and Social Services requirements (and have they a joint plan?), + car parking and access, + possibly a GP practice? |
| 39. | Mrs Hall  
BS16 1PA | Resident over 35 years in beautiful village – many changes already  
Main concerns:  
- Density – 550 dwellings too many – need space for school, recreation hall, hospital etc  
- Proposed number of dwellings has increased  
- Roads already congested – will not improve when hospital closes and site is redeveloped.  
- Village ‘rat runs’ at peak times  
- Have requested pedestrian crossing by village hall – not delivered.  
- Public transport – currently very poor.  
- 2 bus journeys to doctors  
- Need GP on site  
- Listed Buildings not cared for.  
- Preservation/Green belt – village needs protection from encroachment. |
| 40. | Mrs J L Hill  
Grange Park Frenchay  
Bristol | Resident for 30 years.  
Object:  
- Decision to close Frenchay hospital was flawed – Southmead access is poor.  
- Not clear why number of houses has increased.  
- Roads cannot cope (33% of UL homes have 2 or more cars) – football stadium will also make it worse |
| 41. Ms S Horrocks  BS16 1NB | 1. Clarity  
- Proposals not clear.  
- Vision – too corporate speak – meaningless.  
2. Principles  
- Draft CS only considers housing – not new hospital  
- Housing OK – but need a mix including for families and the elderly  
- SGC pushing for Extra care is good  
- Affordable housing not mentioned.  
- Need affordable for first time buyers.  
- Avoid buy to let – no commitment to area  
1. Surveys  
- Not all key features have been adequately identified and safeguarded- environment, transport, community cohesion.  
2. Detailed points  
**Open spaces**  
- Reject Draft CS as not all green features are protected – green oasis on the outskirts of Bristol (from CA SPD 2007)  
- Protect setting of listed buildings – key to sustainable approach.  
- NPPF balances economic, social and environmental issues.  
- Protect nature reserve/woodland  
- Trees have been replaced - but woodland not well managed by Trust – not a reason to remove it. Just improve it where it is.  
- Need access to tree surveys  
- Question whether aim to retain Lime Tree Avenue for long-term is a firm enough commitment.  
- Trees and greens spaces make the character of Frenchay.  
**Buildings** |
- Hass Macmillan building been considered for retention.

**Integration into Community**
- Reject Draft CS as does not explain how integration will be achieved.
- Why has a community centre been dismissed?
- Puts too much emphasis on Village Hall which has limited space.
- Access form site to Village Hall not good.
- Better integration with existing facilities than is proposed in Draft CS – i.e. hospital café, WRVS shop and open spaces, tennis courts.
- Retain tennis courts.
- What formal sports provision will be made – unclear?

**Density and Style**
- 28 hectares – 13.5 for housing and 2.6 ha for hospital – current hospital less than 16-1 ha.
- 30 dph target on 13.5 ha = 405 units so why 550 – no analysis.
- Existing hospital buildings are not an appropriate precedent for future character areas and density.
- NPPF promotes good design.
- Inappropriate examples of density given in FAQs and designs in Draft CS not appropriate to Frenchay.
- Frenchay has distinctive architectural character, vernacular cottages, pennant sandstone etc which should provide design clues.

**Traffic**
- Hospital traffic is not major cause of congestion – but rat running.
- Problem areas – opposite cedar hall, Dove Corner,
- Little on supporting sustainable transport – will be car dependent – need more buses.
- Need bus access to UWE/Harry Stoke, Bristol.
- Need adequate parking on site.

**Economics**
- NPPF balances economic and environmental issues – NBHT financial pressures should not override local concerns.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 42. | A Jones | As a long term resident of Frenchay Village, I wish to oppose the proposals for the development of this site on the following grounds:  

**Traffic congestion**  
At peak times it is already difficult to leave the village either at the top of Frenchay Hill or Pearces Hill. It can take over 20 minutes to turn onto the main road where the congestion continues in both directions. The increased traffic generated by the proposed number of new dwellings can only exacerbate this situation, leading to virtual gridlock in the area. Additionally the proposed provision for new resident parking seems to be in adequate leading to the similar frustrations caused by cars parked all along Beckspool Road and other smaller residential roads.  

**Density of Housing**  
The proposed density is far too high. It will place severe pressure on existing community facilities which are extremely limited at present. The unique character and history of the area stands to be swamped by a development where the stated aim of the developers is to raise as much money from the site with little regard to the impact on the existing countryside and landscape. It is a pity that given such a unique opportunity to create a new development more thought has not been given to the impact on the more rural surroundings, taking into account that Frenchay Village is in the heart of a conservation area.  

**Leisure**  
The hospital grounds have tennis courts and a swimming pool that have been used over a number of years by both staff and other Frenchay residents. The proposed development does not retain any of these facilities, nor does it provide any other alternatives for sport. Given that the proposed number of new residents may increase by some 1200 or more, some thought should be given to retaining or replacing these facilities. Again the rationale behind the proposed development is to generate as much money as possible without any thought being given to both the existing community who will lose these facilities and the new community who will have none. |
| 43. | C Jones | I write to express my concerns regarding the amount of redevelopment proposed to the Frenchay Hospital site following its downgrading in 2014. I fear that 550 houses are too many and that much impact will be made to the Conservation Area, particularly to the woodland, which is not in as bad an order as has been described. Further, I cannot understand why the school has not been offered the site its governors believe to be the best - that by the CLIC house entrance. Also, I believe there should be a GP’s Surgery due to the increased population - It is very inconvenient for sick people to have to travel all the way to Fishponds or Downend for appointments, especially if they do not have transport. |
| 44. | S Jones | As a long term resident of Frenchay Village (Grove View, Frenchay Hill BS16 1LR) I wish to oppose the proposals for the development of this site on the following grounds:  

**Traffic congestion**  
At peak times it is already difficult to leave the village either at the top of Frenchay Hill or Pearces Hill. It can take over 20
minutes to turn onto the main road where the congestion continues in both directions. The increased traffic generated by the proposed number of new dwellings can only exacerbate this situation, leading to virtual gridlock in the area. Additionally the proposed provision for new resident parking seems to be inadequate leading to the similar frustrations caused by cars parked all along Beckspool Road and other smaller residential roads.

Density of Housing
The proposed density is far too high. It will place severe pressure on existing community facilities which are extremely limited at present. The unique character and history of the area stands to be swamped by a development where the stated aim of the developers is to raise as much money from the site with little regard to the impact on the existing countryside and landscape. It is a pity that given such a unique opportunity to create a new development more thought has not been given to the impact on the more rural surroundings, taking into account that Frenchay Village is in the heart of a conservation area.

Leisure
The hospital grounds have tennis courts and a swimming pool that have been used over a number of years by both staff and other Frenchay residents. The proposed development does not retain any of these facilities, nor does it provide any other alternatives for sport. Given that the proposed number of new residents may increase by some 1200 or more, some thought should be given to retaining or replacing these facilities. Again the rationale behind the proposed development is to generate as much money as possible without any thought being given to both the existing community who will lose these facilities and the new community who will have none.

D.H. Johnstone
Homestead Gardens Frenchay.

Herewith comments on the above Plan.
Ref para. 3.3 - The Macmillan Centre is not mentioned as a building to be retained. Does this show an intention for it to be removed?

Ref. para. 8.1 - The Plan is out of keeping with the character and appearance of Frenchay; it represents an overdevelopment of the site which would be cramped in appearance. The housing densities of 35-45 dph are far greater and more extensive than anything currently existing in Frenchay. The majority of Frenchay is of a density below 32dph. and where there are clusters of higher density dwellings these are small in area, (e.g. Tanners Court at 0.49ha).

Although it is reasonable to expect specialist housing such as retirement properties to be of higher density, no such dwellings are shown in the Plan.

Car parking is not mentioned in the description of the "formal residential" area, although it is mentioned for the other areas. This "formal" area comprises approximately 200 dwellings and occupies some 38% of the housing area and yet there appears to be no parking provision.

The majority of the hospital buildings bordering the site are single storey and set back from the road. To put two and three storey buildings closer to the Bristol Road and to change the use of a surface car park fronting Beckspool road to a Gateway building, which could be up to 3 storeys high, would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality.

Ref para. 8.2 - Frenchay is characterised by a mix of housing styles which includes individual larger houses in both pre- and post war areas. To reflect the characteristics of the locality the Plan should include houses of this type. It is difficult to
envisage how such dwellings can be accommodated within the "suburban" density of 35-40 dph.

| 46. | Mr R Jempson  
BS16 1JR | Concerned at Hospital redevelopment  
- Traffic will impact on road network – what improvements are proposed?  
- Locate new hospital in the ‘New Wards’ 101-201  
- Retain Macmillan Centre  
- Consider impacts on both SGC and BCC parts of Frenhay |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 47. | Mrs Jean Kinsey  
BS16 1PQ. | As a resident of Frenchay for 29 years, I am writing to express my fears over the proposed plans for the Frenchay Hospital Site.  
I wish South Gloucestershire Council **not to approve** the proposed Outline Planning Application for the Frenchay Hospital Site and to consider the following:  
1. Other major developments are about to take place within this area and will create an urban sprawl, swallowing up Frenchay. It is imperative that we do not create a 'ghetto' type development which could destroy this unique and historic Village. I am sure the incoming and existing residents would want the development to be an exciting layout with open areas to replicate the adjoining Common and to maintain the country environment we all enjoy. This can only be achieved by controlling the number of dwellings on the site.  
2. Size of School - imperative for the size of building/land to take into account the increased number of pupils which will come into the new development.  
3. Lack of GP Surgery - could this be integrated into the proposed Community Hospital.  
4. Destruction of Trees - the Tree Preservation Order should be adhered to.  
5. Traffic - increase and parking facilities.  
At the meeting held on 3rd Sept.2012 by the Winterbourne Parish Council to discuss the Draft Concept Statement, many residents who attended expressed their concern that both the **North Bristol NHS Trust and GVA would totally ignore all our concerns and carry out their own agenda - ie: to make as much money as possible by whatever means.** |
| 48. | Adrian Kerton.  
BS34 8XN. | I consider it important that the direct cycle route that currently runs from the existing entrance opposite the Old Gloucester Road to the exit on to Beckspool Road near its junction with Pearces Hill be implemented in the developer's plans as part of a valuable safe cycling route from Stoke Gifford to Fishponds.  
Please ensure this is contained in the developer's plans. |
| 49. | C Kwiatkowski & N McKay  
BS16 1LU | Thank you for giving residents the opportunity to comment on the Frenchay Hospital Draft Statement. We live in Frenchay Village and as an Associate Architect, I am familiar with schemes of that scale and the relevant requirements of different |
Local Authorities.

We have the following comments on the Draft Concept Statement:

**Information provided and Design Code**
Although the statement gives sufficient general information, it seems that a lot more detail will need to be added for an Outline Planning Application. It appears that this will not go out for consultation based on the consultation diagrams as outlined under 3.3, but I hope that you will invite further comments on the proposals before they are submitted. We would also expect a Design Code to be put forward with the Outline Application (similar to the Charlton Hayes development in Filton) to define the design quality and appearance of the scheme. We would also expect to see parts of the masterplan worked up further as ‘proving layouts’ to demonstrate that the size of the parcels works with the house types proposed.

**Integration of the Existing Village**
No real proposals have been made as to how the existing village can be integrated apart from confirming an intention. It appears that the new development currently sits next to the existing Frenchay Village rather than proposing strong links.

**Use**
It is surprising that employment is not part of the masterplan (apart from the proposed health care services) as Policy CS25 and the Concept Statement outlines ‘new neighbourhoods will provide opportunities for people to live near to where they work and be well integrated with existing communities’. Most residents will need to use their car to go to work as large employment opportunities are not in walkable distance (e.g. Airbus, MOD) which will increase the volume of traffic. It would be desirable to propose at least good opportunities for home-working.

**Sustainability**
No commitment has been made regarding Code for Sustainable Homes; we would expect this to tie in with national standards. It appears that no innovative housing has been incorporated. If photovoltaic panels are proposed, these should be integrated into the scheme rather than just stuck-on as an afterthought.

The opportunity for a CHP for the scheme should be investigated, especially with the health care service use being retained. Existing properties could be given the opportunity to link into this system.

**Quality of the Development**
The proposed character areas analysis does not demonstrate very much detail and relevance to Frenchay regarding house types, typical features and materials used. Examples should be given as to what could be proposed as well as proposed materials, length of terraces, parking regimes, colours etc, all of which should be part of the Design Code.

There will always be a discussion between ‘Traditional’ and ‘Contemporary’ but fake Georgian houses with stuck-on chimneys (which are mostly UPVC), low quality materials, forced ‘twee’ houses and visible service boxes outside the dwellings need to be avoided - this can be influenced by the Council. We would generally welcome a more contemporary approach to the development.

Especially the examples shown for the suburban residential areas are poor and do not seem to provide a high quality residential space.

The quality of the green spaces/ POS should also be defined further in the Outline Application with possible S106 contributions to be considered.
Traffic and Parking

Although we are sure that a TIA has been carried out, the impact of the school during rush hour does not seem to have been taken into account. Beckspool Road is already very busy with people using this alternative route to get to Frenchay Park Road/ Stoke Lane/ MOD/ Filton/ Junction 2 of the M32 in order to avoid the M32 roundabout. Access from this side would aggravate the traffic problems in the morning/afternoon rush-hour and these peak traffic movement will also affect the access to the Ring Road.

Although the junction Beckspool Road/ Bristol Road is not directly part of the scheme, it would be desirable to improve the traffic flow and the junction. Waiting times to get onto the Ring Road from Beckspool Road are around 10-12 minutes in rush hour. It is feared that this will get worse with a school access from the south side of the development.

No road sections have been shown so far but it would be desirable to bring more green into the development (street trees) and not restrict this to the Lime Tree Avenue.

More pedestrian and cycling connections from south to north should be proposed to link the scheme with the existing residential areas. In the existing hospital, these connections are rare and not obvious at all.

Packing should be integrated naturally into the development. There should be an open feel to the development without gated parking courtyards and blocked through-routes.

We are hoping that you will be considering our concerns and we would like to ask the project team to publicise further details on the points being raised before the outline application will be submitted.

Further to the meeting held in Frenchay on 3rd September to discuss and provide feedback please record my notes as below, thanks again for your assistance and attending the meeting.

Page 33 of the Draft Concept statement – The figure of circa 550 dwellings is too intense for the site. The figure needs to be circa 400 which can be arrived by building some larger plots and providing more open spaces within the site and a community building, shop and GP surgery. More work needed on the site for the school rather than just option 1 and 2 that are stated. The site must be chosen to have a minimum number of cars dropping off at school time and enable walking or cycling to school. A school at the end of the road from Clic Cottage that was suggested at the meeting and has been discussed is an ideal site, the existing safer routes to school area on Beckspool Road which is currently used will assist with this.

Page 16 – Issue 1 – the design of the houses, particularly on the boundary of the site must reflect the period buildings in Frenchay. If some larger properties are put in this area this would help to bring the density figures down to circa 400. Issue 2 – Poor analysis and incorrect conclusions on the impact on traffic, this must be conducted properly and again a lower density of housing would reduce the impact on existing overloaded road network at peak times. The junction of the ring road from Frenchay goes from 1 lane into 4 and this needs to be improved to cope with extra cars.

Page 14 4.4 Removal of any healthy trees must not happen as per the current views of SGC and Tree officer Chris Wright during recent surveys in Frenchay. The area of lime trees must not be disturbed and destruction of woodlands avoided.

Page 17 – The GP surgery must be pursued. The green open spaces to be transferred to SGC or WPC to ensure management for the future.
Page 21 – All areas marked in conservation area to be remain undeveloped.

Grade II listed Frenchay Park House future use needs to be explained further as unsatisfactory statements in document.

An option to provide elderly accommodation on the site needs to be pursued which will have a lesser impact on traffic and potential anti-social problems with a large housing estate.

51. Mrs Kembery  
BS16 1LU

- Page 33 - The figure of 550 dwellings is too intense for the site. The figure needs to be around 400 with more mixed use of community buildings, shops and elderly accommodation.
- Page 16 – The design on the houses must reflect the older properties in Frenchay to blend in with the surroundings.
- Page 17 – The green opens spaces to be retained and all areas marked in conservation areas to be remained undeveloped.
- The traffic problems at peak times in Frenchay are well known, the analysis is insufficient in the concept statement and the impact must be researched and the road infrastructure improved.
- The school site options need much more thought and the option on the existing site buildings on the road from Becskpool Road past Clic cottage to be pursued.
- Overall a poor concept statement that as not addressed the consultation in Frenchay over the past years.

52. Mrs J C Kinsey  
BS16 1PH

I am writing regards the above planning issue. I have listed my main concerns from this vague and ambiguous draft proposal.

I am a resident in Frenchay at the address listed and my children have both attended Frenchay School.

My concerns over the Draft Concept Statement are as follows:

1. The proposed number of houses is too many for the village.
2. The impact of the additional vehicle movements has not been assessed satisfactorily or addressed as such in the draft statement.
3. The boundary woodland and wildlife area appears at risk from the statement.
4. The style of the development

In detail:
1. The proposed number of houses is too many for the village.
   The original numbers of houses was estimated to be 350 in January 2012 and now has an estimate of 550 house with wording that would suggest that this figure in being refined could grow further. The village has grown organically over the years and as such has developed and managed the growth. Such a figure as 550 houses would double the village and offers the potential to destroy the community that has evolved through this steady growth. The development would be bigger than the existing. By going to the lower number it would allow for the homes to be built in space similar and more proportional to the existing developments within the village therefore maintaining the attraction of the area.
2. The impact of the additional vehicle movements has not been assessed satisfactorily or addressed as such in the draft statement. I have been through a number of the new developments across the South Gloucestershire area at various times and can see that a development of this proposed size brings avoidable issues with regard vehicle movement and parking. Vehicle ownership is not determined by the number of spaces at a home or the ability to park outside ones home and as such it is clear that through excessive density this issue pushes vehicles onto the roads and common areas of a development. This is a further reason to manage the size of the development to a reasonable level. I also can not see sufficient provision or sufficient proposal in the development to facilitate the vehicle movements in what is already and incredibly difficult area in all three main routes for access and egress. We have an issue of huge vehicle movement "cutting" through the village to avoid the 4174 congestion. This number of homes would bring an unmanageable number of vehicle movements for the village.

3. The boundary woodland and wildlife area appears at risk from the statement. The boundary issues I believe are a means to increase he developable area as referred to in my first point and as such should be resisted fully. The wording in the Draft Concept Statement gives far too much freedom and interpretation and must not be left in this format. The wildlife area is also as such that it was introduced and managed for core principles that I do not believe have changed. The only change is the desire to use this are to increase developable area. Green, woodland and nature areas are integral to the core attraction of Frenchay and should be protected fully through this development.

4. The style of the development. Frenchay has a very clear identity and though the support of local groups such as the Frenchay Preservation Society has managed to keep this very much at the front of development and preservation. I would ask that this is a guiding principle in the housing style, development of the site and the decisions on how to integrate the development into our village. It is essential that this development is designed and built in a way that allows it to become part of our village and the community grow. Failure to do this would see a development that stands alone in the walls of an old hospital.

Time will tell us if communities are listened to or ignored. I believe the redevelopment to offer an exciting opportunity for Frenchay and the Trust should be concerned to leave its legacy in Frenchay that is appropriate and I keeping with the village it has been in for so many years.

53. Mr J Kinsey  
BS16 1PH

I am writing regards the above planning issue. I have listed my main concerns from this vague and ambiguous draft proposal.

I am a resident in Frenchay at the address listed and my children have both attended Frenchay School.

My concerns over the Draft Concept Statement are as follows:
1. The proposed number of houses is too many for the village.
2. The impact of the additional vehicle movements has not been assessed satisfactorily or addressed as such in the draft statement.
3. The boundary woodland and wildlife area appears at risk from the statement.

4. The style of the development

In detail:

1. The proposed number of houses is too many for the village.

The original numbers of houses was estimated to be 350 in January 2012 and now has an estimate of 550 house with wording that would suggest that this figure in being refined could grow further. The village has grown organically over the years and as such has developed and managed the growth. Such a figure as 550 houses would double the village and offers the potential to destroy the community that has evolved through this steady growth. The development would be bigger than the existing. By going to the lower number it would allow for the homes to be built in space similar and more proportional to the existing developments within the village therefore maintaining the attraction of the area.

2. The impact of the additional vehicle movements has not been assessed satisfactorily or addressed as such in the draft statement.

I have been through a number of the new developments across the South Gloucestershire area at various times and can see that a development of this proposed size brings avoidable issues with regard vehicle movement and parking. Vehicle ownership is not determined by the number of spaces at a home or the ability to park outside ones home and as such it is clear that through excessive density this issue pushes vehicles onto the roads and common areas of a development. This is a further reason to manage the size of the development to a reasonable level. I also can not see sufficient provision or sufficient proposal in the development to facilitate the vehicle movements in what is already and incredibly difficult area in all three main routes for access and egress. We have an issue of huge vehicle movement "cutting" through the village to avoid the 4174 congestion. This number of homes would bring an unmanageable number of vehicle movements for the village.

3. The boundary woodland and wildlife area appears at risk from the statement.

The boundary issues I believe are a means to increase he developable area as referred to in my first point and as such should be resisted fully. The wording in the Draft Concept Statement gives far too much freedom and interpretation and must not be left in this format. The wildlife area is also as such that it was introduced and managed for core principles that I do not believe have changed. The only change is the desire to use this are to increase developable area. Green, woodland and nature areas are integral to the core attraction of Frenchay and should be protected fully through this development.

4. The style of the development.

Frenchay has a very clear identity and though the support of local groups such as the Frenchay Preservation Society has managed to keep this very much at the front of development and preservation. I would ask that this is a guiding principle in the housing style, development of the site and the decisions on how to integrate the development into our village. It is essential that this development is designed and built in a way that allows it to become part of our village and the community grow. Failure to do this would see a development that stands alone in the walls of an old hospital.

Time will tell us if communities are listened to or ignored. I believe the redevelopment to offer an exciting opportunity for Frenchay and the Trust should be concerned to leave its legacy in Frenchay that is appropriate and I keeping with the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 54. | Mrs J Loell BS16 1NJ    | **Density – 350-400 more realistic:**  
  o 550 homes and a larger school would result in gridlock  
  o Traffic has increased with temporary use of site for major trauma.  
  o Traffic builds up in autumn term with new pupils and UWE Students.  
  o 2+ lanes is a waste of road space.  
  o Use materials in keeping with village.  
  o GP surgery – absolute essential to serve population growth  
  o Need calming on Beckspool Road when parking pressures eased.  
  o The site boundary opposite The Common in Beckspool Road must blend in and enhance the area. |
| 55. | Mr & Mrs L Lewis BS16 1NZ | **Housing – proposed number is excessive and will adversely affect wider village.**  
  Traffic and parking – 500+ dwellings would compound existing problems.  
  Community facilities – Essential to provide a community centre and GP Surgery (nearest alternative is in Downend) |
| 56. | M L Leaver BS16 5UA      | **Object to the change of use of the site and possible future housing.**  
  - Any development close to the Conservation Area should be resisted.  
  - Site has served the area well as a hospital  
  - Change would be a departure from the development plan – need to consult Government and local people. (FOI request what has happened to date)  
  - 550 dwellings of ‘Georgian character’ would be out of character with the general low rise buildings at present and overpowering of village.  
  - Wants to be kept informed and consulted. |
| 57. | Mrs B Lewin BS16 1LP     | **Too little information made available to local people and their representatives.**  
  - Need to advise all residents when new documents are issued. Many elderly residents do not have or want computers.  
  - Plans displayed at meeting were too difficult to view – too small and too many people.  
  - Traffic – already major problems at peak hours and will get worse.  
  - Need GP and Clinic if village doubles in size |
- Need proper school and recreation facilities for children.
- Do not want another Bradley Stoke.
- Housing – must be designed sensitively – well spaced etc as with existing village.
- Conservation land and Listed Buildings neglected – not an argument for redevelopment
- Increase in housing from 350-550 is not justified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>58.</th>
<th>Mrs J Llewellyn BS37 6QP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not think that all the key features of the existing site have been safeguarded. I read paragraph 6.4 on page 22. I spent a lot of time and effort, along with many others, in fund-raising for the Barbara Russell Children’s Ward a few years ago. I was employed in the old children’s ward. It seems tragic that this spacious building cannot be retained for community use. I assume the planned school will not be close enough to make use of it. Paragraph 8.1 on page 28 does not appear to retain this building as it is all to be housing in that area. I hope that the relevant committees can consider this again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>59.</th>
<th>Mrs J A Lovell BS16 1NJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to make the following comments:- Ref numbers 6,7,8,9 and 10. I feel that the density for 350-450 dwellings would be a much more realistic density for the following reasons:- The building of 550 dwellings is going to completely gridlock Beckspool Road and the surrounding roads, bearing in mind a New Bigger School is to be built taking in many more pupils/traffic. Being realistic I know that things are going to change in this area and I beg you to propose the reduction of the density of dwellings allowed to be built from 550 to 350/450 and to ensure they are to be built using materials in keeping with his Historic Village which dates back to 1673 and which has been quoted in the Bristol Evening Post as “A Beautiful Green Oasis at the end of the M32 Bristol”. Ref number 8. A GP Surgery would be an absolute essential to be included in the planning as the population will significantly increase in number. Ref number 14. The traffic referred to with regard to the hospital staff and visitors has worsened greatly during this temporary period of Frenchay Hospital becoming the Major Trauma Hospital while Southmead Hospital is being developed and the flow and parking of traffic is mainly throughout the day, abating significantly after 8-00pm. I live in Penn Drive off Beckspool Road Frenchay and once all the schools and colleges return after the summer holidays Beckspool Road becomes a nightmare with non-stop traffic from around 7-00am and at times grid-locked, causing difficulty for local residents to access onto Beckspool Road. I personally find this a ludicrous situation knowing that running parallel alongside the snarled up Beckspool Road there is the mostly empty 2+ Lane on the Ring Road at this Peak Time and I cannot understand the logic of having built two lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the Ring Road only to leave one of them practically empty when it is desperately needed to help take away the Peak
Time traffic from Beckspool Road. To my reasoning this is madness and if we are to have a bigger population in this area I
propose that the 2+ Lane should be re-instated to 2 lanes at all times.

With regard to the mention of less on-street parking on Beckspool Road causing increase in traffic speed, I would propose
that this could be resolved by putting Calming Measures in place thus making Beckspool Road the much safer road for the
entrance to the New School.

**Ref number 11.** It is imperative that the boundary site opposite Frenchay Common in Beckspool Road blends in and
enhances this beautiful Open Common Land.

I would like to thank you in anticipation for your time and I sincerely hope that my proposals will be given consideration by
the South Gloucestershire Council.

---

| 60. | A. Lewis  
| BS16 2SZ | I would like to register my concern regarding the above project. While it is recognised by most residents of Frenchay that
the land has to be utilised following the departure of the hospital it is also felt that such a huge development in a relatively
small village must enhance not detract from the beauty of the area.

My major concerns are:

1. The number of units proposed has increased from 350 - 550 during the consultation period.
2. Protection of all the trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders.
3. Suitable facilities for all the community from pre-school to adults being provided within the new complex.
4. Road and footpath improvements to ensure safe routes to school and to accommodate the inevitable increase in Peak
Traffic Flows in an area which already struggles to cope during certain periods in the day.

I hope these comments will assist you in understanding the range of concerns felt by local people.

---

| 61. | Eurof Lewis  
| BS16 2SZ | I am writing to you to register my concerns regarding the above proposed redevelopment of the existing Frenchay Hospital
Site. There are several issues that need to be addressed in the Draft Concept Statement but before doing so I feel there is
a more profound matter to be considered. This proposal, which will have the greatest impact on Frenchay since it first
formation many centuries ago, however public consideration lasts only from 1st Aug to 14th Sept. an inordinately short time
to get the best considered result for the future. I felt that on the 3rd Sept.’s meeting the community had for the first time
absorbed the full impact of the proposals which given rise to some real concerns from many people.

To me an excellent example of the lateral thinking needed was when one of the speakers at the meeting of the 3rd
suggested providing a facility similar to the development by St. Monica’s at Westbury on Trym. After detailed investigation
this may not be a suitable total solution but it certainly is worthy of consideration bearing in mind the demographic time
bomb of an ageing population. However a little more time would allow such an investigation, while to stick to the present
time-table could despoil Frenchay for ever all for the cost of a few weeks. The topics which have raised the most concerns
have been:

- Traffic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Protection of open spaces and trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density of Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctors Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of areas within Frenchay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many of these would be accommodated to a lesser or greater extent by the creation of a residential care home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak flow traffic generation virtually removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School needs would radically alter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density of housing units could be more easily satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A completely new dimension would be added to the overall village character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major concerns I have with the concept statement are identified above and as the co-author of the Parish Council response I will not burden you with having to read them twice, on the basis that the eloquence of an argument is in its content rather than in the number of times it is repeated. However I would like to register those same concerns with you now.

62. Martin Longbottom  
BS16 1PQ

In response to the 'concept statement' for the development of Frenchay Hospital grounds, published by GVA, I have the following comments:

1. I consider it is essential that the green area south of the Lime Tree Avenue and the area designated as a Nature Reserve are preserved. In order that by some nefarious means theses areas do not become prey to developers, I propose that they be made over to Winterbourne Parish Council or South Gloucestershire Council. In this way they could be maintained and protected from future development.

2. If as many house as have been proposed in the statement are to be built, do NOT allow / give planning permission for the type of narrow roads and lack of parking spaces as have been built in the Stoke Park development. Stoke Park is a terrible example of crowding a lot of dwellings in a small area. Please don't let it happen at Frenchay, provide plenty of parking space and easy access.

3. I attended the workshop on the future development that was held in January. One of the suggestions that was put forward at that event was the removal of the Hospital boundary wall between CLIC Cottage and the tennis courts in front of Frenchay Park House. This would open up the conservation area and give the appearance of the Common being on both sides of Beckspool Road. Views from the new development would then be to the parish church and across the Common to the White Lion, bringing the new residents into the existing village.

If the wall is retained all round the new estate, it will be like a prison camp and become a separate community. There must be access across such artificial barriers so that the new estate can become part of the Frenchay community.
| 63. | Richard Langton Hewer  
Emeritus Consultant  
Neurologist | Please think on these things.  

I have just seen this document. I wish to request that more time be allowed for consideration of the document. I suggest three months. The NHS has yet to publish its own plans and nothing should be done until the NBT has done so. The two documents can then be considered together.  

I attach a letter that I have written to the Bristol Post about the issue of rehabilitation. It is most important that there is a full discussion of all relevant matters before any irrevocable decisions are made. I am available for discussion if this would be helpful.  

Tel. 0117 9732110  
To The Editor, Bristol Post  

Dear Sirs  

REHABILITATION FACILITIES IN BRISTOL  

People walking with both legs amputated above the knee. Blade runners such as Oscar Pistorius and Jonnie Peacock. Iliesa Delana with only one leg winning the high jump with a leap of 1.74 metres. People with intellectual problems achieving great things on horseback.  

The Paralympics have shown how in many instances disability can be overcome. Success depends upon determination and also on the surgical and medical input of doctors, therapists, and others.  

Rehabilitation is concerned with helping disabled people and their families achieve the highest possible quality of life compatible with the diagnosis, age, type/severity of disability and circumstances. The value of specialist rehabilitation was shown by Sir Ludwick Guttman working at Stoke Mandeville hospital during the second world war. When he arrived at the hospital in the early 1940's the wards were full of young injured servicemen with paralysed legs due to spinal cord injuries. Virtually all were doubly incontinent and had deep festering pressure sores. Most were likely to die. The remainder were condemned to a life of terrible pain, depression and disablement. Sir Ludwig developed programmes of prevention and treatment. The young men were given intensive skilled nursing care and physiotherapy. Many servicemen achieved a remarkable level of recovery and lived worthwhile lives thereafter.  

I visited Stoke Mandeville in 1953 with a group of medical students. Sir Ludwig showed us a young sailor with paralysed legs walking—using the only functioning muscle—the latissimus dorsi—the nerve supply of which is derived from high up in the spinal cord-often above the level of cord damage. The muscle is attached to the edge of the pelvis and the patient learned how to swing his pelvis one way and then another way thus enabling him to take some small steps. The patients were all involved in sporting activities and this became the basis of the paralympic movement. Sir Ludwick had totally changed our perception of disability and had demonstrated the value of intensive skilled rehabilitation.  

The value of intensive rehabilitation is currently demonstrated at Headley Court which is the combined services rehabilitation centre. At this unit soldiers and airmen injured in Afghanistan and elsewhere are treated using the Guttman
principles.
Bristol does not have an NHS in-patient rehabilitation unit (apart from some beds for stroke patients). Other towns and cities in the southwest do have a unit of this type—Truro, Plymouth, Exeter, and Taunton. Bristol with its clinical population of about a million needs one. At the moment patients are looked after on general, and other, wards where intensive rehabilitation is not available despite the best efforts of the overstretched nursing and therapy staff. There is constant pressure to get patients out of hospital, often long before they are ready to go home.

A wide variety of patients are affected including those recovering from multiple injuries, head injury, recent amputations, and those who have undergone neurosurgical procedures (tumours, subarachnoid haemorrhage, etc). In addition there are patients with disabling neurological conditions such as multiple sclerosis, motor neurone disease and Parkinson’s disease who require in-patient assessment and intensive therapy from time to time. Southmead hospital is now designated as a major trauma centre and will require rehabilitation facilities.

There is no point in undertaking major surgery and high quality acute care if we do not provide good aftercare. This would be wasteful in the extreme. It is clear that many disabled people would benefit by being cared for in a rehabilitation unit with highly trained staff.

The only realistic place for a rehabilitation unit would be on the Frenchay hospital site.

The unit would require 25-30 beds. It would be in a pleasant rural surrounding and could have attached to it a sports area for disabled people, a swimming/remedial pool, and a specially designed garden. These later facilities could be open to local residents. There would be a support group which would raise funds for the unit. The unit would be fully integrated with “the community” and staff would probably have responsibilities also outside the unit.

The North Bristol Trust (NBT) wishes to sell off the site for development leaving only a small section for NHS facilities. Even existing units such as the Barbara Russell unit for children and the Macmillan Palliative unit are to be demolished. Whether or not their services will be provided elsewhere remains to be seen.

Bristol requires a plan for rehabilitation. This would, of course include the BRI (University Hospitals, Bristol. UHB).

The present plans to sell off the Frenchay Hospital site should be put on hold until the above and other matters are resolved. This is now urgent. There is a once in a life-time opportunity to help our disabled patients. It could be you or me one day!

Dear Mr. Luton, Many thanks for your message of Sept. 12.

I was pleased to learn that you have had a number of comments on
The proposals. I will send you under separate cover a copy of an
Article that is published in The Post today.

I am of course fully aware of the existence of BIRU. The rehabilitation
Issues go beyond this.
It was a pleasure to read your thoughtful response.
You have asked for comments on the Site Concept Statement dated July 2012 which sets out some background and intentions regarding proposed redevelopment of the Site ahead of submission of a request for outline planning permission.

By way of background, I am a local resident of Frenchay and my property directly abuts the boundary of the Site (to the south side) which is divided by an old stone wall which forms part of the listed boundary of both my property (the Old House) and the adjacent NHS Trust HQ building on the Site. For this reason I have a very direct interest in the future of the Site.

I request that SGC do not endorse the concept statement in its current form. The reasons for this are set out below. I also suggest some conditions that SGC may wish to consider as part of a re-submitted concept statement which can more adequately "inform the emerging development".

Dealing with the particular questions on which you have asked for comment:

**Clarity of Document and Development Principles:**

No, the document is not clear.

It is not possible to evaluate a concept for the Site when there is insufficient information as to the concept for the whole site – in particular, no mention is made of the mid or longer term plans for the listed buildings. Given that the size of the listed footprint within the context of the overall Site, the future plans for these buildings must be transparent and is a key component to enable proper consultation to evaluate the supporting use of the remainder of the Site. And how can the Council even entertain an endorsement of the concept statement without taking the opportunity to request a programme of repair and maintenance to the listed buildings on site which are in an urgent state of disrepair to the extent of risk of loss. There is no report of the listed buildings officer covered in the concept statement. I personally would also like to raise the need for urgent repairs to the boundary wall which divides the listed buildings on the Site from my own property.

I would like to see further details made available of the ongoing use of the site by the North Bristol NHS trust – this context is also needed to understand and evaluate overall concept for Site. Section 3.3. is too vague and states "current proposals are being further developed". There is mention of staff car parking provision (p.16) – but how much is needed or will be provided?

South Gloucestershire Council itself has provided no guidance to local residents of other possible uses for the Site – v. residential. In order to fully evaluate the concept proposed, can you advise the options that the Council itself might consider such as retirement use, park and ride, retail etc or otherwise explain the rationale why these cannot be put into consideration? Can SGC purchase any part of the Site itself to provide other local amenities?

Is the Council satisfied i that the NHS trust has itself properly and fully considered and tested all other options for the Site and what information can be made available as to how the NHS trust has narrowed down its choice to the current concept?

On p. 13 – should we not await the report on the Core Strategy?

The concept statement provides no data on the current number of residents in Frenchay and existing residential units – without this it is not possible to evaluate the effect of the additional residential construction on current village numbers and amenities – what would be the overall % size increase (or at least % range increase) in population resulting from the
Following on from the above point, the concept statement mentions the construction of a new primary school and makes a rather more vague mention of a possible GP surgery and all other amenities are wrapped up in a general statement (p.17). A commitment needs to be made on key amenities and size of those amenities that will be made available to enable any approval to the concept of residential use given the overall size of the proposed redevelopment and the effect it will have on the wider community in terms of influx of numbers.

The concept report glibly refers to deterioration in traffic volumes (5.7 and 6.10). This demonstrates a complete disregard of the existing traffic problems that blight Frenchay (caused not by hospital traffic but by commuter cut-through during rush hour). The current traffic problem needs action and resolution before local residents can be asked to sensibly review a concept for the Site. I would like to see the Council trialling the closure of Beckspool Road to traffic turning left at the junction with Cleeve Hill by the Village Hall to solve the current issues along with some traffic calming measures through the village. Why would this not be worth consideration?

In addition to the above, the residents needs some further clarity and commitment regarding local transport links and cycle paths etc sufficient to evaluate the concept in the round (7.3).

**Surveys:**

As stated above, there is no report from the listed buildings officer on the NHS Trust HQ and Stables. I would also like to see a survey done on the boundary wall to ascertain its status of repair.

The surveys that have been completed have not been made available for review.

The overview (p. 2) states that the concept statement seeks to “recognise existing landscape features” but the key features of the site to be retained (beyond the listed buildings) are not clear.

**Consultation:**

Regarding consultation – no, this has not been adequately addressed. If you search “Frenchay hospital redevelopment” on the SGC site, it does not take you to the concept statement. Instead it takes you to an out of date application relating to the need for an EIA survey and states that the deadline date for comments has lapsed. Until this is rectified on the SGC site then it would be unfair to close the consultation period. The need to comment and consider the concept statement is slowly filtering around the village but the dissemination of information is inevitably slow when there has been no direct mailing by SGC to local residents of the plans for the Site.

**Conclusion**

My sense from discussion with other residents is that a residential use might well be accommodated but would urge SGC to address the issues raised above (along with those of others) in a revised and updated concept statement to better inform the residents and so ensure that the interests of SGC, NHS and the residents are better aligned – this will be the key to the future success of the Site and the support of the local community. Given the views expressed at a recent public meeting, if the Concept Statement is endorsed “as is” then it will create a feeling of bad will which will be detrimental to the local community.
|   | J & M Low                             | We are writing to register our strong objection to the proposed housing development on the Frenchay hospital site. Whilst we appreciate the need for new housing, the proposed density of housing is extremely excessive. The main issues we are so concerned about are:  
1. The traffic on all roads leading to Hambrook lights, (especially Beckspool Road, Bristol Road and the ring road) is already excessive. In the mornings, Beckspool Road leading to Bristol Road, is often congested to the extent that the traffic queues past Riverwood Road. In addition to this, the M32 junction 1 southbound exit, is extremely congested in the evenings. This is so stressful, with people pushing in lanes etc., that we both chose different routes home (many miles out of our way) from our places of work to avoid it!  
2. The density of housing is going to completely change the feel of Frenchay. It has always been a quiet, quaint place to live. We have not lived here our whole lives (6 years), but have had aspirations to move here for all our married life(28 years), which I'm sure would have changed if these houses had already been built!  
3. The facilities in the area are completely unsuitable for a large input of residents. I understand that the prices of the houses will probably bring different ages and families, for which there certainly are not facilities to match that diverse a population! Finally, we realise that some properties will need to be built on the Frenchay hospital site and we are not objecting to this. Our objection is to the completely excessive numbers being discussed. Looking at our above points, we can't imagine how 100 houses would be managed, certainly not over 500!!!  
Trusting you will carefully consider our concerns and come to a sensible conclusion. |
|   | Mrs Milstead BS16 1NQ | Appalled at the number of dwellings proposed.  
- 550 dwellings, 1000+ people will change Frenchay for ever.  
- No mention of the MacMillan Centre being retained.  
- All trees must be retained within the Conservation Area and healthy trees maintained.  
- Need GP Surgery – two buses to Fishponds  
- Height limit on any flats.  
- Locate school where day care centre is at present  
- Pen Spaces and recreation must be included.  
- No mention of garages for dwellings.  
- Infrastructure improvements required – pavements wider than current 3ft around Village Hall.  
- Congestion on roads and junctions |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need more information before any plans are drawn up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Mrs M Morris</td>
<td>Resident for over 45 years. Retained facilities BIRU Burden Centre New Community Hospital Therapy and specialist services as outpatients? Avon and Area Stroke Services? Cancer services – Macmillan Nurses? Future of museum and its building not clear. Pleased that most open spaces and memorial trees will be retained. Concerned at loss of northern woodland/nature reserve. Concerned at proposals to build on open land. Council to manage open spaces in future Maintain healthy trees including Lime Avenue. Replace school on day centre site. Why are housing numbers increasing with each iteration of the concept statement – 550 would almost double size of the village. Varied densities give Frenchay its character.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Mrs A Mackellar</td>
<td>Main concerns of local people are: The High density of housing The likelihood of traffic chaos The encroachment on conservation areas and demolition of woodland 550 dwellings is far too many – would overwhelm village and village facilities. (e.g. village hall overcrowded without increase in population)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   |   | o Traffic is already gridlocked at times and public transport is poor.  
|   |   | o Lack of space left for parking will impact on local roads.  
|   |   | o Earlier consultation offered protection for open space south of Lime Trees – now proposed for a primary school – unacceptable.  
|   |   | o Need continuation of woodland buffer to Cedar Hall.  
|   |   | o Nature Reserve should be restored and looked after.  
|   |   | o GVA should note public feedback and amend plans.  
|   |   | o Not against development but we do want it to enhance the nature of the village and not detract from it.  
|   |   |   
| 69. | Peter Maughan  
BS16 1PQ | I am happy that the Frenchay Hospital site should be redeveloped broadly for residential purposes but not for 550 houses. This would cause impossible traffic jams. Currently the narrow roads around Frenchay become blocked during the rush hours and to have a further 550 plus cars all travelling along the narrow Frenchay roads would be horrendous. 
I am absolutely opposed to the destruction of the wooded area on the North border of the Frenchay hospital site. My home boarders that site and I observe many animal and birds live in the area and often come into my garden including rare wood peckers, badgers, deer and foxes. Destroying the wooded area would destroy their habitat which is surely bordering on criminal. Animals have just as much right as humans to live in Frenchay! 
I believe the trees on that North border also have protected status and therefore it is illegal and immoral to tear them down. We must consider future generations and allow them to enjoy old established trees and the wild life that these trees support.  
|   |   |   
| 70. | E Moore | I would like to respond to the outline development plan for Frenchay Hospital. I am a resident of Froomshaw Road. I am dismayed that the proposed occupancy of the site has been raised from 350 to 550. I would favour a smaller number of proposed new residents. 
I am also concerned at the proposals to build over the green space that is currently adjacent to the Lime Tree Avenue in the hospital grounds. I would favour keeping this green space. I think it is important to retain the green spaces in and around Frenchay to maintain the character of the area. 
Losing the area of woodland to the north east of the site is also disappointing although I understand that the trees have not been maintained. I think it is an area of natural habitat that enables the area to maintain several populations of wildlife. 
I am worried that local residents concerns are going to be put secondary to the desires of North Bristol NHS to maximise the amount of money they can raise from the sale of the site. However it has to be borne in mind that after NBT has moved out, we will all still be living here with the legacy of the decisions which are to be taken.  
|   |   |   
| 71. | B Morgan  
Homestead Gardens  
Frenchay | The trees behind lower Homestead Gardens do not provide an adequate screen against development at the rear of those houses. Please ask GVA to extend the Northern tree protection to the same depth in this area as shown below: |
Having experienced the concern shown by residents at last evening meeting may I make a suggestion. It would be an excellent site on which to build a retirement village. The land is flat and if two story units were built it would free up twice the number of units now in question. It would solve the traffic problems at peak times. There is only the need to build a school to replace the present one. The recreation hall required would remove the problem with the present over loading at the Village Hall. The area under conservation would remain as an amenity. The small hospital intended would serve the residents. The developer would be happy, everyone would be happy.

72. J Meering
The Admin Block, BS16 1LE

Perhaps slightly irrelevant but I just want to express what a very interesting and detailed document this is, especially all the maps.
Excellent work whoever put this together!!

73. P Morley
Frenchay

Your name and email address have been passed to me as the officer responsible for dealing with correspondence on the above subject. Perhaps I should begin by offering you my sympathy for having such a thankless task.

Having said that I would like to ask you to take note of the following points:-

1. I think it reasonable to strongly advocate that greater weight is given to the views of residents whose dwellings actually have a boundary with the hospital site or are equally as close and that that weighting should be reduced as the distance of dwellings from the site increases.

2. As far as I am able to ascertain the present population of Frenchay is about 1200 or thereabouts. The density of housing development proposed in the latest publication at 550 dwellings would increase that population by some 100%. This seems to me to be a totally unreasonable increase to impose on a village with the unique characteristics of Frenchay. Half of this number would be substantial.

3. There seem to be differing views as to the effect that the change in use of the site might have on traffic conditions. Whatever the truth of this turns out to be the opportunity must be taken to reduce on street parking and improve the safety of access to and egress from the hospital site and other properties in the immediate area.

4. There are areas of woodland and unmanaged ground on the site which are important to the wellbeing of wildlife especially birds in the whole area and not just the site itself. This facility must be preserved as far as can be done by ensuring that the maximum possible amount of this type of environment stays even if it has to be managed to a limited extent to make it compatible with the rest of the site.

5. If the proposed primary school were to be built close to Cedar Hall boundary with due consideration to the wildlife point made above I would find that more acceptable than dwellings in the same position.

6. The various organisations both public and private with an interest in maximising the return to be made on this project have resources available to them which far exceed those of the local residents. In considering what I am sure will be a multiplicity of representations I hope the people who make the final decisions will have that in mind and I hope that the
relevant planning regulations that will be applied with sympathy to the underdogs rather than the big guns.

| 74. | P Mather  
| BS16 2SZ |  

I write further to the meeting at Frenchay Village Hall on 3rd September 2012, to consider the proposed development of the Frenchay Hospital site. I have a number of concerns regarding the GVA proposals as outlined in their Draft Concept Statement.

My 3 main concerns centre around the following areas:

1. The destruction of open spaces and trees
2. The density of the proposed development
3. The apparent indifference to traffic congestion

**The destruction of open spaces and trees:**

The Draft Concept Statement 2012 FAQ document makes it clear that the plan is to remove as many inconvenient obstacles as possible so that only a few 'key trees' are left. GVA are then able to sell the maximum amount of land for development. This will obviously benefit the North Bristol NHS Trust financially, but the GVA proposals would cause environmental damage and affect the quality of life for people in the area.

A speaker at the FAQ meeting at Frenchay Village Hall on 3rd September 2012 stated that a survey of the lime trees in Lime Tree Avenue in 2009 described the trees as 'mid-life' as they live for 500 years.

We were also told that someone with forethought some 10 years or so ago planted some lime trees at the bottom end of the site near the museum, just in case any established lime trees required replacing.

GVA need to look again at their proposals for open space and trees – their current plan is simply not acceptable.

**The density of the proposed development:**

The published figures vary as to how many dwellings there are in Frenchay currently.

They range from 683 (as per the Parish Plan) to 1100 (which is the number of homes to which Frenchay News is delivered).

I understand the variance is to do with housing adjoined to Frenchay, South Gloucestershire which is technically in Bristol, but they are geographically and in every other sense, part of the Frenchay community who use the roads, school, churches, village hall, pub and all other amenities.

If one adds the Frenchay community figure of 1100 homes to the GVA's proposed 550 new homes, a total of 1783 is achieved. With a population density of approximately 2.4 persons per dwelling that is a total population of 3960 persons.

The existing village hall which acts as a social hub for the village would be unable to cope with the demands of nearly 4,000 people, yet the GVA's proposals offer no suggestion as to how community facilities could be improved. Either a new Village Hall or Community Centre with sufficient parking is required as part of the new development.

There is mention of a GP Surgery "if there is a demonstrated need for additional primary care capacity". Focusing solely upon the proposed 'new' residents to Frenchay is likely to inappropriately skew any decision on a new GP surgery.
Surely GVA are not expecting nearly 4000 people, when sick, to fight the increased traffic to drive to a doctor in another area? The only alternative would be to rely upon a patchy bus service that would similarly have to battle the more densely packed local roads instigated by GVA proposals.

The apparent indifference to traffic congestion

At the present time, local roads are unable to cope efficiently with the traffic caused by people commuting either into the City or attempting to access the outer ring road and motorway network. I experience this problem currently on a daily basis. The sheer volume of rush hour traffic means it can take me 30 minutes to travel the short distance (perhaps 1 mile) from my house in Grange Park to the junction of the M3.

There is nothing in the Draft Concept Statement to indicate what road infrastructure is proposed to cope with the increased level of population. It is worth noting also that the current population of Frenchay is skewed demographically, with a higher than average proportion of retired residents. It is unlikely that pattern will be repeated across the new dwellings, meaning the number of commuters travelling at rush hour will in fact increase disproportionately to the current situation.

The number of man hours lost and the amount of pollution being created must be colossal and the GVA proposal of such a high total population increase will only compound the issues. As far as I am aware no traffic count data has been made available to the public. This should be done in order to show true and expected traffic flows, and to make it clear to the public what is going to be done to ease this problem.

All of these issues link into one another, and the answer is to build less houses, so that the roads are less congested, trees would not be put at risk, so that there are more open spaces and less demand upon the amenities and more room for new ones.

Frenchay is a unique and delightful place to live, and I ask that South Gloucestershire Council places quality of life at the top of the list of objectives in relation to these draft proposals and not allow GVA to ruin a community in the interest of making as much money as possible for the North Bristol NHS Trust.

Following the recent meeting at Frenchay Village Hall on 3rd September 2012, I have a number of concerns regarding the GVA proposals which have been outlined in their Draft Concept Statement.

The 3 main issues of concern are as follows:

- The destruction of open spaces and trees
- The density of the proposed development
- The apparent indifference to traffic congestion

The destruction of open spaces and trees:

The Draft Concept Statement 2012 FAQ document makes it clear that the plan is to remove as many inconvenient obstacles as possible so that only a few ‘key trees’ are left. GVA are then able to sell the maximum amount of land for development. This will obviously benefit the North Bristol NHS Trust financially, but the GVA proposals would cause environmental damage and affect the quality of life for people in the area.
A speaker at the FAQ meeting at Frenchay Village Hall on 3.09.2012 stated that a survey of the lime trees in Lime Tree Avenue in 2009 described the trees as 'mid life' as they live for 500 years.

We were also informed that someone with forethought 10 years or so ago planted some lime trees at the bottom end of the site near the museum, just in case any established lime trees required replacing.

GVA need to look again at their proposals for open space and trees – their current plan is simply not acceptable.

The density of the proposed development:

The published figures vary as to how many dwellings there are in Frenchay currently.

They range from 683 (as per the Parish Plan) to 1100 (homes to which Frenchay News is delivered).

I understand the variance is to do with housing adjoined to Frenchay (South Glos) which are technically in Bristol, but they are geographically and in every other sense, part of the Frenchay community who use the roads, school, churches, village hall, pub and all other amenities.

If one adds the Frenchay community figure of 1100 homes to the GVA's proposed 550 new homes, a total of 1783 is achieved.

With a population density of approximately 2.4 persons per dwelling that is a total population of 3960 persons.

The existing Village Hall which acts as a social hub for the village would be unable to cope with the demands of nearly 4,000 people, yet the GVA's proposals offer no suggestion as to how community facilities could be improved.

The current pre-school in the Village Hall would be unable to cope with the number of children that would be living in Frenchay and it is completely unacceptable for GVA to expect families to travel to a pre-school in another area. Either a new Village Hall or Community Centre with sufficient parking is required as part of the new development.

There is mention of a GP Surgery "if there is a demonstrated need for additional primary care capacity".

Focusing solely upon the proposed 'new' residents to Frenchay is likely to skew any decision on a new GP surgery.

Surely GVA are not expecting nearly 4000 people, when sick, to fight the increased traffic to drive to a doctors in another area?

An alternative would be to rely upon a patchy bus service which would have to battle the more densely packed local roads instigated by GVA proposals.

The apparent indifference to traffic congestion

At the present time, local roads are unable to cope efficiently with the traffic caused by people commuting either into the City or attempting to access the outer ring road and motorway network. There is nothing in the Draft Concept Statement to indicate what road infrastructure is proposed to cope with this level of population.

As far as I am aware no traffic count data has been made available to the public. This should be done in order to show true and expected traffic flows, and to make it clear to the public what is going to be done to ease this problem.

All of these issues link into one another, and the answer is to build less houses, so that the roads are less congested, trees...
would not be put at risk, so that there are more open spaces and less demand upon the amenities and more room for new ones.

Frenchay is a unique and delightful place to live, and I ask that South Gloucestershire Council places quality of life at the top of the list of objectives in relation to these draft proposals and not allow GVA to ruin a community in the interest of making as much money as possible for the North Bristol NHS Trust.

| 76. | Mr H W Milkins  
| BS16 1NP | May I express my concerns with the above development proposals particularly in respect of the possible density of the new dwellings and the impact on the visual amenity which now exists on the hospital site.  

A development of up to 550 homes/flats will lead to a huge increase in traffic flows on the surrounding roads. At present, Beckspool Road is used regularly as a rat-run by drivers wishing to avoid the ring roads with its traffic lights and 2+ lane, and unless the problems is given careful consideration I fear the situation will worsen.

I also believe that attention should be given to harmonisation within the development in order that buildings should blend in well and make an attractive adjunct to the village and the common land which adjoins.

My chief concern is that the nature Reserve and all the mature and memorial trees should be retained. I appreciate the need for the new Primary school on site, but why were the developers not constrained to building only, on the land already occupied by the hospital and car parking areas?

I trust that you will take these concerns into account when deciding the way forward. |

| 77. | K Morrison  
| Frenchay Resident | p.17 Issue 4  

- I am concerned that the Team Response says there will be ‘possible healthcare provision’ on the site and would like to know what will happen on the 2.5 hectares of reserved land if provision is not made for a healthcare centre. I believe there is a real need for a GP surgery within this site especially due to the increased number of residents who will be moving into the new houses. Many current residents use the GP surgery in Fishponds which is either a car journey or 2 buses away. As the local area and South Gloucestershire is losing the Frenchay A&E provision I would like to see a drop-in clinic and GP surgery on this site.

- Regarding the tennis courts. At the moment the tennis club courts are sited in front of Frenchay Park House which I understand will be considered for planning at a later date. I fear that plans will be drawn up to use the land on the main site for the school and houses in this first phase but when planning for Frenchay Park House is discussed the courts may have nowhere to be relocated to unless they are included in the planning discussions at this stage.

- The Team’s Response regarding amenities simply mentions the museum and open spaces. I feel this is lacking in imagination and that this could be an opportunity to provide exciting community facilities in the area for families, home workers and social activities including perhaps a workspace cafe, arts centre or shop. |

p.17 Issue 5  

- I notice that the option for a Village Centre for the area has already ‘been dismissed’. I wonder if this could be
reconsidered as I feel that this could be an amenity for the area and perhaps this had been dismissed early on because most people were initially focussed on the issues of density and conservation when initial proposals were drawn up for this development before community facilities were really explored.

p.22 6.7
I have concerns that planning is being made for a 1 form school entry Primary School with land being reserved for 2 form entry size. I would like the Council to be clear about what will happen to this reserved land if the school remains at 1 form entry - could planning permission be made at a later stage for yet more housing (which of course would impact on provision needed in the school). Also if the school is built on part of the Conservation area or existing open spaces I would like to see an equitable sized area of open space being provided for in compensation for this within another part of the site.

p26
The Vision Statement for this development states that the development would bring ‘...quality integrating redevelopment and community infrastructure’ to the site but I feel that the Concept Statement seriously lacks clarity in the vision for community infrastructure within this development.

p28 8.1
• I am concerned that the style of housing is using the layout of the hospital site as an excuse to have high density housing. It states that it would build to ‘reflect the existing 1940’s Ward format linear grain’ and ‘taking reference from the density of existing build form’. Surely a new housing plan does not have to reflect the hospital layout.

• I notice there is a Gateway Development drawn on the plan, near the museum, with no explanation about what this is and how many dwellings it might involve. I am concerned these details may get overlooked if they are not made explicit.

My final comments are more general.
Firstly I would like to see the Frenchay Park House and Stables remain within the current planning application so that this space can be considered alongside the main site in terms of total housing density or space for potential community usage. By considering it at a later date we could miss the opportunity to be creative with the space in the overall consideration for the plan and I would not like to see yet another request for residential use applied for at a later date especially if adequate community facilities have not been included in the first planning stage.

Finally I would welcome the idea of some provision for a retirement development to be considered within the plans for new houses in the scheme as this could encourage a mixed community on the site.

78. H Miller
    D Owen Davies
    D Miller
    BS16 1LR

There are several points we wish to make about the development of the Frenchay Hospital site.
Firstly, we feel that the local community has not had adequate time to fully digest such a complex development and the impact it will have on the local residents/community. Moreover we have not been given enough information to enable us to make relevant comments/raise concerns, and any such information we have had has been subject to various changes.

From the current information we have, our main concerns are as follows:
a) It was stated in the South Gloucestershire Strategic Plan that the anticipated number of houses for the Frenchay Site was 350 and now it is 550, so from the word go the goal posts have been moved - why?

The density of the site is a major concern, as a high density development will have a negative and detrimental impact on the residents/community/green, open spaces.

b) The development of Trust HQ and the stable block appears to have been removed from the application - why?

c) Volume and traffic management is a considerable issue for the area as a whole yet a detailed traffic management survey still needs to be undertaken. Without a detailed survey it is difficult to comment. Will this be undertaken so we can at least comment on how future traffic movements will effect Frenchay and the wider area? To say “future traffic movements will be well below existing movement” is not adequate. Traffic may be reduced by hospital workers no longer driving to the hospital but this is a different pattern to that of people driving from the area to get to work/school/shopping outside of the local area. Already, residents trying to leave for work/school are joining an already saturated road system. Future development will add to the already significant congestion.

d) Any development of the green, open spaces is unacceptable. With the building of a housing development on the site it is even more crucial conservation areas and green spaces are preserved. Such areas should be handed over to the parish council for safe keeping and future maintenance. The hospital to date has failed in its obligations to properly maintain the woodlands and open space and should now not be rewarded by being able to build on any such area. Apparently the argument is some of the trees/woodland area is “unsafe” and such trees should be removed - allowing for houses?

Again it is difficult to comment. If the woodlands and trees in question had been properly maintain would there still be a question of their removal?

e) The need for a new school is already recognised. However, the two preferred locations seem more aligned to maximising profits for the hospital with little regard for the residents or the community at large. Both proposals in the concept statement would entail the development of the open spaces (see above). We strongly oppose a school being built on the site by Frenchay Museum. This would particularly impact on the green space and remove it from community use.

In general, our concerns are about the density of the housing on the site and taken in conjunction with all the other development in South Gloucestershire this is a major concern. The development of the open spaces is strongly opposed by us and I understand the community. Concerning the open spaces it is paramount such areas are handed over to the Parish Council so a developer can not acquire them to add to their “land bank” to develop at any stage in the future. I understand developer already has a green field site at Mangotsfield in their “land bank” to develop at later stage/ relaxation to current legislation about green field sites. Suggesting the developer is responsible for such areas is wholly unacceptable.

As previously stated we have not had either enough time or information to properly comment about such a complex development and the impact it will have on local residents and wider community.

It is important the community has clarification about the density of the housing (i.e. number of units), traffic movements from a detailed traffic survey, the situation of the school and how we can ensure the preservation of the green open space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 79. | Mr A H Newman BS16 1NB | Resident for over 50 years.  
Concerned at:  
- 550 dwellings will increase traffic pressures – already congestion and on street parking.  
- Need local GP surgery.  
- Proposals would undermine the village status as a Conservation Area  
- The process has lacked local democratic input.  
- Views of local residents should prevail over those of property developer – without this will remain totally opposed to the development. |
| 80. | J Norton      | We have lived in this beautiful village for 26 years and are appalled at the proposal to build 550 houses on the hospital site.  
The village which has evolved slowly through the years to become one of the foremost examples of an English village would be lost in sprawl of housing and traffic.  
As has been previously proposed conservation orders should be imposed on village open spaces to restrict developers.  
It is estimated that 3,000 vehicles an hour pass through the village at peak times. The addition of hundreds of homes will ensure gridlock which is experienced by people at present who are unable to park in the vicinity of their homes. The priority should be - how best can this village be preserved whatever development takes place?  
The proposed number of houses, which has steadily increased since initial proposals, should be decreased.  
A full analysis of traffic flow and parking must be provided. |
| 81. | T Norton      | The hospital is being demolished and we have to accept that housing will be the main concern of the developers.  
The number of units is increasing every time a new paper is being published.  
350 to begin with and that was thought to be too many, increasing to 550 which I think is far too many for the site.  
With only 680 homes existing in Frenchay at the present, this increase of almost 100% will be intolerable from many points of view.  
Traffic management, schooling, loss of open space affecting the landscape and the view from the common.  
The heritage of this village could be put at risk by lack of control over the developers by the South Glos. Council.  
The tree preservation order dated 18th March 2010 appears to cover only half the hospital site and the majority of trees covered are only about 30 years old.  
Many mature trees and the rest of the site do not appear to be covered.  
Why?  
British Standards No. 5837.  
States that on a new development where trees exist, they should be used as a design tool and enhance the development.  
Will South Glos. ensure that this is carried out?  
The number of beds in the planned community hospital has reduced since the first plan was published, a GP surgery has also been dropped and this is an urgently required service. |
| 82. | Mr & Mrs T J Olpin | Concerned at 550 dwellings: |
| BS16 1LW | o Will impact on hospital grounds and bring 12-1300 people.  
o Roads cannot cope.  
o Bus services are inadequate  
o Road safety concerns for young and elderly – paths too narrow.  
o Reducing numbers would ease pressures and leave space for sports, social and GP facilities etc. |
| --- | --- |
| 83. Mr R Olds  
BS16 1PH | o Too many houses proposed – will change character of area.  
o Existing GP two bus journeys away in Fishponds – need local provision.  
o Parking – need adequate provision for residents, school etc – need information to be published.  
o Traffic congestion will be worse.  
o Need to see detailed appraisal of impact on historic environment and Conservation Area.  
o Urgent renovation is required of Listed Buildings and a proposal for their future use. |
| 84. Mrs A Olds  
BS16 1PH | o Number of dwellings – is too high – fat too large influx of people into the village – will destroy character.  
o Need a GP surgery – existing provision is not adequate – and also pharmacy. Perhaps annexed to new cottage hospital.  
o Existing GP two bus journeys away in Fishponds – not good when unwell. |
| 85. R Oram  
BS16 1LS | I would like to register my concerns over the publicised plans for the proposed development of the Frenchay Hospital site.  
1. **Scale of development.** As a resident of Frenchay Village I am concerned that the number of proposed dwellings is excessive and will have a severe adverse impact on the current village and its inhabitants:  
   • The size and nature of the development will overwhelm the current village and will completely spoil what is a beautiful, historical and treasured conservation area.  
   • The additional traffic generated by this number of residential dwellings will make life impossible for existing villagers  
      I strongly feel that the development should be scaled down to a more appropriate number of dwellings – perhaps 300?  
2. **Loss of Tennis Courts.** As villagers we have always benefited from use of the tennis courts on the hospital site. As villagers we have been entitled to join the Frenchay Hospital Tennis Club and both adults and children make regular use of this facility. Often non-members also use this Facility either as guests or when not in use |
by members.

I strongly feel that the development should recognise this facility and either preserve the courts for village use and/or provide alternative courts on the site.

86. L Oram

As a resident of Frenchay for 40 years I wish to express my serious concern at the proposal to build 550 homes on the site of Frenchay Hospital and to make the following points:

1. 550 homes is far too many for a site of that size – 200 should be the maximum considered for a village the size of Frenchay to absorb.

2. Frenchay's character which is unique is there for the benefit of residents and visitors alike, and would be destroyed by this development with its sole aim of making money.

3. The roads are already congested but would obviously be far more so. Without proper infrastructure it would be impossible to get into or out of Frenchay for the gridlock.

4. The tennis court, which is the only valuable sports asset shared by the community and residents is never mentioned and would be an irreplaceable loss. Old and young share the health benefits provided.

If the development is build it cannot be un-built and a beautiful village would be destroyed. Please do not let this happen.

87. Helen and Mike Owen.
(Submitted by R Edmond)

See also separate email below

1) The height and density of the buildings - the less dense the proposed housing for the site the less impact on the local community, traffic congestion and local resources/infrastructure. The proposed number of houses would more than double the size of the present local community

2) The site of the school - we strongly object to the school be built on the proposed site by the museum. This would undoubtedly encroach on the green space! Loosing this space would have a negative/detrimental impact on the community. Not only is the character of the village to be changed by the building of the proposed housing but to loose any of the green space in the process would be extremely detrimental to the local community. The proposed plans play on the fact that the local community would benefit from improved facilities and have access to green open pace. This would not be the case if the school is built on this site. Moreover the report states that the school being proposed is in excess of projected pupil numbers - to build a school not only bigger than is actually required but to build it and reduce local access to the green space is not acceptable. Apart from the loss of green space it would further add to the already obvious traffic congestion and be more of a safety hazard than it is at present.

3) We appreciate that a compromise will have to be achieved but the views of the existing community need to be listened to and taken in to account in finalising the plans. As above the main issues for us are the height and density of the housing, bearing in mind the overall number of houses being built in South Gloucestershire, particularly in the immediate surrounding area to the hospital site- the greater the number of houses the greater the impact all round. Finally the green space needs to be protected.
| 88. | T Oram  
BS16 1LB | I would like to register my concerns over the publicised plans for the proposed development of the Frenchay Hospital site. We have only recently bought a house in the area, and did so largely because of the small quiet village feel. As such I am very concerned about the scale of development. I am concerned that the number of proposed dwellings is excessive and will have a severe adverse impact on the current village and its inhabitants:  
- The size and nature of the development will overwhelm the current village and will completely spoil what is a beautiful, historical and treasured conservation area.  
- The additional traffic generated by this number of residential dwellings will make life impossible for existing villagers  
I strongly feel that the development should be scaled down to a more appropriate number of dwellings.  
Another concern I have is the Loss of the Frenchay Hospital Tennis Courts. I grew up in the village and have used these courts for around 20 years of my life. I personally view these courts as key to the social side of the village using the courts both to exercise in and meet up with people on. The tennis club that meets there on a Monday evening provides the opportunity for people throughout the village to get to know each other better and build a strong community.  
I strongly feel that the development should recognise this facility and either preserve the courts for village use and/or provide alternative courts on the site for use of Frenchay tennis club. |
| 89. | Mr R Oaten.  
BS16 1NH | I write to express my concerns at the proposed development at the Frenchay hospital site.  
My wife and I moved to Cedar Hall 28 years ago and have loved the area since then. We always considered it “A village”... The overriding concern we have is that we will lose the village and become lost in the urban sprawl or even a Mini-Satellite Town! A whole swath of green will be lost.  
The traffic situation is already madness and to be considering another 550+ houses is wrong!!!. Yes a new school is wanted and can be accepted as part of the developments to come, but the numbers of houses do NOT equate for this place.  
I trust you will register my concerns and reconsider better options.  
Please listen to the people of Frenchay... we all want a realistic satisfactory resolution |
| 90. | A Pinder  
Co-ordinator,  
Friends of the Earth  
South Gloucestershire  
BS35 1NA | We apologise for the lateness of this response.  
Briefly, we found this statement confusing, unimaginative and unsympathetic to the environment.  
The statement is badly written, so we had great difficulty understanding it.  
We infer that the intention is to destroy all trees and wildlife that they are not obliged to keep. Because of the size of the site, a little imagination should find ways to keep most if not all of the woodland, thus preserving not only the tree cover but also the wildlife that lives there. |
Because of the size and position of the site and its existing trees and listed buildings, this is a rare opportunity to build a high quality urban village. If a much lower proportion of the land were devoted to roads and parking then both a better environment and higher dwelling density could be provided, sufficient to support a centre of shops and other services and a public transport node, reducing the need for car ownership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>91. Jacqui Parsons</th>
<th>I personally think that some of the land should be retained for at least ten years to protect the Trust. Land prices are extremely high and we have a commodity that if (I am of course not saying it will) the new hospital proves to be too small then the land is already there for the Trust to use (at no purchase cost) with limited Permissions needing to be sought. If the new hospital does prove adequate the land would have not decreased in value but increased in value and provide a valuable boost to the Trust’s income ten years down the road.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Bristol NHS Trust Southmead Hospital BS10 5NB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>92. M and L Pick</th>
<th>Can I please register my concerns and objection to the proposed density of 550 Houses and dwellings on the Frenchay site. My concerns are ;-) * The Concept report is vague (no detail for example on the Traffic survey) and the Maths on the Density calculations very suspect as recorded at the Residents meeting last night , 3 Sept. * The 550 dwellings will in my opinion ;-) 1. Cause chaotic congestion on the surrounding roads 2. Endanger the Conservation Area within the Hospital grounds that must be kept Green 3. Over burden existing infrastructure or lack thereof........i.e. The community Centre is only a may be, there are no shops, play areas such bas swings etc or a Doctors surgery. 4.Cause a compromise on design that would with less Density allow for a more open and Village type architecture and lay out sympathetic to the old Village. I am also concerned that the ‘fourth’ option for the School, i.e. at the top of the Clic Cottage road at T junction with Lime Avenue has not been fully considered or indeed the School governors invited to comment on this location. It would appear to be a strong contender. Finally due to the above I would welcome ;-) A complete re-write, a version 2 of the concept report covering the above concerns. Overall I believe a reduction in the number of dwellings is essential to address these issues and the unique environment of Frenchay.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS16 1 LZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 93. | Mrs S Peters  
BS16 1NH |
|---|---|
| I am Chairman of Cedar Hall Management Company Limited, a 2 ½ acre estate comprising 31 apartments abutting the north east boundary of the Frenchay Hospital development site.  
All residents here have been notified of the existence of the current Concept Statement and those who wished have had sight of this document. I have had a number of residents contact me verbally and in writing who wished me to write to you registering their concerns. They have been advised that it would be more appropriate to write to South Gloucestershire Council personally but they asked if I would make you aware of the general issues they have regarding this development.  
We are extremely concerned that an area of woodland and nature reserve, including a small pond on this redevelopment site (W1 on the TPO map dated 15 September 2010) and the woodland buffer zone adjacent to properties on Malmains Drive (W2 on the TPO map) are being considered for inclusion into the developable area. In addition the boundary of the hospital site, on the east of the site, contains a substantial number of mature trees and a large Yew hedge adjoining the nature reserve and our boundary wall and this is also earmarked for development. This area forms a link between the two TPO sites and a safe corridor for wildlife, birds and a general habitat for other creatures.  
We appreciate that the grounds of Frenchay Hospital do not have any formal designation in nature conservation terms but we believe they have a general value to natural woodland and wildlife. We believe that the nature reserve specifically has received various grants over a number of years which would not have been made if these areas had no value to wildlife. Quite recently deer have been seen in the nature reserve and badgers have been seen in the vicinity.  
We would like to see the retention of a buffer zone around the perimeter of the site and suggest that the green spaces and boundary areas be upgraded to conservation status, ideally being gifted to the parish council in order that they can maintain these areas, as they currently do with the common land.  
With regard to the development site, we believe that the current proposed density of homes in the Concept Statement is out of proportion to the existing area and certainly not in keeping with the CS16 statement that the new development should be ‘informed by the character of the local area’. The proposed number of housing units has increased substantially, by over 50%, since the initial discussion at the January 2012 workshop. In our opinion the whole developable area should be reduced.  
Finally a number of residents here have no objection to the option shown in the Concept Statement siting the proposed school in the north east area of the site but, until plans are confirmed as to the nature and size of the housing proposed as an alternative to this school, are unable to make a balanced judgement on any alternative option available. They do appreciate however that there may be a more appropriate site being proposed, on the site of the current day hospital, for the primary school that would ensure a more cohesive approach and integration of the school into the existing community. | 94. | Chris Peters  
BS16 1NH |
|---|---|
| I am writing to register my concerns regarding the Concept Statement for the redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital.  
I am extremely concerned that the pond, woodland and area adjacent to Malmains Drive, shown on the TPO map are now being considered for development. In fact that I understand that the TPO areas may be ‘nibbled’ into causes me great concern as this seems contrary to the whole point of TPO’s. There are areas around the boundary of the site which are not }
included as a buffer zone against the development of houses and amenities and I believe that this is an important factor that should be included in the planning permission. The wildlife in this area would be greatly affected should a buffer zone not be included in the plans.

I understand that the parish council would be keen to take on maintenance of any areas that are earmarked as conservation land and would suggest that all the green spaces and the boundary areas along with the existing TPO area be upgraded to conservation land and gifted to the parish council for this purpose.

I have reviewed the plans for the development site and believe that the current proposed density of homes in the Concept Statement is out of proportion to the existing area. Why has the proposed number of units increased by over 50% since the original proposals. The number of 550 units will be of a substantial greater density than the existing area and not in keeping with the village character and the character of the local area. I believe that the whole developable area should be reduced.

I fully support the proposed site of the school on the north east of the site but in order to obtain integration with the village suggest that the existing primary school be utilised to accommodate a nursery school (currently the playgroup is in the village hall).

I would prefer if the existing village hall be allocated funds from the redevelopment in order to upgrade the facilities rather than have a new build community facility on the development site. This would ensure that the link between the new community and the village is enhanced.

I believe that a satellite health centre would be a welcome facility, as the additional residents on the new site will require these facilities and a doctors surgery in the immediate area would help alleviate some of the associated problems with traffic congestion and the limited public transport service which the existing residents have to currently negotiate.

My responses to the questions are as follows:

1. Clarity - The document proposes clear development principles.
2. Principles - I agree that the proposed redevelopment should primarily be for residential development. However, I feel that there should be more emphasis on community facilities (see below 6.1 and 6.2).
3. Surveys - The proposals ignore and fail to safeguard the importance both to the Frenchay Community and Council Policy of open spaces in and adjacent to the Frenchay Conservation Area.
4. Consultation - This has been a satisfactory process in that it has responded to residents comments and modified proposals. However, by initially asking one resident to set up the Frenchay User Group (FUG) and the subsequent timings of meetings, it has meant that some residents have been excluded from the discussions. It also means that GVA responded to the most vociferous residents only and not necessarily to an objective community view. I acknowledge that the Parish Council has tried to overcome this with public meetings. I feel that time constraints and the complexity of documentation make it difficult to have a true community response.
5. Specific comments - I disagree with the proposal to locate the school in one of two options (Pages 29 fig9 and 33 options 1 &2) i.e. near the Museum or behind Cedar Hall. There is also a proposal that part of the Suburban Residential Area1 (Page 28, 8.1.5 and Page 29 fig9) uses part of the open space behind Cedar Hall. I believe the
Council should insist on maintaining the Frenchay Conservation Area and the Protected Open Spaces i.e. areas covered by Historic Parks and Gardens (Policy L10) and Open Spaces (Policy L5). Any development, including residential, school, or hospital and social facilities should surely only be allowed on areas that have previously been developed.

6. Other related issues –

6.1. In 2009 every Frenchay household received a questionnaire as part of the Winterbourne Parish Plan Survey (WVPP). This attempted to engage every resident in the community and establish community views and priorities. The results demonstrated the importance of open spaces to our community.

For example:

When asked about the most important aspects of the Frenchay environment, 419 residents said Green Open Spaces, 479 said Frenchay Common, and 356 said The Conservation area.

When asked about the management of green spaces, 405 residents wanted to maintain the green spaces within the hospital grounds.

There were individual comments about the hospital site, but to date none of these have been published. Typically these included “If the hospital closes, the site should be made a Conservation Area” and “include Frenchay Hospital and its grounds, if not already included”

Thus the Parish Plan Group survey, which predates the current consultation process, supports the activities of the current FUG.

6.2. The need for improved Community facilities such as a daytime meeting place and a café were clearly identified in the WVPP survey. The major increase in resident population implied by 550 dwellings surely indicates a need for community facilities over and above those already identified. Whilst GVA included these after the original stakeholder meeting, it has eliminated the provision of community facilities at subsequent meetings. It has stated that community facilities would be available in out of school hours on the school site. Frenchay Village Hall representatives have also identified a need for more preschool facilities during the day. Surely these daytime needs should be addressed in the draft concept statement, as any developer would be unlikely to provide these unless already specified in the subsequent outline planning permission.

6.3. Frenchay is a somewhat fragmented community, consisting of four areas: The Village, Malmains, Riverwood and Other Fringe areas. The WVPP survey has already identified a need to develop a cohesive community. Whilst the current consultation exercise may be having a positive effect in this respect, I believe residents in the new development will always be alienated by our existing community unless a more satisfactory compromise is tabled by GVA.

6.4. The listed buildings are being treated as a separate planning exercise. The Concept Statement however, fails to acknowledge that these could ultimately become additional residential dwellings and that there would be an additional impact on Frenchay.

6.5. If economic and/ or Trust restructuring restraints prevent the provision of a community hospital then any land set aside for this could also become residential. I appreciate that my last two points (6.4 and 6.5) in planning terms
cannot be considered, but I do feel that the implications for our Frenchay community should be taken into account and in this sense, the site treated as a whole.

6.6. The transport studies appear to relate to volume of traffic entering/leaving the site. Has the volume of external traffic that sometimes causes gridlock along Beckspool Road/Begbrook Park and Bristol Road/Frenchay Park Road been considered? Similarly, has the volume of traffic that uses the hospital site as a rat run in peak hours also been accounted for in the calculations?

6.7. There is a strip of land in Begbrook Park, opposite St John Fisher, which is bounded by the hospital chain link fence on one side and the historic retaining wall on the other. Is this owned by South Gloucestershire or the hospital trust? If owned and maintained by South Gloucestershire it will have been excluded in the hospital survey and any protected wildlife activity in this and adjacent areas will not have been taken into consideration in the draft concept statement.

2nd response includes details of Parish Plan findings.

The draft concept statement is not acceptable and I reject it with particular regard to the following:

1. Density of proposed units
As I understand it the present population of the immediate Frenchay village area in which the site is located is approx 650-700 persons, the population within the wider Frenchay boundary being of the order of 1250 people. If the proposed 550 units are constructed, the resulting additional 1200-1300 residents or more would have the effect of doubling or trebling the Frenchay population. Frenchay would be swamped and its defining character irrevocably lost. Whilst I agree that the development should, subject to my comments below, be mainly residential the proposed 550 units is excessive and must be reduced to preserve the character of Frenchay.

The retention of Frenchay Park House and Stable Block for its current use is stated to be for the interim (section 6.2, p22). Subsequent conversion of these buildings into apartments would further increase the unit density on the site and these buildings must not therefore be treated separately. They must be included within the draft Concept Statement.

The Conservation Area and Tree Preservation Orders must be respected and not developed for construction purposes.

With regard to the woodlands around the northern boundary of the site and the NE corner of the site I fail to understand how a TPO which has been in force barely 2 years can be seemingly swept aside in any part, bearing in mind the reasons for granting the Order. (There is contradiction in the draft Concept Statement over the future of the northern boundary woodlands – see fig 7 on p21 and fig 8 on p25)

A new school must not be located on Conservation Area land. A suitable location for the school, facing the top of the access road leading from the Common, has been suggested but not included as an option. This location would assist in achieving the stated aim of integrating the new development with the existing village.

2. Community needs
Apart from the school there is no realistic provision for the needs of a much enlarged community and there seems to have been no meaningful research into or analysis of what exactly those needs might be, for example sports facilities and GP surgery as a minimum. It is inconceivable that the existing Frenchay Village Hall could cope on its own with the needs of a population 2 or 3 times larger than at present.
For many years land in Malmains Drive has been earmarked for the construction of a new school. Construction of a new school within the hospital site would release the Malmains Drive land for housing development and this would further increase pressure for adequate community amenities provision. Whilst such development is clearly not within the remit of the draft Concept Statement its potential impact must not be ignored in considering the draft Statement in the context of amenity provision within Frenchay.

3 Parking and Traffic
The draft Concept Statement refers to analysis of traffic flows into and out of the existing hospital site (section 4.7, issue 2, p16) but does not publish its analysis. It does not acknowledge that the present comings and goings are spread throughout the day whereas as a largely residential site most traffic movements will be condensed into the rush hours at the start and end of the working day. At such times of the day at present, the existing road network struggles to cope.

The proposed new Health and Social Care Centre is stated to have dedicated parking provision. ‘Dedicated’ is not quantified or defined but should be. The current parking problems throughout Frenchay are in large part caused by the Trust’s policy of restricting staff parking on site. The result is, in my road at least, the majority of parked cars are those of hospital staff and are therefore parked for the duration of their (often lengthy) work shifts. The draft Concept Statement refers only to an anticipated reduction in on-street staff parking (section 4.7, issue 2, p16). If the Trust’s policy is unaltered in relation to the new Health and Social Care Centre then the problem of parked cars causing residents’ difficulties of access to their own homes will remain. The draft Concept Statement should therefore provide for and define realistic allocation of adequate staff parking as well as for patients and visitors, within the new Health facility footprint.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>97.</th>
<th>Mrs Jen Palfreman BS16 1PQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I cannot accept the draft Concept Statement in its present form and I therefore think it should be rejected. I am concerned first and foremost about the loss of Frenchay’s character which will result from so many housing units being built. I believe the development should be mostly residential but 550 units is too many in the available space and not at all in keeping with the current housing density in Frenchay. A doubling (or more) in the number of Frenchay’s residents will destroy the atmosphere which makes Frenchay the attractive place which it is today and has been traditionally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am also concerned that no provision seems to have been made in the Draft Statement for amenities for the numbers of people envisaged. Amenities such sports facilities, pre school/nursery provision and a GP surgery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No statement has been made about the longer term use for Frenchay Park House and Stables. These would almost certainly be converted to multiple residency use thus adding to the difficulties referred to above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conservation Areas must not be built upon and the Tree Protection Orders should not be interfered with, particularly as the orders were made so recently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My other main concern is parking and traffic. Currently traffic going into and out of the hospital is spread throughout the day but when the site has become residential, traffic movements will be concentrated around the morning and evening rush hours. The roads cannot cope at present so with so many additional vehicle movements at these times gridlock will occur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present NBHT policy on staff parking has made life very difficult for existing residents accessing their properties, receiving visitors or deliveries. Unless the Draft Concept Statement makes explicit a requirement for sufficient staff parking within the confines of the new Health facility boundaries, residents’ problems in the areas closest to the new facility will not be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main concern is housing number 550 dwellings:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **98. Mrs M Redmond**  
BS16 1 PQ | o Frenchay is a pleasant place with a mix of social classes..  
o Recent development has evolved – to accommodate modest change – but character remains – now at risk.  
o How can site accommodate 550 dwellings and a school, open spaces, community facilities etc?  
o Too many packed in too tightly – poor planning and social consequences.  
o Should not be a new community within a community.  
o Look to other uses to complement housing – sports facilities, medical park, Libraries, elderly peoples housing – avoids large influx of new residents.  
o Need GP surgery.  
o Need improved public transport  
o Need new shops.  
o Need better/wider roads.  
o Only allow up to 150 dwellings.  
o Call on local councillors to support call for a reduced scheme. |
| **99. Dr J V Redmond**  
BS16 1PQ | o Want people to refuse this ludicrous plan.  
o Forward all comments to local Councillors.  
o Conservation land – trees covered by TPOs – were planted to replace those lost to Dutch elm disease.  
o Need tree surveys to be made publicly available – question their health.  
o Why hasn’t Council pressured the Trust to manage the trees.  
  o Trees - Value to wildlife – future developers must fund upkeep.  
  o Nature reserve – has educational role – funded by public – mismanaged by Trust  
  o Must preserve open areas.  
  o A school would benefit form access to green spaces.  
  o Investment in Southmead – poor judgement – mortgaged. |
o 200 dwellings has increased to 550 without justification.
o Should not be a separate community.
o Traffic is dreadful – especially peak hours.
o Parking issues on common unresolved.
o Need a new school
o Protect Lime Avenue.
o Need GP Surgery – at least a branch surgery.
o Widen access to M32 and Ring Road.
o Hope issues are considered and concerned at suggestion that petitions don’t count.

100 Richards
BS16 1PH

Object most strongly to loss of Nature reserve and Wildlife Conservation area for school playing fields or residential
development.

Northern tree boundary is thin between site and 18-22 Homestead Gardens – no development near boundaries.

101 Mrs M Rathore

We are writing in response to the Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept Statement.

Please note that we are opposed to the development on the current proposed basis. South Gloucestershire Council "the
Council" invites comments under the following headings:

i. Clarity

The Concept Statement lacked detail in relation to many key points which could regarded as of significant
importance. In particular inadequate consideration has been given to detrimental effect such a large scale
development would have on the character of the village. Much of the open spaces are to be given over to
construction of buildings. The open spaces act as a natural drainage field and while superficial detail has been
provided about how water (rainfall and domestic) will be drained away from the site, academic studies carried out
on other developments which have gone ahead have shown that such large scale shrinkage of open land causes
increased risk of flooding. The council should provide more detail and make available for inspection a copy of any
survey or research paper it, or the developers have commissioned in this regard.

Inadequate information has been provided about the impact of the development on the volume of traffic in the
area. In particular the suggestion that the volume of traffic impact will be minimal and comparable to the volumes
of traffic generated by the current use of the site is regarded as unrealistic. Added traffic will cause environmental
pollution which some research has suggested could contribute to the decay of historic and important buildings.
within the village.

Proper consideration has not been given to how the volume of traffic could be reduced, for example by linking the site to a cycle track, provision of a free or subsidised, or better (more frequent) buses into Bristol, and Parkway Railway Station.

No consideration has been given to tackling the substantial carbon footprint the development will create. The Council and the developers should carry out further consultation with bodies and organisations that could help in this regard. Some of the impact could be reduced by retaining more open space (reducing the density of the homes) and planting trees in these spaces.

In relation to Fire/Police no consideration has been given in relation to the location (response times) and added burden that would be placed on already stretched services. No consideration appears to have been given to crime prevention.

The Concept Statement lacked clarity in relation to these points.

In order to provide an honest and balanced Concept Statement a further section needs to be included which sets out the disadvantages of the proposed development so as to ensure that the document does not come across as one sided – which in its present form, it does.

ii. Principles.

The proposed development is far too large. There has been gradual upward movement in the number of homes being proposed. If the proposal is followed through to implementation this will almost double the size of the dwellings and population of the area. To suggest that such large scale development would have a marginal or moderate impact on the area is wrong.

The site should be redeveloped almost exclusively for residential purposes.

iii. Surveys

We do not believe that all adequate safeguards are in place to protect the fabric, character and historic nature of the "old village" and the open spaces/grounds in the Frenchay Hospital site.

iv. Consultation

The consultation period is far too short and narrow in its remit and in some areas lack transparency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>102</th>
<th>Mr Nicholas C Roberts BS16 1PQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I attended the meeting on Tuesday 3rd September. A few issues occurred to me which might have been covered in other meetings but I am still curious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Has there ever been a mining survey done to see if any of the old Harry Stoke Mines run under there area, only I believe that Frenchay Hospital were limited to the height they could build due to the these mines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. In the 1940s, was the hospital on main drainage or on cesspits for drainage? Would there be any biological hazard from medical waste, Anthrax for example?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr Brian Moffat, archaeological director of an excavation of a medieval hospital near Edinburgh, said his team had encountered buried anthrax spores which had survived for hundreds of years. (Soutra)

3. I am not a stick in the mud and welcome change if it has been carefully thought through. I question the traffic flows around the Frenchay area and would like to see the in depth report, the flows quoted for example is this taken over 24 hours or only at rush hour? Is the number quoted over a long period, i.e. all day? If 550 or even 450 houses were to be built, how many cars would be making the run to work and school runs in the morning adding to an already over loaded road system. There are only effectively three roads in and out of the Frenchay area, one via Cleave Tea Gardens, one via Hambrook traffic lights, and the third the road to Stapleton.

4. Transport, i.e. Buses, it can be a nightmare on local services now at 7.45am, how are all these extra people going to commute to where ever?

5. Could we not get the conservation area reclassified as an SSI area?

I think the redevelopment could work a lot better with a more realistic number of properties being built, say 375 to 425, but I think with that number I believe a GP surgery should be a part of the overall grand design. Residents at present seem to be going to Cosham, Fishponds or Leap Valley surgeries, 400 extra houses for example could add another 1200 people to the area, what impact would that have on existing resources? It is difficult to get appointments now, what would it be like then?

I am also very concerned that Frenchay maintains its village like qualities, once lost it will be recovered.

I think green areas in Frenchay are very important and this should be maintained at all costs.
I have read with interest the Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept Statement and make my comments below. I have summarised the main points under the first question to avoid repetition.

1. Clarity (Do you feel that the document is clear on the development principles for the site?)

The document remains very broad brush and lacks true clarity, specifically in relation to the underpinning principles which are not explicit (section 7). In the current document there is insufficient guidance both for South Gloucestershire Council and potential developers.

i. Number of proposed dwellings
While there is clearly a stated intention to reflect and retain the character of Frenchay and this is to be welcomed, the current proposal of 550 dwellings appear very high and would almost double the current population of the parish of Frenchay.

I urge the Council to look very closely at the density of proposed housing and the impact of this on the local community. Initial proposals were for 350 dwellings.

ii. Link of new development into the existing village
The concept statement refers paths and cycle paths to link the new housing development to the existing village. However, there is no clear indication as to how this will be managed. Beckspool/Frenchay Park Road which runs across the Common from the Village Hall to the mini-roundabout is a busy thoroughfare, especially in the morning and evening when used for commuter traffic. There is no designated crossing place other than the school 'lollipop' crossing.

I urge the Council to review the traffic arrangements and to consider closing the road between the Village Hall and the mini-roundabout to through traffic. A pedestrian area could be created between the drive to the Church and the hospital access road by CLIC cottage. This would still allow access to Frenchay and Pearces's Hill, to the parish church and to the new site but would support walkers and cyclists.

iii. Retention of character of the village
I welcome the stated intention to try to reflect the architecture and atmosphere of the existing village as described in section 8 of the draft concept statement, through creating different characters for the zones of development.

I would urge the Council in addition also to consider innovation and long-term sustainability...setting this development which is in a lovely setting, at the cutting edge with different types of housing e.g. eco-houses, rather than simply replicating what exists in other local developments

iv. Integration of listed buildings
I am disappointed that despite the stated intention to preserve the heritage of the site, the decision has been made to deal separately with the sale of the two listed buildings, rather than seeing them as an integral part of the development.

I urge the Council to consider how the two developments might be more closely linked (see also comments below re. community facilities)
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **v. Community facilities** | I feel that this part of the statement referred to fleetingly in the concept statement is very under-developed.  

**Village Hall** - We have an ageing and well-used village hall - a very dedicated fundraising group attempting to carry out improvements and repairs through fundraising. The new development is an ideal opportunity to create a village hall/community centre that is fit for the next 50 years. Initially, there had been a proposal that the village hall (with perhaps a small shop or cafe could be placed in the old stables). This would help pick up many points in the vision statement (community links, sustainability, facilities)  

- **Medical facilities** - This is an ideal opportunity to look ahead to future needs and give proper consideration to a doctors' surgery and other healthcare facilities  

- **Housing for older people** - The Council may wish to consider including specialist accommodation for older people on the site e.g. similar to that provided by St Monica's Trust. Integrating this into a new community would create true integration.  

**vi. Retention of open spaces**  
I welcome the stated intention to retain open spaces and hope that all the woodland and trees around the northern perimeter will be retained. I would also hope that the number of allotments might be increased, perhaps creating some community allotments.  

**vii. Traffic and transport**  
I have concerns about the level of traffic and provision of public transport facilities and request that a specific and detailed study/analysis should be carried out and made public.  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2. Principles** (Do you agree that the site should be developed broadly as described in the draft concept statement i.e. mainly for residential development?) | I agree that residential development should be included on the site - see also comments re. density, community facilities, open spaces etc in answer to the previous section.  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3. Surveys** (Do you consider that all the key features of the site have been adequately identified and safeguarded in shaping the proposals?) | See response to question 1  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4. Consultation** (Do you agree that the consultation in developing the proposals has been generally satisfactory?) | There have been several opportunities for consultation. However, in reality very little has changed as a result e.g. in relation to housing density, transport, community facilities!  

**5. Specific comments on the document**  
See responses to question 1 above
Thank you for your e-mail in which you ask me to elaborate on the provision of community facilities on the Frenchay Hospital site. I apologise for the delay in coming back to you. I outline my suggestions briefly below, and would be very happy to expand on these if it would be helpful. As I state below, there has been very little discussion to date on this issue and to my knowledge the range of options has not been fully explored with the whole community.

**Provision of community facilities and infrastructure**

I have looked at the definitions provided in the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy document (Dec 2011). My starting point is the facilities that we currently have in place in Frenchay and how these may be enhanced/developed as part of the new development on the hospital site. I haven’t referred to medical facilities other than reference to a doctor’s surgery, nor to the new primary school as discussions are taking place elsewhere on both of these topics.

The key existing facilities in Frenchay village are:

- **the village hall** - which is well-used and well-loved with an established and active management committee. However, the hall is in urgent need of updating and renovation, and very considerable energy and resource continues to be spent on fund-raising to undertake a very gradual modernisation. In addition, there are ongoing and very valid concerns about the safety of the road exit point, particularly at busy times of day.

- **Frenchay pre-school** - this very successful and highly rated pre-school uses the village hall facilities, including a small outside space. However, I do not know if the current premises would be suitable for increased child numbers.

- **the village shop** - my personal view is that despite the efforts of the current proprietors, the shop is under-used because of its location on the far side of the hospital. As a result, it doesn’t get enough custom to be able to provide a true community service.

- **the village museum** - a highly successful venture using the lodge at the entry to the hospital.

- **the village tennis courts** - the tennis club is thriving and the community values very highly this facility

In addition we have the primary school, Frenchay church, Frenchay Chapel and the pub. All of these facilities have been developed quite separately over time.

**Opportunity provided by the development of Frenchay Hospital site - one suggestion**

The development of the hospital site now provides us with a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to re-look at Frenchay’s community facilities and to consider how they can be enhanced in order to meet the needs of the new and greatly enlarged village. In the early discussions with the NHS Trust there was talk of the development of a community hub, though this was never clearly defined. I suggest that we revisit some of the original ideas, with a view to:

1. linking the new and existing communities through providing accessible and attractive co-located facilities fit for the increased size of the new community over the next 50+ years.
2. using the some of the existing heritage buildings (the old stables) as the location. These are well situated and accessible from both the new and existing parts of the village. They provide the bridge from historic Frenchay to the new 21st century Frenchay.

Included might be some or all of the following:

- a new village hall/community/cultural centre, co-located with a small shop/cafe and the Frenchay pre-school (if not linked to the primary school).
- the museum
- a doctor's surgery?

Adjacent would be:

- the new primary school
- the tennis courts
- a children's playground?

**Why the Stables?**

A number of residents are concerned that it is proposed that the two listed buildings on the site be sold off as a 'separate package', potentially divorced from the rest of the development. If at least one of these were to be used to enhance the facilities for the village, this would be a very positive move and provide a shared focus for existing and new residents.

**Management and multi-use issues**

You refer to these in your e-mail. If existing facilities were to be co-located, all come with existing management arrangements and are run by volunteers. Presumably these would continue and be adapted if necessary.

There may be options to look at multi-use use e.g. between school and community.

**Ways forward**

The community facilities appear to have slipped off the agenda for discussion at the public meetings, as understandably the focus has been on the actual housing development. However, both the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy (para 10.74, 10.75) and the Draft Concept statement (para 7.4) do stress the need for integration and added value to the community. In the latter the primary school is the only example given.

I think that it would be very useful if through the residents' and users' group some further discussion could take place, even if broad brush at this stage. At the very least discussion should take place with all concerned parties e.g. Village Hall committee, pre-school management, tennis club, museum committee etc.

If this an area that you feel could be pursued further, and I sense that it is, what would be the timescale for the community coming up with more precise suggestions in order to meet your deadline of 28th November?
Do please contact me again if you would like to discuss issues further. I will also pass on a copy of this e-mail to the Residents' User Group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>104</th>
<th>P Rogerson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Density of housing. Number has increased from 350 to 550 this year. Paragraph 8 says this will be refined - how many more?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green spaces and woodland to be reduced - this is so important to be kept</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic. Already gridlock at times. There could be 2 or more cars for each household. Also there is no mention of garaging or parking for these dwellings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 105 | Dr G Rosenberg  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms C Rosenberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In summary our main conclusions are that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. We support the redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital Site for housing purposes, but we object strongly to the proposed number of 550 housing units which we consider to be over-intensive and unsubstantiated;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We support the development of a single Primary School for Frenchay on the hospital site, but we object to this encroaching on either the woodland area which is a nature reserve or on any of the existing green spaces;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We believe the concept statement fails to deliver on the vision for the site set out in section 7, and in particular it lacks cohesion, fails to demonstrate how it will achieve integration or sustainability, and doesn’t deliver on community infrastructure;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We believe this is a poor quality site plan and in particular that the Draft Concept Statement is lacking in evidence, is incomplete, and contains numerous errors;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We are especially concerned that the traffic flow analysis in the Concept Statement has been inadequate and it has not demonstrated that traffic flows caused by the proposed 550 housing units will be acceptable;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We believe the consultation process has been inadequate, the timing of the Concept Statement consultation has been poor (it being initiated over a holiday period), and most important of all, the views of residents have been almost entirely ignored.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these major flaws in the consultation process and the master plan it presents, we strongly urge the Council not to endorse this Draft Concept Statement.

The following sections set out our reasoning for the above conclusion.

**Clarity of Document**

We are immensely frustrated at the poor quality of Concept Statement submitted by the North Bristol Trust for the following reasons:

1. The Site Context (section 1) used for planning is too localised to be valid. It doesn’t identify: 1) shops at Cleevewood Road, in Downend and in Begbrook; 2) cycle routes on the ring road, out to UWE and the other side of Oldbury Court; 3) children’s playgrounds in Oldbury Court, Begbrook, and Heathfields; 4) Post Offices at Begbrook and Downend; and 5) employment opportunities for example at UWE, at the Emersons Green Science Park, and at Abbey Wood and other employers on the ring road. By failing to identify these amenities and places, plus the routes and distances to them, the planning fails to consider how residents in the new development will access these, whether they are sufficiently accessible, and whether additional infrastructure is needed to help people access.
these services and places of work. No consideration is therefore given in the plan to connecting the new
development to the existing cycle network or other public transport (buses and rail).

2. The plan largely fails to address the impacts of the hospital closure and the development of housing on the local area, and in particular, whether this will give rise to changes in the bus services, what level of additional pressure will fall on existing community infrastructure such as the Village Hall, playgrounds, and local doctor’s practices and dentists.

3. The sections setting out forecasted changes to traffic flows (5.7 and 6.10) are not well substantiated and appear to present a very limited analysis. We are concerned that they assess in isolation only movements to and from the hospital site, and ignore the additional significant though flows of traffic in the village. The key potential problem then arises when the analysis appears to assume that traffic flows to and from the new development will follow similar routes as those currently generated by the hospital, when it is quite probable that the destinations and therefore directions will be quite different. The concern then would be the additional impact of traffic from 550 houses leaving Frenchay during peak rush hour in the morning, and then returning in the evening. There should have been a more complete analysis of this key impact area in support of this Concept Statement to demonstrate that the impacts would be acceptable.

4. Our foremost concern is the problem of housing density and how this is handled in the plan. The potential for new houses for the Frenchay Hospital site were assessed by South Gloucestershire Council as up to 370 in the December 2010 Strategic Housing Land Availability Survey (SHLAA), and then subsequently raised to 450 in December 2011 in its ‘Core Strategy Incorporating Post Submission Changes’. For some inexplicable reason, the NBT Concept Statement for the Frenchay site in 34 pages does not even reference this critical figure or planning document. Instead, with a sleight of hand it proposes 550 houses for the site, a 22% increase over and above the current SGC SHLAA, without justification, nor the evidence to demonstrate that the impacts would be acceptable.

5. In relation to the woodlands and trees the Concept Statement notes “Further work is required firstly by the Council to confirm and update the TPO’s to reflect tree condition and presence.” Why has this issue not been resolved prior to presenting the Concept Statement since this is a key issue.

6. There remains uncertainty in relation to the future use of Frenchay Park House and the old Stables, and therefore the potential for further cumulative impacts arising out of traffic flows to and from these buildings.

7. We are aware that other developers are not developing land in and around North Bristol and South Gloucester due to the difficulty in selling housing. This Concept Statement fails to justify the need for housing of this intensity and quality, that this is the best use of this land, and that the units produced will be marketable. No evidence is given comparing the alternative options and business cases with lower housing densities.

Development Principles
In general we agree that the principles (connectivity, sustainability, conservation of heritage) would be acceptable. However there is a lack of any serious or substantive plan to show how these would be implemented, and the principle of community cohesion should have been a significant consideration in the master planning. The result of these omissions, coupled with a lack of innovative thinking, is the division of the site into four sub-developments plus a school and hospital. Opportunities to consider more energy efficient solutions such as district heating with combined heat and power systems.
are then overlooked. By ignoring community cohesion, the developer has failed to recognize the key importance of providing a single two form entry primary school for Frenchay.

**Surveys of Key Features of the Site**

We are very concerned about the independence and integrity of the surveys completed to support the concept statement as follows:

1. The traffic survey figures presented bear no correlation whatsoever to the experience we have of traffic flows through the village during peak hours in the morning and evening.

2. The surveys of the trees and woodlands on the site, and comments made throughout the consultation process and in the Concept Statement, has continually over-stated spurious problems of windthrow, and the quality of various trees such as those on Lime Tree Avenue. For example:

   “The advice on the quality of the Lime Tree Avenue questions the longevity of this landscape feature in its current form. The proposed option is to replant one side of Lime Tree Avenue and translocate the semi mature trees on the south side of the avenue to create the new double sided avenue for the future.”

   This particular statement would result apparently in mature trees being uprooted and replaced by saplings, and potentially destroy habitat in hollow trees for bats. We question the need for this action and object strongly to any plan to remove the established trees in what is a local landmark. They should only be replaced as and when needed. The Concept Statement continues:

   “The woodland has not been thinned during this time resulting in dense etiolated specimens. The proposed option is retain the north boundary treed area and to remove the whole of the north eastern woodland allowing the retention and enhancement of the mature (historic) tree screen around the boundary edge. This option would allow the new primary school and associated playing fields to be located on this part of the site (the Trust’s preferred option if a primary school is required on site).”

   This amounts to the removal of circa 2.5 Ha of the woodland that comprises the nature reserve. This nature reserve is there not to provide specimen trees but a wildlife habitat and is therefore by definition messy and wild. Any prior poor management practices are the result of the neglect of the NBT. We object strongly to any plans that would see this woodland removed for reasons of biodiversity, local utility and amenity, and value in carbon storage. The woodlands should remain a reserve and management transferred to the Parish Council or a wildlife trust.

   What is lacking in the tree surveys completed to date and presented in the Concept Statement is credible independent expertise.

**Consultation Process**

NBT have repeatedly claimed a desire to leave a ‘legacy’ and have stated that they wanted to seek compromise with the local community and achieve a mutually satisfying arrangement. NBT’s project director, Viv Tomkinson, said on 22nd March 2012 in the Post: “We have been asking people for their views to see what their take is and how we can make sure that in taking the site forward in the longer term, we are creating a lasting legacy. It is an absolutely beautiful site and something that NBT wants to walk away from proudly, in terms of making sure the legacy for the local community is a lasting one.” It is no wonder then that residents are angered, when after six months of consultation, NBT and its
consultants have consistently ignored all of the principal concerns raised by the local community. The results of the resident surveys have not been released. Options for the new school location were proposed at the public exhibition and then changed or withdrawn without any consultation or reasoned justification – on what basis have the two final proposed school locations emerged?

Further Specific Comments

3. We agree with the need for primary school provision and support the SGC preference for an holistic approach and a two form entry primary school. However this should not encroach on green spaces or the nature reserve.

4. We would like to see consideration given to the stables becoming a community use facility as per the Winterbourne Barn.

In Conclusion

We are not opposed to housing development on the Frenchay Hospital site. However, if there is to be a fair balance struck between the need for new houses, whilst maintaining a healthy and high quality urban environment in which people want to live, then both developers and our Council’s should to listen to the views of residents whose ‘lived experience’ of any area should be a core part of the planning process, and in all cases consultations must be a meaningful activity. The concept statement now under consideration for the Frenchay Hospital fails this test. It will be a tragedy for Frenchay village if South Gloucester Council endorse this statement, and added to this, it will set a very low standard for all the other future developments to come across the North Bristol/South Gloucester area. We urge the Council to reject this Concept Statement.

| 106 | T Southwell BS16 9BJ | I had a quick read of the concept statement, it's clear a lot of work has gone into this and it's glad the council is thinking about this seriously.
A few comments to note:
- The Frenchay traffic lights are very badly jammed in the morning, adding more residential units in this area is likely to cause bigger queues coming from Frenchay to the lights. Can we please get this junction fixed as part of the development (ideas like turning the bus lane into a 2+ lane, adding a slip left lane coming from Frenchay onto the ring-road avoiding the lights or perhaps even an under-pass?). The developers could pay for this as part of the deal when building the houses!
- It would be good to encourage use of the Frenchay open space for people outside the housing area, making sure there is a good children's play equipment and other facilities together with off-street parking for families would be great.
- It's a real shame it's going to be packed with high-density housing, could the houses not be built in the same style/layout as the existing older properties in the area? |

| 107 | N Stonelake | RE: Point Number 6 – other issues
I've scanned the document regarding the changes to Frenchay Hospital’s site and have conducted a search for the words “bank”, “cash point”, and “money” but was not able to find any reference to these on the proposals. |
As a resident of Frenchay and a working mum of two small children something I personally find frustrating about living here is that I must drive to a cash point to obtain free withdrawals of cash and to bank a cheque. There is an ATM in the Frenchay garage and I think the shop has one too, but both of these charge for withdrawals, perhaps some people don’t mind getting charged, however it’s not a luxury I can afford.

I am also the Secretary for the Frenchay and Parent Toddler Group, we bank at the nearest bank to Frenchay, but this is in Downend. To have a bank in Frenchay would make our transactions much easier, as these are often conducted with a gaggle of pre-schoolers.

If there is an opportunity to get a free withdrawal ATM machine into the plans this would be fantastic, if a bank/building society were to be part of the plans this would be even better. Apologies if I’m a little late in submitting this request, I was a little busy with a newborn last year when the consultations were taking place.

The idea of a new school being built on the site is an excellent one for which I am in favour. I’m sure you’ll be receiving plenty of feedback from existing parents regarding the facilities on offer.

Best wishes with all the plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>108</th>
<th>Sansum BS16 1NQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th September regarding the redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital my concerns are as follows, using the leaflet with questions issued at the meeting. Redevelopment is proposed to include a new community hospital, retention of Brain Rehabilitation Unit and the Burden Centre. What of the Macmillan Hospital, will that building remain, will it continue to be used as a palliative care hospital? Which open spaces will be retained and how will they be managed? Will the new development be behind the existing walls and trees, who will keep the walls and Trees maintained. What health facilities are proposed? Will there be a GP surgery, dentist, community centre for the estimated 12-1300 new residents? Frenchay Village Hall is already put to good use by the existing long-standing residents. 550 dwellings is far too many for the existing infrastructure to cope with. Most homes will have at least 1 car and at present it is a nightmare to get out of Frenchay before starting ones journey. Of course there will be additional peak hour traffic. Please bear in mind most residents of Frenchay take pride in there homes and surroundings including the trees that have preservation orders on them, requiring permission form SGC to attend to trees in ones own garden.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>109</th>
<th>K F Thorne (1) BS16 1PH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wish to comment on the proposed destruction of the Nature Reserve and Wildlife Conservation Area which includes a Woodland area the subject of Tree Preservation Order 0678, section W2, confirmed on 15th September 2010. 1. Frenchay Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document March 2007 Plan 1(PTE-07-0378) (email Attachment) shows the whole of the Woodland area and green space to be ‘Open space to be protected’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sansum BS16 1NQ**
After attending the meeting on 5th September regarding the redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital my concerns are as follows, using the leaflet with questions issued at the meeting. Redevelopment is proposed to include a new community hospital, retention of Brain Rehabilitation Unit and the Burden Centre. What of the Macmillan Hospital, will that building remain, will it continue to be used as a palliative care hospital? Which open spaces will be retained and how will they be managed? Will the new development be behind the existing walls and trees, who will keep the walls and Trees maintained. What health facilities are proposed? Will there be a GP surgery, dentist, community centre for the estimated 12-1300 new residents? Frenchay Village Hall is already put to good use by the existing long-standing residents. 550 dwellings is far too many for the existing infrastructure to cope with. Most homes will have at least 1 car and at present it is a nightmare to get out of Frenchay before starting ones journey. Of course there will be additional peak hour traffic. Please bear in mind most residents of Frenchay take pride in there homes and surroundings including the trees that have preservation orders on them, requiring permission form SGC to attend to trees in ones own garden. 

**K F Thorne (1) BS16 1PH**
I wish to comment on the proposed destruction of the Nature Reserve and Wildlife Conservation Area which includes a Woodland area the subject of Tree Preservation Order 0678, section W2, confirmed on 15th September 2010. 1. Frenchay Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document March 2007 Plan 1(PTE-07-0378) (email Attachment) shows the whole of the Woodland area and green space to be ‘Open space to be protected’.
Plan 2 (PTE-07-0379) (email Attachment) states, ‘Retain green backdrop & ensure buildings within the hospital site do not harm views or setting of historic buildings’.

2. Concept Statement proposals

Page 23, 6.9 Trees. ‘The proposed option is retain the north boundary tree area and to remove the whole of the north eastern woodland allowing the retention and enhancement of the mature (historic) tree screen around the boundary edge’.

3. Comment

1. Eastern Boundary. The top section of the eastern fringe will only be screened by a band of trees of negligible depth when compared with the area proposed by the Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document. This area includes the original Cedar Hall building where the boundary wall is only just over 6’ in height.

2. North Boundary. At the rear of numbers 18/20/22 Homestead Gardens the proposed tree screen is very thin (in some cases only one tree). The Friends Burial Ground abuts this area. In its desire to maximise the area for residential development, GVA have shown an unrealistic wedge shaped section of the proposed school playing fields virtually ‘lapping’ against the rear of these locations (alternatively residential development).

4. Possible compromise solution

If it is not possible to save the whole of the Nature Reserve and Wildlife Conservation area, then we would like to submit that the Northern tree boundary screen be extended to the same depth behind lower Homestead Gardens (nos.18/20/22) as shown on the attached Appendix. Although part of this area is meadow, this solution will at least give the residents ‘in the firing line’ a degree of protection as well as shielding the rear of the Quakers and original Cedar Hall boundaries.

On 4th September, I sent an email relating to the protection of the rear of houses at the lower end of Homestead Gardens from development.

Please find attached the following PDF pictures - Picture 1 graphically illustrates the position:

1. Picture taken in the winter showing that there is virtually no tree screen in places. This would mean that GVA’s Concept Statement proposals will result in playing fields/residential development lapping the rear boundary wall in lower Homestead Gardens in some places.

2. Picture of the Trust’s own Frenchay Hospital Nature Reserve sign. This shows the extent of the Reserve - it is not merely the Woodland area the subject of a TPO.

If you could kindly acknowledge receipt of this email, I would be very grateful.

To CYP (Jo Rees),

I wish to make the following points in respect of the Concept Statement and in particular the options for the site of the primary school. Although two Options for the new School are shown, page 24 indicates that Option 1 is ‘the Trust’s preferred option if a primary school is required on site’. Both Options suggested in the Statement are those which allow the
maximum potential residential development. The footprint for the school shown for both Options 1 (and 2) is grossly understated and misleading. Thus, in his recent submission to Mike Luton, Russ Green of 14 Begbrook Park, an architect and primary school planning specialist, overlaid the more realistic footprint for a 2FE school on the site of Option 2.

I would like to comment on Option 1 as follows:

1. Option 1 shows the location of the school within the Nature Reserve and Wildlife Conservation area (the Woodland), despite it being the subject of a Tree Preservation Order that is less than two years old. The Nature Reserve was set up by Frenchay Healthcare Trust in 1987 and, for over a quarter of a century, has become established as a natural habitat for numerous forms of wildlife. The Frenchay Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document of 2007 recognises its importance.

2. Lack of consultation with the public. The last presentation made by GVA on 21st June 2012 was verbal – very few, if any, members of the public attending would have been aware of Option 1 in the position shown. The Statement on Page 2 of the Concept Statement that ‘the process is heavily informed by a series of public consultation events…’ is flawed in this important respect. Although reference was made by GVA at the 21st June meeting to ‘nibbling’ into the Woodland, the proposed destruction of the whole of the Woodland for a 2 Form school (or residential development) was not conveyed to those members of the public attending.

3. The intention to maximise the land available for residential development is indicated by the outline of the area in the Woodland marked as available for ‘school expansion.’ This shows the school playing field somewhat unrealistically tapering into a wedge and virtually lapping against the rear of houses in lower Homestead Gardens, thus freeing up more land on the northern part of the Woodland for development.

4. Option 1 in the Statement indicates access from the Beckspool Road entrance, but not dedicated for use only by school traffic (Page 24, 6.10 indicates that it is a secondary access to the Development). The location of the proposed new school within the Development will result in school traffic being shared with residential and other site traffic. As a resident of Frenchay with a granddaughter at Frenchay Village School I am aware of the hazardous traffic/parking problems that occur around the existing school both before the commencement and at the end of the school day. I understand that the new school is likely to accommodate around 420 children (it is assumed that a 1 Form entry school would be unacceptable to the LEA) with the addition of accommodation for pre-school children currently based in the Village Hall. It is understood that the new school will also be a community facility to be used out of hours. The traffic flow generated by the new school will, therefore, be much greater than that currently experienced and at the start of the school day will coincide with peak residential movements within the Development.

5. There is an issue of noise with this location for the existing residents on the Northern and Eastern Boundaries. 210-420 small children having a party 3 times a day can generate significant noise in the order of 65dB. As the new school is likely to be used out of hours as a community activity, ‘around the clock’ disturbance is inevitable. Quite a different matter for new residents who consciously move into a house next to an existing school.

6. School Governors. I believe too much emphasis should not be placed on the current incumbents’ views – the recent Chairman resigned over this issue. In isolation, Option 1 might appear as the ideal for the school but does not
address the issues raised above and does not give sufficient consideration to Option 4

During the course of non-public discussions with GVA, the idea of locating the new school at the end of site entrance ‘C’ (facing Frenchay Common on the CLIC Cottage road) and on the site of the current Day Hospital was suggested. This is Option 4 and is referred to in the Statement as ‘Urban School form without playing fields…’ Jo Davis (on behalf of GVA) has stated that NBT would not be not be keen to pursue this option as it “takes up prime development land”.

Russ Green has kindly overlaid the possible school footprint for a 2FE school on the site of Option 4 and this is included as an email attachment.

We believe the advantages of Option 4 should not be summarily dismissed for the following reasons:

1. The more central location within the village and the retention of the highly-prized relationship between the school and the church/village/community.

2. Beckspool Road could be a dedicated access/egress road solely for the children and staff to get to/ from school which would provide the following advantages:
   a. the safety of the children - which is paramount (recently published surveys confirm that the majority of accidents involving children occur at delivery/pick-up times)
   b. reduction in the traffic flow/congestion that will otherwise occur around the site of Option 1.
   c. cessation of a ‘rat-run’ for drivers using the hospital site as a short-cut to get to/from Bristol Road

3. A school in this position with its vista across the considerable area of Conservation green space to its frontage and views to the common and church would have a less urban feel than that proposed in Option 1(with residential development alongside its western and northern boundary (see 3.above).

4. Such a location would not consume any green space but would allow its full recreational potential to be realised whilst the children could share its beauty daily.

5. The Concept Statement refers to Option 4 as ‘without playing fields.’ However, within stepping distance are the Conservation area green spaces between CLIC Cottage and the Museum, which would provide playing fields of a size considerably greater than that now proposed in Option 1.

6. I understand that the cost of developing the school on the site of the Day Hospital could be significantly lower, given the Day Centre’s existing ground works and services.

I hope that the above comments will assist you in your deliberations and decision-making. I have discussed this issue with a number of supportive residents on the Northern and Eastern boundaries and Bob Woodward at No.38 Malmains Drive. Russ Green has already submitted his views relating to Option 2 to Mike Luton and also supports Option 4.

The above address has been in my family since it was built in 1938. I grew up there and returned to the family home with my own family in 2002, where we have live for the last 10 years. I have seen many changes to the village in the last 50 years.
years and feel most have enhanced and improved the community of Frenchay not marred its beauty.

I have attended all the public meetings during the process of changes proposed for the Frenchay Hospital site and accept things have to change but feel there are many flaws in the proposals and feel we, the villagers of Frenchay are not being told everything or being listened too.

I would like to state my main concerns which I know reflect everyone else who lives in the area. Questions 6, 7 & 8, all refer to the number of houses planned on the site. How can you warrant a change from the original figure of 350 to 550, these will almost double the size of Frenchay. It will lose the community feel it has and draw us nearer to the city of Bristol, losing the feel of a village. People came here to live, to be in a village, if we wanted to live in the town we would have made a different choice.

The number of properties will also affect question 14, Frenchay is already struggling at peak rush hour times. Has a survey been done? How are you going to avoid the problem getting worse? It states that current indications are that there will be fewer trips than present. I disagree, not all the staff at the hospital start work and finish work at peak times. I accept that not everyone on the new development will be travelling at peak times but with many couples/families having 2 or more cars. There could be up to another 1000 cars trying to get in/out of Frenchay at peak times. Beckspool Rd, Malmains Drive, Bristol Rd, Frenchay Park Rd, Filton Rd, Cleevewood Rd, Bromley Heath Rd, Cleeve Hill, Ring Rd and M32 are already heavy congested.

Many of the employees at Frenchay Hospital live in the surrounding areas; will still have to come in this direction to get across to Southmead Hospital when they transfer. Has that been considered? You can improve the bus services but you can’t force people to go on them. The bus fares in Bristol/South Glos are expensive compared with other parts of the country and at what stage would any improved service commence?

I feel a lot more thought needs to go into the plans for this development, we need to be told the more and the truth about the plans and as promised our views taken in to consideration.

| 111 | Mr R D Taylor  
BS16 1VQ  
Letter via Cllr Tim Bowles | I am writing to draw your attention to the meeting held on Monday at Frenchay Village hall. September 4th 2012. My concerns are:
2 the traffic flow that will occur at peak times of travel.
3 No consideration for road layout in and around the area
4 No consideration for cycle tracks, and finally ,
5 no allowance in your plans for bus services.
I should bring to your notice the area in Frenchay that are Preservation Areas, The Green belt in the area has been completely ignored. The felling of trees in the hospital grounds which you are considering removing these come under the preservation order of trees in the hospital grounds.
Lastly my concern is there is no official site proposed for the local primary school and no consideration for a doctors surgery. |
| 112 | N Taylor | I reject the Concept Statement especially in regard to the following:
1. DENSITY |
550 units are far too many if the character of Frenchay is not to be destroyed. In particular:

a. the existing Conservation Area and the trees with a Preservation Order must be respected. These restrictions are there for a reason i.e. to preserve the character of this special area. It follows that the school should be located elsewhere on the site. This would reduce the area available for housing.

b. 550 units with an extra 1300+ residents would more than double the population of Frenchay. This cannot happen without due regard for the needs of this much enlarged community. These needs have not been fully assessed. Proper provision would also reduce the area available for housing. It is not good enough to pack the site with houses and think about these things later. With extra residents we need more facilities such as a Doctors Surgery, play park and community centre.

I would like to strongly object to the destruction of any green space or felling of trees as I believe green belt land and conservation areas should be left untouched. I also believe that a neighbouring council is planning to build on green belt land between Frenchay Hospital and Stoke Lane. This will place an even greater need for the construction of facilities for the residents of Frenchay new and old.

2. TRAFFIC FLOW

a. Frenchay is already subject to serious traffic congestion especially in the rush hours with people travelling from the whole area to work and accessing the M32, M4, Ring Road and other major sites like UWE. With say 1000+ additional residents taking to the roads at rush hours, this congestion will increase.

Whilst there will be compensating reductions due to fewer hospital workers and visitors, their trips are phased throughout the day. The peak will only get worse.

b. A major problem in Frenchay is the practice of hospital workers parking on Frenchay common and adjacent roads. This is especially hazardous during busy times with volumes of traffic moving in each direction. Can we be assured that the new Community Hospital will have sufficient parking for staff and visitors - and that they will not be discouraged from using it by charges?

3. CHARITIES

A number of charities have become established within Frenchay Hospital, many local residents give their time to fund raising and helping out with these. There seems to be no mention of provision for the Charities who will surely loose a tremendous amount of support when the Hospital is downgraded and their buildings replaced with houses.

4. ASBESTOS AND OTHER HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

There are a large number of buildings with the Hospital complex that have asbestos within their construction. I would like to see reassurance from the trust and the council that these materials will be removed from the site without any fibres being released into the surrounding area. I would also like to see a fund started to compensate the residents of Frenchay who may succumbed to cancer in years to come caused by the disturbance of said materials and other hazardous substances during the demolition of the hospital.
| 113 | Carol Thorne  
BS16 1LR | OPEN SPACES - section 6.6  
The Supplementary Planning Document for Frenchay Conservation Area states that development proposals “in connection with the hospital .....should recognise the high quality sensitive historic and landscape character and setting of the site”.  
“The following principles will apply to any new buildings, alterations or redevelopment on the site  
- Protect important views and setting of the listed buildings and conservation area.  
- Maintain the open green area, trees and former parkland adjoining Frenchay Park.  
- Retain and enhance the integrity of Lime Tree Avenue....... No new buildings should encroach into this area. The loss of trees or harm to the avenue character will be resisted. Any proposed redevelopment of existing buildings should be set back from the avenue and enhance the setting.”  
Any development of the hospital should retain the open spaces and the listed trees on the site. These form an important backdrop to the surrounding Conservation Area. I hope that South Gloucestershire Council will negotiate with North Bristol Hospital Trust to separate the open spaces from the land to be developed. These could then be transferred to South Gloucester Unitary Authority or Winterbourne Parish Council to be used for formal or informal use. The land south of Lime Tree Avenue would be ideal for football pitches as there is a shortage in Frenchay. At present a small pitch is marked out on the common by the primary school and is use by several groups causing heavy wear through the winter.  
The proposal to site the new primary school on the land south of Lime Tree Avenue would ruin the views from the Common into the site. Even if most of the school site is open playing fields these would be surrounded by a 3 metre high fence (as in the present school).  
The Retention of the open spaces is the most important concern which South Glos Authority should address. Once these have been developed there is no going back and they are lost forever. |
| 114 | B & D Tyrer  
BS16 1LZ | We reject the concept statements as the emphasis in developing the site is upon building the maximum number of residences rather than integration with the existing Frenchay Village and providing facilities that can be enjoyed by all. The number of residence proposed is too great and the sites of the homes shown on the plans is unacceptable  
The land concerned is public property and although hitherto in the custodianship of Frenchay Hospital, The Trust having denied the residents of Frenchay the hospital they demanded, thus leaving vacant most of the site, that land should be transferred to South Gloucester Council for them to develop in the interests of the residents of Frenchay rather than turning it over to private developers.  
In the event of that not occurring consideration should first be given to the needs of the enlarged community before deciding how many residences will be built and where they will be sited and we make the following comments in that regard;  
1. Health and Social Care Centre Para 6.3  
It is essential that a G.P surgery is included in the plan and of a dental surgery. There is clearly need for both already. |
2. Retention of Existing Health Care Facilities Para 6.4. The Macmillan facility should be retained or re-sited in a purpose built unit.

3. Open Spaces and Trees. Paras 6.6 and 6.9
All existing trees should be retained and there should be no encroachment on the present nature reserve or woodland.

3. Education. Para 6.7
Options 1, 2 and 3 are not appropriate sites for the school. Option 1 impinges on the woodland public open space. Option 2 would extend onto conservation land and create access and parking hazards. Option 3 is too far removed from the existing village. The preferred site is option 4 with easy access from Beckspool Road and a closer link to the existing village.

4. The Trust Building and surrounding land should not be excluded from the scheme. It could be put to good use if it were transferred to the Winterbourne Parish Council on Trust to utilise it as a Community Centre. The existing Village Hall is on the fringes of the Village. The accommodation and the facilities there are limited. The main Hall can only accommodate 130 persons and would not be able to serve the needs of an enlarged community. In any event an adequate Community Centre with facilities for all age groups must be included in the scheme. In addition outdoor areas for sports should be set aside.

5. Access. Para 6.10
The Mini Roundabout access should be close to vehicular traffic. It is already a major traffic hazard.

Increased bus provision is essential to more destinations in and around Bristol.

| 115 | Robert Thorne |
| Frenchay Hill, Frenchay, Bristol |

**OPEN SPACES** - section 6.6

Frenchay is at present one of the most pleasant areas to live in South Gloucestershire and, as such, much of it has been designated a Conservation Area. This is remarkable because a look at a map shows the area is in close proximity to the M32, M4, and Ring Road and adjacent to large housing estates in Bristol. As such, Frenchay is fragile and could lose its specialness if the open spaces on the present hospital sight are eroded.

As shown in the aerial view in section 1.1 of the Concept Statement, the site is at present ringed on three sides by open spaces, treed areas and a nature area. Although these have not been maintained to the highest of standards by the hospital, they are still very attractive and much valued. With the huge percentage increase in the number of houses in Frenchay resulting from the proposed development, it is essential that these areas are in no way eaten into by the development. Yet fig 8 Opportunities Plan shows these areas being reduced. Both proposed sites for a new school are in these areas, and also a substantial amount is being encroached upon by housing development. This is completely unacceptable and will destroy the fragile beauty of Frenchay.

The new school is essential, but the site option suggested at an earlier stage in discussions but now not included, is the proper position for the new school. This is at the junction of Lime Tree Avenue and the road from CLIC cottage (where, I believe, the Macmillan Centre now stands).
The open spaces and wooded areas referred to above should be handed over to South Gloucestershire County Council for maintenance.

Also, the mature lime trees along Lime Tree Avenue must be maintained.

If the above adjustments are made to the concept plan, Frenchay could remain the beautiful place it now is to the benefit of both the new and existing community. If this is not done, and existing green spaces are reduced while the number of houses in Frenchay is hugely increased, Frenchay will no longer be special. New housing must only be on areas presently used for hospital buildings.

| 116 | P & A Upton  
|     | BS16 1NY  |
|     | My wife and I are residents of Frenchay (9 Grove Bank, BS16 1NY) and very concerned about the plans being discussed for Frenchay Hospital. Our concerns are numerous and as follows:

i) Frenchay is already extremely congested at morning rush-hour, contributed to a great extent by traffic passing through the village from outside areas. Although we technically do not have to arrive for work in central Bristol until 09:00, we already have to leave the house by 07:30, otherwise the traffic makes for an incredibly difficult trip out of the village. Another 550 houses would have a disastrous effect on this situation.

ii) Frenchay is a beautiful village (described as one of the most beautiful in the country). A development of this size would be a dreadful blot on the landscape. It’s increasingly rare to have conservation areas such as Frenchay in such close proximity to a city, so we’re very keen not to see a unique area turned into just another sprawling housing development.

iii) There are woodlands potentially affected, some of which involve tree preservation orders. There is also at least one listed building on the site. It is vital, for the heritage of the village, that nothing is done to compromise the future of these items.

iv) The effect on the village is untested and unknown. Surely a prudent approach would be to grant consent for a much smaller number of houses and ascertain the effect of such before rushing in to what is quite potentially a catastrophe.

In light of the above, I would urge you to reflect on whether any development at all is appropriate, but even if it is, then please, consider a far lower number of houses and ascertain the effect of such before rushing in to what is quite potentially a catastrophe.

I wish to comment on the proposed density of housing on the above site. The current road network in and around Frenchay cannot cope with current through traffic movements at present and the addition of 550 households with a minimum of 1 car movement per home will make the situation intolerable. These cars will be needed as public transport is poor.

There are no plans shown to improve access or egress from the site. There appears to be a move to escalate house numbers regardless of the knock on effect to existing Frenchay residents. I am also concerned that North Bristol NHS trust appears to be neglecting basic maintenance on Frenchay Park House and
the stables - a cynic might think that these two important listed buildings were being allowed to fall into disrepair so that in
the fullness of time they would be past repair - releasing still more building land. Please register my concerns about these
issues.

Mr Bob Woodward
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Re: Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept Statement July 2012

1. Background

As one who has been resident in Frenchay for more than half a century I feel privileged to live in this lovely area with its
typical English country village setting, the beautiful common and St John the Baptist Church, the elegant Georgian houses,
the Quaker’s Meeting House, the Unitarian Church and the Village Pub, all surrounded by the splendid open countryside
with its gorgeous trees and the River Frome passing through.
The Frenchay Hospital site is quite magnificent and presents a golden opportunity for people with vision and understanding
to create a lasting legacy of which we can all be proud. This is a challenge that must not be missed!

I feel that I can claim to have a good understanding of this development as my brother John and I, trading as Woodward
Bros, Builders, were the proud recipients of a European Architectural Heritage Award, for the reconstruction of Market
Street, Wotton-under-Edge in 1975. We also received many accolades for our restoration of Chipping Manor, the Rev
Roland Hill’s Tabernacle Church, and the development of the twenty-acre Parklands Estate, all in Wotton-under-Edge.

From the outset of the many and varied projects we undertook in Wotton-under-Edge we ensured that we had a dialogue
with everyone who wanted their opinions to be considered. We also ensured that we noted the most constructive comments
and made every effort to incorporate them into our projects. My brother John and I still enjoy our regular visits to Wotton to
relive those long-ago halcyon days and we are proud of what we helped to create.

2. The Draft Concept Statement (DCS)

Whilst I understand that you have received a large number of objections to the Draft Concept Statement (DCS) I very much
wish to add my observations, as I feel there may be aspects that have not been fully covered.
It is staggering that more than nine months have been taken up with so called ‘consultations’ and, whereas the initial
suggestion in January showed that 350 dwellings were to be proposed, this figure has gradually risen, in increments of 50,
to a staggering 550!

My initial reaction after reading the DCS was one of disbelief. The despairing comments made by some of the members of
the Resident’s User Group (at the recent public meeting held in the Frenchay Village Hall on Monday 3rd September) came
back to me again and again – “they (GVA and NBT) have not taken notice of a thing we have said”.

I realise how much times have changed when the agents appointed to handle the Frenchay site (GVA) openly admit that
their brief is simply to:
A. Obtain permission for the absolute maximum number of properties
B. Get the highest possible cash return

Sadly this sort of brief does not allow for serious consideration of how best to leave a “lasting legacy” as was claimed by the
GVA and NBT representatives at the first public meeting held in Frenchay Village Hall on 28th March this year.

Although it may be that some of the headings below are outside of your scope or control, I feel it is important that they are
2

listed as they may prove useful in your deliberations.

2.1 Health Care

In 1921 Bristol Corporation (Health Committee) purchased Frenchay Park, complete with its 70 acres of land. The site was to be dedicated to ‘health care’ – initially for the open air treatment of young TB sufferers – it was known as Frenchay Park Sanatorium.

Although its name has changed several times – more recently known as Frenchay Healthcare Trust and now North Bristol NHS Trust – the site has enjoyed the support of legions of friends and organisations that have assisted in the hospital gaining an international reputation for many of its specialities in health care.

Many of the supporters felt badly let down when they became aware that the decision - to relocate the hospital services within a new ‘super hospital’ on the Southmead site - had been taken before a series of meaningless ‘consultations’ on Frenchay’s future was held.

A petition to save ‘Frenchay’, bearing more than 50,000 signatures, was delivered to London for the Health Minister’s attention and was totally ignored.

It has now been confirmed that the Macmillan Palliative Care Unit (MPCU) and the Barbara Russell Childrens Unit (BRCU) are to be demolished.

The former is an 8 bedded Unit that has an outstanding reputation for its hospice style compassion, care and attention, to those at the terminal stage of life. It was built with charity funds and, although it was originally intended to retain this building, that decision has recently been reversed. Apparently NBT has no intention of replacing these invaluable palliative care beds.

More than £3,500,000 was raised by the Jack and Jill Appeal to create the splendid Barbara Russell Childrens Unit and, upon reaching this target figure, the Appeal Committee were presented with a VAT bill for a further £470,000! With over £4million pounds eventually raised the Unit was officially opened in 2000.

The building is in excellent condition and is capable of giving many more years of service. Although an excellent alternative use – as a rehabilitation unit – has been presented this has been turned down as “losing too much potential building land”.

Q Is there no accountability for public funds?

Q How are NBT able to abandon their health care responsibilities in this manner – whilst claiming they need to maximise the sale of the site to plough the proceeds back into health care?

Q Having benefitted for many years, in Planning terms, from the established use of the site for ‘Health Care’ is NBT now able to gain permission for development - to the exclusion of unmet health needs?

2.3 Frenchay Hospital Site Plan 2003

The attached plan (*page 12) is entitled “Option ‘A’ Southmead as Major Site” and demonstrates that, with almost all of the hospital buildings removed, the ‘Land surplus to NHS requirements is 14.5 Ha/35.83 Acres’.

It is worth noting that this shows:

- the Macmillan Unit being retained

  to achieve ‘14.5 Ha/35.83 Acres’ ALL the wooded areas have been removed

- the Barbara Russell Childrens Unit – just 3 years old – would be demolished
It is little wonder that supporters feel 'used' when confronted with this information.

2.4 Tree Preservation Order REF SGTP00678

Trees covered by W1 (behind Malmains Drive)

Due to my hospitalisation I was unable to attend the exhibition at Frenchay HQ early in the year and it was, therefore, at the public meeting, held at Frenchay Village Hall, on 28 March this year, that I first became aware that NBT/GVA were suggesting that the copse of trees at the rear of the houses on the south side of Malmains Drive, abutting the hospital site, might be felled to extend the potential developable land holding.

It was with considerable dismay that I publicly expressed my anger and disappointment at what was being suggested. Comments from the representatives of NBT and GVA such as “we must hold our hands up and admit that we have been poor managers of these woods. The trees are too close together and much of the woodland is in need of some good husbandry” were all made as part of their case for removal of the trees. There was, however, no mention of any TPOs or restrictions of any kind.

After the meeting, I was approached by Viv Tomkinson (NBT) and Jo Davis (GVA) who asked if I would be agreeable to meeting with them to discuss matters privately, rather than have public confrontations. A meeting was later arranged to take place on at NBT HQ which I attended together with other Frenchay residents - Les Palfreman, Ken Thorne, Martin Sheppard and Cllr Alan Kembry (to ensure that others were aware of what was going on). Viv Tomkinson and Simon Wood apologised unreservedly for the fact that the public meeting had taken place without proper research having been undertaken.

They were completely unaware that there was a TPO in existence relating to the trees on the northern boundary or the Nature Reserve, and asked if they could make a copy of our documents. The TPO, (REF SGTP00678) had been obtained by Dr John Redmond, who lives in Malmains Drive and it states that it “was confirmed on the 15th September 2010 for the following reasons: the trees contribute to the visual amenities of the area. This means that the Order will remain in effect.”

The meeting was the forerunner of the setting up of the Residents’ User Group (RUG), (from which I stepped down very quickly when I realised that the ‘consultations’ were following the NBT’s usual pattern of simply becoming a charade, and there was clearly no intention of considering the opinions/ideas/suggestions that the members offered).

The TPO consists of 3 sections:

- The wooded area on the northern boundary/Malmains Drive (W1)
- The Nature Reserve (W2)
- No individually identified trees within the site

Neither Simon Woods or Viv Tomkinson were aware that the TPO existed, nor did they have any information on the history of the wooded area, which is surprising considering that I had had correspondence on the matter with Simon over a number of years (copies available). The reason the trees are so close together is that they were planted by NBT’s predecessor to replace the splendid row of Scots Pine that were felled c1975, to become a nursery for young saplings to be planted and to be relocated on sites under their control. As is the case with so many plans for the land and buildings this was not followed through and the trees have had virtually no attention since.
The reason that some of us who live in Malmains Drive had pursued the TPO, was because NBT appeared to have been so short-sighted in allowing the Brian Injury Rehabilitation Unit (BIRU) to encroach so near to the wooded area, thus creating a ‘pinch-point’; (*TPO 1 and TPO 2 on page 13).

NBT have since confirmed that the trees on the northern boundary will remain.

Trees covered by W2 (Nature Reserve)

The Nature Reserve was set up in 1987 and has benefitting from a number of grants (*TPO 3 and TPO 4 page 14).

This is yet another example of lack of management/neglect and GVA are trying hard to use the reason of the poor state of some of the trees to seek permission to extend the developable area of the site. Jo Davis has stated that the results of the professional surveys warn that if the front row of trees are removed those behind, that have relied on the protection they have provided, will have to be felled.

I understand that Alan Freke, Curator of the Frenchay Museum, has forwarded you a copy of the ‘Frenchay Hospital Tree Walk’ leaflet which lists 27 of the specimen tress in, and around, the Nature Reserve.

The notice board (TPO 4) explains something of the wildlife that can be found and, although the neglect is blatantly apparent amongst the trees and the overgrown pond, this has, perhaps, encouraged even more birds and animals to make their homes here.

2.5 Proposed location of School

GVA/NBT has not, in my opinion, presented the various options for the siting of a school in a fair manner. Although it has been made abundantly clear to them that to place it in the Conservation Area (near the Museum) is a ‘no-go’ they persist in asking for this to be considered.

The idea of using the car park and the abutting Nature Reserve seems to appeal to them as, again this would, as Jo Davis has said, allow the Reserve to be used “by way of compensation” for having to include this facility.

To place the school in this position is unthinkable:
- It would be farcical to over-ride the TPO, which is barely two years old
- The TPO clearly states “the trees contribute to the visual amenities of the area”
- The TPO also states “… that the Order will remain in effect”

The Brain Injury Rehabilitation Unit was, as I understand the position, sited at the extremity of the land-holding for the peace and tranquillity it offered. The safety aspects of placing a school so close to this unit do not appear to have been considered.

Planning Permission for the building of a Care Home alongside the BIRU has also been obtained.

2.5.1 Preferred location of School

From my observations within the RUG discussions, and from Frenchay residents generally, the suggestion of locating the school on the current ‘John James Day Hospital’ site (at the end of the entrance road from Beckspool Road, past CLIC Cottage, to the ‘T’ junction - the plot in question is directly in front of you – this site is facing Frenchay Common, St John the Baptist Church and the present school. It is a splendid location and it:
- Retains the link with the Church, the Village and the Common
Provides a safe environment for the children to access and egress the school
Gives the opportunity to have a ‘dedicated’ road exclusively for the school
Prevents the continuation of the ‘rat run’ for drivers to and from Bristol Road
Allows the splendid green areas to be used by the children in safety

In the event that the density of development is reduced to a more reasonable level a one-form school could be considered, which would further enhance the case for this location.

2.6 Surveys
2.6.1 Hazardous Material

Section 4.3 of the DCS – headed ‘Contamination Report’ gives scant coverage of the potential risks of "hot spot" contamination and/or the vast amount of asbestos, with its risk of airborne spores.

This is a blatant omission insofar as GVA have reported to the RUG meeting that, due to NBT being ‘strapped for cash’ it is their intention to ‘clean’ the site in stages i.e. to divide the danger areas into a number of sections and then to clean and sell the first in order to fund the second - the second to fund the third, and so on. This means that development, and the arrival of new residents, will take place on any particular section whilst cleaning is taking place on the next/adjacent section.

It is incredulous that the agents for a hospital Trust – dedicated to health care – can conceive a plan that would put people at greater risk by bringing them closer to the dangers! I trust that care will be taken to ensure the entire site is comprehensively cleaned before development begins.

2.6.2 Coal
There also appears to be a further serious omission in the DCS with no mention being made of the existence of coal under the site:

   Extract from Frenchay Village Museum News in Winterbourne Parish Council’s Quarterly Newsletter Summer 2012 – “In the 1950s as the Queen came to the throne, the last coal mine in Bristol opened here, but then closed after ten years leaving vast reserves of coal under Frenchay”

   Extract from ‘The History of Frenchay Hospital’ by James C Briggs (obtainable from Frenchay Museum) page 105 – “Our Architect then prepared detailed plans of a modern 13 storey building for 300 nursing staff, which coal mining experts associated with the new shallow drift mine at Stoke Gifford, quickly brought down to eight storeys because of possible subsidence and financial stringency then shrunk without trace – other than those splendid drawings.”

And on page 106 “The proximity of the coal mine and the report that the main seam ran directly underneath the hospital almost wrecked the building of the Neurosurgery Theatres, saved by the device of introducing a raft of pitch in the foundation work.”

Q Why is no reference made to the presence of coal with the main seam running “directly underneath the hospital”? Is this considered unimportant? Or, again, has proper research not be carried out?
Q Given the current shortage of coal (recent reports of planned closure of Power Station) is this not a matter that should be fully investigated?
2.7 Listed Buildings
2.7.1 NBT HQ (formerly Frenchay Park Mansion/ Sister’s House etc)

An extract from 'The History of Frenchay Hospital' by James C Briggs, on page 14, describes the house as “The Sisters’ House is the Georgian Frenchay Park Mansion, the biggest of the old houses in Georgian Frenchay”

GVA/NBT has chosen to exclude the listed buildings and surrounding land from consideration in the DCS, which makes the plans for the site incomplete. The future of these buildings surely has a major bearing on the decisions for the development as a whole and, in my opinion, it is imperative that they are considered at the same time.

My concerns are, I believe, reinforced by the following:
This grand building is sadly deteriorating at an alarming rate as evidenced on the attached photographs:
(*Page 15 HQ 1&2) The front entrance to the former Mansion shows signs of neglect and the pair of outer doors on the porch have disappeared in recent years.
(*Pages 16 HQ 3-4) The pictures of the sill and stonework highlight the unimaginable decay that has gone unchecked on this listed building.
HQ 4 This shows similar decay - a window to the east elevation.
(*Page 17 Listed Chapel) These are ‘before and after’ shots of a window in the adjoining Unitarian Chapel, now beautifully restored.
Frenchay boasts many Georgian architectural ‘gems’ and these pictures are a reminder of how fortunate we are that almost all of these precious buildings are valued and lovingly cared for by their proud owners, unlike the former Frenchay Park Mansion which is being allowed to rot.

2.7.2 The Garden of the former Mansion

A few short years ago the garden, with its ornamental trees, was a source of great beauty. Sadly, this too is showing signs of lack of care and attention:
(*Pages 18-20 Ref HQ1-5 Garden). Ornamental trees are being choked with brambles, the specimen Blue Atlas Cedar has been lopped in an appalling manner.

2.7.3 The Stable Block

Unfortunately, the plan to rescue this building with the creation of an MS Nerve Centre was abandon in 2003, amidst the uncertainty of the long-term future of the hospital.
(*Pages 21-24 Ref HQ1-7 Stable Block). This building has enormous potential but these shots demonstrate the lack of attention and care that is accelerating its sad decline.

2.8 Parking

The ‘scar on the landscape’ for the past 8 years or so, has been the car parking problems created by NBT’s decision to levy a charge on all car user visitors and staff at the hospital. The impact on the local residents and the damage to a great deal of common land has been catastrophic. The quality of life in, and around, Frenchay has been seriously compromised by NBT’s actions.
(*Pages 25-28 Ref 1-8 Parking) The shots here are a random selection from literally hundreds taken in the Frenchay area.
Lack of concern for the common land is obvious. Figures given for traffic movements in and out of the hospital cannot be accurate with so many visitors, staff and others, avoiding the charges by parking outside. It does beg the question of how the hospital authorities are allowed to abandon these responsibilities, whilst highlighting the crucial need for sufficient spaces being made within the new development.

2.9 Density

One can only assume that the ridiculously high figure of 550 is simply a ‘try on’ in the hope of securing 250 or so houses. For GVA to have been offered the chance to create “a lasting legacy” one would have reasonably expected to see an exciting plan with flair and panache, befitting a site of this outstanding calibre, instead of which we are faced with the possibility of an over-crowded housing estate.

2.10 Conclusion

The foregoing, together with the pictorial evidence attached, demonstrates that the authors of the DCS have failed miserably to rise to the challenge that this almost unique site demands. It is a matter of grave concern that (as recorded above) there is an ongoing catalogue of lack of research, mismanagement, and, particularly, neglect.

I feel that I can be forgiven for suggesting that the exclusion of the Listed Buildings from the DCS appears to be an attempt to remove them (and their condition) from the Planners view and consideration. Left to decay at their present rate it may be that in a few years from now, an application to demolish these precious buildings will be received.

In all the circumstances I trust that you, and your colleagues, will dismiss the DCS as presented with a request for a plan that is worthy of this magnificent site. To accept the contents would be, with respect, to reward the lack of care and attention that is recorded in this document.

A new plan should include at least some of the following:
- Consideration of a Retirement Village – there are some magnificent examples to replicate – this would allow older residents who dread the thoughts of leaving the village to retain their connections
- It would also release for sale the homes in Frenchay vacated by the relocation of elderly folk, to welcome new residents to this desirable area
- A Care/Nursing Home might also be considered – complementing the proposed Cottage Hospital
- A Doctor’s surgery is clearly needed for the area around Frenchay
- A Leisure Centre would encourage ‘integration’ between old and new residents

To encapsulate these suggestions into a new plan, whilst also embracing the Listed Buildings, would be to give a service to the local residents, the majority of whom have been outstanding supporters of the hospital over many years. Such a scheme would not necessarily reduce the overall capital receipt upon the sale of the site. I can only repeat my original plea to everyone involved in deciding these issues: THIS REALLY IS A DREAM SITE PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW IT TO BECOME A NIGHTMARE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full response Includes photographs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd response</td>
<td>Further to my response to the Draft Concept Statement, dated 7th October, I am writing following the headline article in the Bristol Post (Thursday 25th October by Vicki Mathias, the newspaper’s health correspondent), reporting that the provision of a community hospital (as per the assurances given by NBT in 2004, that the community hospital would be an integral part of the main hospital provision) is in doubt and there are “Fears health care centre will not be built at all”. Vicki reminds us that “the plan for a health and social care centre at Frenchay, revealed last year, was for a partnership with a private organisation which would build and run the site. Under the plans a contract was due to be finalised next month”. Apparently a new review, looking at services for older people, rehabilitation and urgent care, has been put in place. This is expected to be completed in the spring ready for proposals to be in place in 2015. This news clearly has a devastating effect on the Draft Concept Statement and renders the NBT/GVA deliberations and submissions ineffective. In the circumstances I am writing to ask that the Draft Concept Statement – already seriously flawed as outlined in my previous email and by others in their correspondence with you – is treated as no longer worthy of consideration in its current form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 119 | H A Whatley  
BS16 1NG | I am writing to record my concerns about the 'draft' Concept Statement issued over the summer of 2012. I have seen and read the current proposals and attended the residents' meeting in Frenchay on the evening of Monday 3rd September.  
Whilst I accept that a well-considered concept statement is a useful guide to planning policy, my concerns about the current proposals may be summarised as follows:  
1. Too great a density of development and concern over heights / styles of architecture  
2. Inadequate protection of existing conservation areas, associated green spaces and TPOs etc  
3. Lack of satisfactory traffic management & transport proposals  
4. Very few communal facilities - including a Doctor's surgery etc  
5. Failure to grasp the opportunity to re-use many of the existing buildings on site  
6. Impractical location for the school - with the ideal site not even short-listed...  
In my opinion, South Glos Council should not adopt the Concept Statement as currently drafted and should seriously listen to and act on the many comments being made before establishing any policy guidelines for future re-development. |

| 120 | J Whatley | I am deeply concerned about many issues in the Draft Concept Statement and generally agree with the points made at the consultation meeting held on Monday 3rd September. I wish to underline the following points  
1) the increased densities proposed are unacceptable and not in keeping with the area.  
2) All the green spaces need to be preserved and the trees retained.  
3) Inadequate consideration has been given to Traffic Transport and Parking issues. |
4) Community Facilities appear to have been marginalised....meeting and play spaces and a GP surgery will be needed for the new and existing villagers...2 buses are currently needed to get to local GP surgeries.

5) The school needs to be central to the new and existing village developments, to minimise the travel to school distances and car use and not on preservation land..

6) The demolition of almost all the existing hospital buildings, including the most recent and those built as a result of considerable public and charitable donations appears to be completely illogical...surely at least some could be retained/reused.

It appears that the Draft Concept Statement is inadequate and I recommend it is re written or that the Council reject it and write their own.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>121</th>
<th>S Whitby-Coles Frenchay Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are a number of observations I would like to put forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It would appear that the number of proposed residential homes is far too high, regardless of the so called statistics for density etc. One has occasionally to just adopt a simple common sense approach, and look at the practicalities rather than what it looks like on paper. One only has to look into history to see how often what looked great on paper became a massive disaster in practical terms. If you know Frenchay well you will immediately understand how local residents are bemused at how the infra-structure will cope with the possibility of potentially 1000 cars attempting to leave Frenchay at rush hour/ school time, and returning in the evening!! This may not be an exaggeration!

Therefore a rethink on numbers and density would seem appropriate, before its too late to change things. I would suggest 350 would be more than enough....although of course not offering as much profit to the developer, but certainly kinder to the existing highways and byways and therefore to the local community as a whole.

2. Option one Fig.8 page 25, looks to be the most sensible siting of the new school, which of course is essential in these times, and local people are very aware of the need to support the need for a bigger capacity, however much we love our tradition of Frenchay C of E School, having watched our children grow up there. However we can only hope that all rigour is taken to fulfill the proposals promise to consider the environmental impact on a truly beautiful area of the site, that offers home to so much flora and fauna.

3. What will be the legacy that Frenchay Hospital will leave this community that has supported it unstintingly over so many years.....in sickness and health?

I would like to see the Stable Block donated to the local Community as a Project that could become a community development similar to that of Winterbourne Barn. A place that could hold varieties of functions, concerts, sales, choirs, dramas, teas etc etc. creating opportunities to bring together the new and existing communities for their mutual benefit and enjoyment.

This would be a wonderful legacy for the Hospital to leave, for which the old and new communities would always be grateful.

It would also ensure the conservation and preservation of an important building and area of this site which has long been neglected. It would not impinge upon the rest of the site development. It can only enhance it in so very many ways.
| 122 | Mr & Mrs S J Wadey  
BS16 2SZ | I am writing to you as a resident of Frenchay to object to the proposed development of the Frenchay Hospital site, as set out in the Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept Statement July 2012.  
Frenchay is a quiet rural area which would be significantly compromised by the proposed development including negative impacts from increased volume transport, residential noise and damage to the conservation area. I therefore do not agree that the site should be redeveloped as described in the draft concept statement for mainly residential development. |
| 123 | C Winsor (Chris)  
BS16 1NT | I strongly object to the proposed development of this site as laid out in the Concept Statement submitted to you by the North Bristol NHS Trust and GVA Grimley.  
My objection is for the following reasons:  
1. The proposed development will hugely impact the already dreadful traffic problems particularly at rush hours.  
2. The development intends to build on conservation and protected land.  
3. No provision has been made for any social amenities as part of development.  
4. The volume of houses proposed will damage this unique village and its surrounds forever.  
5. Over the years The NHS Trust has shown scant regard for its immediate neighbours or its responsibilities regarding Graded property onsite. This development is the final insult and must be restrained.  
I might add that the extremely limited timescales make preparing a concerted response from the people of Frenchay very difficult as we have no existing mechanism or elected representatives to express the strongly held views against the development. |
| 124 | C WINSOR (Clare)  
BS16 1NT | I and many of my neighbours in the village are extremely concerned with the current proposal. It has a number of aspects which are totally unacceptable to the residents not least because they appear to ‘fly in the face’ of planning policy and show no regard for one of South Gloucestershire’s unique assets.  
Specifically the areas of major concern are:  
- Complete disregard for conservation area boundaries which have been designated and enforced within the area over many years to protect the special nature of the Village  
- Complete disregard for protecting trees which have been identified as of special interest and importance in the landscape |
| 125 | **J Williams**  
Harford Drive,  
Frenchay.  

Further to a meeting on Monday 3rd September at the Frenchay Village Hall I would like to register my objections to the above.  
I understand that with the scaling down of Frenchay Hospital redevelopment needs to take place on the hospital site but I object strongly to the amount of dwellings proposed. Frenchay is a quiet, unspoiled village, and myself and many other residents choose to live here for this reason. By almost doubling the amount of residents the quiet village will be ruined forever.  
If have no objection to housing for over 55s, what I do object to is the sheer number of houses and flats, many of which will no doubt, be bought by buy to let owners and rented out to students etc, being in the proximity of the UWE. I live in Harford Drive and we have enough problems here as the number of rental properties has increased. People who don't live here for more than 6 months or a year, have no interest in the area in the long term.  
My other main concern is the impact on traffic in the area. Traffic is already a major problem from around 7am until 9am and again from around 4pm. Sometimes the traffic is tailed back so far along Beckspool Road I cannot emerge from Harford Drive - as many cars use Beckspool Road as a short cut to the motorways and the ring road. We already have traffic for the UWE and the MOD at peak times which is a major problem and no doubt this would become much worst with the increase in the population of Frenchay. |
| 126 | **G West**  

I would like to make the following comments on the document:  

**Clarity**
This is not a clear proposal at all. Indeed there are so many anomalies in the document it is tempting to think that it has been deliberately presented in a confusing manner to make commenting on it difficult. I will make more specific points later, but I would particularly like to draw your attention to the inaccuracies and contradictions on the maps in the document, particularly the map on page 5 and partial and limited history of the site on page 8.

**Principles**

Whilst I am broadly in favour to see the majority of the site used for housing and a school, the number of housing units seems very high for type of site and the impact that it will have on the village. I am not content that the development should be allowed to go ahead without any amenities provided. The concept statement makes no mention of any community use buildings and only a fleeting mention of formal sports facilities for which no area of land seems to have been set aside. It is disappointing to see no area of land has been zoned for job creation. It also seems a shame that none of the existing buildings cannot be re-used. Surely the WW2 Water Tower could be developed as flats?

**Surveys**

Whilst the some key features of the site have been identified, it is not clear whether all are really recognised by the proposer. The 'Arboriculture Survey' (p.14 4.4) seems at odds with comments on page 19 5.4. On P19 the proposer acknowledges that "Both woodlands (northern and north east(sic) boundaries) are protected by Tree Preservation Orders" and also recognises their value to wildlife and notes a lot of bat activity (P.18 5.3) but then goes on on P.19 to propose that the Health Trust's preferred option is to 'remove the whole of the north eastern woodland" to provide a site for the school. This would also mean the loss of the pond. From the consultation meetings that have been held is has emerged that the proposer does not have a clear understanding of the TPOs that are in place on the site. The 'survey' that the proposer offers on traffic movements is so vague as to useless.

**Consultation**

I don't consider the consultation process to have been fair or clear. The first workshop was by invitation only and only a few local people were involved. The first public meeting held at Frenchay Village Hall was so over-subscribed that people were turned away as the Hall could not hold them all. People even stood in the kitchen and reception areas. The second public meeting held at Frenchay Village Hall was not attended by any representative of the Health Trust or their agents so it was not possible to get any answers to questions posed.

**Specific Comments**

The are a lot of anomalies in the maps. The map on P.5 showing the 'context' in wildly inaccurate; the area to the south of the hospital in shown as having been built post 1980, yet in truth the housing along Frenchay Park Road and the south west corner of the hospital was all built pre- Second World War and the 'Froomshaw Estate' built by Bristol City Council was complete by 1960. The Petrol Filling station and Shop is missing from the map - This error was pointed out at an early stage of the 'consultation'. The buildings along Begbrook Park are also mostly pre-WW2 (The Catholic Church dates to 1950) with some earlier. Only the estate built around 'The Newlands is later. The area marked on the map as 'Historic Village of Frenchay' is divided in two with one half marked as being built 1950-1980 which is clearly wrong. The photograph on P.8 shows buildings on both sides of Frenchay Hill in the 'early 19th Century' - all these buildings are still extant.
To the north of the hospital site the part of Malmains Drive which borders the hospital is shown as being of 1950-1980 vintage, whereas in truth the road was planned and mostly built before WW2. The hospital trust have a large photograph in their reception area showing the hospital before WW2 with Malmains Drive and most of its houses clearly visible in the background. The area around the convenience (sic) store dates to before WW1.

Even the hospital site itself is incorrect with the large 'Phase One' building development marked as originating between 1950 - 1980 when in fact it was built in 1992 as acknowledged on P.8 of the Trust's proposal. The small area on the hospital site marked (incorrectly) as being from the period 1920-1930 is the remaining buildings of the 'new' Children's Sanitorium built in 1931. For some reason these buildings do not appear (coloured green) on the map on P.11 which purports to show all the pre-1948 development on the site. The maps referred to also show the perimeter of the site extending beyond the hospital grounds around the road entrances. This cannot be right. On the final map on P.29 the area of land around the Brain Injury Unit seems to be much reduced with development indicated for land apparently controlled by the Brain Unit. A strange anomaly.

The photograph on P.27 marked 'Image of Frenchay Common looking from the Hospital' shows no such thing. The photograph is taken on the Common. The Hospital is behind a high stone wall at that point.

I do not think that it is appropriate that the future of Frenchay Park House is considered separately; it is an integral part of the site and needs to be considered in context within the development. A change in use (say to an Hotel) could radically change the traffic patterns and parking requirements within the development and with the Trust's preferred site for the school being so close it is important that the building's use takes into consideration the possible proximity of a large number of children.

There is another anomaly in the document that makes it difficult to truely judge the proposal; On P.4 of the proposal the Trust states that "The existing Frenchay Hospital site equates to approximately 70 acres (28.3 hectares)" yet on P.33 it states that it will seek Outline Planning Permission for "Demolition of all main hospital buildings and redevelopment of 70 acres (28.5ha)". If the entirety of the site is 70 acres, the area of redevelopment must surely be less given the areas occupied by the Brain Injury Unit, The Burden Centre, Frenchay Park House and the green areas for which no development has been proposed. If we cannot accurately judge what area is actually to be redeveloped it makes it very difficult to accurately assess the proposal.

**Other Items**

P.17 "There was consensus not to create a series of new openings through the existing boundary wall ..." I'm not sure where this consensus came from, but I would like to see consideration of removal of parts of the boundary wall where the green area meets the Common (ie. along Beckspool Road by the 'Clic Cottage' entrance, so that visually the green areas would flow together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>127</th>
<th>C Williamson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am relatively new resident of Frenchay Village having lived in the village for only 18 months, however I feel that I must pass on my concerns to you regarding the proposals for the Frenchay Hospital Site. I am a supporter of change and development for the good, and I think that the development could be of great value to the current community, however I am deeply concerned that the density of the proposed residential areas will cause extensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
traffic congestion within Frenchay and further problems for the already congested ring road.

The proposal documents states that future traffic movements post development would be 'well below' existing movements.(P20). However, a large proportion of the traffic on the Frenchay road network are not using the hospital but purely accessing the ring road, motorway or the City Centre via Stapleton Road. To build a further 550 dwellings on a site where people are travelling to work, shopping etc by car will not reduce the significant traffic volumes and congestion in the surrounding area but increase it, surely!

Has a survey of road users actually been carried out? I would be very interested to see how many of the cars are of commuters.

I also believe the proposed number of dwellings is too high, how did the number rise from 350 to 550 in such a short space of time?

Frenchay does not have the basic amenities facilities to meet the needs of an additional 1300 people. It is essential that community facilities e.g school, community centre, doctors surgery are considered. These would be of benefit to us all, but the site surely is too small to accomodate such high density accomodation and everything it needs to go with it?

I am also concerned that there may be an increase in anti social behaviour, as the number of teenagers increases, the natural place for anti-social behaviour to take place would be the common, around the pub or village hall, places where we consider beauty spots, safe for our children to play.

Frenchay is a beautiful, peaceful location which enhances South Gloucestershire. It would be a shame to lose this tranquil location.

Have all options for the site been fully considered? what about retirement accomodation? or using some of the buildings as historic land marks, have the National Trust been appoached, they already own some of the land in Frenchay?

I do hope that you are taking the views of Frenchay residents in a serious manner, we all want the development to be a success, something which can enhance what is already great about Frenchay, and bring the village prosperity but keeping its appeal and exclusivity.

Please see our comments below regarding the Frenchay Hospital draft concept statement.

Clarity
We agree that the document is clear and detailed.

Principles
We agree that a significant proportion of the development should be for residential. However, those new residential units will require community services, for example, shops, GP surgery and sporting facilities so all of these need to be there. The proposed density is also too high.

There will be a large amount of traffic movement, although the hospital currently generates a lot of traffic, residential development will result in a lot of traffic flow in the opposite directions to that currently generated.

Frenchay is an area of outstanding natural beauty and a conservation area therefore we do not agree that the site should be developed.
be developed broadly as described. There’s much reference to density in certain areas based on the current density. Whilst areas of the hospital are more densely developed than other areas, we do not see why the redeveloped site should be developed broadly in line with existing development density and should instead be developed in the best interests of the overall site and surrounding area. So if one area is densely developed now then there's no real reason why it should be densely developed in future and vice versa. Could the rationale for the proposed approach be that the current hospital site has more densely developed areas than lightly developed areas?

**Specific comments**

Page 16 – The number of houses proposed is too high for the site. SGC policy requires a minimum of 30 units per hectare but this document proposes the number of units to be significantly higher than the minimum. The proposal is for 9 hectares at a density of 40-45 units, which at the higher end is 50% above SGC’s minimum. There’s a further 4.5 hectares at a density of 35-40 units.

Page 28 Key development areas and principles

The document refers to 5 residential areas and in each talks about the density of existing buildings. Once the hospital has been demolished then, unless the existing roads are being retained to remind people of what used to here, then there’s no real point in proposing the new development at the same density as the current hospital. It would be far better to plan the overall development based on what would be best for the site as a whole.

The formal residential area does not make any reference to parking arrangements whereas all others refer to a mixture of on and off street parking. A general concern with any development site (not just this hospital site) is that most developments can be made to look good right up until the point that the residents move in and start filling the streets with cars. It’s not clear whether any of the proposals are for apartments or whether they are all houses. If apartments are planned then parking provision for these should be underground to improve the visual impact by not having lots of car parking spaces and cars on view.

**Other issues**

The tennis courts have existed in front of the headquarters building since 1920, clearly shown on map number 1 on page 9 and widely used by the community. We know that SGC is keen for these to be moved as they are in front of a listed building. Any developer will be aware of that but will not be keen to provide alternative space for these on what would otherwise be development land so we expect the council to look after the wider needs of the community when considering a planning application. Therefore we feel that the provision for alternative tennis courts should be covered at an early stage or that SGC should agree that they can stay where they are for the long term if a suitable new location is not made available within the site.

| 129 | Mrs J Watkins  
| BS16 1NX | I wish to express the following points of concern regarding the redevelopment of the Frenchay Hospital site, as a current resident of Frenchay.  
1. I have genuine concerns that 550 new homes is far too many homes to be built on the site, this would have a detrimental effect on the current village environment and character, this would ruin a history that has taken hundreds of years to establish that has been protected in recent years by conservation area protection, that appears to have little value in this current plan. The site should be based on the style of existing developments in Frenchay, such as Grange park and |
Riverwood. Paying particular attention to the stone used and space between homes.

2. I feel that the development should be spread over a number of years in say four or more phases to graduate the growth in population and ensure the appropriate infrastructure is in place. The current traffic situation is unacceptable without 500 more houses.

3. There should be absolutely no building on existing green field sites such as the existing field the helicopter lands and no old stone walls should be demolished, after all a normal member of the public would not get permission to do so, so why should you?

4. Suitable facilities such as a doctors surgery and local shop should be included.

5. An appropriate, realistic number of parking places should be built into the plan.

6. The current community facilities i.e. the village hall should be given full support to continue with its valuable service to the community, as it has provided for over 100 years during, and beyond the development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>130</th>
<th>Mr A &amp; Mrs K Yates, BS16 1NY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A P Julian, BS16 1NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr A Ward &amp; Miss R Julian, BS16 1RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction.**

The aim of the following submission is to detail conclusions drawn after reading the Frenchay Hospital Concept Statement July 2012. All the following points in this submission refer back to the Frenchay Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document March 2007 (Frenchay Conservation Area SPD). Quotation marks will indicate any text I have inserted from this document.

**General Comments on the Frenchay Hospital Concept Statement.**

Overall lack of real information and the tightness of timeframe for submission of meaningful and considered comments. I rang the Planning Contact Centre to confirm that an email submission would be accepted up to the end of Friday 14th September.

**Areas Commented Upon**

1. Lime Tree Avenue including proposal to site new school here and the Gateway development. This is the only section that I have commented upon with any serious reference back to the Frenchay Conservation Area SPD. All other comments are in outline only.

2. New proposed buildings fronting onto Frenchay Common.

3. North and North west wooded areas. Retention/Removal.

4. Style of proposed dwellings abutting conservation areas.

5. Traffic Volumes and direction plus Pollution and Air Quality.


**Background Detail.**
"A Conservation Area is an area of Special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which is desirable to preserve or enhance." (p2)

"Frenchay has been described as a green oasis on the outskirts of Bristol...........Great care should be taken in its development" (p3)

"In designating a Conservation Area the local planning authority has a duty to ensure that any proposed development will preserve or enhance the special qualities of the area. " (p2)

From (p13) "For any large-scale redevelopment proposals, a detailed conservation area assessment and design concept statement are essential. The following principles will apply to any new buildings, alterations or redevelopment on the site"

The July 2012 Concept Statement contains very little information or even text relating to the specific requirements of the Conservation Area status covering a considerable area of the Hospital site. This is a great concern. It must be noted that publication of the Frenchay Conservation Area SPD in March 2007, came after a considerable dialogue with local residents and thus it must be assumed to be an accurate representation of the views held by the all concerned parties. We have the Concept Plan but where is the detailed conservation area assessment?

The Frenchay Conservation Area SPD has a section entitled Keeping and Enhancing the Character (p7). It states "...the wrong details or materials, erosion of walls and loss of trees can harm the unique character and downgrade the area" It goes on to state that "new development ...needs to be in scale and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is important that it does not adversely harm the setting of the existing historic features, views ..."

The Frenchay Conservation Area SPD section entitled "Preservation and Enhancement Strategy" (p13) is particularly relevant.

".......New development or alteration needs to be in scale and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is important that it does not adversely harm the setting of the existing historic features, views or archaeology. "

"Protect important views and resist the loss of trees, green or open space and informal verges which contribute to the character of the settlement.

Seek to retain existing trees and secure a replacement planting strategy. New planting should recognise the historic context by using appropriate species, layout and scale."

**Frenchay Hospital**

The Frenchay Conservation Area SPD has a section specific to Frenchay Park - Frenchay Hospital Site.

"Frenchay Park House, with its adjoining open space and specimen trees (remnants of the former Parkland) and Lime tree avenue are important elements within the Conservation Area providing an attractive setting to the listed buildings and historic character. The lawns and parkland trees both original and new planting, contribute significantly to the setting of the house and adjoining Common land. The trees and shrubs of the site provide an important role in screening the modern hospital development in views from the Common. Recent encroachments by parking and building, particularly of the Lime tree avenue have adversely affected the character of the Conservation Area." (p12)
Comment 1

The following comes from the section Preservation and Enhancement Strategy / development Guidelines p(13) and I have selected the Lime Avenue as an example because in a Concept Statement that has very little real information on many key areas, this is one of the few examples that shows Development/GVA Conservation Area re-development goals.

"Retain and enhance the integrity of Lime Tree Avenue, which helps to screen the modern buildings beyond. No new buildings, structures or parking should encroach into this area. The loss of trees or harm to the avenue character will be resisted. Any proposed redevelopment of existing buildings should be set back from the avenue and enhance the setting."

The Concept Document, 4.4 Arboriculture Survey, states "The avenue of lime trees ..... show some levels of deterioration." What does this mean exactly?

Later in Concept Document 5.4 Trees, we read "Arboricultural advice has been provided regarding the retention or replanting of the lime tree avenue which is in decline." Again, what does this mean and what is the purpose of this statement?

Finally in Concept Document 6.9 Trees, we are told that "The advice on the quality on the Lime Tree Avenue questions the longevity of this landscape feature in its current form. The proposed option is to replant one side of the lime tree avenue and translocate the semi mature trees on the south side of the avenue to create the new double sided avenue for the future."

In a few pages we have gone from some levels of deterioration, to the developer stating that the Lime Tree Avenue needs to be replanted. Which of the three statements is the developer position? There is a sense of being led to final statement upon the viability of the Lime Tree Avenue. I cannot help but question why there is nothing in the 2007 Frenchay Conservation Area SPD that refers to a need for seemingly extreme remedial work. Just at a time when the screening properties of the Lime Tree Avenue would help to soften and anchor the new development into the greater landscape that is Frenchay Common, it is suggested that all the existing Lime trees will be cut down? Referring back to the Frenchay Conservation Area SPD, (p13) there is a picture showing the semi-mature Limes that are potentially to be relocated. They are not on the same scale as the existing trees in the Lime Avenue. When taken together with a second line of re-planted Lime trees, the visual spectacle will be lost. Any screening potential will be lost. This would be particularly destructive to the Conservation Area character as the developer is suggesting that three storey, terraced, brick and render town houses should be fronting on to the Lime Tree Avenue. Referring to Frenchay Conservation Area SPD (p13) "Protect important views and setting of the listed buildings and conservation area. Ensure the location, height, scale and massing of development does not impinge on views or project above the trees giving a more built up feel or competing with nearby historic buildings."

If the last statement from the Concept Statement is accepted the result will be that in my lifetime, I and others will have this highly valued green asset taken from us. I ask the council to take the position stated above and retain and enhance the integrity of Lime Tree Avenue and include this in the planning application constraints. It would go against the spirit of the Conservation Area aims if, as an individual, the Frenchay Conservation Area SPD is enforced for a single tree and then relaxed for a developer wishing to significantly change a whole avenue of trees. The same rules must apply to all.

Comment 2

Also with reference to the Frenchay Conservation Area SPD and the Conservation Area in front of the Lime Tree Avenue,
but this time with reference to the proposal to site the new school and / or the Gateway development. I strongly believe that these proposals are contrary to the whole point of a conservation area and must therefore be resisted. Frenchay Conservation Area SPD (p12) states "Recent encroachments by parking and building particularly of the Lime Tree Avenue have affected the character of the Conservation Area." It would mean far more encroachment if either proposal were to be adopted.

Comment 3
The wooded areas on the North and North East of the Frenchay Hospital site. In the Concept Statement, whilst the North wooded area retains much of its volume, the wooded area in the North East will be reduced to just a few mature boundary trees. This would lead to the views from the Frenchay Village Hall end of the common changing significantly. The screen provided by a depth of trees enables a continuity of green as one moves along that section of common. The backdrop becomes even more important when the area is viewed from the hedgerow in the hillyfields/valley. The backdrop is also important to Cedar Hall and Malmaison residents, whose outlook would be seriously denuded. Finally, the North West wooded area has a historic and archaeological park designation on the maps of the Frenchay Conservation Area SPD. I would therefore question exactly what the various planning designations require from potential developers.

The following entry is from document South Gloucestershire Planning Document PTE-07-0634 Historic Parks & Gardens in South Gloucestershire
"Frenchay Hospital, Frenchay, Winterbourne, ST 638 777, 10a, SMR 11078. Frenchay Conservation Area. C18 parkland now substantially built over by hospital: fine avenue and specimen trees; cedar, Wellingtonia, monkey-puzzle, holm oak; ha-ha; walled garden; entrance lodges. French Park House (LBII) mid C18, extended early C19; stableblock (LBII) mid C19. Major hospital and HQ of Frenchay Health Authority."

It is also noteworthy that information regarding the future development plans for the Frenchay Park House amounts to the statement "retained buildings". Comment is therefore not possible.

Comment 4
Referencing the proposed dwellings that will be built abutting any of the historic and/or conservation areas.
Again the lack of the any detail regarding the very special qualities of the environment within and abutting the Conservation Area prevents a specific and focused analysis of the proposals.

(p13) "Protect important views and setting of the listed buildings and conservation area. Ensure the location, height, scale and massing of development does not impinge on views or project above the trees giving a more built up feel or competing with nearby historic buildings."

The Frenchay Conservation Area SPD (p6) "brick was seldom used except as surrounds to windows or doors on Victorian cottages."

(p11), The Georgian Houses and Churches states "The adjoining Rectory in brick detracts from the traditional character and would benefit from planting to the front and side to screen it from view.

The photographs of typical proposed dwellings along the frontage seen from the Common and abutting the Lime Tree Avenue, shows generic brick, three storey terraced dwellings in a Georgian style. The developers document states that the
proposed style is in keeping with Frenchay Common House and Bradfords’ House. Neither of these historic houses have any exposed brick. Rather they are rendered in a soft, Bath stone colour to complement both the Pennant stone of the church and the finish of the grander houses that are also part of the view. Therefore, where does the considerable use of red brick fit in with the Frenchay Conservation Area SPD document statement regarding brick in the Rectory and its use generally within Frenchay?

Another important fact is that this area has $360^0$ views when use of and movement/driving around the common, is taken into consideration. It must surely be vital for the retention rather than destruction of the character, that this fact is prioritised.

Comment 5

Traffic data. It appears that informal observations have been the basis for the statements within the Concept Statement. An important piece of data is the volume of traffic flow in each direction, along with peak flow data plus subsequent modelling of the traffic flow in the whole area. Currently this is not present.

Increased traffic volumes that are slow moving will inevitably generate more pollution. I am unable to comment further due to lack of data, specifically, what is pollution currently and how do traffic models predict that this will alter?

Comment 6

Buildings proposed for Demolition - Macmillian Palliative/End of Life Care Facility.

The Macmillan building was funded by charitable donations therefore those of us that contributed, wish to know exactly what is happening to the Macmillan building? If the building is destroyed, where will replacement provision be based?

The only current provision of this type is provided by Macmillan and St Peters Hospice. The large expansion in the local population suggests that the loss of this service would be significant. If the building is being demolished, will reimbursement will be offered to Macmillan in order that this highly valued and much needed service will be replaced?

We, the undersigned have had to submit one comment document between us. This has been forced upon us due to the lack of information about the Concept Plan and the opportunity afforded to residents to comment. This in itself needs to be improved.

I have carefully read the Draft Concept Statement regarding the redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital, and I have serious concerns about the plan to build 550 houses at the site.

(a) Section 7 discusses the housing numbers of the proposed development. However, the average density of this development is not given. As a mathematician I find it very misleading because the average density is the most important figure in this context. Given that about 30-35 acres at the site will be used for housing, it can be calculated that building 550 houses yields the average density $38.8-45.3$ dph (dwellings per hectare).

Let us compare the above density with the the sample of existing village densities given in Section 7. The average density of this sample is $30.5$ dph, and the upper quartile is equal to 32.7 dph. The upper quartile shows the start point of the upper tail of the distribution for the above sample. Roughly speaking, an upper (lower) tail of a distribution provides atypical elements of this distribution, which are very far from the average. Thus, the upper tail of the sample of the existing village densities consists of sites with dph greater than 32.7, i.e. the Tanners Court and the cluster of cottages south of the primary
The main question is why the average density of the proposed development (38.8-45.3 dph) is much higher than the average density (30.5 dph) of the sample of existing village densities? Also, as explained above, why is the proposed development in one row with the Tanners Court and the cluster of cottages south of the primary school, comprising the worst part of Frenchay from the viewpoint of densities?

(b) Section 14 is devoted to the likely impact of the development on the local roads, and says that "the critical issue will be whether there is additional peak hour traffic". The answer to this question is not given in the paper, but as a specialist in traffic networks I can confidently say that there will be additional peak hour traffic in the morning rush hours. The main problem is long queues during morning rush hours to get to the ring road. However, in mornings, the hospital stuff is going from the ring road and other places towards the hospital, thus not contributing to this problem. With the new development, many new residents will be going to their workplaces through the ring road, thus making the existing morning queues much worse. How will this problem be solved?

(c) There are currently no playgrounds for children in Frenchay, no sport centre, and few sport facilities. This problem is important to me because I have two children. With the considerable increase of the population, how are you going to address this serious issue?

I have the following concerns about the plan to build 550 houses at the site:

1. There are long queues in the morning rush hours to get to the ring road. With the new development, many new residents will go to their workplaces through the ring road creating even longer queues. Good bus services might help to reduce queues, however we don't have such services in Frenchay. The majority of busses that I need to travel to UWE (e.g. First services 18, 318 and 319) travel on Bristol Road. They don't travel through Frenchay and their timetable could be much better. The only bus that travels close to where I live is bus 312 but it does not operate until mid-morning. Are you going to improve the bus services in Frenchay and if yes, then when problem will be solved?

2. The second problem is that there are currently no playgrounds for children in Frenchay at all! We don't have any sport centre/swimming pool. As far as I understand, we may expect much more families with children and teenagers in Frenchay. Are you going to improve this situation?

3. We do need doctors surgery in Frenchay. Also, there must be more shops, cafe/pub and other places for socialising. Do you have any plans to improve infrastructure in Frenchay and if yes, then what exactly are you going to build and when?

4. However, my biggest concern is the number of houses that will be built on the Frenchay Hospital site. If all 550 dwellings are built, then it will be even more difficult to achieve good standards in the level of infrastructure/facilities in Frenchay, and we may expect increase in crime.

Unfortunately I missed the deadline for comments regarding the GVA Concept Statement for development of the Frenchay Hospital site and I am unable to attend the AGM this evening. I would therefore like to make some comments as a resident of Frenchay, which I hope will be taken into account in the decision to accept any development plans for the site.
Firstly, from the information I have seen so far the over-riding driver for the development appears to be maximisation of the land value for the NHS trust. Whilst they are a public body this cannot be allowed to be the primary driver, particularly given the historic and special nature of Frenchay and the potential for the permanent negative impact that a poorly conceived development may have on the village.

My primary concerns for the development are the number of housing units proposed (around 500) and the taking of green space for the construction of buildings (e.g. school). GVA previously made a comparison to recent nearby developments in Hanham Hall and Cheswick in order to justify the proposed density for the Frenchay development. This is clearly misleading and does not take account of the specific and special nature of Frenchay Village and incorporated green space. My personal view is that all current green space within the Frenchay Hospital site should be preserved and not built upon, and the school should be located within the current developable area, with the number of residential units reduced to somewhere nearer 300. The design of all residential units within the site should be in keeping with the environment. I also understand that the plans for the community hospital are now uncertain.

On the basis of the above I would therefore request that the Concept Statement for the development is rejected until a time that the development plans and the wishes of the community of Frenchay are better aligned to create a positive change for the area.

Feedback from organisations

1. Winterbourne Parish Council

There are several matters that need to be addressed as presented in the draft statement. However the biggest danger we have is in responding to matters raised and ignoring the macro concepts of a new development of this kind.

It would be as well to remind ourselves of the Introduction to South Gloucestershire’s Conservation document for the area in 2007.

_Frenchay was designated as a Conservation Area in 1975 in recognition of its unique architectural and historic character and appearance, with buildings, its attractive setting, Commons, open spaces and adjoining wooded river valley._

_In designating a Conservation Area the local planning authority has a duty to ensure that any proposed development will preserve or enhance qualities of the area._

It has also been stated in the South Gloucestershire Strategic Plan that they anticipated something like 350 houses and not the 550 units now hospital. There is a lack of clarity about how the figure of 550 units was arrived at.

An example of concern is that Para 1.1 of the Concept Statement defines the ‘application boundary’ which includes the Trust HQ and Stable these buildings have been taken out of the application -Why?

Surely since it has been stated that these buildings will be redeveloped the master plan should cover the whole area. Many of the issues raised at meetings are dependent on the type of development at different locations; a hotel has been mentioned as indeed have luxury flats. The demand for services would be quite different in these two cases.

It is regrettable therefore that it will be necessary to look very closely at any proposals made and test each one against the criteria of:
IS IT IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF FRENCHAY?

OPEN SPACES - section 6.6

The Supplementary Planning Document for Frenchay Conservation Area states that development proposals “in connection with the hospital ... recognise the high quality sensitive historic and landscape character and setting of the site”.

“The following principles will apply to any new buildings, alterations or redevelopment on the site

- Protect important views and setting of the listed buildings and conservation area.
- Maintain the open green area, trees and former parkland adjoining Frenchay Park.
- Retain and enhance the integrity of Lime Tree Avenue....... No new buildings should encroach into this area. The loss of trees or harm character will be resisted. Any proposed redevelopment of existing buildings should be set back from the avenue and enhance the setting.

Any development of the hospital should retain the open spaces and the listed trees on the site. These form an important backdrop to the surrounding Conservation Area. Winterbourne Parish Council hopes that South Gloucestershire Council will negotiate with North Bristol Hospital Trust to secure spaces from the land to be developed. These could then be transferred to South Gloucestershire Council or Winterbourne Parish Council with backing to help in the future maintenance of the land to be used for formal or informal use. Past experience with the hospital has shown that it is important an agreement is put in place before planning permission is given.

The land south of Lime Tree Avenue would be ideal for community recreation and sports usage as there is a shortage in Frenchay. An option offered by the hospital is for the open land to be managed by the developers. Winterbourne Parish Council considers that the land should be transferred prior to any development commencing.

The proposal to site the new primary school on the land south of Lime Tree Avenue would ruin the views from the Common into the site. Even if the school site is open playing fields these would be surrounded by a 3 metre high fence (as in the present school).

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

In the absence of detailed traffic survey information it is difficult to comment. Unusual units have been used to measure traffic flows in the Draft Statement. The simple facts are that a hospital has many varied working shift patterns which in turn means that peak flows are not greatly different to average flows. However any domestic housing area will have very distinct peak flows at early morning and early evening, which means in this case peak flows of 1000+ vehicles during a peak period. The road network locally is already saturated with traffic at peak times resulting in totally unsuited roads for larger scale runs’.

There are four matters that will need attention:-

- Sufficient off street parking to accommodate all hospital staff, patients and visitors.
- B4058 from A4174 to Snuff Mills will need to be upgraded to accommodate new flow patterns at the junctions, this to include footpath works and new school routes to school.
- Junction of Cleevewood Road and Beckspool Road will need to be upgraded to accommodate new flow patterns.
• Traffic calming initiative on Begbrook Park at its junction with Frenchay Park Road and also on Cleevedwood Road either side of the river bridge.

The site is within an existing road system. The traffic is already at saturation point and there is nothing in the Concept Statement to address how this traffic will be reduced.

The Concept Statement asserts that “future traffic movements will be well below existing movements”.

Much of the traffic in the roads surrounding the hospital is passing through Frenchay to U.W.E, Bristol Business Park and to the Eastville junction (the present junction from the A4174 Ring Road is so congested that cars prefer to drive through Frenchay to Eastville). This means that cars will funnel out of the site in the mornings on to a road which is already saturated with through traffic.

**DENSITY – 9.0**

The Concept Statement states that the Trust is submitting an outline planning application including:

*Approximately 550 residential units across the site at an average density of 35-45 per hectare on the net developable area.*

South Gloucestershire’s guidelines state that there should be at least 30 residential units per hectare. However, this is not an undeveloped site and infrastructure can be put in place to make a development at this density sustainable. Special account should be taken of the unique nature of the site to a conservation Area and a well known area attraction for visitors.

The proposal to build 550 units as stated in the concept document is completely incompatible with the extract of the S Gloucestershire Local Plan shown below

Frenchay Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document

This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides an appraisal of the Frenchay Conservation Area. It sets out the main features contributing to its distinctive character and appearance of the Conservation Area along with a strategy for its preservation and enhancement. The SPD will support the relevant policies of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan and will be used when assessing the merits of development proposals.

On P7 of this document the following two paragraphs state

2) Ensure that any new development (or alteration) respects the historic context. New development or alteration needs to be in scale and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is important that it does not adversely harm the setting of the existing historic features, such as archaeology.

3) Minimise the impact of existing modern development by ensuring adjoining modern development does not impinge on the historic characteristic.

Enhancement proposals should seek to reduce this impact by protecting important views or gaps and using planting and natural stone walls to soften the impact of obtrusive features and create a sense of enclosure and place.

While the open views are protected looking South East towards the Common, the attractive views to the North West skyline looking towards the hill near Stoke Park will be denied to many if three storey buildings are considered.

The concept shows 40-45 units/Hectare on the area adjacent to the Bristol Road which means it must contain three storey buildings, while these are tolerable in some situations it is hardly the open vista culture associated with the area of Frenchay.

**Community Facilities**

Without knowing the precise nature of the final layout it is difficult to establish what the total community needs will be. However there are certain...
• The young children’s play area.
• Youth facilities including a sports hall.
• Pre school facilities connected to the new school.
• Financial contribution to enhance the existing Village Hall to serve the enlarged community.
• Other needs as they evolve.

GVA has indicated that the development will be in phases over a period of up to 10 years. It is important that the funding needs to be in place when Planning Permission is granted.

Primary School
The need for a new school is already recognized. However the preferred locations seem more aligned to maximising profits for the hospital rather than best for the future community. Both options in the Concept Statement would mean using open spaces which the community strongly opposes.

The option of erecting the school at the junction of Lime Tree Walk and the road leading from Clic cottage seems the best option since it satisfies the criteria:-
• Provides a safe route to school from most areas that it would serve incorporating the existing South Gloucestershire Council’s Safer Routes zones.
• The access from Clic cottage would be for the school’s exclusive use providing both a safe environment, parking facilities and access to open spaces.
• Enjoys ready access to the village church.
• Community facilities such as a preschool group and the use of a hall for activities could be managed by using the school as a community setting which would provide an income for the school and avoid costly running costs in a separate provision.

Doctors’ Surgery.
While the hospital has been very positive on this issue the Primary Care Trust has stated that at present there is no need for a new surgery. However local people are finding it difficult to visit their Doctor by public transport and the matter needs further investigation.

Points to be considered are:-
1. While the existing population may not satisfy PCT criteria, new developments in the area will establish such a need.
2. One Doctor has stated that should a building be provided then he would be keen to establish a satellite surgery to his main practice, this would provide a local service soon to be followed by expansion into a full surgery should the need arise.
3. Within the existing medical facility appropriate accommodation suitable for a surgery could be found. This would have financial and environmental advantages.
4. Alternatively, provision could be made within the development of the new community hospital.

We also have to remember that while issues of this kind can be based on mutual trust, when confidence in that trust has been eroded then care is taken in ensuring that any agreements made are legally drawn up.
Unfortunately in this instance that trust has been badly damaged in the past. Three separate examples are:-

- On-street Parking demonstrated a complete disregard for the local environment although initially claimed to be for logistic reasons, it was found that it was for financial gain.
- Provision of an area of land for a children’s play area offered by the hospital, when Winterbourne Parish Council provided funding for the site, the hospital reneged on its promise.
- The sale of the property offered to the Museum again the hospital reneged on the deal when the community provided the financial backing to be completed.

Winterbourne Parish Council sees that the project has the potential to be a positive development for Frenchay. It will be the biggest change to a generation. It is essential that the Concept Statement addresses the legitimate concerns of the Community and Winterbourne Parish Council.

South Gloucestershire Council and the North Bristol Hospital Trust will then leave a legacy that everyone can be proud of.

### 2. Winterbourne Parish Council (2) 13 November 2012

**Proposed Redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital**

On 5th November, at a full meeting of Winterbourne Parish Council, Members unanimously passed a motion deprecating the handling of the above issues. While there are many matters regarding promises made and then not kept, by the developers, they are issues for another time, but it has to be said, each broken promise reduces the community’s trust in the developer.

However the motion is strictly focused on the timing of the submission of the Concept Statement and a profound concern over the two important matters described below:

1. The future of the listed buildings: these have been deliberately excluded from the application.
2. The recent uncertainty regarding the building of the Community Hospital: it forms a significant part of the Concept Statement and we understand also be in the outline planning permission.

The doubts surrounding these two matters concern the Parish Council greatly and we would ask that any application be deferred until there is further discussion with the developer about these issues.

Furthermore, we understand that a similar redevelopment of Blackberry Hill hospital, by UBHT and Linden Homes, will be progressed by a “Community Approach” so that the public concerns can be addressed, and local ideas embraced, Winterbourne Parish Council and Frenchay residents would welcome this approach.

### 3. RUG Alan Jocelyn

As you know, from my earlier e-mail of 31st August, members of RUG are very concerned about the pace of the planning process. In particular from the release of the Concept Statement on 31st July, to the deadline for responses from the public by 14th September, even with the possibility to extend the period until the end of September, seems far too short, especially as the holiday month of August fell within this period when it is very difficult to make contact with people.

I feel I should restate that RUG has spoken to many local residents and can confirm that they are only now beginning to realise the scale, and the changes being proposed. Happily, the subsequent debate is starting to generate new ideas that could, not only be more acceptable to
benefit the wider community, but may even raise the value of the site. One particular concept is the construction of a high quality ‘retirement home’ which respect its closeness to the proposed Community Hospital would seem ideal. Such a development, together with building a number of new houses, a new school, would fulfil several social needs whilst, at the same time, significantly reducing the drawbacks of a ‘housing estate’, as currently proposed.

RUG is confident that further ideas will emerge from the community which could, perhaps, be assessed more effectively if a ‘Community Advisory Group’ was established, similar to the one being created by Linden Homes/NBT to advise on the redevelopment of the Blackberry Hill Hospital site.

With the above thoughts in mind, I request, on behalf of RUG, and with the support of local residents, that the current planning process be extended for a further six months, thereby allowing time for a more ‘community cohesive’ approach to developing the site. An extension to the deadline of this duration would provide GVA time to include the Listed Buildings and associated land as, at present, this is missing from their Concept Statement rendering it incomplete.

We are faced with the greatest change to Frenchay Village for more than a century. It would be tragic to rush the process and get it wrong for future generations to come.

The Residents User Group (RUG) of Frenchay was created to help the interchange of information between those planning the future of Frenchay Village, principally GVA Grimley (GVA), together with the North Bristol Health Trust, and local residents. Thus, it has been widely acknowledged that those who will have to live with the resultant development, should participate in the planning process and that their views should help GVA develop a plan which will be welcomed by residents and enhance Frenchay by creating a new, expanded community.

As the principal conduit of information, RUG has seen copies of 42 individual responses from local residents to the published Concept Statement, all without exception, have expressed deep concern over three key issues:

1. The retention, management, development, ownership and security of all green open spaces
2. The number, style and quality of houses
3. The lack of any plan to deal with the increase in rush hour traffic

In addition, many residents were also concerned about the following:

4. The need/location of a new school
5. The lack of community facilities including a GP Surgery
6. A disregard of the Conservation area SPD from SGC in 2007

Other residents were of the opinion that the CS was seriously flawed and that it should be rejected by SGC.

With around 200 residents at the recent Winterbourne Parish Council meeting in Frenchay, it is clear that the community has a strong desire to respond accordingly to the CS.
However, having seen these views, RUG would like to take this opportunity to suggest a way forward.

Both Simon Jenkins, Chairman of the National Trust, and Simon Thurley, Chief Executive of English Heritage, have recently declared how fo...rating is an example. So it is particularly important that any changes to such places are very carefully considered. Furthermore, the buildings and open spaces, which characterise Frenchay are, not just a pleasure to the eye, but the very special community spirit that characterises Frenchay. Thus, local events are always sold out, neighbourly support is widespread and spaces is generous.

In the last 60 years, two major architectural experiments within the UK scarred the landscape and destroyed communities. The first was the brutal accommodation which rapidly isolated its occupants and most of the blocks have now been demolished. The second was the urban estate, which led to a soulless sprawl of houses and absence of any sense of community.

Clearly, such a development must be avoided which is why the density of housing and loss of open spaces, as described in the CS, are therefore, feel that further consultation is needed to explore the key elements of the development and would suggest that different ‘visions’ for the site be considered.

For example, a mixed development could be considered comprising of a retirement village, similar to the highly successful one built by the on the edge of the Downs, together with a smaller number, say 200, family homes. The children of the latter, when added to the existing number, would generate the need for a 210 entry school, instead of the huge 420 entry school that 550 houses would require.

In addition, community facilities such as a leisure centre, which could include a swimming pool, exercise facilities and a garden for disabled people, that would benefit the existing disabled residents from the Manor House in Frenchay. A nursing home may also be appropriate if there was a village within the development. Other possibilities include a GP surgery, which would fit in very well with the new community hospital that is much needed rehabilitation unit.

There are, almost certainly, many more ideas that local people could bring to the planning process which would enhance the community of Frenchay. With respect we recommend that GVA establish a ‘Community Board’, similar to the one being created by Linden Homes/NBT to advise on the redevelopment of the Blackberry Hill Hospital site.

We are deeply concerned at the pace of the planning process. Thus the decision to close Frenchay Hospital was taken 5 years ago when the community are being asked to give their opinion on the development of the site in a matter of weeks.

It is essential to remember that Frenchay is part of Britain’s heritage and every effort must be made to ensure that appropriate development that a real community can be maintained which may, perhaps, become an example to other developers.

---

5. **Frenchay School**  
G Rosenberg

I am writing on behalf of Frenchay Primary School’s Board of Governors to set out our response to the South Gloucestershire Council (SGC) on the Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept Statement.

As a Governing Body we formed a Working Group in 2011 to review the impacts the housing development proposed for the Frenchay hospital on primary school provision in Frenchay, and consider this in the light of the facilities and teaching currently provided at Frenchay Primary School.

**FPS Governing Body Involvement in the Consultation**

In support of this, the Governing Body’s Working Group has held several meetings with staff from the Local Authority’s Department for Children, People and reviewed the projections of the demand for primary pupil places in Frenchay area. We have also engaged with North Bristol Trust...
late 2011: we held three meetings with NBT and their consultants on the 4th July 2011, 6th September 2011 and 1st November 2011 to discuss school provision and the impacts the hospital site redevelopment would have on Frenchay Primary School. Governors also attended the Consult Workshop on the 16th January 2012.

We would like to note that we have not had any direct formal contact with NBT or their consultants subsequent to the public exhibition. However, Teacher and Community Governors, we attended the Public Exhibition on Wednesday 21st March as well as several local public meetings.

You have asked consultees to comment on the clarity of the concept statement and the consultation process. We find there are significant remaining uncertainties in the Concept Statement with respect to the layout of roads, footpaths and cycle routes. Section 6.7 refers to a “detailed review of options”: we have not had access to this detailed review and were not informed about Options 3 and 4 prior to the issue of the Draft Concept Statement. We have not been informed about the rationale for the emergence of the two preferred options presented in the Concept Statement, or the reasons for the emergence.

FPS Governing Body Assessment of Future Primary School Needs in Frenchay

In April 2012, following on from the NBT Public Exhibition, we consulted widely with our parents and staff regarding their expectations of local school provision. The key statistical findings of our survey were:

1. An overwhelming support for relocating and rebuilding Frenchay Primary School on the Frenchay Hospital site, due to the opportunities this would provide for a dedicated playing field and up-to-date buildings and facilities (See Figure 1 in Annex A).
2. A similarly overwhelming support for the retention of strong social links between Frenchay primary school provision and St John’s Church (See Figure 2 in Annex B).
3. A strong belief that remaining geographically close to St John’s Church is important in preserving the links between the primary school and St John’s (See Figure 3 in Annex C).
4. An overwhelming support for retaining a ‘traditional’ and ‘village feel’ in Frenchay primary school provision (See Figure 4 in Annex D).

Based on the review of the qualitative data in the parent and staff survey results, the FPS Board of Governors then identified a set of essential criteria (presented in full in Annex B) that we believe must be met when locating future primary school provision in Frenchay. In summary these were:

1. Provision of safe access routes to school from all parts of village;
2. Sufficient space consolidated on a single site, including ample playing fields;
3. Long term financial viability;
4. Supportive of safeguarding of children;
5. A sustainable development;
6. Geographically in a central location in the village;
7. Well-lit and modern classrooms;
8. Retention of current school ethos and ‘traditional village feel’;
9. Sensitive location with respect to environmental noise.
Conclusions

As a Governing Body the key conclusions we have drawn from our review of the needs for primary school provision in Frenchay, coupled with
of the Draft Concept Statement, are set out below.

Firstly, the Board of Governors believe there is an urgent need for a two-form entry primary school as part of the Frenchay Hospital site redev
welcome its provision in the proposed Concept Statement for the following reasons:

1. It is clear that the scale and location of the housing development being proposed in the Concept Statement will, without doubt, create a major
demand for local primary school places in Frenchay. These additional places cannot, under any circumstances, be accommodated within the exis
at Frenchay Primary School which is already oversubscribed, and we therefore agree with the statement in Section 6.7 of the Concept Statement
that “there is insufficient capacity to accommodate these anticipated school places in the existing Frenchay CofE Primary School”.

2. In meeting the needs for primary school provision in Frenchay, the clear message from our parent and staff survey is that the two qualitativ
of a ‘traditional village atmosphere’ and ‘strong links’ with St John’s Baptist Church are of utmost importance. We believe that alongside Frenc
pub, the Church and the Village Hall, the primary school fulfils a key role in creating community cohesion. For these reasons, the Governors sup
principle of locating a single primary school on the hospital site: it provides a central location within the village and relatively close proximity to the
Baptist church; and we therefore support SGC in seeking a “holistic approach to community provision”.

3. We believe that it would be detrimental for local children of such a young age to travel outside of Frenchay for their primary education. This
because of our great concern that this would have a significantly adverse impact on social cohesion in Frenchay. However we also recognize the
of additional traffic congestion and ensuring safe routes to local schools for primary age children educated out of area. We therefore strongly b
children in Frenchay should attend a local primary school and all feedback with our stakeholders has endorsed this principle.

4. We are aware that NBT are seeking to redevelop the Frenchay Hospital site on a relatively rapid timescale in order to recover the capital re
sale of the land. We are also aware (as mentioned above) that there are insufficient primary school places in the area to meet additional dem
imperative that the provision of new primary school places is in line with the scale and pace of housing redevelopment. This will go some way to
competing claims for admission from parents. We believe the availability of land on the hospital site can and should be used to mitigate this ris

Secondly, the Board of Governors was able to assess the suitability of the three options proposed at the Public Exhibition against the criteria
Annex B. In July 2012 we concluded:

1. Option 1 (by Village Museum) would provide a suitable site for a school, but due to it encroaching on conservation land would be unlikely to
support;

2. Option 2 (car park behind stables) would provide a suitable site for the school and meet its needs well, but the shape of the footprint could be

3. Option 3 (adapting the stable block) was least well suited to the school’s needs: it would be the most expensive to deliver and maintain and
meet out criteria of financial viability.

However, due to the relatively short timescale of the consultation on the Draft Concept Statement, and that this consultation period has coinci
summer holidays, it has not been possible to complete a similar assessment of Option 1 as presented in the Draft Concept Statement (Section
impact of this now extending into the woodland area.

Overall, we believe that the Concept Statement has considered a very limited set of locations for primary school provision. Furthermore we wo
understand the reasoning for changing the footprint for the site to the north of Frenchay Park House. In addition, the Governors identified a fou
possible site (opposite hospital site entrance ‘C’ and on the site of the current Day Hospital) which we believe is worthy of consideration.

**Other Considerations**

We also would like note two further relevant considerations. Firstly Frenchay is a Church of England Voluntary Controlled Primary School with historical and strong contemporary links to St John’s Church as identified in the 2010-11 Anglican Schools Report: “The Christian ethos of the school is important to all stakeholders and has a positive impact on the learning and choices made by the pupils” and “Links with the local church are still very significant and have a positive impact on the learning experiences of pupils.” It is therefore of no surprise that a further strongly held view of parents, fully supported by the Governing Body and endorsed by the Diocesan Board of Education (DBE), is the need to retain the excellent and strong links with St John’s Church. We are in no doubt that the distance between the school and the church is a major factor in maintaining these strong ties and the distinctiveness that the Church of England brings to the school.

Secondly, in recent years Frenchay Primary School has made major steps forward in the quality of education it is providing for its children and this is supported by the 2011 OFSTED report which rated the overall provision as good:

“Frenchay Church of England Primary School provides a good education for its pupils, which fully reflects its Christian ethos. It enables them to make good progress in both their academic and personal development. The leadership and management of teaching and learning are strong. As a result, pupils are well-prepared for staff changes, teaching is good and is still improving.”

The current school is undoubtedly a major asset in the community already, and the school’s leadership and teachers are committed to continuing to improve and have set the goal of becoming an outstanding school.

Based on both these factors, the ethos and pedigree of the education the school is delivering, we strongly believe that it would be preferable, for the community and future residents in the new housing, to build on the success of the existing school. For these additional reasons, the Governors recommend in the Concept Statement the provision of a new 2 form entry primary school (providing 420 places in total) to serve new and existing residents in the Frenchay area.

Finally on behalf of the Board of Governors at Frenchay Primary School, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Concept Statement.

Note full response also includes results of FPS Stakeholder Consultation.

<p>| 6. | Yate Town Council | Yate Town Council objects to any development on the current site and grounds of Frenchay Hospital. Yate Town Council objects to the loss of a hospital facility in South Gloucestershire area and does not accept Southmead Hospital as a convenient alternative due to lack of public transport and distance/congestion. Yate Town Council objects to the surrender of any land at Frenchay Hospital which will subsequently restrict any reinstatement of facilities in the future. |
| 7. | Business West | Business West (Chambers of Commerce) represents over 6000 businesses in Bristol, Bath, Swindon, Wiltshire and Gloucestershire and is one of the most influential business leadership organisations in the UK. We made representations to the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy EIP in support of the concept of new communities within the North Fringe of Bristol and sustainable transport links across the sub region. We therefore play an active role in shaping and promoting positive local engagement. As a business stakeholder we welcome the opportunity to comment on the Frenchay Hospital Site Concept Statement. It is our view that the current site is a major asset in the community already and the school’s leadership and teachers are committed to continuing to improve and have set the goal of becoming an outstanding school. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Statement provides an intelligent and robust response to the site's opportunities and constraints. There have clearly been a number of consults with feedback from the local community informing parts of the scheme. It strikes us that the NHS Trust has sought to accommodate local views where possible. We have considered the transport, access and connectivity aspects of the proposals and consider that the Concept Statement is a robust and well thought out to the movement of people and vehicles. It is our view that the scheme has been sensitively designed to protect heritage assets. It also provides; a balanced element of open space, a range of residential densities and forms that relate to the site, a retained Health Care Services facility and a school location to the east of the site (optional) to assist in integration of the community. It will also provide a balanced and sustainable community across the site with much needed housing for.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. | **Religious Society of Friends**  
Roger Angerson  
Part of our burial ground /garden abuts the boundary wall to the Frenchay Hospital Site which is covered by the Concept Plan, which my Members have read and discussed. My Members would wish to object to the proposed destruction of the Tree belt and Wildlife Conservation Area which form the Northern Boundary of the Site. This wildlife and tree belt provide a most valuable screen and baffle to the existing hospital site, which we feel should be protected and considered an asset to assist in integration of the community. It will also provide a balanced and sustainable community across the site with much needed housing for.  
We would urge the Planning Team in considering these proposals to bear in mind the part which the wildlife and green elements have to play in development plans especially in such a sensitive area as Frenchay with its Listed Buildings and Conservation Area all of which require the maximum possible protection at all times. |
| 9. | **Wessex Water**  
Gillian Sanders  
**Re: Frenchay Hospital Draft Concept Statement (550 Residential Units, Healthcare Use, Primary School)**  
Thank you for your email of 8th August inviting comment on the recently published draft concept statement for development at Frenchay Hospital Site.  
Wessex Water is sewerage undertaker for the Frenchay area with Bristol Water supplying potable water. As such comments are limited to our interest.  
The hospital is currently served by a number of on site private systems which connect to the public sewerage system.  
We are in contact with the applicant’s consultants to determine the status of these sewers in pursuant of the transfer of private sewers legislation October 2011. This will entail a degree of investigation, application and agreement with the developer regarding potential re-use, improvement.
| 10. | **NHS Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire**  
David Tappin | As you may be aware from our presentation to the South Gloucestershire Public Health & Health Scrutiny Committee, the South Gloucestershire Commissioning Group and Primary Care Trust cluster are working jointly with provider organisations (including North Bristol Trust) and other partners (including South Gloucestershire Council) to review and update the wider strategy for rehabilitation services across Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire. It is intended that this review and update of the wider strategy will inform decisions about the scale and scope of future health and social care services in Frenchay.

As you will appreciate it is important not to pre-empt the outcome of this work which is expected to run through to Spring 2013. Nevertheless the Trust remains committed to developing appropriate locally accessible community based services away from acute hospital sites as part of its wider strategy of bringing care closer to home where it is safe and economic to do so.

The thrust of North Bristol Trust’s planning proposal for the Frenchay site is consistent with this strategy.

I trust this response is helpful in explaining the position but please do not hesitate to contact me if you require anything further. |
| 11. | **Public Health**  
Matt Pearce  
Commissioning & Service Development Manager  
NHS South Gloucestershire | Many thanks for contacting me, I am always grateful for health having the opportunity to comment on any future planning decisions.

As you can understand, a number of draft strategies are currently in a state of limbo due to the significant changes with the NHS and the migration of Health to Local Authority.

You may wish to refer to the draft Joint Health Improvement Strategy [http://www.sglos-pct.nhs.uk/publicationsattachments/Draft%20HIS%20v16%20SB%20161110%20colour.doc](http://www.sglos-pct.nhs.uk/publicationsattachments/Draft%20HIS%20v16%20SB%20161110%20colour.doc) which was developed last year, although this is subject to change in the coming months. We are currently developing an Active Travel Delivery Plan for South Gloucestershire Council, but I doubt this will be finalised until early November 2012.

If you are preparing a consultation response, I would be happy to review and input any comments where pertinent to Public Health? |
| 12. | **NHS South Gloucestershire**  
Grant Addison  
Consultant  
Grant Addison | Further to our telephone conversation last month.

As I outlined on the telephone, NHS South Gloucestershire does not anticipate the need for a GP practice on the Frenchay Hospital site but with the healthcare needs of the new residents are met by existing and/or new GP practices. I am working on a set of proposals covering Harry Stoke, Coldharbour Lane, UWE and Frenchay which will set out our proposals in more detail. I expect to be in a position to arrange meetings with appropriate stakeholders in the near future. |
Associates to brief them on our thinking on the health infrastructure needs.

You posed a number of specific questions which had been raised and I have set these out below with responses:

- **Who is responsible for commissioning GP services?**
  - NHS South Gloucestershire has responsibility for commissioning local health care services, including GP services, to meet the needs of the population of South Gloucestershire including the demands of the additional population of the new developments.

- **Should residents approach local GP practices?**
  - NHS South Gloucestershire is responsible for commissioning services so it would be more appropriate for the residents to contact NHS South Gloucestershire rather than the GPs directly.

- **Who should residents contact if they have concerns about provision of GP services?**
  - Any resident (or group) can contact the Patient Advice and Liaison Service (PALS) freephone 0800 073 0907 or email pals@southgloucs.nhs.uk. The PALS team will then ensure that the enquiry is passed to the appropriate individual or department to respond.
  - Questions about future plans for GP provision may also be directed to the Primary Care Commissioning team at the PCT.

- **How will decisions be made on GP services?**
  - NHS South Gloucestershire has a duty to ensure access for residents to GP primary care services.
  - There are four existing GP Practices that cover the Frenchay Hospital site thereby offering a choice of GPs for local residents.
  - NHS South Gloucestershire reviews the availability of GP services and considers whether any new services are required.
  - If new houses are to be constructed NHS South Gloucestershire would consider the needs of that new population against the existing GP services.

- **Are there any firm plans for this area?**
  - There are currently no plans for new GP services in the area.
  - NHS South Gloucestershire is currently considering the implications of the development at Frenchay and in neighbouring developments and will consider what, if any, new GP services should be commissioned to meet the needs of the new population in the area.
  - As these plans are developed, NHS South Gloucestershire will consult local councillors and other stakeholders as appropriate.

- **What is the scope at Frenchay?**
  - NHS South Gloucestershire has no current plans for a GP Practice at Frenchay but will continue to review the need.
  - NHS South Gloucestershire will continue to engage with South Gloucestershire Council to ensure that any health infrastructure needs of new residents of Frenchay and neighbouring development areas are addressed through the master planning and planning process.

1. **GP Primary Care Estates Development Strategy**

   NHS South Gloucestershire’s GP Primary Care Estates Development Strategy sets out a strategy to ensure easier access for residents of new developments to GP Primary Care services.

   It explains NHS South Gloucestershire’s vision for delivering more healthcare in community settings. It sets out the basis for assessing the number of GP services required for new housing developments, the space required for new practices and the cost of developing them.

   It explains that we will now seek fewer larger practices rather than more smaller practices because larger practices have more capacity to provide services. It also sets out a standard for the accessibility of practices which means that no new branch surgeries would be approved in the urban environment.
Gloucestershire.

This document has now been approved by NHS South Gloucestershire and forms the basis for the detailed healthcare requirements development locations – a copy is attached.

2. Harry Stoke development areas
NHS South Gloucestershire has examined a number of development locations in and around the M4 / M32 corridor which we have jointly referred to as "Harry Stoke development areas" and comprise:

- Harry Stoke\(^1\) 1,200 houses
- Cheswick Village\(^2\) (also known as Wallscourt Farm) 711 houses
- East of Harry Stoke 2,000 houses
- Land East of Coldharbour Lane (also known as LECHL) 500 houses
- Frenchay Hospital 450 houses
- **Sub-total** 4,861 houses
  - Planning permission granted 1,911 houses
  - Planning permission not yet granted 2,950 houses
- **plus** University of the West of England (UWE) 1,000 student rooms

Based on 1 student per room and 2.45 residents per new house for the remaining development locations, the development locations with planning permission would represent an additional population of 8,228 which based on 1,700 patients per GP would require 4.2 additional GPs.

Once again, there is insufficient capacity in the local GP Practices (see Appendix B) to accommodate anything other than a small proportion of this population and significant additional capacity will need to be provided in the area.

It is proposed that NHS South Gloucestershire seeks to construct a 651 square metre 4 GP Practice to the standards set out above.

It is proposed that the four GP surgery should be available in 2015 in line with the projected completion of the additional 1,000 student rooms and approximately half of the houses on land East of Coldharbour Lane. It is proposed that the GP facilities are included within the land East of Coldharbour Lane or within the University of the West of England.

As with Filton / Patchway New Neighbourhood, this would be before the majority of the houses in the overall development, however it is important to note...
healthcare facilities available when the earlier residents occupy the houses.

As with Filton / Patchway New Neighbourhood, NHS South Gloucestershire would be willing to consider options for temporary provision from final completion – provided that this was at no additional cost to NHS South Gloucestershire and satisfied relevant CQC Regulations and approved for a new GP Practice.

NHS South Gloucestershire proposes to seek capital contributions from developers towards the construction of the new GP Practice as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Number of dwellings</th>
<th>Number of residents</th>
<th>Capital Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land East of Coldharbour Lane</td>
<td>500 houses</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>£196,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the West of England</td>
<td>1,000 student rooms</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Harry Stoke</td>
<td>2,000 houses</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>£784,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenchay Hospital</td>
<td>450 houses</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>£176,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£1,316,320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, NHS South Gloucestershire would seek to work with South Gloucestershire to achieve equitable contributions from developers using Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or other mechanism. NHS South Gloucestershire would wish to engage with South Gloucestershire Council in advance of the consideration of all planning applications to ensure that the healthcare needs are recognised and NHS South Gloucestershire’s interests are safeguarded.

One of the key challenges in setting out these Section 106 Agreements is that each Section 106 Agreement will be a separate stand-alone developer related to one specific development. NHS South Gloucestershire is concerned that there is a risk that any of the developments may be slower than set out in the current plans, or even not proceed at all.

There is one further aspect to the healthcare provision in this area which relates to the University of the West of England’s university medical current contract is a private arrangement outside the terms of the GP Practice’s NHS contract. NHS South Gloucestershire would wish to take steps to ensure that the practice operates in line with its contract with the NHS. NHS South Gloucestershire would wish to negotiate with the University of the West of England to relocate the healthcare facility for their existing students and combine the existing facilities into a new enlarged facility, in which South Gloucestershire would seek 651 square metres space in addition to the existing University GP accommodation.

---

14. **Bristol City Council**  
Dick Sage  
Project Manager, Strategic Planning

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above document. As you will be aware, that the site abuts the Bristol boundary at Begbrook Park. In addition, Conservation Areas in South Gloucestershire and in Bristol meet just to the south of the hospital. Any major developments in this location are therefore considered by the City Council. Officer comments on the Concept Statement are set out below.
1. The housing densities proposed for the new housing development are welcomed. These will help to ensure that efficient use is made of this brownfield site. The proposals contained in the Concept Statement indicate that this approach will be sympathetic to the context of the historic buildings on the site and of the wider Conservation Area, which links with Bristol’s Stapleton and Frome Valley Conservation Area.

2. The retention of Frenchay Park House, its stables, its settings and the Frenchay Museum are welcomed, ensuring that this part of the Conservation Area is retained and, if necessary, enhanced to preserve the leafy character of the Conservation Area and to provide privacy for the school and the development.

3. The retention of much of the existing open space and woodland within the site is desirable and should secure these assets as an amenity for use by existing communities in and around Frenchay.

4. It is understood that the need for additional primary school provision is pressing - partly arising from the 550 additional homes planned. No doubt this will be a financial point for the immediate communities. Whilst the size and location of the school is a matter for South Gloucestershire Council, it should be noted that developing this on the playing fields between Lime Tree Avenue and Begbrook Park, adjacent to the Bristol boundary is chosen, careful consideration is given to the following:
   - Arrangements for dropping off/picking up children attending the new school should be designed with great care, particularly if a two form entry is proposed. Measures should be adopted to minimise congestion, traffic hazards and noise impacts, ideally by providing a separate area for the site.
   - The south west boundary of the site is currently screened from Begbrook Park, to various degrees, by existing trees and other vegetation retained and, if necessary, enhanced to preserve the leafy character of the Conservation Area and to provide privacy for the school and the development.

5. We are pleased to note the projected decrease in traffic generation which is expected to result from the redevelopment of the site. This offers the potential for the operation of the immediate road network, with potential benefits to Bristol residents in adjacent areas. However, careful evaluation of patterns and vehicle types will be needed to ensure that:
   - Predicted traffic flows are translated into real reductions and that routes in the vicinity of the hospital site do not simply attract diverted traffic to more congested routes.
   - Traffic management measures respond to any change in the nature of traffic flows – e.g. arising from the site’s role as an origin rather than a destination with different peak flow patterns from those of a major hospital.

6. In addition to the above, we have a number of specific comments relating to traffic movements which could potentially affecting Bristol:
   - We would expect thorough modelling of transport impact including the Stoke Lane/Frenchay Park Road junction, in Bristol. This should be committed developments in the area. We would like an opportunity to examine any effects carefully, to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts on Bristol.
   - We have major concerns about continued use of the Begbrook Park/Bristol Road/Frenchay Road roundabout, which is of poor design. We would prefer to see this removed, possibly with alternate priority junctions from Frenchay Park Road and/or Begbrook Park Road, with different peak flow patterns from those of a major hospital.
   - We would like to see improved pedestrian and cycle links to the site. In particular, there are opportunities to improve links to Oldland Common and the A38.
   - We would be keen to see improvements to bus services, particularly those using Frenchay Park Road.
If the impact has an impact within Bristol, then we would expect appropriate mitigation to be provided – either S.106 or CIL. Lastly, we request that the Council be kept informed of the progress of the proposed development, particularly in respect of the outline application for the development to be submitted within the next few months.

15. **English Heritage**  
**Caroline Power**

Thank you for giving English heritage an opportunity to be consulted on this important document. We believe that this is a significant site within Gloucestershire being partly within the Frenchay Conservation Area and containing a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets. We have a number of comments to make regarding the document.

- There needs to be a clear list of heritage assets that are within or adjunct to the red line area at the beginning of this document so that we know what assets may be impacted upon by this proposal.

- We are most concerned that the issue regarding the future of the main Grade II listed building and its associated and separately listed structures have been deliberately omitted from this concept statement. We would argue that one of the main reasons for this development will be to help secure the future of this designated complex. Without any proposal for its future within the Statement, we consider the development to be flawed and does not conform to the Guidance inherent in the NPPF – core Principle 17 for sustainable development.

- Whilst we would wish to support the principle of a school for this development, we are concerned about the option for it being located opposite the main Avenue leading into the site. As this is within the Conservation Area and is part of the original grounds to the main house, we feel that this is an important open space within this context and also provides part of the more distant setting to the listed complex within the setting to the adjacent conservation area and historic buildings. We would resist any proposal for a school or any other form of development in this location.

- An alternative site for the school is shown to the north of the Trust HQ in a wooded area of the site. We contend that this is an important open space within the setting to the adjacent conservation area and historic buildings. This location would also meet with our resistance.

- It is surprising that the concept statement has not considered more school location options than the two that are indicated, as it must be acknowledged that these locations are likely to throw up concerns about proximity to and adverse impact upon the Trust HQ complex. Further analysis of these locations needs to be undertaken to look at other locations that are in more appropriate and sustainable locations.

- We are aware that there are other buildings and structures of local interest within the site that have not been considered for retention in the concept statement. We note that there are other documents that have assessed the heritage value of this but as they have not been seen by us to understand how these have informed the concept statement. We also note that an Historic Landscape Assessment has also been undertaken but again we have not had the benefit of seeing this document. In both cases these are critical to the overall understanding of this complex and would ask that the Conservation Officer is given an opportunity to meet the assessors of the buildings on this site so that they can explain the conclusions regarding these intrinsically distinctive buildings to the history and evolution of the hospital site.

16. **English Nature**  
**Amanda Grundy**

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 03 August 2012 which was received by Natural England on 06 August 2012. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and
the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England does not consider that this proposal poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment which would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of the proposal.

1 Cases which might affect a SSSI, Natura 2000 site, National Park, Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or a large population of a protected species or generic issues which affect a large suite of sites or may set a precedent and thereby affect a significant quantity of habitat across the country.


The lack of specific comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment; bodies and individuals may make comments that will help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of the environmental value of the site in the decision making process.

In particular, we would expect the LPA to assess and consider the possible impacts resulting from this proposal on the following when determining a future planning application:

Protected species

Where there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by the proposed development, the LPA should request information from the applicant before determining a future application (Paragraph 99 Circular 06/05).

Natural England has produced standing advice, which is available on our website Natural England Standing Advice to help local planning authorities understand the impact of particular developments on protected or BAP species should they be identified as an issue. The standing advice also states that following receipt of survey information, local planning authorities should undertake further consultation with Natural England.

Local wildlife sites

If the proposal site is on or adjacent to a local wildlife site, e.g. Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR), the LPA should ensure it has sufficient information to fully understand the impact of the proposal on the local wildlife site, and the importance of this in relation to development plan policies, before it determines a future application.

Biodiversity enhancements

Future development at this site appears to provide opportunities to incorporate features into the design which are beneficial to wildlife, such as roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes. The authority should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site, from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for a future application. This is in accordance with Paragraph 118 of the National Planning Framework. Additionally, we would draw your attention to Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) which states that a 'public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purposes of conserving biodiversity'. Section 40(3) of the same Act also states that ‘conserving biodiversity includes, in relation to a living organism or type of habitat, safeguarding and enhancing a population or habitat’.

Landscape enhancements

Future development at this site may also provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools and developers to consider new development and ensure that it makes a positive contribution in terms of design, form and location, to the character of the area.
functions of the landscape and avoids any unacceptable impacts.

If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England.

| 17. | **Avon Wildlife Trust**  
Steve Micklewright  
Director of Community Programmes | Avon Wildlife Trust has been contacted by a concerned Frenchay resident about the impact on wildlife and the natural environment as a result of the Masterplan for Frenchay Hospital which I understand you are responsible for developing. I have visited the site and undertaken an initial appraisal in question and the Trust is rather surprised at the direction the Masterplanning for the site appears to be taking.  
While the grounds of Frenchay Hospital do not have any formal designation in nature conservation terms, they have a general value to wildlife providing food sources for birds and bats and general habitat for other creatures, especially badgers. As part of the Masterplanning exercise we are concerned that this general value of the site to wildlife to be maintained and enhanced. We were therefore concerned to hear that the nature reserve area (W1 on the TPO map) and woodland buffer zone adjacent to properties on Malmans's Drive (W2 on the TPO map) were being considered for inclusion in the development. Both areas have good general wildlife value and we would expect areas such as these to be improved and enhanced as part of the development of the site.  
While we are not a part of the Masterplanning process, I wanted you to be aware of our concerns because we will be looking very carefully at any planning application that is lodged for the site and make any appropriate comments. |

| 18. | **Urban Design**  
Dan Jones | **Key Planning Policies.**  
The South Gloucestershire Local Plan (Adopted January 2006) Retained Policies  
D1: Achieving Good Design Quality in New Development  
The South Gloucestershire Design Checklist SPD (Adopted August 2007)  
The South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Pre-Publication Submission Draft (March 2010)  
CS1: High Quality Design  
CS25: Communities of the North Fringe  
National Planning Policy Framework  
Frenchay Conservation Area Appraisal SPD  
**Comments**  
A concept statement should set out the key driving principles for new development. It should assist achieve high quality design and as such, clearly define the site. As such the statement provides a basic overview of the constraints, a summary of the public consultation and some rudimentary development vision. A key fail is in demonstrating how the history / heritage of the site has been taken into account in forming the development vision and hence how a new development will be created.  
In effect the Concept Statement envisages the whole-scale demolition of the hospital buildings with the exception of the Brain Injury unit, the B
HQ and stables, and replacement with a mock Georgian frontage to the historic avenue, and character areas described as ‘village arrangement’ and ‘suburban’ which appears to be predicated on the Redrow Heritage range of housetypes!

**Constraints & Opportunities**

The NPPF para 58 promotes development that ‘responds to local character and history…whilst not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation’.

SGLP and CS1 of the Core Strategy require development to respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness…of the site and locality. Para 16 requires development proposals to respect the character and identity of communities and promote high quality landscaping and street trees along the historic avenue.

Frenchay Conservation Area Appraisal SPD (which is not mentioned in the document) pg 13 also provides a number of more specific principles including:

- Ensuring the location, height, scale and massing of development does not impinge on views or project above the trees giving a more balanced relationship with nearby historic buildings,
- Maintain open green area, trees and former parkland adjoining Frenchay Park, and
- Ensure any proposed development should be set back from the avenue.

With regard the submitted statement, I see little effort to interpret the historic character in principles to guide new development. I note that paragraph that the, ‘hospital structures built during the war could be removed without harm to the site’s two principal assets (the Garde II listed Frenchay stable block). However, this does not mean that this heritage and its intrinsic character should not be reflected in the new development. In fact, the Residential area’ acknowledges that development should have a ‘linear urban grain to reflect the existing 1940’s ward…’, however the images show terraced units, so giving a confused message about what is intended.

Page 9 of the Statement provides a useful historic map showing key tree lines, the remnants of which are acknowledged on the diagram on pg 10 along the original position of the Bristol Road. (this alignment clearly continues to the south), and the ‘historic boundary with pine trees’. No acknowledgement of the opportunity to ‘reinforce’ and or reinstate this route through the new layout.

I also note no mention is made of the water tower on the western boundary of the site. This is a landmark building with some character that is expected that the Concept Statement process should assist this articulation.

Consequently, the opportunities plan (pg25) should incorporate these features. In addition I see little point in reference to the primary school in site given this is acknowledge as the second preference option and it conflicts with the Frenchay CA SPD objectives. I also note the opportunity for foot/cycle access from the allotments onto Beckspool Road.

**Vision for the Site**

The vision statement (pg26) is meaningless and the supporting text provides little more than good planning principles. Visions should go beyond principles and articulate or emphasise an attribute of the site / theme to influence design and or community development objectives. I acknowledge that the Concept Statement process should assist this articulation.

**Key Development Areas & Principles**

I welcome the identification of the **formal character area** and the desire to reflect the existing 1940’s ward formal linear grain. However, I consider the concept as unimaginative and inappropriate for the following reasons:

1. The formality of the ward buildings, is reinforced by the repetitive nature of the gable ends fronting the avenues. Character is added by...
northern elevation of these buildings. The images promoted on pg30 wholly fail to encapsulate this character.

2. Attempting to ‘mock’ a historic architectural style, particularly in close proximity to the real thing is rarely successful unless undertaken in an instance, ceiling heights in historic buildings are usually much higher than modern residential dwellings. This additional height is translated into poor interpretations that inevitably harm the setting of the listed building and conservation area.

A form of architecture specifically formulated for this scheme that takes simple cues from the wards, encapsulates the repetitive nature of the development. This could be shown with a simple sketch and supporting annotations in the Concept Statement.

I have no objection to the identification of a ‘village residential area’. However, I suggest the Concept Statement takes its cues from the Frenchay SPD (The Village, pg 8) in describing development principles, which provides a much clearer description of the type of urban forms and grain that could be vernacular. I also suggest that the Concept Statement does not include images of new build that could be anywhere.

I similarly have no objection to the identification of a ‘suburban’ residential area, but again there needs to be clarity about what this actually means. The promotion of streets will be created. I agree that ‘repetition’ and regularity is an important component, (in house types, materials and detailing etc), as are boundary treatments and landscaping.

The images of the ‘Bowery’ should be deleted. The streets in this scheme are predominantly characterised by ‘deliberate randomness’ in the plan of house types. Its principal positive feature is the use of good quality materials and detailing, but this is a product being promoted nationally and not necessarily in line with the NPPF. The other images are also of developments with density well below that being proposed.

Other

Consideration should be given as to how an element of modern design that promotes sustainability and health and well being can be integrated. Some serviced plots should be reserved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overview (p.2)</strong></td>
<td>The Concept Statement is stated as responding to the guidance issued by SGC, but in terms of baseline/survey responses which have been generated using an approach, the guidance from SGC has been largely ignored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1.2 Context (p.5)</strong></td>
<td>The coloured map which shows local amenities and historic growth lacks the recognition of the parkland to the south of the hospital, the pavilions associated with Frenchay Park House. It also fails to pick up the pavilions and the water tower previously identified as buildings of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.0 Existing Character Areas (p.7)</strong></td>
<td>This plan is rather confusing and the colour coding doesn’t fully match up. Also the open space areas 1 &amp; 2 should be considered as one area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.0 Site History (p.8)</strong></td>
<td>The details concerning the hospital development of the site is rather limited and it is difficult to understand the rationale of having an image of the largest photograph. There are some interesting historic photos of the site in the 1930s and 40s which would be of far more interest and relevance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Planning History
I am unsure what the following means ‘there are not considered any significant developments which materially impact on the vision and principle Statement’. It seems a rather meaningless statement.

Overall it would have been far more convincing if a historic maps were included to show the evolution of the site from the origins of its hospitality function. The first OS map from 1881-1882, as in terms of the consideration of any proposed redevelopment, Frenchay Park House should not be the only feature to be retained, it suggest so implies that the hospital use of the site is not of any importance beyond the use of Frenchay Park House as a sanatorium.

3.3 Historic Landscape Features
This section should demonstrate how the scheme has been influenced by these features, rather than being potentially be further eroded.

One of the key concerns is the 5no. Oaks that demarcate the original alignment of the Frenchay Park Road. These features should be retained for enhancement, but with a new hospital indicated for this part of the site, there could be some potential conflict and further marginalisation.

Non-listed buildings pre-1948 Fig 6 (pre-1948).
This plan fails to highlight the pre-1948 buildings (the pavilions and the water tower) previously identified as buildings of a character and condition suitable for re-use.

3.3 ‘Moving Forward’
The rationale for the site selections of the new community hospital is not given and such a fundamental decision should be more about practicalities. Therefore information on alternative sites and why they were dismissed in favour of a site that would see the new community hospital in this corner of the site would be helpful. I would also suggest that the ‘legacy of Frenchay’ may be something that could be more deliverable or could be associated with a more prominent hospital building.

4.0 ‘Concept Statement Process To Date’
In particular para. 4.6 ‘Historic Landscape and Visual Assessment – the second part is disputed as it unreasonably suggests that the Frenchay Hospital should have foreseen the redevelopment of the hospital site.

Overall it is felt the picture presented within 4.6 is an over-simplification of the issues and fails to recognise the guidance given to date and information that should have taken place to address to agree these issue or approaches are not being entertained by the landowner. Fundamentally in my opinion the history of the site has not informed the vision of the redevelopment.

‘Managing the Constraints’.
Under para. 5.2, the Council’s response to the Conservation Audit has been ignored and again is evidence that the hospital history of the site and the 20\textsuperscript{th} century is being discarded and not considered to be of any significance in shaping the new site. As stated in the SGC response, 4no. pre-war buildings for retention. The statement that all pre-war buildings ‘could be removed without harm to the site’s two principal heritage assets’ is a very myopic statement. Just because the buildings may only be curtilage listed (another point overlooked), it does not mean that some of the buildings are not important character of the site and could be retained to help integrate the old and new.

To simply only be concerned about one phase of the development of the Frenchay site is considered a flawed approach, as the 20\textsuperscript{th} century has not been lost when it should be one of the key influences in the creation of what is expected to be a unique and distinctive development.
Historic Landscape Assessment
As noted previously, what this document contains is largely a scheme of retention which although important, would be largely expected. What are the actual enhancement measures – for example the historic feature identified on page 10 – what actual provision is being made for their enhancement?

6.0 ‘Influences on Masterplan’
Again no effort seems to have been made to project an interpretation of the historic use and character of the hospital use of the site in a project management of buildings of interest or local significance – the water tower for example, or the distinctive character of a number of areas – American village, the historic trees or the Lime Tree Avenue either.

It would have been helpful as part of the consultation process to seek views on the complete replacement of the Lime Tree Avenue which is controversial, would provide a longer terms enhancement and so could be an opportunity to really provide a legacy for the site, but this opportunity has been missed.

I would also raise a concern regarding the approach to Frenchay Park House and the stables. The stables clearly need to be restored, the emphasis on the history of the site being only these two listed structures and nothing else it is inexplicable for there not to be any concept of enhancement proposed at all for these buildings. Although it would be reasonable not to included detailed scheme of conversion in light of the cost but to exclude the two listed building from the scheme with no commitment at all to restoring the structures thereby leaving it for the next owner is not acceptable as these building should benefit from the redevelopment of the site and not potentially mothballed until a new owner comes forward.

Opportunities Plan (p23)
It is disappointing that after all the consultation undertaken with Officers to see the option of a school site in the south-western corner of the remnant parkland, is protected open space within the Frenchay SPD. Equally concerning is the proposed potential ‘gateway development’ also need to retain the open character of this area has been stated on many occasions and so should be removed form the document. The approach to gateway development should also be removed.

The plan also demonstrates a lack of ambition. It essentially is a constraints plan and running through it is a failure to acknowledge the opportunities. The only opportunities included have nothing to do with place making; it is more about discharging the obligations of the landowner and safety. To suggest that the redevelopment for residential use is an opportunity in this context is vague at best and meaningless at worst, as the requirement will not at this stage be a given. The presentation of the ‘opportunity’ should be a conversation on how the scheme would deliver a distinct and incorporating/interpreting existing forms, layouts etc.

7.0 ‘Vision for the Site’
This falls down immediately in my view because the influences in Section 6 fail to have sufficient regard to the existing site.

7.2 – Again there is a failure to acknowledge the importance of the existing structures to the history of Frenchay. To simply focus on Frenchay village short of what is expected. The last sentence appears to touch on the approach which should be adopted, but there is sadly a failure to carry through.

7.6 ‘Vision Statement’
I would agree Dan Jones’ comments that this statement is meaningless. The reference to the ‘existing’, as noted above only refers to the first page of the Frenchay site and so in my view renders this vision for a legacy far too narrow to be considered fully representative of the history of the site...
note the legacy has passed to Frenchay village and not the hospital site.

**Hospital buildings.**

Fig. 9 – Character Areas (p29)
The character areas to south-west should be deleted on the grounds of subdivision would lead to unacceptable loss of what is protected open

‘**Key Development Areas and Principles’**

1) Formal Residential Area – Very little effort has been made to consider any appropriate response to the existing character of the area. In my

   The more of these incorporated and executed correctly, the better the results, but to imply that a Georgian terrace would evoke the memory

   Unfortunately we seem to have missed this stage out in the process..

   The visions for the other areas are equally bland when for example, a reference to boundary treatment (Frenchay Park Road) and the oppor

   one of the key considerations in defining the character and appearance of the area.

Finally the images of the Redrow development are misguided and the suggestion that they set a precedent is both misleading and incorrect.

**CONCLUSION**
The proposed Concept Statement demonstrates very little regard to the character of the existing site. It consequently fails to demonstrate how

   the site has influenced the proposals and show very little imagination in how the legacy of Frenchay will be secured.

   The concern is therefore that rather than a distinctive and unique development that draws on its 20th century use, the opportunities to inve

   to justify its wholesale clearance and create nothing more than a standard housing development.

   Also although too much emphasis has been placed on the historic interest of the site being only the 2 listed buildings in my opinion, the failu

   to these buildings to ensure they have a sustainable future in their current condition and setting is completely unacceptable and needs to be ad

20. **Heritage**
Rebecca Anthony –
Conservation Officer Strategic Planning Policy & Specialist Advice Team

**Policy:** This concept statement relates to a site within Frenchay conservation area, which contains a number of listed buildings as well as buildings

   historic interest (non-designated heritage assets). The application should therefore be assessed in accordance with the following polices and go

   protect the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings: -

   • Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
   • National Planning Policy Framework, in particular chapter 12 ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment’.
   • South Gloucestershire Local Plan (Adopted) January 2006, Policies L12 & L13 – Conservation Areas & Listed Buildings
   • Other policies relating to design and landscape protection are also relevant.

**Comments:** A concept statement has been submitted to South Gloucestershire Council relating to the redevelopment of the hospital site at Fran...
responses have previously been provided in response to the historic landscape assessments and built heritage assessments.

The concept statement relates to the entire site. I have read the concept statement and considered its contents and the wider implications in terms of progressing towards a formal planning application. In its current form I would recommend that the concept statement is not endorsed, for the following reasons:

- The concept statement sets out the requirement of redevelopment to preserve and enhance the historic interest and setting of the grand house and adjacent stables however fails to demonstrate how this will be achieved, and some of the development principles put forward may harm the setting and historic interest of these important assets;

- The concept statement parcels Frenchay Park House and Stables to a limited area of curtilage and does not consider the long term future of the site. By failing to take a more holistic approach to the site and consider the future use or potential requirements for Frenchay Park House and the redevelopment of the site cannot be guaranteed to properly secure the future of the listed buildings. Divorcing the buildings from key part of its historic interest and setting, such as land to the north where the school is proposed and its historic walled garden (allotments);

- It must be demonstrated that sufficient land is retained with the house and stables to sustain them in viable use and preserve their historic value, not only include retention of existing garden and parkland setting to preserve the setting and provide sufficient amenity/garden space required but also sufficient previously developed land for uses such as parking. The parked cars at the front of the house were identified in the historic landscape assessment as detrimental and an area to be enhanced via the development. Until a use for the building is identified it is impossible to state that parking/amenity space may be required although this will certainly be a requirement and therefore to remove land from the house at this stage would be premature. The stables currently do not have a use and are in a poor state of repair. They must be put to a viable use and this will involve consideration of traffic and parking requirements, the siting of which must be sensitive to the setting of the buildings. Without an understanding of the use of the houses and stables it is also not clear how accurate assessments regarding access, traffic numbers and parking can be made. Parking is a significant issue for Frenchay with regard to the setting of the listed buildings and the conservation area and it is essential that a comprehensive approach is taken;

- The repair and restoration of the listed buildings and the historic grounds must form a key concept of any redevelopment. The phased approach to the repair and conversion of buildings requires listed building consent. The map on page 5 is also inaccurate, as is that on page 7 which omits the original 1930’s sanatorium buildings and the water tower. Officers have previously advised that these buildings are worthy of retention. Demolition of these buildings would be a requirement (via a legal agreement) of any planning permission for the site. This repair should be completed at appropriate stages and the cost must be considered at the outset in order to ensure that the site redevelopment is viable. Without understanding the future use of the site and the cost of the repair and conversion it is not clear how a viable development across the whole site can be determined.

- The only strategy put forward within the concept statement for preserving or enhancing the setting of the listed buildings is via the removal of existing buildings. Even if replacement buildings on this area of the site were sensitively designed and scaled, the failure to seek additional enhancement strategies such as the removal of parking to the front of the house or repair of landscape assets such as walls, or retention of all existing green and open space is likely to achieve this aim. Much stronger and robust preservation and enhancement strategies must form part of the concept statement;

- The failure to acknowledge the curtilage status of the pre-1948, which has been raised by officers on a number of occasions, is deliberate and officers do not agree with the curtilage as shown. Furthermore, the map on page 11 is inaccurate as there are additional pre-1948 buildings to the 1920’s sanatorium buildings and the water tower. Officers have previously advised that these buildings are worthy of retention. Demolition of these buildings requires listed building consent. The map on page 5 is also inaccurate, as is that on page 7 which omits the original 1930’s sanatorium buildings and incorrectly illustrates the historic landscape context for Frenchay Park House.

- The concept statement does not reflect the advice provided by officers in relation to key buildings of local architectural and historic interest.
reflect the importance of the former wartime and hospital uses on the site. This is considered to be a significant omission and a failure to adequately aim to respect local context and distinctiveness and the important history of the site.

- The options put forward for the school site are both unacceptable in heritage terms. Option 1 will result in the loss of green open parkland, Frenchay Park House, which must be retained as such. This area of the parkland links the house to its walled garden (allotments) and house, and not replaced by buildings or parking. Although part of the land shown is currently parking there is no built form. Any development would need to be assessed however the ancillary school parking must also be located on the previously developed land, not garden and potential for using the wooded area for some play/outdoor areas but not the extent shown.

- Option 2 has been very clearly discounted by officers for its harmful impact on the setting of the listed buildings and the character and conservation area.

- The reference to a new ‘gateway development on the car park adjacent to Frenchay museum will be strongly resisted for the same reasons.

- Both school options and the ‘gateway development’ would be assessed against policy L5 of the Adopted South Gloucestershire Local and respect open areas.

- Page 26 of the concept statement states that the heritage landscape and heritage assets have been robustly assessed and new development successfully with the old, achieved through the appropriate siting. It is not agreed that the proposed development of green and open areas.

- With regard to the concept statements approach to GP surgery, this appears to be unresolved. If this facility is required space for additional will need to be accommodated. The proposed location for the hospital facility is within the area of the parkland oak trees and the siting therefore needs to be carefully considered at an early stage.

- The general arrangement of character areas appears acceptable however not all of the examples shown are considered suitable. Reflection buildings within the area north of the lime tree avenue may not be legible through pastiche Georgian terraces. If this style of architecture to be of very high quality and design integrity in order to respect the existing buildings within Frenchay. The avenue development should Park House in scale. Opportunities to reflect the more utilitarian and simple form of the hospital wards could be provided at the rears.

- There are many examples of brick buildings illustrated however brick is very uncommon in Frenchay. Reference to appropriate, high quality which respect the local area should be provided as a concept.

- The form of public open space proposed on the parkland south of the lime tree avenue needs to be made clear. Any formal play space require enclosure or ancillary structures such as buildings or lights, would not be acceptable.

**Recommendation:** That the concept statement is not endorsed.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21.</th>
<th><strong>Landscape</strong></th>
<th><strong>Angela Bence-Wilkins</strong></th>
<th><strong>Landscape Architect</strong></th>
<th><strong>Major Sites Team</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I write further to the submission of the draft concept statement and my previous memo of 14 May, regarding the submitted surveys. My initial conclusions were that the submitted draft concept statement sets out the parameters for development of the site and incorporates the findings of the various surveys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.3 identifies the historic landscape features of the site as informed by the historic landscape appraisal carried out, including the landscape management to ensure continuity of historic features as well as management of new and replacement landscape features.

The Constraints Plan at figure 7 and Opportunities Plan at figure 8 follow on from the historic landscape plan and tree assessment and identify opportunities afforded by the sites unique character in order to create an attractive new development, providing a sense of place within this context. As previously identified in the landscape and visual assessment carried out, all Grade A and B trees are to be retained; it would not be in the sites interests to remove any of these key trees if the layout is too tight and will override the TPO. There have been requests for further maintenance works to these trees and Lea wanted to add the TPO layer of protection. The proposed to remove the whole of the NE woodland to allow for development. It is considered that this approach is too radical and the partial portion of the woodland would be preferable, either retained within the school grounds or directly accessible for the school children i.e. for which would be more sympathetic and better comply with policy L1. In landscape terms this is our preferred location, however as stated in the text confirms that the existing use will be retained in the interim. It is imperative that Frenchay Park House and the stables are included within the area SPD and would be opposed in this location.

Option 2 shows the school on the former car-park area adjacent to the museum, using part of the existing open space to the south of the LVA the development should retain and enhance the heritage value of the site and establish a comprehensive framework for sensitive management to ensure continuity of historic features as well as management of new and replacement landscape features.

6.6 of the text states that the final open space calculations will be carried out once the exact housing figures are known. However the site be retained as an asset within the masterplan.
22. **Transportation**  
Tom Roberts  
Engineer  
South Gloucestershire Council  
Major Sites Team  

**Traffic Generation**  
Overall I would expect the proposed development to generate less traffic than the existing hospital although this would need to be looked at in the Transport Assessment which will accompany any future planning application.

**Access Location**  
Para 6.10 “The location of the future development is highly influenced upon access points into the site and internal movement”. This statement I would not expect the existing access points to be viewed as a constraint. Masterplanning of the site should be “land use” lead and access points upgraded to suit the needs of the site. If alterations to the access points are not possible then this should be explained but all options should be accessed have certain limitations and this development offers the opportunity to improve the current situation.

**The mini-roundabout**  
The existing mini-roundabout is substandard in terms of geometry and the arm that serves Frenchay Hospital should be closed to vehicular traffic to prevent unsuitable vehicle turning movements. If these were to be used less then the unexpected vehicle turning movement may actually be more make the roundabout more hazardous. Keeping this in mind pedestrians and cyclists should be explored although associated crossing points would need to be assessed.

**Beckspool Road**  
I would expect road conditions along Beckspool Road to change as result of this development: There will be less overspill parking from the hospital and on-street parking that occurs alongside the common will no longer be necessary. The existing on-street parking effectively narrows the road and through traffic and an increase in vehicle speeds along Beckspool Road is a cause for concern. There will also be an Increase in pedestrians, crossing Beckspool Road to access the site and achieving a safer route to school is important. Traffic calming measures and formalised crossing.

**Pedestrian and cycle accessibility**  
Making the site permeable in terms of pedestrians and cyclists should be a key transportation objective. Pedestrians and cyclists should be provided to link existing cycle routes along Old Gloucester Road and Frenchay Road.

Regards

23. **Trees**  
Lea Bending  
Tree Officer  
Natural and Built Environment  

I have read the submitted concept statement and make the following observations in conjunction with my previous comments of 21/05/2012.

**Trees**  
Trees to be retained have been shown on the plan within the concept statement.

The purpose of the Arboricultural Survey and constraints plan is assess the trees within the site and make preliminary management spec already agreed with the findings. The exception being the Lime Avenue. The options for the Avenue appear to be either fell and replace or my original comments it is still not possible to decide the future of these trees until evidence to support either scheme is available and the expected development is available.
The concept statement states that there are 4 'very' mature Lime trees identified within the site by the Landscape consultant and the Arboriculturist that these trees may meet their demise during the demolition/development of the site. It should be beyond the scope of an initial Tree survey particularly as detailed plans have not been submitted.

I have been unable to locate the Lime trees in question within the submitted Tree Survey and Constraints plan and would therefore ask for numbers and location of the trees in order to inform my assessment.

Woodland TPO's are not just for landscape or screening benefit. The trees also offer high visual amenity to the local area and the act as a windbreak to the site and surrounding external properties.

Although it is true to say that the removal of Woodland edge trees can leave the remaining trees open to wind-throw it does not mean that these should be entirely removed, with the exception of a few trees along the boundary.

These works appear to have been suggested not as a solution to possible wind-throw but in order to expand the developable area to accommodate Option 1 for school provision.

This proposed comprehensive solution, that is the removal of the woodland, does not appear to take into consideration the importance of the woodland to the local area and is not possible to comment on a proposed management plan as no documents have been submitted.

**Option 1**

This option shows the removal of the entire woodland and nature conservation area with the exception of a narrow ‘buffer’ edge which would be maintained to protect external buildings. The suggestion to remove some woodland trees, to my knowledge, did not involve this extent of tree loss.

The removal of the rest of the woodland is shown as necessary to provide expansion room for a 2 form entry school, or as a residential development.

Of the 5 originally suggested options for schools within the site only one other has been explored. Option 2.

**Option 2** is still being shown as within the Conservation area and utilising the existing informal open space as school grounds facilities and the formal open space. This suggestion was already deemed as an undesirable option prior to the submission of the concept statement and I am pleased to note that a detailed assessment of the memorial trees on site will be taking place and look for to the submission of these detailed comments.

**Tree Preservation Orders and Memorial trees**

The concept statement states that the Council will be reviewing the TPO’s on site however this is not the case. I bring my previous comment that Tree Preservation Orders will not be altered until after any development of the site has been completed, whereby the trees on site will be retained where they are included within the Orders, any changes will be made at this point.

I am pleased to note that a detailed assessment of the memorial trees on site will be taking place and look for to the submission of these detailed comments.
Predicted future population

The Influence on the master plan section of the concept statement para 6.6 refers to occupation level of 2.28 residents per dwelling, the Council population figure of 2.45 based on the 2001 Census information based on 550 dwelling the proposed development would generate a population of 1337 residents. Early indications from the 2011 Census suggest an average household size of 2.4 residents per dwelling.

The following calculations provide headline requirements for development of 550 dwellings on the Frenchay Hospital site. Refined calculations for the number and mix of dwellings and take into consideration onsite provision of community facilities can be provided once further details are known about the expected future population of the proposed development once evidence from the 2011 Census has been confirmed.

Connectivity

Good access to existing local facilities and open spaces should be included in the design to promote travel on foot and by bike. The concept sits cycle links with Bristol Road and Beckspool Road

Open Space Requirements

Core Strategy policies CS2 and CS24 seek to secure the provision and or enhancement of open spaces to meet the needs of future occupiers where there is evidence of a local shortfall.

Local open space standards, quality standards and accessibility standards are set out Core Strategy appendix 5.

An audit of accessible open space provision within reasonable travel distances of the proposed development has indicated the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of open space</th>
<th>Existing provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal recreational open space</td>
<td>There is a good supply of informal recreational open space within reasonable travel distance of the proposed development. Informal recreational areas provide for recreational activities such as walking and cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and semi natural green space</td>
<td>There is a good supply of natural and semi natural green space within reasonable travel distance of the proposed development. Natural and semi natural green spaces are still required on site to protect areas of wildlife, biodiversity and conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports Facilities</td>
<td>The existing quantum of outdoor sports facilities within reasonable travel distance of the proposed development is inadequate for the increased demand arising from the proposed development. Provision will need to be made on site to meet these needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for children and young people</td>
<td>The existing quantum of equipped play within reasonable travel distance of the proposed development is inadequate for the future residents. Provision is required on site to meet these needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>The existing quantum of allotment provision within reasonable travel distance of the proposed development is inadequate for the future needs of the future population of the proposed development. Provision is required on site to meet these needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provision for green infrastructure, outdoor space, sport and recreation facilities will be sought according to the following principals:

- New developments must comply with all the appropriate local standards of provision in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility;
- Provision must be delivered on site and creates a more acceptable proposal; and
- The functionality and usability of spaces and facilities must be suitable for their intended purpose.

Taking into consideration the assessment of accessible open space within reasonable travel distance of the proposed development, to meet the needs of the future residents we would expect to see the following amounts of open space provided on site:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of open space</th>
<th>Amount required (Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal recreational open space</strong> – Includes parks, amenity green space and green corridors, providing for informal recreation and access</td>
<td>Adequate provision to protect the character of the locality and visual quality of the development, providing for recreational activities such as walking and cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural &amp; semi natural green space</strong> – Includes areas of green space where the primary purpose is one of wildlife and biodiversity conservation &amp; value</td>
<td>Adequate provision on site to protect areas of wildlife, biodiversity and conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor sports facilities</strong> – Includes all outdoor sports facilities whether naturally or artificially surfaced</td>
<td>A minimum of 2.156ha should be provided on site, with the necessary associated ancillary facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision for children &amp; young people</strong> – Includes all equipped children’s play areas, including provision for young people (skate parks, shelters etc.)</td>
<td>A minimum of 0.3369ha should be provided on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allotments</strong> – An area of allotment plots used for the purpose of producing fruit, vegetable and flowers for personal use</td>
<td>A minimum of 0.2695ha should be provided on site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arrangements need to be put in place to secure the satisfactory future maintenance of any open spaces provided in conjunction with new development. Council be required adopt the open spaces on site, the following contributions per square metre would be required based on 2012-13 prices:

- **Informal recreational open space**: £41.8830 per square metre
- **Natural & semi natural open space**: £21.8430 per square metre
- **Outdoor sports facilities**: £14.3025 per square metre
- **Provision for children & young people**: £166.4925 per square metre
- **Allotments**: £11.0490 per square metre

The covering letter for the concept statement submission concerning the redevelopment of Frenchay Hospital site states that the scheme intends to accommodate all types of open space on site and enable optimum accessibility for both existing and future residents.

The applicants intend to use the land south of the Lime Tree Avenue for outdoor sports provision. We would need to be assured that sufficient provision is provided in this space laid out in accordance with Sport England and Fields in Trust guidance in the correct orientation. We would also expect facilities including changing and storage facilities, and adequate parking.

All on-site provision must be laid out to maximise use and for ease of maintenance. Provision should, wherever possible, be closely related to Children’s playspaces should be laid out in accordance with the Fields in Trust guidance (FIT) and the Councils Play Policy.
Core Strategy Policy CS6 states that the Council will work with partners to deliver infrastructure, services and community facilities to improve the communities.

All new development of a sufficient scale that would add to the overall demand and impact on infrastructure will be required to provide:

- Site specific measures to directly mitigate the impact of the development
- Infrastructure, services and community facilities to mitigate its impacts on existing communities and provide for the needs arising from development

Where necessary infrastructure, services and community facilities cannot be provided onsite, financial contributions will be sought and may be necessary offsite infrastructure investment to mitigate the cumulative impact of development(s).

Core Strategy Policy CS23 states that new development will be required to provide or contribute towards additional, extended or enhanced community infrastructure where it would generate a need for such facilities, in accordance with the following sequential criteria

- Enhance the quality, role and viability of existing facilities that are within easy walking distance of the new development:
- Provide adaptable multi-use building(s) on site in easily accessible location(s) for pedestrians and cyclists.

This approach is consistent with the current approach to community infrastructure set out in Policy LC1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan.

Extra demand arising from the increase in population will lead to increased use of library stock, accelerate deterioration of stock, the range of services will be limited due to an increased proportion of the overall stock being out on loan waiting times for library users for a range of services within the reduction in availability of stock and other facilities will lead to people not using the library.

In order to ameliorate this impact the Council has requested financial contributions towards expanding library services in the area to new residents.

The Council has adopted the Museums Libraries and Archives Council (MLA) recommended standard charge approach in the Library Delivery Plan in negotiations on developer contributions. As detailed in the Library Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Council seeks £107.31 per resident based on £107.31 per 1,000 population.

£107.31 per person is based on the following costs the build costs for South Gloucestershire are based on the MLA benchmark cost figures taken from the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors. The index is made up of new builds and extensions over the whole of the country includes the following:

- Cost of constructing the library building, including space open the public, and back room space (e.g. office, store, toilets etc.)
- Allowances for design and external works, including car parking, hard standing and landscaping
- Cost of initial equipment of the building, including IT equipment and initial book and other stock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of work</th>
<th>Cost per square mean building cost for public library buildings (BCIS)</th>
<th>£1,073.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External works: car parking, hard standing, landscaping, security fencing, signage (assume 15% of build costs)</td>
<td>£2,214.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design costs (assume 15% of building and external works costs)</td>
<td>£2,214.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fitting out costs, including initial book etc stock and ICT (88% of capital costs of £1,624) £1,423.43 
Total cost per sq.m. £3,577.00

The cost of 30sq.m. of library provision at £3,577 per sq.m. is therefore £107,310 per 1,000 persons. The cost per person is therefore £107,310/1,000.

For proposed development of 550 houses at Frenchay Hospital we would expect a contribution of £144,600.23 towards Library Services.

Subject to timing of development and revenue funding contributions will be used to enhance existing local library facilities provided at Downend. The funds will be pooled and use towards the provision of new library facilities at East of Harry Stoke as stated in the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy evidence base for Library Services Dec 2011.

Public Art
Public art is a principle whereby the involvement and activities of artists contribute to the identity, understanding, appreciation and enhancement of a location. For determining applications for major new development the Council will seek the contribution of an agreed percentage of the total development cost for commission of publicly accessible art, craft and design works. It should be acknowledged that the scheme can have clear benefits for developers in terms of the quality of design and interest in a development and subsequently its value. Good design and the use of public art can create a sense of place defining and marketing a new development. Creating a sense of place where residents and legitimate users are able to go about their daily routines without fear of crime or insecurity is also a key element of Secure by Design Initiative for New Homes 2009.

The policy does not aim to add to the total cost of a development, but to secure a percentage of the identified development budget. A public art and open space master plan for which all or part of the public art budget should be developed and agreed with the council. If any of the proposed public art features in an open space to be adopted by the Council then a proportion of the public art budget should be identified for this in the public art plan and community maintenance.

Landmarks and focal points make it easy for people to orientate themselves and find their way around works of art and well-designed street furniture. The design of public spaces give identity and enhance sense of place. The work of artists should be integrated into the design process at the earliest stage. For further information on South Gloucestershire Council’s advice on art and design in the public realm, please refer to “SG Public Realm Advice Note”. For general information regarding public art and percent for art policies, please go to www.publicartonline.org.uk

Community Buildings
Frenchay is an active community which lacks a community facility able to operate as the ‘heart of the community’. A development of this size would meet the needs of the future resident population of Frenchay. The nearest dedicated community centre to Frenchay Hospital is Frenchay Village Hall, which is located at the end of Frenchay Hill and Beckspool Road, the Hall is already in need of work and would not have capacity without enhancement to meet the needs of the future residents.

Core Strategy policy CS6 states that the Council will work with partners to deliver infrastructure, services and community facilities to improve the quality of life in communities.

All new developments of a sufficient scale that would add to the overall demand and impact on infrastructure will be required to provide:

- Site specific measures to directly mitigate the impact of the development
- Infrastructure, services and community facilities to mitigate its impacts on existing communities and provide for the needs arising from the development.
Where necessary infrastructure, services and community facilities cannot be provided onsite, financial contributions will be sought and may be necessary offsite infrastructure investment to mitigate the cumulative impact of development(s).

Core Strategy Policy CS23 states that new development will be required to provide or contribute towards additional, extended or enhanced community infrastructure where it would generate a need for such facilities, in accordance with the following sequential criteria:

- Enhance the quality, role and viability of existing facilities that are within easy walking distance of the new development;
- Provide adaptable multi-use building(s) on site in easily accessible location(s) for pedestrians and cyclists.

This approach is consistent with the current approach set out in Policy LC1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan.

For this development as set out in the South Gloucestershire Core Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan Evidence Base Paper Community Centres 2011 The Council would expect a new community facility onsite to serve the future residents or a financial contribution towards improvements.

South Gloucestershire Council applies a minimum community building floorspace of 0.14 square metres GIFA per person this is inline with the standard of community building provision and falls within the floorspace standards used elsewhere.

For the purposes of calculating the cost of providing community buildings for future growth the Council has therefore assumed a build cost of £2,300 per sq.m. (including land, VAT and loose furniture and equipment). A community facility would need to be ready to and available for the community to use, so it’s a cost for loose furniture such as chairs, tables, reception furniture etc. which is in addition to the build cost. The quality and costs of these items it’s appropriate to use a reasonable figure based on local experience; we have assumed an estimated cost of £50 per sq.m. to provide loose furniture.

This gives a formula for calculating community facility contributions per dwelling as:

\[
\text{Build costs per sq.m.} \times \text{community floor space provision per person} =
\]

\[
£2,300 \times 0.14 = £322 \text{ per person}
\]

For the development of 550 dwelling at Frenchay Hospital site we would expect a contribution of £433,895.00.

Discussions with relevant stake holders will be required regarding how the community space needs of future residents are best met. There are dedicated community centre provided onsite, existing buildings could be assessed to see if any would be suitable and retained for this purpose. If the facility is retained would there be scope to provide additional community space there. Community provision co-located with the proposed onsite community hospital and/or enhancements to the village hall which is close to the site already overstretched and in need enhancement.

**Waste Guidance**

As part of the Council’s aim to improve the quality of life for residents as well as visitors and those who work in South Gloucestershire, the Council seeks to ensure that all domestic properties have adequate storage space to contain waste, including separate storage for dry recyclable and compostable material. This requirement should therefore be considered at the earliest stages of the design process and drawings submitted to the Council when applying for planning permission. Adequate storage areas for waste management facilities and good access are essential.
and vehicles can be difficult to retrofit at later stages in the design process.

**N.B.** The Council has now introduced additional recycling services for residents. (They do not yet apply to all flat dwellers.) These include a 25 litre kitchen caddy (to be stored inside the property) to ease the transition of food waste from the kitchen to the external 25 litre collection caddy.

New developments need to demonstrate that adequate provision is made for the storage and collection of waste and recyclable materials allowing:

- Householders to be able to bring their waste and recycling receptacles out to the edge of the adopted vehicular highway, primarily with the mind;
- The waste contractor to be able to collect waste receptacles without taking their vehicles across private roads and shared driveways, primarily with the mind;
- All dwellings need to accommodate storage of both recycling and waste receptacles. Internal storage areas should be provided to allow relay waste into refuse and recycling, allowing the temporary storage of waste and recycling before it can be transferred to external containers. The Manual for the Streets 2007, Department for Transport stipulates that waste collection vehicles should not have to reverse any further than 20.3m from the kerb. If the waste collection vehicle is expected to turn within the development a turning circle of at least 20.3m widths may be acceptable where on-street parking is discouraged. Swept-path analysis can be used to assess layouts for accessibility.

The Council will require plans showing the location of bin storage within private properties, the location and type of bin storage for flats and dwellings collected. Further information available on the Council website in the document: *Guidance for Developers on Rubbish and Recycling Requirements*.

**Street Lighting Guidance**

All street lighting layouts and equipment specification on new developments will require approval from South Gloucestershire Council before they receive an agreement to adopt a road as public highway.

South Gloucestershire Council street lighting policy encourages fit for purpose lighting with an emphasis on carbon and energy reductions and expectation being to achieve the British Standard with the most efficient and effective designs with minimal maintenance implications.

The *Street Lighting Policy 2008 document* is [here](#) – the two key relevant sections are 1.5 environmental impact and 2.4 lighting design considerations.

The *Street Lighting Developer’s Specification* is [here](#) – the key sections are 3.1 and 3.2 design requirements.

The planting, positioning and species selection of trees and other vegetation needs to be much more considerate of the task of designing light seen. It is important to make sure that lighting levels are retained through the life of the street and schemes take into account the species selected during the normal life of a planting scheme. The more obstructions placed in the path of the light distribution e.g. trees placed in the vicinity of lights required to meet the BS; clearly this is not conducive to low carbon or energy efficient objectives and will have a considerable impact on future maintenance costs. Lighting design and tree positioning cannot be done in isolation.
Any external private lighting also needs to be approved by the Council to ensure that it is designed according to ILE’s guidance. Energising any adopted lighting shall remain the developer’s responsibility.

Developers are free to decide which manufacturer they wish to use for private lighting, however the Council advises that the same equipment is used to keep it aesthetically consistent. The Council strongly recommends the use of a competent street lighting and traffic management engineer to submit.

Future maintenance considerations inline with Construction, Design and Management Regulations 2007, must be applied.

Lighting layouts should be designed in accordance with current British and European Standards as below:

- BS 5489-1:2003 – Code of practice for the design of road lighting – part 1: Lighting of roads and public amenity areas
- BS EN 13201-1:2004 – Road lighting – Part 1: Selection of lighting classes
- BS EN 13201-2:2003 – Road lighting – Part 2: Performance requirements
- BS EN 13201-3:2003 – Road lighting – Part 3: Calculation of Performance
- BS EN 13201-4:2003 – Road lighting – Part 4: Methods of measuring lighting performance
- BS 7671 2008: Requirements for Electrical Installations Regulations

The recommended minimum lighting levels set in the BS are considered to be target levels. Variance of these may be permitted where a balance of aesthetic and safety considerations have been considered and have been approved in writing by the Council.

All submissions must include supporting information to prove compliance with the above standards and recommendations.

Further information is available in the South Gloucestershire Council Street Lighting Developer Specification March 2010 accompanying this manual.

Lighting Engineers Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light.

---

**Affordable Housing Comments**

The Position Statement submitted by the applicants in January 2012 stated that developer contributions would be discussed further in the Concept paper reference was made to affordable housing policy including SGLP H6, Affordable Housing SPD and the Core Strategy.

The Concept Statement has not addressed affordable housing in any way, as there is no mention of affordable housing policy or provision within Frenchay Hospital site, nor whether affordable housing policy will be complied with.

The following requirements are based upon standard Heads of Terms for affordable housing which were provided to the applicant in November:

- 35% of dwellings to be delivered as affordable housing, as defined by PPS3.
• A tenure split of 80% social rent and 20% intermediate housing is identified in the West of England Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

• The Council will seek a range of affordable unit types to meet housing need based upon the findings from the SHMA 2009 shown below:

**Social Rent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Min Size m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1 bed flats</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2 bed flats</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2 bed houses</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3 bed houses</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4 bed houses</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intermediate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Min Size m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1 bed flats</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2 bed flats</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2 bed houses</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3 bed houses</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4 bed houses</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The Council will seek 5% of the affordable housing to meet the wheelchair accommodation standards as set out at Appendix 4 of the Council Supplementary Planning Document.

• This affordable housing is to be delivered without any public subsidy.

• 100% of initial occupants and 75% of subsequent lettings to be nominated by SGC.

• The affordable housing should be distributed across the site in clusters of no more than 6 units, unless a specific pepper potting strategy is justified.

• Design and specification criteria: All units to be built in line with the same standards as the market units (if higher) and to fully comply with Communities Agency (HCA) standards applicable at the time the S.106 will be signed or 6 months prior to start on site whichever date is the later. Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, Lifetime Homes standard, Secured by Design, and with full compliance of RP design brief.

• Delivery is preferred through a Housing Delivery Panel RP – the four West of England Unitary Authorities have set up the Housing Delivery Panel to deliver affordable housing across the West of England. The Housing Delivery Panel will deliver affordable housing to set WoE development and management standards and encourages the developer to work with a member of the Housing Delivery Panel, and in the event of the developer choosing an Affordable Housing provider outside this panel then the same WoE development and management standards will need to be adhered to.

• Phasing - the affordable housing should be built at the same time as the rest of the housing on site in line with agreed triggers as per S.106.
assessment on a site by site basis. Where development will proceed over more than one phase, the amount, type and tenure of the affordable housing will be set out in the affordable housing masterplan schedule approved by the Council. The AH masterplan should be contained within the specific conditions of approval.

- The Council will define affordability outputs in the S.106 agreement, without any further information regarding sales values the affordability will be:
  - social rents to be set at target rents
  - intermediate home ownership: no more than 40% of the market value will be payable by the purchaser so that the unit need of intermediate housing. It is clear that 40% equity shares represent the top slice of households that can afford the range of lower cost intermediate housing will be sought. The annual rent on the equity retained by the RP/AHP should be unsold equity.
  - any other models of intermediate housing will need to meet similar affordability levels as for intermediate home ownership
  - rented housing that will be delivered at a maximum of 75% of the cost of full market rent.
  - service charges will be capped at an appropriate level to ensure that the affordable housing complies with PPS3 (based determined)

- Social rented accommodation to be retained as affordable housing in perpetuity. Right to Acquire does not apply where no public subsidy

- Any capital receipts on intermediate housing to be recycled as capital expenditure on approved affordable housing schemes in South Gloucestershire that the subsidy increases by any capital appreciation on that subsidy.

- For further information see SPD and Appendices [http://www.southglos.gov.uk/_Resources/Publications/PTE/08/0400/PTE-08-0362](http://www.southglos.gov.uk/_Resources/Publications/PTE/08/0400/PTE-08-0362)

ExtraCare Housing

In the Emerging Themes report (January 2010) by the Frenchay Project Board it was set out how it envisaged Frenchay as a substantial health a range of services that enable adults to remain in their own home, preventing patients from being admitted to hospital unnecessarily independence after a stay in hospital.

To provide this support, it was proposed that services based at Frenchay could include:

- A community hospital providing a range of outpatient, diagnostic, treatment and therapy services with a strong focus on rehabilitation.
- Services provided by non-NHS organisations and North Bristol Trust that would be well placed in this health and social care centre.
- Potential to develop Extra Care Housing (specialist independent accommodation with a high level of personal support available at all home.

Paragraph 6.3 of the Concept Statement does refer to the Health& Social Care centre, proposed to be sited on 2.5 hectares in the know understood that consideration for the delivery of services is being made by the CCG and no definitive decision has been made , there is an ab ExtraCare proposal mentioned above.

South Gloucestershire Council remain fully supportive of an appropriate ExftraCare development in line with detail contained in the ExtraCare Frenchay Hospital site

Please note that these comments are those of an officer of the Council and will not bind the Council to any future course of action or decision.
| 26. | Environmental Health  
Shaun Fudge  
EHHO |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to commenting, I would like further information as detailed below. Without this information, I cannot make an informed decision on this application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**

At the appropriate stage in the planning process, an assessment of the likely impact of the development on air quality should be carried out by the Environmental Health Officer. The assessment should consider the impact the proposed development will have in terms of the air quality objectives described in the National Air Quality Strategy. It is recommended that the Environmental Protection Team (environmental.protection@southglos.gov.uk) is contacted for further advice on what sort of assessment.

I understand that an EIA is not required for the development. However, an air quality assessment should be submitted as part of the planning application, particularly in that the development proposal introduces significant new car parking (i.e. more than 100 spaces outside with recognised guidance published by Environmental Protection UK - Development Control: Planning for Air Quality (2010 Update) [http://www.environmentalprotection.org.uk/assets/library/documents/Air_Quality_Guidance_2010_%28final2%29.pdf](http://www.environmentalprotection.org.uk/assets/library/documents/Air_Quality_Guidance_2010_%28final2%29.pdf)

I appreciate that the Concept Statement states that there will be a lower number of cars accessing and exiting the site than is currently general. However, any potential impact on local air quality cannot be ruled out without an air quality assessment being undertaken.

I have some concerns regarding the potential impact of any changes in traffic on air quality at the Hambrook Crossroads nearby. Monitoring indicates that it is close to the nitrogen dioxide annual mean objective and any increased traffic emissions could result in a deterioration of air quality, and possibly a declaration of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The currently declared AQMAs in Kingswood, Staple Hill and Cribbs Causeway, however, are not likely to apply because of their distance from the development site.

**Contaminated Land**

The concept statement cites a Phase 1 ground investigation report submitted in November 2011 and an initial Phase 2 investigation submitted in December 2011. The concept statement notes the potential for contamination from a boiler house, chemical store, substations etc. There is an initial scope to remove made ground and soft landscaping. It is noted that it is proposed to produce a technical strategy for dealing with contamination at a future date.

A scheme to safely remove asbestos from all buildings is noted.

The desk study appears to be comprehensive and consider all the potential sources of contamination. I note the intention to undertake a further intrusive investigation and understand this may be restricted initially, due to the site still being occupied. A full intrusive investigation will however be required to produce a necessary remediation scheme in terms of the final layout of the site, once proposals for the site have been agreed.

I understand demolition of the buildings and removal of drainage systems will be undertaken by the hospital trust. Information regarding the contents removed at this stage and I would therefore recommend close liaison between the environmental consultant and the trust during these works to ensure the site is comprehensive.

**Noise**

An appropriate assessment should be undertaken and an acoustic report prepared in respect of minimising the adverse impact of noise from the development.
|   | Jo Rees  
  CYP Access & Planning Officer | In response to the Frenchay Hospital Site Concept Statement, the Department for Children & Young People would like the following points to be highlighted:

1. The Department for Children and Young People calculate contributions on the basis of 36 primary and 18 secondary pupils per 100 dwellings available. A different pupil number calculator based on the number of bedrooms is applied if the dwelling mix is known.

   Based on CYP’s pupil number calculator, a development size of circa 550 dwellings would generate c. 200 additional primary school places (the number of places will depend on the type and mix of dwellings). Existing local primary school provision in the area is oversubscribed and given national increases for primary school places is projected to increase year on year. Late applicants and movers into the area are often referred to schools nearest to their home address and currently there are few spare places across Key Stage 1. High demand for places is even more acute in neighbouring South Gloucestershire/Bristol border. Local and national figures indicate the upward trend is set to continue.

   The Council will look to secure both land and a financial contribution for the development of a new primary school. The school should be part of the development and preferably co-located with other educational/community and social facilities.

2. There is no mention in the Concept Statement of access to secondary school provision for pupils generated by the proposed development. A financial contribution to provide additional secondary places or transport to the nearest provision, may be required, particularly, given the anticipated increase in demand for primary phase places. The current primary phase will roll forward to secondary schools within the next 5 years. This will be assessed once a planning application has been submitted.

3. In line with information provided in the South Gloucestershire Council Developers Guide, it should be noted that S106 contributions will be required for Youth Services, Children’s Social Services and Nursery School provision.