

**Proposed changes to elements of Carriageworks planning: The PG Group
response to emails to CAG/www.consultingyou.co.uk/carriageworks & direct
to Jenny Gee. Also acknowledging comments on Montpelier Group Facebook.
Feb 1st 2019.**

24 December 2018

Montpelier Conservation Group

Please reply to: Tony Mason, 104 York Road, Montpelier, Bristol BS6 5QQ

23.12.2018

Re: Carriageworks – PG Group proposed revisions of consented application 14/05930/F

We attended the Public Meeting on 28.11.2018 where the proposed revisions were explained, and the justification for them was set out. We write with our comments on the revisions.

Stokes Croft Facade and Carriageworks - We have no objection to the proposed changes to the Stokes Croft façade and the Grade II listed Carriageworks building.

Market Square - We accept the arguments for the changes to the Market Square and the commercial units surrounding it and consider the changes would improve the functioning of this area.

Block D - We recognise that the increase in height of this building is a consequence of the revisions to the Market Square, and would create an additional 2 affordable units. We understand there is concern from residents of Hepburn Road over the additional storey but are not in a position to assess the impact of the proposed change.

Response: PG appreciates the support on the Carriageworks/Stokes Croft and the Market Square aspects of the scheme. PG can also confirm that they will not be proposing an additional storey to block D.

Block A – Ashley Road facade

The need to increase the accommodation on the site was explained at the public meeting, and we recognise PG Group's concerns over the viability of the consented plans. However, the scale of development on the Carriageworks/Westmoreland House site has always been a contentious issue, so any increase in the scale of the buildings, particularly on the perimeter of the site, must be justified by a viability assessment.

The revised plans increase the façade of the building by one storey and add a further storey set back by 2 metres or so. The parapet would be at the height of the ridge of Tucketts Buildings and the additional storey higher still.

The Inspector's Report on the 2007 refused application indicated that for this part of the site: "... providing the overall height of the proposed development on the Ashley Road frontage would not be higher than the ridge of Tucketts Buildings in the west and steps down towards the Salvation Army Citadel, I find no harm from the proposal to the conservation area" (paragraph 33).

Clearly the proposed revisions fail to satisfy the Inspector's guidance.

Response: The fourth floor is being extended to align with the front of the building however, as confirmed by the Architects, Stride Treglown, the parapet of the 4th floor will be 200mm below the ridge of Tucketts Building. The 5th floor is set back by 2.5m.

We have always maintained the importance of retaining the contrast between the commercial character of Stokes Croft and the more domestic scale and character of Ashley Road, and consider that the proposed increased scale of Block A would conflict with this. It would also be a more dominant feature in views from within the Montpelier Conservation Area.

It is possible that a design which retained the consented height of the Ashley Road façade but had additional accommodation set further back could meet these criteria, but such a proposal would have to be assessed on its merits.

It is also proposed to revise the form of the Ashley Road facade, removing the strongly articulated projecting bays. We have no objection to that alteration, but consider the revised facade to be of insufficient quality for this prominent location, affecting 3 conservation areas and facing an important listed terrace across Ashley Road..

While recognising PG Group's needs, we believe that the proposed revisions to Block A on Ashley Road would cause harm to the Stokes Croft and Montpelier Conservation Areas for the reasons detailed above and we consider this aspect of the proposals must be reconsidered.

Tony Mason

for Montpelier Conservation Group

Revised plans for the Carriageworks – January 2019

Summary

I am concerned about the changes to Block A which abuts on to the pavement on Ashley Road. These are illustrated on the PG Group's consultation website -

<https://consultingyou.co.uk/carriageworks/cgis-of-ashley-road-frontage> and
<https://consultingyou.co.uk/carriageworks/revision-november-28-2018-elevations>

The computer generated imagery (CGI) used is seriously misleading for reasons I spell out below. Over many years there has been slow encroachment into the residential area adjacent to this part of Stokes Croft and there is reason to believe that approval of these changes will make further encroachment more rather than less likely.

The Carriageworks development does bring much needed housing to the area and these changes actually increase the residential aspect of the site. The PG Group is very committed to developing the site in line with the original community vision and the commercial units on the ground floor are very much a part of this vision.

The Drawings

<https://consultingyou.co.uk/carriageworks/revision-november-28-2018-elevations>

The height of the street frontage of Block A in Ashley Road will be greater than anything on the Carriageworks side of Stokes Croft. This is because the roofline is planned to be extended horizontally into Ashley Road and the road slopes away downwards along Ashley Road away from the junction.

Careful scrutiny of the changes in the 2018 drawings from the 2015 ones clearly shows, contrary to what was said in the November 28th public meeting in the Salvation Army premises, that the height of the frontage will not be the top of the parapet on Tucketts Buildings but the top of the roofline there. The roofline on Tucketts Buildings, is, of course set back somewhat.

Response: The change PG is making does bring forward the 4th floor, however the Architects have confirmed the fourth floor parapet is still 200mm lower than the Tuckett Building ridge. These are the drawings that PG shared on 28/11 and nothing has changed since then. Please remember the overall development height is considerably lower than Westmoreland House – which can be seen on the 2015 planning permission drawings.

The Computer Generated Imagery <https://consultingyou.co.uk/carriageworks/cgis-of-ashley-road-frontage>

There are three CGIs, one taken from the top end of Picton Street looking across Ashley Road; one looking east across the junction with Stokes Croft; and one looking west along Ashley Road from opposite the Salvation Army building.

1. The view from Picton Street is distorted and is consequently misleading. The width of Picton Street is exaggerated in relation to the height of Block A – look at the size of the white triangle painted on the road in relation to the supposed height of Block A which actually abuts the pavement across Ashley Road. Look too at the side of the Salvation Army building with the cross on it – that wall in reality is at right angles to Ashley Road. In fact the third CGI – the view looking west towards the Stokes Croft – shows much more accurately how the facades of the two buildings align.

Response: With the view from Picton Street we believed it was important to show the buildings and the street, which wouldn't have been possible using a standard 35mm lens. This view does use a wide angle lens 10-20mm, but it is a straight reproduction in terms of the building matching the photograph. If we had opted for the 35mm view, it would have meant not being able to see as much of the new building as the surrounding buildings would be in the way. When seen in conjunction with the other two views, it is an accurate representation of how the building works within its immediate environment.

Block A in this CGI appears brightly lit, but the new facade faces north and will always be in shadow – and the higher it is and the closer to the road the more the shadow. Looking up Picton Street it will be a looming presence and, in its 2019 incarnation, even more like a cliff edge than before.

A much better way of visualising the impact of these new proposals is to imagine walking up Picton Street from York Road and Bath Buildings. This view will be much darker than in the past and the view of the sky to the left of Block A will only emerge at the very last moment.

Response: There is also a point of view that suggests there will now be a wider skyline as the building is approx. 2 floors lower than Westmoreland House which, whilst set further back from Ashley Road, still stretched from the middle of the site all the way to Stokes Croft.

There is certainly room for discussion regarding the materials, which PG has been saying throughout the process. Perhaps a paler grey or lighter brick would be preferred?

2. The view from the Stokes Croft junction on the CGI suggests that the line of Block A will be lower than the parapet of Tucketts Buildings, whereas an examination of the drawings shows that it will in fact be higher – see <https://consultingyou.co.uk/carriageworks/revision-november-28-2018-elevations>

Response: The view is absolutely accurate from the perspective taken. The main building will not be higher than Tucketts Building and as previously confirmed will remain 200mm lower than Tucketts ridge; the setback will be taller and is clearly shown on the 2018

drawings. The proposed Ashley Road elevation is set back from that of Tucketts on the Stokes Croft corner to help open up the entrance to the new courtyard.

3. The view looking west from outside the Salvation Army building is also misleading. The sight line shown suggests that, when looking along Ashley Road to the junction with Stokes Croft there is a smooth transition from the gable end of the Salvation Army building to Block A. The wall to the right of the picture reveals exactly the point from which this photo was taken – that is to say the point at which the gable end protrudes over the new roofline which was previously set back some six feet on the fifth floor. Such a view of the new building would only be possible for a few steps walking in this direction towards Stokes Croft.

Response: The photograph and CGI are an accurate representation of what will be seen from a particular viewpoint, this is the nature of this type of representation. The aim of the CGI was to show how the building would look from a point when walking up Ashley Road. As explained on the 28th, the 4th floor has been extended to align with the Ashley Road elevation, the 5th floor is set back by 2.5m. Walking back or forward any number of paces would provide a different perspective.

4. As with the view from the top of Picton Street, such a walk towards Stokes Croft reveals a rather different gradation in the shifting sightline. There is already a considerable step up from the Salvation Army building and these proposals would enhance the cliff edge effect, which, to be clear, would mean that the wall facing the Salvation Army building would constitute a second cliff edge over and above the similar effect generated by the facade abutting the pavement on Ashley Road itself.

Response: There is a change in step up, but this has been shared and explained in detail by PG. Moving the 4th floor forward will change the relationship between the Salvation Army.

AM

25 January 2019

Resident of picton street:

Could you consider the design on Ashley road to follow that of tucketts building especially the shop fronts, even the large glass windows of the 2015 look so much nicer than the 2018 proposal. The historic parts of Stokes Croft architecture are a lot more appealing than the Salvation Army citadel. The 2018 plans seem to have a lot more low level brickwork an inviting platform for tasteless tagging & vandalism. St Catherine's court at the top of picton street is a prime example, as is the magpie.

EJ

Response: The glass windows in the commercial units of Tuckett House all have varying window designs. The Architects have followed the line of the Tucketts ground floor with the projecting reveals around the ground / first floor window bays, which will be fully glazed at ground floor, again aligning with the character of Tucketts albeit in a contemporary style.

26 January 2019

Hi there

I'm a resident of wellington lane, just off picton st. I've just seen the information about the

proposed changes to the planning permission. What is proposed appears to me to be a substantially different, more imposing building. It will totally change the character of that area and block the light coming down into the south of Picton Street.

Having a six story flat elevation looming over the street rather than the lower building with recessed balconies that was proposed is a major change. It will be one of the tallest buildings in the area and a lot uglier than the previous proposal.

Westmoreland House was set way back from the road so didn't impact the feeling of the area in the way this will, or the light coming through to the Montpelier side of the new development.

Is there a way to register our objection? Thanks and best wishes

Response: The fourth floor is being extended to align with the front of the building however, as confirmed by the Architects, Stride Treglown, the parapet of the 4th floor will be 200mm below the ridge of Tucketts Building. The 5th floor is set back by 2.5m. Whilst Westmoreland House was set back, it also extended through to Stokes Croft as shown on the 2015 Planning permission elevations attached.

Hi - I would like to register my concern about the revised plans for the block on Ashley Road.

I feel the building proposed is too high and will block light and the aspect looking up Picton Street. Picton Street is a delicate Georgian shopping street that is unique in the city. This massive block will overpower the view up the street and is out of keeping.

I understand they want to add more flats, but suggest that this added height, close to the road, is not the answer. Thank you. JA

York Road resident

30 January 2019

Hello,

I was hoping to raise concerns regarding proposed changes to block A, it looks to be a much more commercial rather than residential unit, the changes to the facade including loss of size of balcony and potential green and outdoor spaces, the frontage in the original submission was more discrete due to the recessed areas, helping break up the impact of the building, together with the increase in height at street level I am concerned it will be overbearing, at the exit to Picton Street and surrounding buildings. I understand simplifying the design enables more units and is easier to build but architecturally I feel the new proposed plans is a step backwards.

Kind regards

RS

Carriageworks Facebook page

26 January 2019

Looks like the original is the same size as the existing buildings - new one is GINORMOUS. I have a hunch they've changed it to cram in some more flats and make some more quids?

26 January 2019

Why have the proposals been amended by PG Group? My understanding of the viability assessment change is that 'reasonable' not 'competitive' returns may be expected, and that the price paid for the land is never to be used for justifying a reduction in affordable homes built. So presumably they haven't based it on this ground

Response: As demolition has progressed The PG Group has been able to more accurately assess the costs of development, which exceed original expectations. To balance this, PG has sought to increase the number of units on site in a way that has the least impact on the surrounding area.

www.consultingyou.co.uk/carriageworks website

1/12/18

Block A looks quite tricky in terms of means of egress, as it has a single staircase for about a hundred beds between floors 1-5. Some 150 people may have to use the same single escape route.

Perhaps a second regular staircase would eat too much of the footprint, but have other options been explored for a secondary escape route (e.g external emergency stairs)? What is the position of Fire & Rescue on the proposed arrangement?

Response: The Architects for the development, Stride Treglown, have considered this point in the revised designs. They have reviewed the revised design with consulting Fire Engineers FRaMS and their advice was that the single stair solution proposed would be compliant with the building regulations when used with a mechanical smoke extract system and sprinklers.

The roofs of Blocks A and B appear covered in solar panels in the overview. Are there specific practical reasons for the other blocks not to get any panels?

Response: The original planning permission for the development included a roof garden on Block D. This is no longer practical (the block is mainly affordable housing and none of the social providers wish to take on the upkeep) so this could change and I will make sure the point is made. The Carriageworks and Westmorland House (Blocks B and C on the Key Plan). Westmorland House will have solar panels but Carriageworks, being a listed building, does not.

PCM

December 5, 2018

Hi CAG

My only concern with this is that I think all blocks of flats should have two stairwells even if they can't have two lifts. This is a safety issue.

There is an access issue too – that would mean two lifts are essential if people with mobility

issues are housed in the flats. Where I live there is one lift – that essentially stops people with mobility issues leaving the building when the lift is out of order.

On an aside – If there were an underground car park I would expect it to have two access points from ground level. As it is my block on the Harbourside has only one access point to the car park. This is a safety issue in the event of a fire. We know how badly fire affected Millennium Square a few years back.

Best

H

Response: Please see above, this covers the access arrangements. There is no underground car parking.

Note: Many other comments on Montpelier Facebook pages

facebook.com/groups/373348409438870/

Response: These have been read and the responses above cover the issues raised

This information will be shared by CAG, added to www.consultingyou.co.uk/carriageworks web site and with people who have requested to be updated.

Many thanks for all the input and help from CAG in collating this document - Jenny Gee.