



Brief summary of the amended plans:

Overdevelopment & harm to heritage: Still too dense, too big and too high!

- Overall number of housing units only reduced from 122 to 116 - that's just six fewer and a reduction of only 5%! The scheme remains overwhelming, overbearing and densely populated.
- Only one block has been reduced by a storey and one other by the height of a ruler - 300mm! There will still be 4 huge blocks of flats up to five stories high which, along with the houses on site, are too close together, too close to neighboring houses, too high and completely out of character with a conservation area, swamping nearby two storey homes and stifling the beautiful grade 2 listed, Steiner-inspired, Grace House that lies at the heart of the site.
- Other purely cosmetic changes have little impact on the scale of the scheme. e.g. the colour of the facade on some buildings has changed.
- The council asked for a 'landscape-led' scheme but any changes to the greenery is tinkering around the edges - quite literally. Huge apartment blocks and houses still dominate this site leaving very little green space.

Traffic: No increase in parking spaces

- The new plans show zero improvement in on-site parking provision and no reliable information to support claims there won't be overspill or that if there was, it could be accommodated on the nearby roads. There are still only 65 spaces for 116 units of mainly 2-bedroomed flats.

- Developers have provided very little further information to justify the low number of on site car parking spaces. For example, they have failed to respond to Bristol City Council's request to provide a breakdown of staff parking needs across the day.
- The developers have finally accepted there can't be an access on Etloe Road for safety reasons - but it's hardly a concession as the council's traffic experts made it clear that was completely unacceptable anyway.
- But they are merely shifting the problem elsewhere and are now proposing an entrance to the site and emergency access via the Glen which would have a knock-on effect on those nearby roads as well as posing a safety risk if fire engines ever had to navigate the already overcrowded roads that lead there.

Loss of trees and Wildlife: Still too many trees earmarked for felling

- Around 40% of trees on site will still be chopped down - among them two mature trees the council arboricultural officer said should be protected because of their cultural significance.
- Fewer replacement trees are now being planted onsite as there simply isn't room for them to grow healthily between the tall buildings. They'll have to be planted off site - but because there's no suitable grounds nearby to do this - they could be planted miles away meaning our neighbourhood loses out on vital tree cover and carbon dioxide absorbers.
- We are checking the Biodiversity Net Gain claims which last time were way off. And the Bristol Tree Forum are warning we must be vigilant that replacement trees are actually planted rather than it becoming a money transaction only.

Loss of Special Educational needs provision:

- At the moment there will be no replacement school places on site to make up for the loss of this vital community asset.
- The vague offer on the table at the moment is possibly occasional and shared use of a room in what is described as an 'Urban Village hall'.
- Experts tell us this arrangement would not work from a safeguarding aspect.
- This is not the significant SEND provision which Bristol desperately needs and is an insult to the legacy of St Christopher's which served the city's vulnerable children for more than 70 years.
- As one local councillor said recently on Twitter *"There are SEND kids in Bristol desperately needing suitable provision. The St Christopher's site is a SCHOOL. Our children's needs should have priority over developers' profits."*

Lack of affordable housing:

- The developers have always argued against providing affordable housing saying it wasn't viable with their business model. Even though Bristol desperately needs homes for everyone - not just luxury properties.
- They repeatedly pushed for this luxury retirement complex to be declared as a residential care home (also known as Class C2).
- Developers have interpreted this classification as absolving them from providing affordable housing on-site.
- But we understand from other legal precedents involving similar extra care complexes, that councils can still argue there SHOULD be affordable housing on site. So we await the final legal verdict.
- Contributing to off-site affordable housing elsewhere is not an adequate alternative,

