

## Appendix I –Detailed letters in response to consultation

Question 7 concerns about proposals.

We have in the first instance some issues about the proposed development. These are mainly about the infrastructure, not only with your site but with all four developments outlined.

These developments should have an infrastructure that is sound, workable and achievable, with well thought out transport strategies in place before any work can commence on any of the four developments.

Taking all four developments sites as a whole, it would appear that all four transport strategies and road schemes are all heading towards the existing Cumberland Basin-Ashton Vale network. Thus in my opinion this is going to cause massive problems with congestion. The present day situation is bad enough.

Rapid Bus Transport should be Cheap, Reliable and Frequent, to encourage me to use it. Heaven help us if the First Group gets their hands on this.

You are proposing a new rail station at Long Ashton which of course could be welcome if were not for the proposed new B.C.F.C. stadium. I believe this station would be 1km from the new stadium. At present B.C.F.C. supporters are prepared to park in Long Ashton village, and then walk approx 2.4km to their present stadium. Home and away fans would just google this station target it as a convenient way of getting to the stadium, and then walk through Long Ashton to and from the stadium: potentially this could have dire consequences for Long Ashton village given the past history of football supporters when they meet. Also it is very vague in your proposals if such a station would ever be built.

Taking your proposals of the two T junctions onto the A370 Long Ashton Bypass controlled by traffic lights is a non starter. This would cause massive congestion at most times of the working week. This would be before anyone reached the Cumberland Basin where the other proposed road links from other developments would merge.

I assume one of the T junctions would be the extension of the ring road from Hicks Gate, bringing even more traffic into an already congested area. The environmental impact on this area would be devastating

Question 7 cont page 2.

The proposed transport Rapid Bus Transport would be on dedicated highways as I understand, but nevertheless they eventually end up on the existing network, and then would get in the same queue as me.

It is interesting to note that Bristol City Council and Bath and North East Somerset Council have formally objected to the extension of Bristol Airport on the grounds of environmental issues.

Obviously a new primary school is to be welcomed in Long Ashton. But perhaps I am being cynical when I think that this is a carrot for the Long Ashton Parish Council or North Somerset Council not to raise too many objections to your proposals. Same as World Cup Football is a lovely spun carrot at the proposed new football stadium with Bristol City Council.

The density of dwellings is very important and your proposals of 35 per hectare could be improved upon. But perhaps once again I am being cynical when I believe that builders such as George Wimpy and Charles Church try to move the goal posts such as they did on the old University Research Station. They start a development to plan but then want to cram more dwellings, as and when new stages of the development start, and appeal and re appeal until they get their way. Under no circumstances must this be allowed to happen.

I welcome the University of Bristol vision to be able to compete as a world leader of Universities and provide the wonderful education that they give to their students, also as a major employer in Bristol.

However my vision is of untold misery and congestion for commuters in South Bristol and surrounding areas, if these four developments are allowed to continue as separate planning applications without the infrastructure in place first.

Question 7 page 3 cont.

Does Bristol City Council consult with North Somerset on such matters? Past history would suggest that this is difficult to achieve. Bearing in mind the fiasco of agreeing on a proposed tram system between Bristol Council and South Gloucester Council.

My vision would be not to have four separate developments each looking after their own interests and they all get round the table and have these consultations exercises as one including representatives from both councils.

**The environmental issues with transport and road links/systems must be in my opinion addressed before any planning permission is granted to build any new buildings/dwellings.**

I am not against new dwelling in the first instance, however I must object to your proposals including the other three until such times the above are addressed.

To: Avril Baker,

Avril Baker Consultancy,

5, Lilymead Ave,

Bristol. BS4 2BY

RE: LONG ASHTON PROPOSALS

Dear Sir/Madam,

I feel that I am unable to complete your form because I completely disagree with the concept you are trying to promote and consider that any answers to what I consider to be loaded questions will only be taken as condoning any such development. No doubt any filled in forms would enable you to put a tick in the "consulted the public box".

From past experience I would not trust any member of the University's governing body as far as I could throw them. I consider their record on the previous development is one of (to be charitable) extreme incompetence.

This nonsense about quoting the buzz words such "appropriate development" and "sustainable village extension" either supplied by you or your masters are meaningless. I believe the University's sole object is to raise as much money as it can and then as it did previously, divest itself of all responsibility for what takes place. You said that this would not happen, but I was involved in the previous development and heard what was promised. The old refectory was going to be kept as a village hall, the bungalows in Fenshurst Gardens would have bungalows adjoining them and the wall on the village main road would be kept intact. None of these happened and for which I consider the University should be held responsible and pay the Parish Council compensation for what I believe to be blatant dishonesty. They should also carry the burden of the costs incurred in the three enquiries concerning the initial development.

The idea that we would be able to enjoy green open spaces is another stupid statement! What have we got now?

The idea that a rail station would be built is yet another sop floated by I don't know who. Whose land would be taken for that? Oh yes! And they/you want to preserve the Green Belt --- by covering it with as many houses as you can cram in.

I believe that no matter what villagers say, greed by the University will talk and as in the first instance the views of any individual and agreements will be circumvented. What worries me is that there appears to be very little to stop the University doing whatever it wants. I did notice that your presentation that I attended did not mention our elected representatives or is that a ploy to by-pass them as much as possible. Surely in any such discussion you should have shown the views of the various councils. Have you indeed talked to them and discovered that their response is not what you expected? I will probably copy this letter to the Parish Council.

Well, you did ask for a response!!!!!!