

## **RESPONSE TO 21/06933/F – 1 PASSAGE STREET, BS2.**

### **The Proposal.**

Demolish existing building for office led redevelopment of c16,000sq m up to 12 storeys in height.

### **Objection to the Principle of Redevelopment.**

Bristol Civic Society objects to the principle of this proposal which would require the demolition of a relatively modern building. We believe that consideration should be given to upgrading and extending the accommodation whilst retaining the bulk of the existing building. We ask the Council to consider whether this would be a more sustainable solution in line with its climate change mitigation objectives.

The Society lodged an objection to this application in January 2022. Although there have been some changes to the design of the building, we do not regard these as substantial. We also note that Historic England are still not satisfied with the changes.

### **Issues Raised by the Proposal.**

Whilst objecting to the principle of the proposal, the Society has considered the application and registers the following concerns:

#### **Height and Massing.**

The Society considers that the proposal is an over development of a relatively constrained site. We consider a more modest proposal should be brought forward if the Council is minded to permit the redevelopment of this site.

#### **Visual Impact.**

The enormity of the visual impact and its harm to surrounding area are clearly shown by the verified visual montages particularly views 1, 2, 7, 8, 15 and 16.

We agree with and support the views of Historic England regarding the adverse impact of the proposal on the Grade II\* Pip and Jay Church and Generator Building. Historic England state that a reduction in height would significantly reduce the impact and harm of the proposed development on these buildings.

Its impact on views of the Shot Tower is mitigated to some extent by stepping back of upper floors. Nonetheless, the visual impact of the Shot Tower would be diminished.

In addition, the proposal would overbear and overshadow the existing modest buildings on the opposite side of Passage Street.

#### **Public Realm.**

The Society is disappointed that public access to the edge of the Floating Harbour is not included. If the development is permitted, public access to the waterside should be provided.

### Accessibility.

The site is well served by public transport and so the Society would support the approach of limiting the space for car parking, and providing cycle parking in excess of policy requirements. We are not clear what provision would be made for mobility impaired staff and visitors and trust the Council will assess this to its satisfaction.