

**Dr Charlotte Laurence of Norfolk Crescent Green Residents' Association**

**CABINET 6.05.09 PUBLIC REALM & MOVEMENT STRATEGY (Item 12)**

I am speaking about the “suggested” footbridge to Norfolk Crescent, which has been proposed for a second time in PRMS. As members are aware, the bridge has always been a major issue for our residents and many objected when it was first proposed in BWR SPD.

Our neighbourhood is at the epicentre of redevelopment in Bath and our historic environment, listed buildings and community will be extremely affected by the height, mass and scale of BWR East and West. Many homes will suffer severe loss of light and overshadowing, especially in Grade I listed Norfolk Crescent, the south end of which is just 30 metres from BWR East.

A bridge **would harm the setting of the Grade 1 Crescent and damage the structure itself**, have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area, cause loss or harm to trees and landscape, cause loss of **residential amenity** and users could cause noise disturbance.

**All this is for a bridge of unproven need, there being two others in close proximity which could fulfil the same function.** Now PRMS introduces yet more proposals for the Green and Riverside which, when added to those of BWR and the bridge, could reduce residents' quality of life even more and render this thriving community **unsustainable**.

We were most grateful when the Sponsoring Cabinet Member for Planning recommended an amendment to BWR SPD prior to its adoption and that Cabinet approved it. The wording was that “**The case for any additional crossing would need to be demonstrated, including consideration of the impact on local residents (Local Plan policy D2).**” We request, in the strongest possible terms that **precisely this wording** is used in the PRMS and that Cabinet ensures that this applies to all approvals consistently, whether they are for PRMS as a strategy, council policy or SPD etc. The draft PRMS, we note, comments “In the case of the suggested footbridge, any proposal within this document would not override the policies in the SPD for BWR.” It is unclear whether this has the same meaning as the agreed amendment, and we request the original wording is substituted for the sake of consistency.

Thank you.