

STATEMENT NUMBER A7

Development Control Committee Meeting - 11.08.21 6, Clyde Park/Clyde Lane, Redland - Applicn.no. 21/00746/F

1. There is obviously a major difference between the residents who have provided a planning assessment by an experienced planning consultant, David Glasson MRTPI, which sets out reasons why the development should not proceed and also sets out reasons for refusal. This document is not referred to in the OR. Nor is the expert Heritage Assessment by Andrew Foyle, MA, which wholly differs from the officer assessment, applies all the local and national guidance and finds harm to the Conservation Area ('CA'). The matters which I refer to below come from these reports, particularly Mr. Foyle's, which reference in detail the Conservation Area Appraisal ('CAA') - which the OR does not.

2. As Mr. Foyle finds, this development does not safeguard or enhance the Conservation Area but harms it and is contrary to policies BCS22 and DM21 and the NPPF.

3. The fundamental point made by the OR (see pp. 1 & 10) is that "*The overall principle of mews development in this part of the conservation area is ... already established*" and therefore residential development in the gardens is acceptable. It is, with respect to the Officer, a basic misunderstanding of the character of the area. No dwellings have so far been built in the gardens of Clyde Park properties; nor have they ever been there historically. The earliest OS plan of 1884 shows no mews dwellings in gardens. It shows a stables/coach houses block (not dwellings) on the site of the present modern houses at the end of Clyde Lane, thus avoiding the need for stables in individual gardens. These modern houses replace a 20th century commercial development.

4. There is good reason why dwellings should not be built in the gardens. This part of the CA has a "*particularly verdant character*" and is "*rich in trees*" (CAA 7.1.6j & 7.1.6t). Glimpsed views "*add greatly to [the CA's] special interest*"; these include views to and from private gardens and along the rear building line to front and rear elevations, roofscapes and landscapes (CAA 6.2.10). These qualities remain today. The proposed development is harmful to the Conservation Area and the CAA and these qualities and its special interest because:

(1) Development in gardens and loss of views across and through gardens (CAA p. 49 – says: this is seen as a weakness and a threat to the CA). The CAA describes threats: "*Continued or increased loss of gaps between houses through development in side plots and gardens preventing views and reducing verdant character.*" It adds to the threats: "*Loss of views through gaps between houses and gardens being developed.*" (CAA, p. 49 – emphasis supplied). Unfortunately, this development is an example of these threats and the harm to the special qualities of the CA.

(2) A 2-storey house will significantly reduce and encroach on views to St. Saviours Church* both from Clyde Lane and from the Elliston Road (north) terrace which are Unlisted Buildings of Merit. The CA appraisal by Andrew Foyle shows these are harms which should be avoided. *(CAA lists as a Building of Merit: Community and Cultural Landmark - 7.1.6 & 7.5.3).

(3) It ignores a careful appraisal by the expert heritage architect, Andrew Foyle, (none was provided by the applicant) which identifies harm which is not outweighed by any benefit.

5. In short, and regrettably, the OR has not correctly assessed the character of the CA here. There is not now and never has been "*any overall principle of mews development*" in this part of the CA and so the development will not appear as a '*subservient traditional mews property*' [OR, p. 12] because there are no such properties in these gardens. There are no, and never have been, dwellings in the gardens - hence they cannot be '*traditional*'; still less is a 2-storey dwelling, which replaces a garage, '*subservient*'. The development is contrary to the CA Appraisal with development in a garden with loss of views and verdant character; harm to the views of St. Saviours Church; and as a result there is obvious harm to the CA – which merits refusal.

Peter Wadsley

