

STATEMENT NUMBER A9

Objection to application no. 21/00746/F. “Demolition of existing residential garage and erection of 2no. bed two storey mews house, with front and rear courtyards”. Amy and Richard Goodall, Clyde Mews, Bristol

We are making this objection as residents of Clyde Mews. As such we would like to first point to some inaccuracies within the report to the committee (30.06.2021) regarding Clyde Lane and Clyde Mews.

On page 1 under the site description, the wording correctly points out that Clyde Mews is adjacent to Clyde Lane but incorrectly implies that there are “existing small scale mews developments” in the latter. This is the case elsewhere in the report also, including where Clyde Lane is incorrectly cited as an example of an “intimate street of mews...set behind the principal Victorian streets within the conservation area” and where the height of the proposed development is described as “consistent with that of surrounding mews properties within the lane”. Later references to “the mews setting” on Clyde Lane are also misleading. There is in fact no such development on Clyde Lane and Clyde Mews is a separate road. There are no mews buildings fronting Clyde Lane and it is not a “mews style street” or “intimate street” but a lane providing access to other properties, principally the back of the large Victorian villas on Clyde Park and a couple of homes at the end of Elliston Road, and access to Clyde Mews which is a no through road. There are no residential properties on the side of Clyde Lane on which the development is proposed, only garages.

Whilst the principle of mews development in this part of the conservation area has been established since 1-6 Clyde Mews were built in 1989, the context of this development was rather different in that it was a former builder’s yard, with the houses replacing buildings of a similar footprint and height. Crucially, they are all 3-bedroom houses suitable for families, each with a garden, a garage and additional parking (both a separate parking space in a private car park and the ability to safely park in front of the property on the road). The proposed single property provides only 2 bedrooms, very limited outside space in the form of small courtyards, and no parking. Reference is also made to The Coach House, a more recent development at the end of both Clyde Lane and Clyde Mews. Unlike the proposed development, the former building was of the same footprint and height. Therefore, we feel any comparison is inappropriate.

We also question whether the proposed property serves to address the housing shortage in the area. This area requires additional 3-bedrom housing with outside space, not additional 2-bedroom flats, of which this house is the equivalent. We note that another recent small 2-storey development, on the site of the former bakery on Lower Redland Road, is being used as an Airbnb. Without restrictions in place, we fear this may be used for the same purpose.

We object to this development on the basis of harm to the conservation area. There is no doubt that a two-storey property on this site will significantly alter the character of Clyde Lane which currently provides an open view through numerous mature trees across the back of St Saviours Church. Far from preserving and enhancing the conservation area’s special appearance and character, this development will damage it. Approval of this application would represent a breach of Policy DM21 (Development of Private Gardens) that states that any development of garden land should not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, if this development sets a precedent, the biodiversity of the area will be further affected, with a particular threat to the magnificent London Plane tree which is a distinctive feature of the area enjoyed by many, as well as home to a range of wildlife.

We also object since it increases the risk of limiting access to Clyde Mews. Whilst we welcome the recommended condition on page 16 of the report that residents of the property

be denied the right to apply for parking permits, we question how practical this is and worry about cars being parked outside the property and causing an obstruction.