

STATEMENT NUMBER A10

Objection to Application Number 21/00746/F)

6 Clyde Park, Bristol BS6 6RR

Guy Poultney (Councillor for Cotham)

I would strongly encourage the Committee to reject this application. The development demolishes a small, low garage sited in the garden of 6 Clyde Park and replaces it with a two-storey house fronting onto a section of Clyde Lane which has no other houses on it.

Parking

As acknowledged by the Bristol City Council Transport Development Management on Pg. 5 of the officer's report, *"the area already experiences parking stress due to insufficient parking, any additional vehicles associated with future residents will make this worse for existing residents in the local area."*

This development removes off-street parking spaces and adds demand for additional parking spaces. It also requires the felling of a cherry tree and an apple tree to do so, with no remaining room for on-site replacement. The suggested mitigation – plant trees elsewhere and deny any residents parking permits is inadequate.

Mixed and Balanced Community

As acknowledged in the Officer's report (on Pg. 8) – there is a huge imbalance in this part of Cotham between flats (78%) and family homes (22%). This data is based on 2011 census data – since when the problem has dramatically worsened.

The number of the family homes has been further significantly reduced by the number of HMO conversions permitted by BCC, as well as further subdivision of family homes into flats. The effect of this has been a radical over-densification with huge implications for the residential amenity of the neighbourhood. Local infrastructure has been stretched beyond breaking point, and problems with street waste, parking problems, and noise issues have become endemic.

Policy BSC18 of the adopted Core Strategy states *"...developments should contribute to a mix of housing types and avoid excessive concentrations of one particular type"* that development *"should aim to contribute to the diversity of housing in the local area and help to redress any housing imbalance that exists"*.

There is an existing dramatic imbalance which this development would clearly worsen: it reduces the volume of land designated for large family homes and replaces it with a type of

property of which there is already oversupply – adding to the existing and unacceptable problems being experienced by local residents as a result of this imbalance.

The character or appearance of this part of the Cotham & Redland Conservation Area

Policy BCS21 requires new development to *“contribute positively to an area's character and identity”* and Policy DM26 clearly states *“Development will not be permitted where it would be harmful to local character and distinctiveness”* and *“backland development will be expected to be subservient in height, scale, mass and form to the surrounding frontage buildings.”*

Policy DM27 requires that *“the height, scale and massing of development should be appropriate to the immediate context, site constraints, character of adjoining streets and spaces and setting.”*

As noted in the Officer's report, Bristol Core Strategy Policy BCS22 requires development to *“safeguard or enhance heritage assets and the character and setting of areas of acknowledged importance including Conservation Areas.”* and *“The Cotham and Redland Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2011) states that new development or infill that fails to respect the character of an area, or ignores the predominant building lines, scale, proportions, details or materials etc. can cause **serious harm** to the special interest of the Conservation Area.”*

This development would represent a further act of over-densification – resulting from the desire by developers to maximise the monetary value of every square inch of land. There are no other dwellings on this side of this section of Clyde Lane for the proposed development to be subservient to.

The development proposed adds an isolated two-storey house to a row of back gardens, sheds and small garages. While the proposed building itself may be similar to nearby properties, it entirely ignores the predominant building lines, scale and proportions of its location. It is entirely out of keeping with the existing layout, completely inappropriate to the locality, and causes serious harm to the Conservation area.

Furthermore, these threat are explicitly articulated in the Cotham and Redland Character Appraisal and Management Proposals which include as “Main Issues Affecting Residential Areas” the following:

- Loss of trees
- Loss of ... gardens to infill
- Volume of on-street parking
- Subdivision of properties into flats adding pressure to the public realm.

These problems are all directly worsened by this proposed development. The proposals also note the *“verdant character given by trees and planting in private gardens and street trees.”*

as a strength of this locality (pg. 56) and the same document observes that “*Where roads are developed on one side only the existing trees to rear gardens are a valuable feature.*” (Pg. 40). This is precisely the case here – and a strength that would be threatened by the proposed development.

Garden Loss

Policy DM21 of the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies sets out three tests for allowing development under these circumstances – none of which are met:

1) The proposal would represent a more efficient use of land where higher densities are more appropriate

Higher densities are not appropriate here. The policy concerned clearly states in its explanatory notes that this test is not met unless “the proposed development would not result in harm to the character of the area” (DM21 Bristol Local Plan Review: Retained Local Plan Policies Pg. 38). As previously noted, the locality is over-developed and has become unbalanced in terms of property types which is acknowledged as harmful under Policy BSC18 of the adopted core strategy

2) The development will result in a significant improvement to the urban design of the area

Policies DM30 and DM31 in the Site Allocations and Development Management Policies require development to “safeguard the amenity of the host premises and neighbouring occupiers”.

The proposed development emphatically does not contribute positively to the area’s character or identity, and actively harms it by contributing further to over inappropriate over-densification in an entirely inappropriate location.

3) The proposal is an extension to an existing dwelling

It is not an extension (as confirmed in the officers’ report on pg. 7)

Conclusion

I would respectfully ask the Committee to acknowledge the precedent this development would set. In this case the developer seeks to maximise the value of the property’s footprint by cramming an additional two-storey dwelling into a garden setting where it is entirely inappropriate.

The development proposed constitutes a significant loss of amenity for neighbouring properties and contributes to recognised problems of over-densification, the further subdivision of properties in the area, and the excessive concentration of smaller dwellings. It cannot possibly be said to be good design.

The development takes a discreet row of back gardens, sheds and small garages and adds a two-storey house entirely out of keeping with its surroundings. Not only is it detrimental and harmful to the character and identity of the area in its own right, it worsens an acknowledged and serious existing harm, and creates a greater potential for more harm in the future.

This has been recognised by past and present local councillors, local residents, neighbouring dwellings, local planning groups, and residents' associations. I would urge the committee to recognise the overwhelming objections from the local community and reject this application.

Yours sincerely,

Guy Poultney (Councillor for Cotham)