

From: Matt & Jess [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2024 9:29 PM
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Objections to No.59 planning application 24/02509/PINS

[REDACTED]
Dear Applications Team,

I have been informed by a neighbour that some of the links to documents did not work in my previous email. I have gone through and checked them all, correcting where necessary - all the links in the quoted email below should now work properly.

Kind regards,

Matthew Porter

On Sat, Jul 20, 2024 at 4:52 PM Matt & Jess [REDACTED] wrote:
Dear Applications Team,

We strongly object to planning application [24/02509/PINS](#), to create a large HMO (sui generis), on the following grounds:

1. **Discrepancy in plans/number of residents:** The application is supposedly for up to 8 people, but the [Proposed plans](#) (including the double occupancy [garden room](#)) show room occupancy for 9 people, not 8.
2. **Additional discrepancy in plans:** The [Proposed Plan for the application 24/00349/CP](#) (certified 30th January 2024) shows the 2nd floor as having 1 bathroom and 2 single occupancy bedrooms. The [Existing Floor Plan for this application](#) shows the 2nd floor as having 1 bedroom, 1 "office" and 2 off-suite bathrooms. In other words, the current plan doesn't match what was permitted originally.
3. **Garden Room:** Page 9 of the [Officer Report for application number 24/00271/F](#) states: "...*The use of the former garage as a double room raises concerns*". This application has been re-submitted with no changes in this regard, so all the reasons this was originally rejected (e.g. no cooking facilities for the garden room, overlooking No.57, "...*Poor outlook and inadequate light*", etc) still stand.
4. **Noise:** The first paragraph of page 4 of [the cover letter](#) states "*The second reason for refusal related to impact on neighbours due to the high number of occupants proposed. Occupancy has now been reduced from twelve to eight, and given that this would only be an increase in two from the present situation, it is not considered harmful to residential amenity.*"

Being adjoining neighbours, we have already experienced a **significant** increase of noise since the tenants began moving into No.59, with an incremental increase with each new tenant. We regularly hear clear phone conversations coming through the wall from the tenant in the first floor front room (bedroom 5), late into the night while we are trying to sleep. We hear tenants showering at all hours of the day and night. The noise coming through from the communal kitchen/living area is particularly loud and invasive, especially when they have gatherings/guests. We have already had to speak to the tenants about the

levels of noise being made at unsociable hours, and we know that the other adjoining neighbour at No.57 has had to do the same.

This unwelcome change to our home has already taken a significant toll on our mental health, and left us with the sinking feeling that we are inevitably going to have to move in the near future. We are not only under mental and emotional strain because of the 6 tenants already living there, but we live in fear of a *suis generis* application being approved, which would pave the way for up to 12 tenants to be moved into the existing space.

As such, we **strongly** reject the applicant's assertion that an increase of 2 more residents would "*not [be] considered harmful to residential amenity*". This would in fact be an increase of 33% to the already unacceptable levels of noise and stress we are already being subjected to on a daily basis.

One more note on this subject: Despite assurances from Dr Davis that she would have sound insulation installed along the adjoining wall, we have experienced absolutely no evidence of this having been done whatsoever. We spoke to the owner of the construction company about this proposed insulation, and he explained that should it be installed it would be pretty much useless anyway, due to the thickness/type of insulation they could realistically install in this type of property.

5. **Parking:** Page 5 of the [cover letter](#) states that "*...of the six current tenants, only one owns a car*". This is false; we have observed that at least 3 of the current tenants (that we know of) own and use a car, and we have already noticed an increase in difficulty trying to park outside our house. Furthermore, if and when these tenants eventually move out and are replaced by new tenants, there is nothing stopping them all bringing a new car to the street. In fact, despite the applicant's original assurances (in their [application for a 12 person HMO](#)) that this was to be a "*car free development*" [page 8], [the property's listing on Sparerooms.co.uk](#) states that there is "*On street parking with no restrictions or permits needed*". Additionally the applicant has no ability to enforce a no-car policy and has not demonstrated any attempt to do so.

Furthermore, the cover letter incorrectly states that the church hall opposite the property is only used by local clubs, 4 nights a week. In fact, as evidenced by [the schedule on the church hall's website](#) and the attached photograph of the noticeboard outside, the church hall is in use 7 days a week, for a variety of clubs and private bookings throughout the day. We also reject the applicant's presumption that the clubs and events "*...Would most likely be attended by local children, and as such parents would generally walk rather than drive their children there.*". As residents who live directly opposite, we regularly observe large amounts of cars fighting for spaces and dropping children off in the road. The applicant has failed to take into account not only the many visitors from outside the immediate area, but also what happens in bad weather, when even local families will be more likely to drive to the venue. These same points can also be applied to parents during school pick-up/drop-off times.

The cover letter also states (on page 5) that they attach "*... A recent appeal decision at 15 Hollywood Road ... where the Inspector was satisfied that a 9-bed HMO would not generate any more on-street parking than a large family dwelling, given the pattern of car ownership in the area identified within the 2021 Census.*" This is a mis-representation of the Inspectors comments. They actually said (on page 18 of the same letter) that they were "*...Not convinced that the proposed development would generate four additional cars on the highway network*", which is not the same as saying that 9 separate dwellings would generate the same amount of vehicles as 1 large family. We also would like to point out that this 2021

census was conducted during the Covid pandemic, an anomaly that would likely have impacted people's answers re: their living situations and the number of vehicles at any one residence.

Additionally, the cover letter claims (on page 4) that "*Neighbours stated that the use of the church opposite the site, and the proximity of the primary school, resulted in parking stress, but provided no evidence*". This statement is also false; our neighbour Vicky Blackwell at No.57 submitted photographic evidence, taken around school use hours, of parking stress in the street. This was submitted as evidence under application [24/00271/F](#) but since this application has been refused, the neighbours' objections seemed to have been removed from public view.

The applicant has re-submitted exactly the same [on-street car parking stress survey](#) (dated March 2024), which again claims that "*The application proposals will be car-free*". This was rejected by TDM on 11/4/24 as the "*Parking survey does not fully assess the impact of parking at the peak parking times*", and that "*There is insufficient evidence that the impact of unrestricted parking arising from the development proposal on the local street will not cause road safety issues*". We feel that the original view of the TDM remains valid, particularly as the survey was originally conducted after 10pm. We feel it should be noted that any new parking survey which the applicant may submit between now and September 2024 will not be able to take into account additional parking stresses created by school/church term-time-only activities.

6. **Refuse storage:** Page 5 of the [cover letter](#) states that "*Policy-compliant storage (1 set of containers for every three bedrooms, equating to two sets of containers) is now proposed to the front forecourt.*" This property has had 6 tenants / bedrooms in effect for more than a month now, and they still only have one set of containers/bins, with excess refuse being left out on the street when the refuse collectors decline to take it. This assurance that they will get more bins if they get 2 or 3 more tenants lacks any evidence.

We appreciate your consideration of the above points, and we would urge you to refuse this and any further applications seeking to increase the number of dwellings or residents at No.59 Langton Road.

Yours sincerely,

Matthew & Jessica Porter

████████████████████