

From: Helen Attree [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 4:38 PM
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: 59 Langton Road Bristol BS4 4ER - S62A/2024/0050



Reference	24/02509/PINS
Alternative Reference	S62A/2024/0050
Address	59 Langton Road Bristol BS4 4ER
Proposal	Application for Planning Permission for Change of use from a small dwellinghouse in multiple occupation to a large dwellinghouse in multiple occupation (sui generis) for eight people, including two bedrooms, two bathrooms, and minor demolition and external alterations to detached garage to facilitate use as a large dwellinghouse.

From: Mrs Helen Attree, [REDACTED]

To: Section 62A Applications Team, The Planning Inspectorate

I am writing to object to the Section 62A application for a change of use from a small dwelling house in multiple occupation for 3-6 people (C4) to a large dwellinghouse in multiple occupation (sui generis) for 8 people.

I was made aware of this most recent application in a letter from Bristol City Council dated 4th July 2024 which unfortunately did not include the requisite notice it stated was attached. When the notice was displayed publicly, attached to a lamp post near the property on Friday 12th July, this was undated. Therefore, from the date the notice was made available, this has given less than 3 weeks to review and submit an objection by 1st August 2024.

The numerous applications for this property, 6 in total since April 2023, have caused confusion and lack transparency. With the conflicting information, it is often difficult to understand the intent of the planning applications for this former 2 bedroom terraced family home. The most recent rejected application aimed for occupancy of up to 12 people.

My comments in objection to the application will hopefully allow me to express my concerns for this current application, and highlight what appear to be inconsistencies in the application letter submitted on behalf of the applicant by Stokes Morgan Planning, which reflect a lack of local knowledge of the Brislington/St Annes area, demonstrating minimal time spent at the property by both the owner, and her planning representative.

Excessive redevelopment

The covering letter confirms there will be no proposed external alterations (in addition to the existing redevelopment that has taken place over the past year) other than minor demolition of the existing garage, to create a further bedroom in the garage. There have been no details provided of the level of minor demolition, nor discussions with local residents, for us to understand the impact to us, and potential detriment to our properties, by this further development planned at the property. A number of properties have already experienced damage from the existing redevelopments, the level of demolition and potential impact of the development work were not disclosed.

As local residents, we have experienced substantial inconvenience over the past year by the extensive redevelopment of the previous 2 bedroom family home, and whilst the covering letter focuses on the potential need for single household accommodation, the reality in the area, is a lack of family accommodation available to rent, in what is mainly a family orientated street.

As the existing garage is an outbuilding originally built with the intention of providing storage for a car, it is unlikely that it would have sufficient insulation and damp proofing to be suitable for use as a living area without substantial redevelopment.

Stokes Morgan Planning have provided information relating to planning decisions for other properties in the wider Brislington area, which do not appear to have any similarity with the planned further development at 59 Langton Road.

17 Bloomfield Road is located opposite a Bristol City Council depot which provides parking for its employees. The local Sainsburys supermarket near the Bloomfield Road property, as well as the Black Castle public house, offer sufficient parking for their customers. Therefore, this property would not experience the same parking demands by visitors to the road, as experienced in Langton Road which is located between two schools, opposite a Church and Church Hall, none of which offer parking. In addition, I note that 17 Bloomfield Road was previously a 4 bedroom 2 reception property, and now a 7 bedroom HMO following agreed extension. 59 Langton Road differs in comparison as this was a 2 bedroom property which has been extended to more than triple the original occupancy for which the property was originally intended, in fact 4 times as many bedrooms if the garage were to be permitted as an additional bedroom.

15 Hollywood Road, again not close to Langton Road, was a 4 bedroom 2 reception property, extended to proposed 9 bedrooms. This application appears to have been rejected and the new planning application is now under consideration for a children's home, so does not appear to have any relevance to this application for 59 Langton Road.

It is also noted that neither of these applications included an intent to house residents in a garage at the end of the garden.

An inconsistency appears between 4245.PL2.03_Existing_Plans_Rev_B_Redacted.pdf supporting this application which shows 2 ensuite bedrooms on the ground floor, 3 ensuite bedrooms on the 1st floor and 1 bedroom, an office and 2 bathrooms on the 2nd floor, and the existing plans approved under application 24/00349/CP | Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a Proposed Use or Development - Change of use from a C3a dwellinghouse to a small house in multiple occupation for 3-6 people (C4). | 59 Langton Road Bristol BS4 4ER. Under this previously approved application for the current agreed 3-6 people, document Prop Plans (2) reflects 2 ensuite bedrooms on the ground floor, 2 ensuite bedrooms and a study on the 1st floor, and 2 bedrooms and a bathroom on the 2nd floor. Perhaps further development has already taken place beyond that already agreed, in anticipation of approval of this new application.

Noise

The previous approval for a dormer roof extension has caused an increase in noise experienced within my property, [REDACTED]. Although, the occupancy of this roof area of the house is unclear whether it is based on the existing agreed plans for the current 4-6 person occupancy,

or if this has already been changed to that shown on the existing plans for the proposed additional development.

If the sound proofing insulation is insufficient in the roof extension, this would indicate this is also insufficient in the main building, impacting the directly adjoining properties. Whilst the property was being developed, I had inconvenience of building noise on a daily basis on weekdays, including during anti social hours, causing me to complain. I was extremely surprised at the level of noise which was able to travel beyond the adjoining property into mine [REDACTED] having never previously been able to hear any noise from number 59. I believe this evidences that the extensive work undertaken at number 59 has severely reduced the existing sound insulation which has not been taken into consideration when arranging these renovations.

I believe this noise issue should be addressed based on the existing number of agreed occupants, and would need to be assessed fully before any consideration to increase the occupancy further. If I can hear noise even though not directly adjoining the property, then the level of noise experienced by adjoining neighbours must be unbearable. I am aware that both adjoining neighbours have already needed to raise complaints regarding noise nuisance, and there appears to be no accountability by the owner to try to resolve this issue.

Parking

The focus of this application appears to be the intent to accommodate at least one additional person within the main property which already appears to have been developed into a 7 bedroom property, also intending to use the garage as an additional bedroom (application says one person in the garage, supporting documentation indicates 2 additional occupants). Based on the parking difficulties already within the street for existing residents, it is unclear why this is not being retained as a garage to be used by one or more of the existing tenants to park their vehicles. This would allow the garage to be used for its intended purpose and not add to the existing parking issues in Langton Road and surrounding roads.

The applicant has commented that she believes only one resident owns a car, however there are at least 3 of the residents using cars and adding to the on street parking stress, even more if their guests are also travelling by car. Although the previous covering letter from Stokes Morgan referenced bus services, this appears to have been sourced from website enquiries and does not truly reflect the lack of bus services in the local area. Most residents travel by car as there is no reliable, regular public transport in the area at present.

There was a Parking Stress survey undertaken to support the previous rejected application. Traffic Development Management, whilst initially appearing to support the survey, retracted their support after realising this did not reflect the parking issues at peak times, after receiving feedback from residents. I had also explained to the team that the survey undertaken did not take place at the time stated in the results. I had offered evidence to confirm that on Wednesday 6th March, whilst the survey states this was undertaken from 22:00, this is actually incorrect as I was home before 10pm with my car parked in the street. Therefore the survey should be deemed invalid as did not comply with Bristol City Council's published methodology, by not taking place at the time stated.

In addition to the survey not meeting the prescribed requirements, this did not consider the impact of parking issues at peak times with events at the school and church, not all of which are public events so not advertised. The traffic survey also noted that residents are obstructing

our own driveways, but have not explored why we need to do this, due to the ongoing parking difficulties in the road.

It is noted that in the previous application which was rejected, although all individual objections have now been removed from the record online, in excess of 100 local residents raised objections, and my review of the key issues of these objections highlighted parking issues as the main concern based on local residents' actual experiences and knowledge of the local area. The property owner has an unsubstantiated opinion that she feels that children will be walked to activities at the church but this is not the reality, and perhaps she may wish to visit the property at these peak times to truly understand the parking difficulties in the vicinity of her property.

There is also likelihood of a further reduction of onstreet parking availability if proposed traffic safety measures around the school are implemented.

Stokes Morgan have commented that there has been no evidence provided of the parking difficulties. If it could be outlined what we need to provide, other than the previous statements of over 100 local residents, please confirm the precise requirements needed, and we will be happy to provide this to support our objection.

Refuse storage

At present, there appears to be inadequate waste collection units at the property, one black bin, one green box and one blue cardboard bag. The cardboard bag is often not collected as it exceeds capacity, similarly with the one green box for cans and plastic, and the bin has been noted as overflowing. I have photographic evidence although not included here as my photos are similar to those already supplied by other objectors.

Even if additional bins and boxes were supplied to the property, without agreed refuse management at the property, including responsibility for putting refuse onto the street for collection in a timely manner, and putting the bins/boxes back into the storage facilities once collected to avoid obstruction to the public footpath, the waste will be allowed to accumulate. This would lead to risk of vermin, creating an unpleasant environment for the tenants at the front of the property where they might experience the smell from the waste, as well as other local residents.

I have noticed that the black bin was recently left on the pavement for over a week before collection, causing obstruction to parents and children attending the local school.

I believe that the owner could arrange for more effective management of the property to ensure that these issues are not allowed to accumulate, and do not believe it would be appropriate to increase the occupancy further, causing increased refuse to accumulate, until these existing issues are addressed.

Ethics

As noted above, the intent to house an individual or couple in a garage at the end of the garden is completely unethical. The suitability of a detached garage built many years ago, with only minor alterations planned, meaning insufficient soundproofing and insulation, would be uninhabitable. I am shocked that anyone would consider this is acceptable living conditions, and the requirement to cross the garden (not covered) in all weather conditions to access the main property, is impractical.

Summary

These multiple, conflicting applications, as well as the ongoing need to spend personal time reviewing documentation and preparing objections (such as this one) are having a detrimental impact on my health, causing constant anxiety, worry and concern, and I hope that at some stage they will stop.

Prior to submitting further applications, perhaps the owner might wish to engage with local residents to understand our concerns regarding the current occupancy to provide some reassurance that these will be addressed, and offer solutions. In addition, the owner could also liaise with her tenants currently living within the property to ensure they have an understanding of Bristol City Council's requirements for refuse storage and collection (including when the refuse collection days occur and arranging responsibility for moving the bins and boxes for collection) as well as encouraging the existing tenants to consider the impact of their noise at anti social hours on local residents.

If this case does proceed to a hearing, I would be happy to attend to present my objection, including my evidence of the parking survey not being carried out after 10pm, and would also aim to gather any required evidence needed to support our objections on the grounds of parking issues at peak times (which will clearly not be possible until the schools and activities recommence fully in September).

Yours faithfully

Helen Attree